

India

FOR THE

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, APRIL 28, 1899.

[REGISTERED AS A PRESS... 2D NEWSPAPER. BY POST, 2/6.]

No. 69. NEW SERIES.
No. 183. OLD SERIES.

Notes and News	205	The Budget and the Sugar Bill ...	212
The Quarterly Review on Lord Elgin's		Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji at Dewsbury	212
Viceroyalty	208	Indian Affairs in Parliament:	
Indians at the Town of Court	209	Special Report	213
Our London Letter	210	Public Meetings on Indian Que-	
Chronicle of the Week	211	stions: The Work of the British	
Letter to the Editor: An Indian on		Committee	215
the Sugar Duty Act	212	Advertisements	216

NOTES AND NEWS.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON, as will be seen from his reply to Sir William Wedderburn's question on April 20, still declines to free Sirdar Natu and his brother from the restrictions imposed upon them under Regulation XXV of 1827. Two months ago (INDIA, February 2, p. 97) we described the nature of the present restrictions. The Natus have been released from prison, but they are still confined to one district; and their immovable property being attached, they have to live on a monthly allowance doled out to them by the Government. Even the sturdiest apologists of the Government's policy find it impossible any longer to defend this cruel and meaningless restraint. The Anglo-Indian *Times of India* put the matter very clearly and fairly at the beginning of the year:—

The unexplained and as it to-day seems purposeless restraint which is imposed upon them cannot last for ever, and unless the Government are able to satisfy the public that there are grave reasons of State which require that two men who are permitted to roam at will over a whole collectorate shall be debarred access to their homes and estates elsewhere, they must be prepared for a withdrawal of the tacit and patient confidence with which many of us have until recently regarded their action in this matter. We ourselves seriously doubt whether it is possible to say to-day, as we said in March of last year, that Government might be trusted not to take up the Regulation of 1827 as a plaything. It was as a serious and, as we believed, necessary weapon of social defence that they took it in hand in July, 1897. Who will say this to-day, when this formidable weapon is employed merely in confining to a particular district a couple of men who for nearly a year past have not been deemed dangerous enough to be kept in goal, and in depriving them of their property when it is no longer thought necessary to deprive them of liberty?

Lord George Hamilton takes refuge in the phrase that he has "no intention of interfering with the discretion of the Government of Bombay." We must say plainly that this seems to us a really disgraceful piece of hypocrisy. Does any sane man imagine that the Government of Bombay on its own initiative either arrested the Natus in the first instance or still keeps them prisoners of State? Has not Lord George Hamilton admitted that the arrests were made with his sanction? If he wishes to avoid the inference that it was he himself who was responsible for the use of the obsolete Regulation of 1827 he must present to Parliament the correspondence which passed upon the matter between the India Office, the Government of India, and the Bombay Government. His pretext for the present restrictions upon the Natus is "the interests of public tranquillity and order." But, as the *Times of India* says, "if so light a restraint as confinement within the limits of a spacious collectorate is sufficient to make these men harmless to the State, they cannot now be very dangerous persons." Lord G. Hamilton says that he has information that Poona is not tranquil. What is the nature of his information, and whence is it obtained? Does he not realise that he is in a singularly bad position to offer vague assurances of this kind to Parliament and the public, seeing that his present amended pretext for the detention of the Natus follows two other pretexts which, as they were not vague, were promptly rebutted? It is melancholy and humiliating that the rights of British subjects should at this time of day be capable of being impaired in this fashion and with so little chance of redress.

We take the following statement of the case from the *Morning Leader* of Saturday last:—

The *Spectator* is justly indignant to-day at the suggestion or theory

No. 17. VOL. XI.

that, revision being refused, the French Government will pardon Dreyfus on condition of his not returning to France. "It is needless to say," the *Spectator* thinks, "that this monstrous compromise will satisfy no one." We cordially agree. But how is it that the Englishmen who are following with such genuine and proper interest the progress of the "affaire Dreyfus" in France, so completely ignore our own Dreyfus case—we mean of course, the case of Sirdar Natu and his brother? These men, like Dreyfus, have been condemned and deported. Unlike him, they have not had even the semblance of a trial, and they have not been informed of the nature of the charge alleged against them. When they were suddenly arrested at Poona a year and nine months ago, and imprisoned without trial, Lord George Hamilton assured the House of Commons that this violent proceeding would "lead to the unravelling of the plot which had been formed" to murder Lieutenant Ayerst and Mr. Rand. It was illegal in any case to employ the Regulation of 1827, for the detection of murder; and, unfortunately for this theory, it was soon shown that, in connexion with the crimes referred to, there was no plot to unravel. The actual murderers were arrested, convicted, and hanged, and the hasty theory of conspiracy was destroyed. But that did not daunt Lord George Hamilton. He suggested another theory (2) that the Natus had resisted the measures to combat the plague. This charge, even if it had been proved, could not have justified recourse to measures so summary. But so far was it from being proved that the contrary was established by means of correspondence which had passed between Sirdar Natu and the plague authorities. This precious afterthought having also been disposed of, Lord George Hamilton fell back upon (3) another formula—that the Natus could not be released until it was certain that they could not endanger public tranquillity. He still sticks to this formula which, it will be seen, is so vague and general that it cannot easily be dealt with. Therefore Sirdar Natu and his brother, after nearly two years, without trial and without knowing the specific ground of accusation against them, are still subject to restrictions upon their persons and their property. No wonder even a "robust" Anglo-Indian journal like the *Times of India* at length rebels and takes Lord George Hamilton severely to task. The restrictions upon the prisoners have to some extent been relaxed. But they still remain prisoners of State, though the very relaxations which have been allowed are inconsistent with a serious belief that to release them wholly would endanger the public peace. It is high time that the public at home grasped the meaning of this "monstrous compromise" and brought Lord George Hamilton to his senses.

A remarkable letter signed by "Englishman" was published in the *Statesman* of March 26, on the subject of the ill-omened Calcutta Municipality Bill. The writer states expressly that the Bill involves grave political danger, and goes on to say:—

If this Municipal Bill is passed into law, I do not hesitate to say it will give rise to an amount of deep resentment and heart-burning throughout the whole of educated India, such as the authors of the measure little dream of. It will create a bitter race feeling between European and Native that will not soon die out, and that will throw back the progress of the country for a generation of years. I believe it to be impossible to exaggerate the sense of alarm and distrust of the Government's motives and intentions that the Bill has aroused.

The writer speaks from the environment of Calcutta. The *Champion*, which speaks with equally intimate knowledge of the other side of India, declares that "nothing that the Government has done in recent years, except perhaps its Poona policy, has alarmed people anxious for good government so much as this wretched Calcutta Municipality Bill." It would be very strange that two independent observers at opposite sides of the country should have felt compelled to take such serious views of public opinion on this Bill if there were really nothing in it. We think their views are only too well grounded, and well worthy of the attention of the authorities.

The form in which the first access of trouble will fall upon the Government is clearly indicated by "Englishman":—

If this Bill is passed in its present form, let me warn the Government of what will happen. The people are acute enough to see through the flimsy pretence, whereby under a cloak of zeal for Municipal reform it is sought to deal a death-blow at the policy of local Self-Government, to deprive their representatives in the Corporation of all power, reducing them to the position of mere cyphers; and they will simply withdraw from the Municipal administration of the City in a body. They will, in fact, boycott the

Corporation, and, with not a single Native Commissioner, the whole Municipal administration of the town will come to a standstill.

It is not easy to see what other course is open to a self-respecting Native gentleman, however anxious he may be to perform his civic duty. There is no obligation to submit to gratuitous slights. How the Government is to carry on the local administration of Calcutta without the co-operation—the willing and zealous co-operation—of the best citizens we do not pretend to understand. As the *Champion* points out, the Government found insuperable difficulty in this policy at Karachi, and eventually had to give in. Something of the same sort happened at Bombay in the plague. Perhaps Calcutta will furnish the decisive lesson.

The other day we remarked how the *Hamburgischer Correspondent* has its eye upon the British administration of India. Now there has come into our hands the *Berliner Tageblatt* of April 17, where we find an article by Dr. Karl Blind on "India as an Unknown Country" (*Indien als Terra Incognita*). Dr. Blind recalls a conversation he once had, many years ago, with a distinguished English statesman, now deceased, in which the latter, according to Dr. Blind, displayed the most astonishing ignorance of our position in India. The statesman would not hear of the possibility of fresh external or internal troubles, resting his confidence on the strength of the British occupation. Pressed by Dr. Blind to estimate the numbers of English in India, he put the figure at 3,000,000, and was somewhat aghast when the learned Doctor brought it down, on the authority of official statistics, to a modest total of 114,000 Europeans. "Of course," adds Dr. Blind, "this friend of mine had to take part in the Cabinet in decisions upon the fate of India. And this experience with him by no means stands alone. I have heard many well-known politicians and journalists, not to speak of educated people generally, display in private conversation the most incredible ignorance of the number of the inhabitants and the English military force in India, as well as of the races, languages, and religions of the country." Dr. Blind mercifully acknowledges brilliant exceptions. But the general fact remains that "not only the mass of Englishmen, but even prominent statesmen, trouble themselves surprisingly little about India." One more than usually well informed statesman once remarked to Dr. Blind: "In our great Asiatic Empire we have rather in an accidental sort of way stumbled upon greatness."

Dr. Karl Blind imagines that we may also stumble out of such greatness. He sets out in the *Tageblatt* the main points of Sir William Wedderburn's address at the Liberal Forwards Club, and gives marked credit to Sir William for his single-minded efforts to prevent his countrymen from making that bad stumble. We do not care to anticipate what German readers will think of our Parliamentary treatment of the Budget of some three hundred millions of people, or of the sketch of Lord George Hamilton's qualifications to govern "this immense Empire." Our high Indian officials will be interested to learn that Dr. Karl Blind regards Sir William as a "philanthropic and upright man," and declares that he is doing "a useful work in persistently pointing out the shortcomings of the Indian Government." In the address in question Dr. Blind says Sir William "gave expression to many a bitter yet wholesome truth." We repeat, on Dr. Blind's authority, a strange story about Mr. Gladstone. An Indian of high rank, who was visiting at Hawarden, asked the great statesman—after he had been three Premier—what he thought of the annual National Congress. "Ah, I see," replied Mr. Gladstone, "you mean what do I think of these meetings about infant marriage," and at once launched out on the question. "Gladstone," says Dr. Blind, "had not known anything about the National Congresses." But surely there must be some misconception at the root of this story?

There appears, as we have more than once observed, to be something in the wind forecasting an official modification of views respecting Chitral. On April 13 Reuter telegraphed from Simla that "owing to the peaceful state of affairs on the frontier, the despatch of Chitral reliefs, which were ordered to proceed thither in May, has been countermanded." There is room for criticism of the cause

suggested for the effect; but that may pass in the meantime. Then on April 15 "A Correspondent"—not "Our Correspondent"—telegraphed to the *Times* from Allahabad mentioning "a number of more or less alarming rumours" in consequence of the countermanding of the reliefs, and suggesting as the "true explanation" that the change of policy arises from Colonel Thorburn's report "upon the fortifications and the barrack accommodation and other needs of the garrison." That may be; but it does not matter in the least what peg the Government choose to hang their policy upon. As the *Pioneer* remarks, "there appears to be some lack of forethought in these arrangements, and the sudden change of plan has certainly caused uneasiness on the frontier." We shall be glad if this puzzling shiftiness turns out to be the Government's strategic plan of returning to rational views and practice by withdrawal from the wilds of Chitral.

It is with much regret that we record the death of Colonel Sir Robert Warburton. It was he who controlled the Khyber Pass from 1879 down to a short time before the recent outbreak of hostilities. Very probably, if he had not retired, he might have been able through his extraordinary influence with the tribes to modify in material ways the actual course of events. This influence may in part have been due to the fact that the Colonel was himself half an Afghan. In 1842 his father volunteered as one of six officers to go to Kabul as hostages; and on his return he brought with him an Afghan princess, a near relative of the present Amir, whom he married, and who became the mother of the redoubtable warden of the Khyber. Warburton's methods were thoroughly sound. The basis of his administration was conciliation and justice, and that was how he contrived to keep the Khyber on a Kafilā day as safe as Hyde Park on a Sunday afternoon. The newer methods of aggression and menace, which seek not peace and friendliness but scalps and decorations, cannot be expected to lead to such satisfactory results as distinguished the administration of the great Warden of the Marches.

Dr. Sarat K. Mullick, in a letter to a recent issue of the *Saturday Review*, very properly castigated a previous correspondent of that journal, who, while speaking up for the Eurasians, thought it necessary to run down the pure Indians. Dr. Mullick rightly accepts the ground of equal chances for Eurasians and pure Indians, and Anglo-Indians also for that matter. "The Indians," he truly points out, "have ever urged that there should be no favour shown to any section. They stand by the Royal Proclamation, which gave to her Majesty's subjects the same rights and privileges regardless of caste, or creed, or colour." That is the sound basis. One can only be amazed at a writer who can, at this time of day, talk about "unscrupulous native agitation"; why, native agitation cannot afford to stultify itself by being "unscrupulous" even if it wished to do so. Nor is it very easy to attach a meaning to the wild complaint of "government resolutions dividing the civil administration into sections being called for by the demands of reckless agitators." When a man does condescend to be definite, he ought to be accurate, especially in accusation. "Expenditure on native high education," he says, "appears to have proved disappointing." Appears? Where and how? Dr. Mullick answers:—

Perhaps Mr. Madge will graciously permit Lord Curzon to be his equal, if not his superior, as regards the educational question. The Viceroy stated the other day that he was glad to find that education had made great progress, that it had left its mark on the different Services, which had risen both in intellectual tone and moral level, and that they compared most favourably with the Services in Great Britain.

Only the other day we had also the weighty testimony of Sir Antony MacDonnell at Allahabad. No; there is value for the money. What is disappointing in the matter is that the "expenditure" is so low.

It is surely a pity that the *Hindu* should have good ground for the remark that "the ways of British officials in Native States seem to be uniform in being oppressive and unreasonable, and in being intolerant of criticism besides." The comment arises on some correspondence in the *Bombay Gazette*, which sets forth the extremely arbitrary

treatment of a pleader, Mr. D. C. Fernandez, of Kirwar, by Colonel Wray, the political agent in Kolhapur. It seems that Mr. Fernandez has been deprived of his *sanad* to practice before the Kolhapur courts, for the ostensible reason that he "is found to have submitted to the Bombay Government petitions about some groundless allegations against the Durbar." There is a lack of clearness and definiteness here; and the alleged grounds, in any case, appear to be extremely puerile. We quote the *Hindu* :—

Mr. Fernandez in his petitions to his Excellency the Governor of Bombay states that on October 5 last Colonel Wray, the Political Agent, sent for him and asked him peremptorily if he was the author or concerned in the letters appearing against him in the columns of the *Bombay Gazette*, and that on being told in reply that the best course would be to ascertain it from the proprietor of the newspaper, Colonel Wray required him to clear the point at once, delivering his sentence almost in the same breath to the effect that his *sanad* had been taken away. Another petition addressed to the Private Secretary to the Governor narrates the story of the Durbar deputed special detectives to watch the movements of the person and to report the names of all who may have anything to do with him. The joint action of the Political Agent and the Durbar seems to be most unjustifiable, if the version of Mr. Fernandez is correct, and if at the same time no better reason is assigned for the persecution than the one now published.

There is but too much truth in the *Hindu's* remark that the "official element in Native States, whether Indian or European, has an aversion to face the light of day, and the easiest and the commonest solution of questions that might cause the authorities the slightest annoyance is to burke all enquiries and issue summary orders." But this is hardly the height of statecraft, to say nothing of common honesty.

The Madras Government has circulated a Memorandum on the Madras Land Bill "as modified by the majority of the Select Committee sitting at Ootacamund," "for the information of the remaining and the newly-added members of the Committee with a short note of the main changes made therein." It seems unfortunate that the Committee should be broken up in this fashion by the exigencies of holidaying at Ooty. However, there is some sign of grace in turning out even a little Memorandum. For one thing, we think it is wise to cut out the English legal terminology, so far as it is not pretty strictly applicable, for it certainly "tends to prejudice or obscure the true relations which subsist between the zemindar and the rayat"; English land law having been made assiduously in the interest of the English landlord. Para. 10 is this :—

(10) On the analogy of the Punjab Tenancy Act and other recent "rent" legislation the sole jurisdiction over all suits or applications relating to fiscal or revenue matters and over matters in which such questions are inseparably mixed up is conferred, not on the Civil Court, but on the Collector and the Board of Revenue. This section declares that all suits for the recovery of arrears of land-revenue shall be heard and determined by the Collectors in a Revenue Court and no Civil Court shall take cognisance of them, while in chapter XVI further provisions relating to jurisdiction and procedure are made.

This proposal is thoroughly bad. It is a gratuitous piece of blundering into a wrong principle. It is practically making the collector judge in his own cause. The collector is the official who gathers in the rent, and he is the last man that ought to be entrusted with judicial jurisdiction over "suits or applications relating to fiscal or revenue matters." We hope this point will be revised thoroughly, and the jurisdiction vested in the civil court alone.

In an able and suggestive article in the new number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* on "The Indian Civil Service as a Model for Cuba and the Philippines" Sir John Jardine cites with approval a passage from "Some Notes on Java," by Mr. Henry Scott Boys, late of the Bengal Civil Service. Referring to India, Mr. Boys says that "the denationalisation of the land, which from the time of Lord Cornwallis till the present day has been more and more completely effected, has resulted in the aggrandisement of a class of wealthy landlords and middlemen at the expense of the cultivator of the soil, and we have surrendered that splendid position as owners of the land which enables the Dutch to appropriate for State purposes the whole rental of the country and to insure that that rental shall always be so moderate in amount as to enable the peasant to pass his days in comfort and without care."

Upon this passage Sir John Jardine remarks :—

That Mr. Boys is right in his estimate of evils is shown by the

trend of our legislation. The Executive Government has of late years changed its policy and done much to save the ignorant peasant owners of land from being ruined by their own imprudence at the hands of money-lenders, whom our earlier laws empowered to sell the fields on mere decrees for debt. In such matters the Executive has wisely listened to the Judges of the High Court, who had long ago, carefully and cautiously, applied the milder rules of English equity to soften the rigour of the British Indian statutes. America has drawn largely from the same fountain of justice, and the works of Chief Justice Story are authorities in India. The original sin lay in the civilians seeing Indian affairs with English eyes, and carrying European notions into Indian practice, as Mr. Thackeray wrote in 1807, in a comment on Lord Cornwallis's permanent settlement of Bengal. In Mill's "History," bk. vi, chapter v, is found the story of that blundering reform of 1789. It was opposed by Warren Hastings; and even Sir John Shore tried to limit it to a ten years' term; but Lord Cornwallis "avowed his intention of establishing an aristocracy upon the European model," and so the unearned increment of the fertile Gangetic plain was made over to a set of tax-collectors, the Zemindars being mistaken for lords of the soil. It was only by good luck the result of delays, that the extension of this policy to Madras was prevented. From my own experience as a Secretary to Indian Governments, I incline to the view of Sir John Shore, that the grievous misunderstandings of that time were due rather to ignorance of Bengal and its people than to what Mill calls the aristocratical ideas of the aristocratical personage, then Governor-General.

That is an interesting sidelight upon the demand for an extension of permanent settlement. But it will be seen that Mr. Boys speaks of the Dutch insuring that the rental "shall always be so moderate in amount as to enable the peasant to pass his days in comfort and without care." There is all the difference in the world between that policy and the repeated and excessive enhancements of land revenue by the Government of India, which drive the rayats to the money-lender as to a deliverer.

An Anglo-Indian correspondent writes :—"The labours of Hercules were twelve. So are those of Lord Curzon—as selected by himself. His Excellency has already knocked one off the list, if we are to take seriously the feat thus recorded in last week's telegrams: 'The Viceroy has sanctioned the construction of 250 miles of tramway railways with a gauge of two feet six inches in the districts north and south of the North-West Provinces.' It may be thought a very small matter to write that single word 'sanctioned' as an Order in Council; but the preamble would be long that described the objects and reasons waiting for the Viceroyal hint to strike the balance. For this decision was only the finishing stroke to what has evidently been one of those protracted administrative controversies which the departments in India carry on for months or even years on end. The dispute has been whether the gauge of two feet or of thirty inches should be adopted for the 'future light frontier railways' and on lines for hill districts. The telegram went on to attach special significance to this apparently small matter of 250 miles in the North-West Provinces, for it is assumed that this decision may apply to two or three thousand miles of this class of light lines. These are to include probably a thousand miles long demanded by the military authorities, to be carried along, not across, the Punjab frontier from Kohat and Kashalgarh down to the Beluch border. That the 'forward' men should find themselves constrained to be content with a thirty-inch gauge may be taken as one amongst other incidental indications that there is still maintained the resolve taken by somebody early last year, that expenditure connected with trans-frontier schemes shall be restrained somehow—until the next scare.

"It may be said that the difference of six inches between the two gauges proposed for these special lines was scarcely worth twelve months of written debate. But it may be noted that the difference is one-fifth, and as this applies not only to capital cost, but to economy in working, the advocates of retrenchment had a strong case. It will also be noted that Lord Curzon gave himself no time to consider the case, but forthwith 'sanctioned' on the higher scale. This may be typical of much that may be expected from the new Viceroy as he knocks off the remaining eleven special 'labours' he has chosen. During his cometary career as a 'talking Viceroy' one negative quality has been made abundantly clear—namely, that he is one of those men in whose composition the conception of financial restraint has no place. For the new Viceroy this idea does not exist. The cue will serve as guidance for those who in India will anxiously watch the out-turn of his lordship's 'twelve labours.'"

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW ON LORD
ELGIN'S VICEROYALTY.

THE new number of the *Quarterly Review* contains an article which by its narrowness of view and rancorous prejudices recalls the worst days of that ultra-Tory organ. It is calculated to bring the people of India into contempt, and to stir up ill-feeling between Mahometan and Hindu. If an Indian journalist had used similar language, in some parts of India at all events, he would without doubt have been promptly invited to attend before a Press Committee. The article purports to be a defence of the policy of Lord Elgin, but he would, we are sure, be the first to repudiate the tone of his self-constituted champion, which in fact is in marked contrast with the conciliatory and kindly spirit of the late Viceroy's farewell speech in Calcutta. The article contains some serious misstatements of fact. In the first place, it is said with regard to the new law of sedition that "the amending Act did no more than bring the Indian law into exact accordance with the law of England, while providing equivalent safeguards for the liberty of the subject." It has been shown on several occasions, both in the House of Commons and in the columns of INDIA, that this statement is untrue, and it is not necessary that we should repeat the argument here. Secondly, the writer states that "the Calcutta Municipality allowed the metropolis to fall into a disgraceful condition, when, by the withdrawal of the mercantile and British element upon it, the administration was left entirely to Brahmans and writers." Our readers are sufficiently familiar already with the facts of the case. It is enough to point out that the success of Sir John Woodburn's plague policy in Calcutta was entirely due to the fact that the whole business was left by him in the hands of those very elected Commissioners of the Calcutta Municipality to whom the *Quarterly* reviewer thus insultingly refers. Thirdly, it is stated with reference to the Poona murders that "subsequent events have shown that the assassination of the two British officers was the act of a fanatic, in pursuance of an organised conspiracy among a certain set of Mahratta Brahmans." This is entirely misleading. The original theory, which attributed the murders to an "organised conspiracy," has been discredited by the avowals of the participants in the crime. Everybody now knows that the Poona murders were acts of personal revenge, the work of "larrikins," and completely devoid of political significance.

One is not surprised that the writer of this article in the *Quarterly* should make a bitter attack on the Indian Congress. "With the catchwords of *fin-de-siècle* Liberalism in his mouth," the Congressman is described as "at heart a hide-bound Conservative." The object which he has in view is to get employment under the Government. He belongs to a class which "grows more and more detached from the rest of the community, and tends to become a hierarchy of that unhealthy description which culminates in the Tchin of Russia," and so on. One cannot but suspect that in the view of the writer the head and front of the offending of these members of Congress is (to quote the high authority of Sir Richard Garth, late Chief Justice of Bengal) that 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 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." Such critics as this reviewer either cannot or will not see that the Indian Congress is the embodiment of the aspirations of the new India, and that, whether we like it or not, our duty is (as Sir Charles Dilke has well expressed the case) "to learn how to live with what is commonly called the Congress movement—namely, with the development of that new India which we have ourselves created." Next, the reviewer discusses what he calls "a recent development of the campaign in the field of religion—a movement set on foot by the literates on the very indefinite issue of the welfare of the cow, the sacred animal dear to all Hindus. . . . The direct and inevitable consequence of this propaganda was the occurrence of riots in several parts of India." But the reviewer ought to know that, unfortunately, religious disturbances in India are no novelty. They have occurred from time

to time in many places and on many different occasions, both before and since the establishment of British rule. Moreover, as regards some of the riots to which reference is made—namely, the riots in Bombay—the Governor, in a letter to the Secretary of State, reported as follows: "The Cow Protection movement is not a new one. We hesitate to adopt the opinion that this movement is the principle cause of the riots in Bombay." When will official critics realise that those who take part in religious riots in India are the poorest and most ignorant classes, and that, here as elsewhere, the prudent policy for English rulers is to secure a good understanding with educated India?

The reviewer then passes on to consider the system of public instruction in India, which (he says) "diverted to purely class interests is, like Frankenstein's monster, getting beyond control." We are not informed upon what foundation of fact this extraordinary statement is based. Certainly there is not anything to support it in the third quinquennial review of the "Progress of Education in India," which was issued only a few weeks ago. It is no doubt true that private resources in India are offered with much greater promptitude to support secondary and higher education than to promote elementary education. But this is no new development. It springs almost inevitably from the social organisation of the people. It was officially recognised in a despatch as long ago as 1859, shortly after the assumption of dominion by the Crown, and it was expressly on this ground declared therein to be desirable that the State should take upon itself directly the duty of elementary education. The blame, therefore, if blame be due, should be laid at the door of the Government. It is perfectly certain that, while vast sums of public money have been spent upon wild-cat adventures beyond the frontier, the service of elementary education has been starved. At the same time it would be most unfair not to recognise that great progress has been made. In the last Decennial Report it is pointed out that, "however small may be the proportion of the literates in a community, there is scarcely a single caste group in India of any numerical importance in which there are not some persons who can read and write. Now, a generation or two back this could not have been said of more than a small fraction of such groups. The education of the country, such as it was, was concentrated to a far greater extent than is the case at present in the priestly, writing, and trading castes, and popular secular education was unknown." One might strengthen the case by many quotations from the report on education just issued but as they were cited in INDIA a week or two ago, it is unnecessary to repeat them. Let us, however, add to them one fact, noticed with satisfaction by the Delhi inspector, that "more boys than formerly are now content to remain at their homes and their hereditary callings after passing the Upper Primary Examination, which is not only a hopeful sign for village education, but must be a decided gain to the community affected." The reviewer devotes considerable space to the frontier policy of Lord Elgin, which he thoroughly endorses. Now the bane of the new frontier, or rather trans-frontier, policy was the well-founded alarm created in the minds of warlike and independent tribes by the making of roads and the establishment of British posts within their territory. As Colonel Hanna has well put the case, "the Afridis began to tremble for their independence since by our seizure of the Samana range we had come to threaten their true right, and, by our occupation of positions in the Swat Valley, the true left of the Mohmands, whose subjugation would give us the command of the Khyber." It may be reasonably hoped that recent events have taught the Government a lesson, for the declaration made by Lord Curzon in his speech at Lahore on March 30 last—"my desire is to respect tribal independence"—if it meant anything, was in effect a condemnation of the policy adopted by his predecessor. But the reviewer does not wish that Lord Elgin should be judged by the way in which he dealt with "these casual alarms and excursions." He says that the work done in preparation for future measures ought to be taken into account, and he assures us that the late Viceroy impressed his personal influence on many branches which directly concern the material needs of the masses. And he concludes with a very fair and legitimate plea on Lord Elgin's behalf: "The *negative* side of a Viceroy's character (he says) has to be considered. 'What's done we partly may

compute, We know not what's resisted.' A little ray of light was shed on this subject in the Viceroy's farewell speech at Calcutta."

INDIANS AT THE INNS OF COURT.

LORD RUSSELL OF KILLOWEN struck a true note in his remarks on the teaching of Indian law students by the Council of Legal Education as reported in our last issue by Mr. C. M. Thacker. Speaking in Gray's Inn, where as our correspondent states there are somewhere about a hundred Indian students, the Lord Chief Justice of England asked what the Council of Legal Education had done or was doing for the professional instruction of these gentlemen in the laws of their own country. One of his auditors promptly exclaimed "Nothing," and unfortunately he was only too near the fact. Probably enough the Council has its answer ready, and there will be some expectation now to see what it is, for it is not to be anticipated that so responsible a body will pass unheeded the serious suggestions of so eminent a critic as Lord Russell. It is not for outsiders like ourselves to profess any esoteric knowledge of the high things of legal education, yet there are certain broad aspects of the situation that lie open to the public, and on some of these it seems desirable that we should, tentatively at least, formulate some opinion.

In the first place it occurs to us to doubt whether the Council of Legal Education is keeping quite abreast of the times. Perhaps we ought rather to say that the Council knows there is something that should be done, but does not quite see how to set about it. We do not know whether it has called in expert opinion to assist its deliberations. If it did see its way clearly—and it is precisely here that the shortcoming probably lies—the Council, we do not for a moment doubt, would hasten to make the requisite arrangements. As all the members of the Council are representatives of the different Inns of Court we take it that they are men of considerable standing in their respective Inns and men also, for the most part at least, in tolerably busy practice. It is just possible—though we may be wrong in the suggestion—that the claims of their briefs may leave them but little time for any comprehensive study of their special duty as members of the Council. It is just possible also—though we may again be wrong—that there may be among them some little tendency of the successful practitioner to undervalue all teaching other than the teaching of actual experience at the Bar. But we will put aside these possibilities, and assume that they all have a single eye to the provision of the best possible theoretical—and, as far as may be, practical—instruction of the young men preparing for Call. Now recently the Council did in fact establish a lectureship or readership in Indian law. They appointed as reader Mr. H. Cowell, whose Tagore lectures on Hindu law have been well known for a quarter of a century, and who no doubt lectured with great ability. Yet the lectures were discontinued after a year or two, simply, if we remember rightly, because the Indian students did not attend. The Council may recall these facts and claim a verdict of acquittal. The Lord Chief Justice thinks they ought to have given the course a longer trial, and therein he is probably right. The same fate, we believe, also befell a course on Roman-Dutch law for South African students in the very capable hands of Mr. Mackarness. It is plain then that the Council sees its duty, but somehow has failed to hit upon the means of successfully discharging it.

We look at the question in this way. The Imperial problem has caught the Council of Legal Education, and is demanding solution from the standpoint of the Bar. If we look back a generation or so we find that students of law from India were then coming over in ones and twos and threes; now they are coming over in boat-loads; and as education progresses in India—and all the more so if prosperity should return—the future will bring them over in still larger numbers. To-day, Mr. Thacker tells us, there are a hundred Indian students at Gray's Inn, which has had a run of popularity recently; Lincoln's Inn and the Middle Temple give hospitality to a good many more, and the Inner Temple to a smaller contingent. Altogether there must be something like a hundred and fifty Indian students in the four Inns. The precise figure is of no real

moment. If there were less than half as many they would still be a sufficiently large body to consider. The Council and the Inns may say that they do consider them, that they teach them—or offer them teaching at least—and examine them and "call" them. And so they do, but the duty is not discharged with the efficiency that Indians have a right to expect.

The point, we think, is this. The work of the Council of Legal Education, as we understand it, is laid out on the fundamental principle of preparing the students to enter on practice, with a certain minimum of theoretical competence. So far good. But the whole scheme of study is framed with a view to prepare men for the practice of the English law in England. Every Indian student who is called to the Bar has gone through the mill for the Bar in England. But that is not his object at all. His object is to practice at the Bar in India. The time has come when the Inns may be expected to recognise that the flocks of Indian students should be prepared for the work they mean to do, and not for other, however excellent, work, which they have no intention of ever doing. The Imperial position of England imposes upon the English Inns of Court a new duty which practically should add a fresh wing to their palace of studies. The thing is to look at this special group of students and say, "What is the proper course of study for these men in view of their future professional work?" The answer gives at once the scheme of their educational training.

To come to particulars. It is clearly necessary that the Indian students should all be required to answer satisfactorily in Constitutional Law and History, and Legal History, Indian as well as English, and in the Elements of Roman Law and Jurisprudence. These are common foundation subjects, in which the standard ought to be kept high. But when we come to the modern law subjects, it seems obvious that the Indian students ought to tackle them from the Indian side. They have their own Contract Code, Penal and Criminal Codes, and Evidence Code. It is on the lines of these codes, therefore, that they ought to be taught every one of the subjects embodied in them. Inasmuch, however, as they will use English Case Reports in everyday practice, it should be an instruction to the Indian Reader to call their attention to important points of divergence between the Indian and the English law. The English Law of Real Property should perhaps be thrown out bodily; it is not of the smallest use to Indian students, except as a mental gymnastic. It is crammed only to be forgotten the day after the examination. We are not quite sure whether Equity is not important enough to be enforced in the same examination with the English students; on the whole, one would hardly suggest any alteration on that point. In place of Real Property, which is about as absurd a study for an Indian as Chinese metaphysics, there might be substituted a stiff course of Hindu and Mahometan law. It would be a great improvement if the last suggestion alone were practically realised. But it is to be decisively insisted upon that whatever is put under the head of Indian law shall be compulsory for Indian students, whether as an independent additional subject or as an option. The first reason for the failure of the Indian Law Readership was the fact that the subject was purely voluntary, and additional; the student could be called without it. That man is a lazy animal is a working hypothesis of certain sciences. The Indian student is a man.

Incidentally, we may remark that Lord Russell's reference to the teaching of Sir Raymond West at Cambridge and of Sir William Markby at Oxford assumes it to be on all fours with the teaching of the Inns of Court. But these Cambridge and Oxford courses do not belong to the scheme for the degree; they do not count for the Bar; they are specially directed, if we mistake not, to the preparation of candidates for the final examination for the Indian Civil Service. The Students are thus mainly, almost altogether, Englishmen, who are going out as civilians. These classes are analogous to those of Professor Neill at University College; and we believe Professor Neill has as many students as Sir Raymond West. But what seems needed at the Inns of Court is a similar course within the compulsion of the Bar examination, and open to Indian students as counting for call to the Bar.

One point more. The Reader should be a man of recognised Indian sympathies. We are not sanguine enough to say that he must be a member of the Indian National

Congress; and we should be extremely sorry to see a Reader abuse his position as a law lecturer to give utterance to political opinion in any shape or form. But the fact remains that, as in the administration of the law, or of the plague, or of the famine, so in the teaching of law or in anything else, the fundamental thing is that the teacher be in sympathy with the Indians. Sympathy is the master-key to the Indian mind. It is a subtle influence that forces itself in everywhere in practical dealings. One is rather ashamed to have to insist on such an elementary matter of practical policy, but the different constitution of the pushful Englishman allows us as yet no alternative. The English appeal to the bare sense of material advantage finds little response from the idealistic Indian; and the best work must be got out of him by the appeal to which he does respond. The Lord Chief Justice, happily, has clearly seized the situation, and his sympathetic tone has gladdened many an Indian heart. As becomes his commanding office, he will, we are assured, exercise his great influence with the Council of Legal Education in the right direction; and we are tolerably certain that the Council only need to see the right way in order to walk in it. The Indians, we confidently anticipate, will soon have reason to congratulate themselves on the generous recognition of their undoubted claims. The Council of Legal Education is very far from likely to allow itself to fall into the slough of discredit that has overtaken the law schools of Bombay and Madras. We shall watch with much interest and hope the development of the question so sympathetically and opportunely brought to a point by the Lord Chief Justice of England.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

(FROM A PARLIAMENTARY CORRESPONDENT.)

MR. MACLEAN has been very much in evidence again since I last wrote in connexion with the Indian sugar bounty question. He is a man of wide and varied knowledge and of grim and deadly determination, and as such he is likely to give poor Lord George Hamilton more than one awkward quarter of an hour before this business is over. Of course he knows, just as many others know, the reason why the Government keeps postponing the day it has promised for the discussion of this subject. That reason is simple and sufficient. Lord George is engaged in sending urgent, not to say frantic, telegrams to Lord Curzon, in a praiseworthy attempt to gain a little elementary acquaintance with the subject. There is about this all the proverbial pathos connected with a good man struggling with adversity. The necessity of some reliable information on the part of the Indian Secretary has been made apparent during the week, for only the other day Lord George committed himself to certain figures as regards the extent of the exports of sugar in the shape of sweetmeats and confectionery from this country to British India. Mr. Maclean doubted the accuracy of the Ministerial statement, and so the hon. member spent a busy morning in the City collecting facts, and he took the precaution to get his figures guaranteed by the Board of Customs. Armed with this further information—which, by the way, was flatly contradictory to Lord George's statements—Mr. Maclean put further questions. The Minister stuck to his point, as Ministers will. Mr. Maclean thereupon protested, and the Speaker of course intervened on the ground that no member must argue a point at question time. The member for Cardiff has many good qualities, but meekness and patience are not among them, and he asked with some heat whether, when a member has facts certified by the Board of Customs, he is to sit still when those facts are contradicted by a Minister. Some of the less manly of the Tories began to shout "Order" with great gusto—especially those who sat just behind Mr. Maclean, whereupon the hon. member turning round said he could not hear what the Speaker was saying owing to the noise, and he would therefore cross to the other side, where perhaps he could hear better; and he solemnly stalked across to the Liberal side amid the cheers of those who had been calling him to order. The incident ended by the Speaker's suggesting that any fresh facts which Mr. Maclean had to bring forward should be incorporated in a fresh question. Since then the President of the Board of Trade has had to explain, with more or less success, why in our official returns of

exports jam and confectionery are put under the heading "Pickles" (!), while another question gives the foreign trader a broad hint as to how to evade the sugar bounty in India by shipping from an English port under the British flag.

Late on last Thursday night I heard one of the most effective speeches I ever listened to in the House of Commons. It came from Sir William Harcourt, and the Liberals for more than half an hour were left roaring with laughter and cheers as this veteran parliamentary gladiator trailed the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Balfour, and Mr. Goschen in the dust. A year or two ago Sir William developed an irritating trick of hesitation, of "hum-ing and haw-ing" as he spoke. There was none of that in his onslaught on the Budget on Thursday. Argument, joke, invective followed each other with a rush, and the speech was delivered with all the "go," the action and energy and resounding emphasis of a trained parliamentary orator. It is an old saying that the House loves one who shows it sport, and it rose at Sir William with enthusiasm. That chamber can at times be about the most dull and dreary place imaginable, but when it is crowded and roused late at night, when you see grave, portly, more than middle-aged gentlemen leaning back and shouting at the glass ceiling like schoolboys in the football field, when there are thundering cheers, rattling choruses of counter-cheers, and literally bellows of "Oh, oh, oh," and every cry known to Parliament—then I doubt whether there is any place on earth equal to the House of Commons. And all these conditions prevailed on Thursday last. I was glad to see Sir William's triumph for I have always been a believer in him. Of course, the Tories tried to make out that Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman was jealous. This is the merest nonsense. Sir Henry is a man whose character and fine temper raise him above any such paltry feeling.

During the past week the House has lost its Father—that is to say the member who had sat in it for the greatest number of years without a break. This, of course, does not necessarily imply that the Father is the oldest man, but Sir John Mowbray who passed away full of years and of honour on Saturday last was 84 years of age, and I do not know any other hon. member who is over 80. The previous Father of the House, Mr. Villiers, had ceased to attend its sittings long before his death. Indeed he was a mere tradition to most of the members when he died. Not so with Sir John, who was in the House on Budget night, shaking hands with his friends as genially as ever. He had taken a very active part in the life of the House, too, for years, for though he seldom spoke he held the important office of Chairman of the Committee of Selection, and therefore had much to do with the everyday work of Parliament.

I doubt if anyone could have hated Sir John Mowbray even if he tried hard. There was such a charming mixture of the antique courtesy of the old school with the utmost geniality, and such a complete absence both of pomposity and of the querulousness which sometimes accompanies extreme age, as to capture everyone. The friendships of Parliament are not formed on party lines by any means. Sir John was an old-fashioned, steady convinced Tory, representing that least democratic of all constituencies, the University of Oxford. Yet he "took to" John Burns, the ultra-democrat of Battersea, directly he entered the House fresh from the turbulence of Trafalgar Square and the noisy triumphs of Hyde Park. And I have heard John Burns say more than once that Sir John Mowbray was the finest specimen of a Briton in the House. Such men and such friendships introduce an element of sweetness and light into the heated and murky atmosphere of parliamentary life.

On Monday the Government—and for Government one may in this case read Mr. Chamberlain—made its latest proposal with regard to old age pensions. It is that another Select Committee should be appointed to enquire into the subject. I know nothing more shameless than the way in which this subject has been dangled before the eyes of the ill-informed voter at elections. Mr. Chamberlain's speech on Monday was a most deplorable performance, and one which must have excited a feeling akin to despair in any man who hopes that honesty and moral backbone are still to be found in our public men. It was really pitiable to hear him juggling with such poor explanations as "I never made any promise, I only made

proposals. Now a proposal is merely a suggestion for discussion. I have only tried to popularise the subject"—and so forth and so on.

Of course there was no lack of laughter at all this, and in a sense it was, I suppose, amusing. But there is another aspect to the case. The thing would be disgraceful enough in connexion with any subject, but when I think of the deluded poor, who thought that at last someone had arisen to see that after a life of hard and self-denying toil, they should have something better than the workhouse to which to look forward, I cannot help feeling disgusted by such "smartness." I would sooner fail to gain a single vote rather than achieve an overwhelming triumph by such low and unworthy tactics. And the people of India may be sure that a party which does not scruple to palter with the hopes and aspirations of the poor here at home, is not likely to be much moved by the wrongs and sufferings of those who are thousands of miles away, and are without direct representation in the House of Commons.

CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

THURSDAY, April 20.—In the House of Lords, Lord Russell of Killowen called attention to the pernicious practice of giving and receiving illicit secret commissions, and presented a Bill on the subject. Its object might be briefly stated as an effort to check, by making them criminal, a large number of inequitable and illegal secret payments, all of which were dishonest and tended to shake confidence between man and man and to discourage honest trade and enterprise.—In the House of Commons consideration of the Budget was resumed in Committee of Ways and Means, Sir William Harcourt making a masterly attack upon the Government's proposal to cut down the repayment of debt.

The marriage of Lord Crewe and Lady Peggy Primrose, the younger daughter of Lord Rosebery, took place in Westminster Abbey, which was crowded. The Prince of Wales, the Duke of Cambridge, and a very large number of distinguished people were among the guests. The Rev. Dr. Butler, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, and the Dean of Westminster were the officiating clergy.

Professor O. M. Edwards, of Oxford, was selected as the Liberal candidate for the representation of Merionethshire, in the room of the late Mr. T. E. Ellis.

FRIDAY, April 21.—In the House of Commons the consideration of the Army Estimates was resumed in Committee of Supply.

Mr. Cecil Rhodes was one of the speakers at a meeting at the Mansion House in support of the social work of the Salvation Army. He testified to the good work done by the army in South Africa and subscribed £200 to the funds. Lord Aberdeen, Lord Monkswell, and Lord Justice Rigby were among the other speakers.

The *Vaterland*, the leading Clerical organ in Vienna, published an article in which, *à propos* of the Samoan difficulty, the writer attributed most of the difficulties of the Continental Powers to the "Shylock" policy of Great Britain and to American competition. He regarded the Anglo-American combination as already superior in naval and economic strength to either the Dual or the Triple Alliance, and advocated united action by all the Powers of Continental Europe against it.

Among other deposition of witnesses in the Dreyfus case published to-day by the *Paris Figaro* was that of Major Forzinetti, who was Governor of Cherche-Midi prison, where Dreyfus was imprisoned before his trial, and who expressed a strong conviction of his innocence.

SATURDAY, April 22.—Sir John Mowbray, one of the representatives in Parliament for Oxford University, and Father of the House of Commons, in which he had sat since 1853, died at his London residence. He was in his eighty-fourth year.

Mr. Goschen, speaking at Sheffield, referred to the more peaceful outlook now as compared with October last, when the pressure of his duties prevented his being present at the Master Cutler's feast. It was not for him to say whether the preparedness of the Navy had anything to do with the change that had come over the situation. Dealing with the question of the propriety of the expenditure on our military and naval armaments, he declined to regard it as a question of party politics. Those who attacked our naval policy believed in the peaceful disposition of other countries, but insisted that we were aggressive. They did not know what the colonial policy of Germany and France now was; they scarcely knew what our own colonial policy was. The old theory of the "right and tight little island" was almost exploded, because we now had frontiers in so many parts of the world, and every British citizen must adapt himself to these new conditions. Another school advocated the erection of granaries to secure our food supply, but our security could rest on only one basis—the supremacy of the sea, which this country had always claimed, and must, under all circumstances, maintain.

Captain Coghlan, of the United States cruiser "Raleigh," in a speech at the Union League Club of New York last night, repeated a dialogue he said he had heard between Admiral Dewey and a German officer who came to the Admiral with a complaint from Admiral Diederichs during the blockade of Manila last year. Admiral Dewey said that the German ships must stop when he said so, and that the slightest infraction of his rule would mean only one thing, and that would be war. Captain Coghlan repeated this statement this evening. He received a sharp official reproof from the Secretary of the Navy and was ordered on board his ship.

MONDAY, April 24.—In the House of Lords the Board of Education Bill was read a second time.—In the House of Commons Sir W. Walrond moved for a committee to consider and report upon the best means of improving the condition of the aged deserving poor and of providing for those of them who were helpless and infirm, and to inquire whether any of the Bills dealing with old-age pensions and submitted to Parliament this Session could with advantage be adopted. The motion was agreed to.—The House went into Committee on the London Government Bill.

Captain Coghlan's speech at New York had, according to the Berlin correspondents, created a very bad impression there; but the German press generally showed a desire not to exaggerate the importance of the incident.—A New York correspondent said it was reported from Washington that the German Ambassador had entered a formal protest against Captain Coghlan's attack on Germany, and that Mr. Secretary Hay replied that, while he disapproved of Captain Coghlan's language, and cherished the friendliest feelings towards Germany, it was for the Navy Department to deal with its officer, the matter being one for discipline, and not for diplomacy. A court-martial on Captain Coghlan was expected.

TUESDAY, April 25.—In the House of Commons the London Government Bill was further considered in Committee.

The tercentenary of the birth of Oliver Cromwell was celebrated in London by a sermon preached by the Rev. Dr. Parker at the City Temple, and a meeting held in the same building in the afternoon, at which addresses were delivered by the Rev. S. Hooking, Mr. J. C. Rickett, M.P., the Rev. Dr. Horton, Mr. Lloyd-George, M.P., and others. A meeting was also held in the evening.

A deputation representing the Peace Crusade waited in London upon M. de Staal, the Russian Ambassador, who was to act as the Czar's plenipotentiary at the International Conference at the Hague. The deputation was introduced by Lord Monkswell, and among the other speakers were the Hon. P. Stanhope, M.P., Mr. T. Burt, M.P., Mr. G. J. Holyoake, and Mrs. Jacob Bright. M. de Staal, in his reply, said the presence of that deputation was a precious and unmistakable evidence of the sympathetic echo in England to the elevated thought which had inspired the Czar. England's co-operation was an important condition for the satisfactory fulfilment of the task committed to the Conference. Many different opinions would undoubtedly be expressed, and therefore one could not know beforehand what might be the result of the deliberations. He hoped, however, that they would succeed in making a serious step in the right direction—a step in the cause of equity, humanity, and peace.

Lord Kitchener had arrived at Berber after a camel ride of 800 miles through the Eastern Sudan. He found the country much ruined, "but the people were everywhere thankful for their release from the Dervish rule." Of course.

WEDNESDAY, April 26.—In the House of Commons, on the motion of Mr. Gordon, the Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland) Bill was read a second time by 177 votes to 122.

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman was the guest of the Eighty Club, and, in responding to the toast of his health, said the plain facts about the financial proposals of the Government were that their expenditure had outrun their income in spite of the marvellous growth of the latter, and therefore there was a deficit in the current year, which the Government proposed to meet by reducing the charge for the reduction of the Debt. That charge had been imposed to maintain the credit and reputation of the nation, and to keep a reserve for the emergency of war or for any exceptional necessity. Now, we were to lose something of the high character of this country in the financial world, to break in on an established policy supported by the authority of our greatest financiers, and to set up a fatal precedent, in order to save £180,000.

It was understood that the Government had decided to contribute, in the form of a yearly subsidy, the full amount which they had been recommended in the report of the Pacific Cable Committee to guarantee for the construction of an all-British cable from Vancouver to Queensland and New Zealand.

The following gentlemen were called to the Bar on Wednesday last:—Syed Mohammad Amir and Kashi Prasad Munshi of Lincoln's Inn; Pherozshah Behramji Malabarji of the Inner Temple; Francis Xavier de Souza, I.C.S., and Kalikrishna Wood Bonnerjee of the Middle Temple; and Bhagat Ram Puri of Gray's Inn.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR.

AN INDIAN ON THE SUGAR DUTY ACT.

TO THE EDITOR OF "INDIA."

SIR,—I am pleased to see that the Indian press is not unanimous in its approval of the Sugar Duty Act. This fact encourages me to appeal to my countrymen not to commit themselves to any attitude with regard to it till they have more fully studied the question in all its bearings. I can fully sympathise and understand why many Indians are loud in their praise of the new tariff. They see with regret that some of the native industries are decaying year by year, and have welcomed the measure as one likely to protect one of them from going to ruin. But the old order of things must pass away to give place to new. We Indians must recognise that while the introduction of Western civilisation, with its new methods and weapons of commerce and trade, has brought many advantages to India, it has also brought some disadvantages—only the gain is greater than the loss. A long residence in this country and my acquaintance with its economic problems convinces me that this duty on imported sugar, while it benefits a few refiners, would, in the long run, be to the disadvantage of the masses of India. It may seem at the outset that the tax on bounty-fed sugar will benefit the Indians. So did the farmers in England think in the early part of this century when foreign wheat was competing with home-grown wheat, and what was the result of the corn laws? The condition of the farmers who were ground down by the landlords, was just as bad as before, and the people were dying for want of bread. When railways were introduced into this country, the men working the stage-coaches prophesied that there would be no horses in a few years, and that the work of the stablemen, saddlers, etc., would come to an end. What is the truth? There are now more horses, more saddlers, stablemen, etc., employed than at any previous time. Any measure that tends to increase the price of a commodity will be to the disadvantage of the masses; or, stated in other words, anything that cheapens a commodity has a tendency to further industrial development all round—this is one of the first principles of economics. The dangers of the sugar duty to my mind are:—

1. It introduces the principle of protection. There is no use in quibbling over this fact. The new tariff is protective. Once this principle is admitted, where will it end? This is a serious question.
 2. It is not a temporary measure, but permanent. It was not called for because of any deficit in the Indian revenue.
 3. By this Act the price of the native unrefined sugar is bound to go up, and thus while few are benefitted the masses of Indians will sure to suffer.
 4. It will act as a check upon industrial development. It will take away any stimulus to manufacture better and purer sugar, and thus make Conservative India more conservative still by helping it to cling to coarse and ancient methods.
 5. If the Government were sincere in their desire to help sugar industry in India, their wisest course would have been to increase facilities for the establishment of sugar refining plant and to encourage the cultivation of beet, for which India affords such immense scope. But protection is no real help. It is turning back the hands of the clock with a vengeance.
- The very fact that the true and devoted friends of India in England—both in the press, in the House of Commons, and elsewhere—are alarmed at the passing of the Sugar Duty Act, and are convinced that India has ultimately nothing to gain by it, ought to make my countrymen pause and think before they decide and speak in its favour.—Yours etc.,

CHOWRY MUTTU, M.D., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P.
Gladsmuir Road, Whitehall Park, N.

THE BUDGET AND THE SUGAR BILL.

[FROM AN INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

BOMBAY, April 7.

The principal topic of the week is the debate on the Budget. The *Pioneer*, as usual, had its sneer at honourable members who indulged in "manuscript eloquence." Thereby hangs a tale which might as well be told for the unenlightened. The procedure in the Viceroyal Legislative Council is that each member speaks sitting instead of standing. It is fancied that a stately dignity, befitting that august assembly, or rather Cabinet, is thereby imparted to the senators. Again, the juniors speak first and the seniors afterwards, the Legislative Secretary arranging the order in which members should be seated. Lastly, there is an unwritten "mandate" that each member should write out his speech beforehand, early, in time to enable the Financial Department to have the speeches printed. On Budget debate day each member gets a few copies of his speech. The Finance Minister, of course, gets a copy of the printed speech of each and every member. Members then read out their printed speeches in their turn. Having had all speeches before him, the Finance Minister has,

of course, touched on all points criticised by the members. It is a kind of reply in which he has the last word. Then comes the turn of the President. He too reads out his printed speech. Lord Curzon followed that practice. He boldly held his speech before him and read it out in ringing tones. There was no affectation that he was making an eloquent impromptu speech. So that the *Pioneer's* sneer is absolutely unworthy of a journal which knows perfectly well what the practice of the Council has been for years past.

As the speeches will be all before you I need not refer to them. But you will notice that there was one ominous declaration from the Whilom Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. Mr. Chitnavis had appealed to Lord Curzon to retrench military expenditure, whereupon the Viceroy replied that he could not acquiesce in any reduction of the number of British soldiers in India. No such proposal would form part of the programme of the Government of India during his time. Here the Jingo "Imperialist" unmasked himself. Let the Liberal party, especially Mr. John Morley, take note of the word. Nor was his lordship at all happy in his finance. He showed that he had yet to learn the rudiments of it. And as he will no doubt wish to win his spurs in foreign diplomacy, it is more than doubtful whether he will ever live to master Indian finance or Indian economics. He lustily re-echoed the cry of the India Office and the official classes of the country, in his reply to the deputation of the Municipality at Simla. He repudiated the statement that India was being "bled." Ignorant Viceroy! Little did he know, when in Hamiltonian strain he essayed to denounce "perfidious" Indian orators on your side, who have been striving their best to show to the British electors the other side of the shield, that the words are a quotation from his great *Guru* or master, Lord Salisbury. But of course, Viscount Cranborne, as Secretary of State for India, was altogether a different personage from the Marquis of Salisbury, the Prime Minister of England.

That little bluster before the Simla Municipality gives no augury of any radical change in Indian finance. We are therefore left to the tender mercies of Mr. Clinton Dawkins. It remains to be seen what miracles he will achieve. For we know that his predecessor, just retired, has achieved a wondrous one. It is this—that after imposing customs and cotton duties, and after a large growth in the normal revenue, he has just managed to give us a net deficit of one crore during his five years' administration.

Lord Curzon made another vigorous pronouncement touching the "Simla Exodus." To all his pompous rhetoric one short reply may be given. The judges of the Bengal High Court have more hard brain-work to go through from day to day during the most trying period of the year (May and June) than all the members of the Government of India put together. But they do not yearn for Simla. And if such judges can manage to live in Calcutta it is idle to seek to justify the annual migration in the eyes of the British public.

Lastly, a word about that intensely selfish piece of legislation—the Sugar Act. The Indian publicists have never well informed themselves in this matter. With the official materials before them they have never cared to study the real issue. The *Bombay Champion* and the *Calcutta Power and Guardian* have proved to the hilt that India has not been able to compete with the imported sugar. Let the cost of production diminish and there may be some chance of India competing with the foreign article. At present the situation is this. Against 4 oz. per head of Indian refined sugar consumed per annum, there are 18 oz. of the imported article, of which nine have been contributed for the last couple of years by the bounty-fed commodity. There is official correspondence to prove that the whole legislation has been manufactured in response to the Bengal Chamber of Commerce egged on from behind by the Mauritius merchants. It is not a fact that Mr. P. M. Mehta, of Bombay, agreed with his colleagues in the Imperial Legislative Council. He could not vote "Aye" because he said there was no evidence before the Council to demonstrate that there has been any injury yet done to the Indian sugar industry by the imports of bounty-fed sugar. Class-legislation is still rampant in India as it was a hundred years ago.

MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI AT DEWSBURY.

The following report of the meeting addressed by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji at Dewsbury on Thursday, April 20, is taken from the *Dewsbury Reporter*:—

Under the auspices of the Gladstone Liberal Club a meeting was held on Thursday night, when an interesting address was delivered by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, ex-M.P. for East Finsbury. There was a large attendance, and the chair was occupied by Mr. John Bell, the president of the club.

At the outset, Mr. Wright read a letter from Mr. Mark Oldroyd, M.P., addressed to Mr. Bardsley. The writer said: "I am glad to know that the committee of the Gladstone Club are taking a real and practical interest in political education. Mr. Naoroji's address is sure to be full of interesting matter on a subject in which the public take a most inadequate interest. It would have given me great pleasure to have been present at the meeting, but I cannot well return to Dewsbury so soon. I have to be there a

week later, but hope to be in regular attendance here until the 28th. I trust the meeting will be a really successful one, and that the late "member for India" may have a gratifying reception. You are at liberty to make whatever use of my name you may think fit in connexion with the meeting."

Mr. NAOROJI, who met with a flattering reception, pointed out that the intimate relations between England and India extended over something like 200 years. The question was whether these relations had been thoroughly satisfactory to both parties or not. They were informed on the one hand that the advent of the British in India had been a great blessing, and that India had enjoyed security to property and life, the extent of which she never before dreamed of. Innumerable other blessings had been bestowed upon them, and therefore they should be grateful and in every way satisfied with the connexion. Unfortunately life was true, and the other part was untrue. Law and order had been introduced by the British, but the question was whether the security of life and property was worth anything to them if they had no property to secure—(laughter)—and their life was but one of starvation. Mr. Naoroji then proceeded to mention, in a sketchy way, what real good had been done to India by this connexion. Under the British system they had allowed freedom of speech and press, and allowed western education to be introduced into their schools. This was a concrete proof of the good British contact with India had done for her. Continuing, Mr. Naoroji put before them the question in two aspects. The British people claimed, and rightly claimed, that they had a high sense of justice and a love of honour and freedom, for which they would sacrifice anything. This, he said, had gained for them their present greatness. Now, what did their sense of honour and justice demand from them in their connexion towards India? The British people had always shown a desire to act according to their sense of duty and honour and justice to that question. The British people had an actual desire to govern India in a spirit of justice, honour, and duty. (Hear, hear.) What he had to complain about was that the mandates they had passed were not carried out, and that they did not trouble to see that they were properly administered. The speaker went exhaustively into figures to prove his position. He thought that if the position of India could be made more prosperous under a better system of government, trade between India and England would be greatly improved. (Cheers.)

Mr. JOSIAH RHODES moved "That it is much to be deplored that the Government of the United Kingdom have not faithfully and honourably carried out the true policy and wishes of the British people towards their fellow subjects, the Indian people, as laid down by Acts and resolutions of Parliament."

Councillor E. BALMFORTH seconded the motion, and spoke of the advantage of having meetings of that sort in connexion with the clubs for educational purposes.

The motion, after being supported by Mr. WILLIAM BEARDSLEY and Councillor W. W. YATES, was carried unanimously.

A vote of thanks was awarded Mr. Naoroji, on the motion of Councillor RHODES, seconded by Councillor OLDROYD.

Imperial Parliament.

Tuesday, April 18.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE OPIUM TRADE.

Mr. PIERE gave notice that he would that day four weeks call attention to the opium trade between India and China, and move a resolution.

MEDALS FOR THE MOHMAND EXPEDITION.

Mr. CHARLES MURRAY asked the Under-Secretary of State for War whether the British troops engaged in the Mohmand expedition, who in August, 1897, earned the Frontier Service Medal which was sanctioned in April, 1898, were now in April, 1899, still awaiting further news of their medal.

Mr. POWELL WILLIAMS: Medals for the North-West Frontier campaigns of 1897 and 1898 are in course of being sent home from India to the depôts of the regiments engaged in the operations for issue to those entitled to them.

SEPOY MUTINY PENSIONS.

Sir JOHN LENG asked the Under-Secretary of State for War if he could state what number of Compassionate Pensions to soldiers who served in the Crimean and Indian Mutiny campaigns had ceased during the last three years in consequence of the deaths of the recipients:

And what number of old soldiers were still in receipt of such Pensions.

Mr. POWELL WILLIAMS: During the last three financial years 422 deaths have occurred among the special campaign pensioners; 2,667 men are still in receipt of these pensions.

ALLEGED OVERCROWDING OF TRANSPORTS.

Mr. PIERE asked the First Lord of the Admiralty what was the number of persons for whom boat accommodation and life-saving gear was provided on the hired transports "Simla" and "Nubia" respectively:

And what was the number required to be provided for on those hired transports by the Board of Trade Regulations under the provisions of the Merchant Shipping (Life-Saving Appliances) Act, 1888, and what was the largest number of passengers and crew carried by each of those vessels on one voyage either during the last or the present troping season, specifying the number of invalids, women, and children.

Mr. GOSCHEN: In both the "Nubia" and "Simla" a lifebelt is

provided for every person on board, and boat accommodation equal to carrying 940 persons. The maximum boat requirements of the Board of Trade, under the Merchant Shipping (Life-Saving Appliances) Act, 1888, for emigrant ships of the same tonnage would be boats equal to carrying about 700 persons, and from this an abatement might be made in the case of vessels like the "Nubia" and "Simla," which are divided into efficient water-tight compartments. The largest numbers carried by the ships on one voyage (home) during the past and present troping seasons are as follows, including the crew, viz., "Nubia," 1,673, including 54 women, 87 children, 79 invalids; "Simla," 1,643, including 35 women, 95 children, 23 invalids.

Thursday, April 20.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

LOW-FLASH OIL IN INDIA.

Sir EDWARD HILL asked the Secretary of State for India whether an Act had been recently passed by the Indian Government for the consolidation and amendment of the petroleum regulations in that country:

Whether he could state what was the legal flash point of petroleum, in India:

Whether such flash point had been found to be satisfactory:

And whether in recent legislation any proposals were made to alter it.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The Act passed in February last was mainly a Consolidation Bill with important amendments.

The legal flash-point is 76° close test, but a cargo of petroleum or petroleum held by dealers, is allowed, if the samples selected from such petroleum have their flashing points on an average at or above 78°, and if no one of these samples has its flashing point below 70°.

A despatch from the Government of India dated Simla, April 24, 1895, states that after a full enquiry the legal flash point was found to be satisfactory. The despatch concludes as follows: "The reports which we have now received show that there have been a few lamp accidents, but their occurrence does not appear to justify the raising of the present legal minimum flashing point, and we see no reason for modifying the opinion previously formed by us in regard to the matter."

In the discussion on the Bill the question of raising the flash point was not suggested.

THE MILITARY WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Mr. HUDSON asked the Secretary of State for India whether, having in view the fact that it was now more than twelve years since the Government of India declared and constituted the Military Works Department to be a Military department, and employment in it Military employment under the Commander-in-Chief, and further, that the new rules, to formulate which General Maitland's Committee were assembled in the summer of 1896, had been three times quashed, and were now for the fourth time postponed after it had been promised that they should come into operation on April 1, 1899, he could give any definite information as to when the rules would really come into force.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I am not aware of any promise having been made that new rules for the Military Works Department would come into operation on the 1st April, 1899.

The subject is now under my consideration and I hope that orders will shortly be issued, but I am unable as yet to fix a date from which they will have effect.

THE BROTHERS NATU.

RESTRICTIONS STILL REMAINED.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDEBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he would now consider the advisability of removing the restrictions on the brothers Natu, who had now been detained without trial for about a year and ten months; and, if not, whether he would state on what grounds, connected with the public tranquillity, they were still prevented returning to their homes.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have seen no reason for altering the decision which I announced on April 21, 1898.

I then stated that I had no intention of interfering with the discretion of the Government of Bombay as to the time when in the interests of public tranquillity and order the present restrictions imposed upon the movement of the Natives could be removed. In the opinion of the Bombay Government that time has not yet arrived, and I can give no pledge with regard to the future.

Mr. J. HERBERT LEWIS: May I ask whether these men are ever to be brought to trial? (Hear, hear.)

Lord G. HAMILTON: They are detained under the regulation of 1827, which does not necessitate a trial.

Sir W. WEDDEBURN: I should like to ask whether, in view of the complete state of tranquillity that prevails and the long time the men have been detained, he will call for a special report in regard to their case. (Opposition cries of "Hear, hear.")

Lord G. HAMILTON: I do not know where the hon. member gathers his information that a complete state of tranquillity prevails at Poona. That is not my information. I see no reason for a special report.

THE SUGAR DUTY ACT.

THE INDUSTRY IN INDIA.

NUMBER OF FACTORIES.

IMPORTANT RETURN.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDEBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, could he state for the last five years the number of factories in India producing refined sugar according to European methods, and the amount produced:

And, whether an estimate could be formed of the quantity of refined sugar produced by Native methods.

Lord G. HAMILTON: There are, I believe, about eleven sugar

factories in British India producing refined sugar according to European methods. But complete statistics of the output of these factories are not available; nor can any trustworthy estimate be formed of the amount of such sugar produced by native methods.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he would agree to the motion for a return as to Indian sugar, which stood on the paper to-day.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I shall be able to furnish the statistics asked under headings (1) to (4) with some approach to completeness. But I cannot furnish the statistics asked under heading (5) of the Return for which the hon. member desires to move.

The Return asked for was as follows:—

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN.—East India (Sugar Importation and Cultivation).—Address for Return showing for each of the years 1852-3 to 1898-9, inclusive: (1) the quantity and the value of imports of Sugar into India from Germany, Austria, and Mauritius; (2) the acreage of sugar cane cultivation in the several provinces of India; (3) the quantity of refined Indian sugar exported from Bengal and the North-West Provinces to other Provinces in India and to the Native States; (4) the quantity of Indian sugar, refined and unrefined, exported to Ceylon, to the United Kingdom, and to other countries; and (5) the number of persons engaged in the sugar industry in India, distinguishing (a) those engaged in refining, and (b) those engaged in producing unrefined sugar.

Mr. MACLEAN asked the Secretary of State for India, with reference to the statement made on Tuesday as to the insignificance of the trade in sweeteners between the United Kingdom and British India, whether he was aware that the total value of this branch of our exports was estimated by competent commercial authorities to be at least £200,000.

Whether the new duties on all these British goods would be withheld.

And, under what statute the Secretary of State claimed a dispensing power not to put in force a law duly passed by the Governor-General of India in Council with his express sanction.

Lord G. HAMILTON: As I stated on the 18th instant, the importations of sugar, including sugar-candy and confectionery, from the United Kingdom into India, on the average of the four years ending March, 1898, were 900 tons, and the value of those importations came to an average of *Rx.* 32,700. I cannot tell on what basis the much larger estimate offered by my honourable friend is founded. The latest United Kingdom published returns for the year 1897 do not bear out that estimate.

As regards the remission of the duty, what I stated was that, in view of the comparatively small amount of these importations, and the difficulty of estimating the quantities of sugar in a given amount of confectionery, I did not know whether the Government of India would think it worth while to insist on their rights.

I have not claimed any dispensing power such as described in the question. But the Governor-General in Council has power, under section 22 of the Sea Customs Act, 1878, to exempt any imported goods from the whole or any part of the customs duties leviable on such goods.

Mr. MACLEAN asked whether the Governor-General in Council had put the powers under the Act mentioned into force.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The Governor-General has the power if he wishes to exercise it, and it has been exercised.

Mr. MACLEAN: As the noble lord seems to dispute the accuracy of my figures, I should like to ask him if he disputes the accuracy of the figures certified by the Statistical Office, London, of the Custom House, as duly entered in the Bill of Entry Department. I will read the particulars which were supplied to me yesterday, with the permission of the House and your indulgence, sir, as this is a most important question. (Ministerial cries of "Oh.")

The SPEAKER: Order, order. The hon. member is discussing an answer. He is not asking for information. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. MACLEAN: Of course, sir, I bow to your ruling; but is a member to have the accuracy of his statements in this House impugned by a Minister and sit down without making any correction? (Opposition cheers.)

The SPEAKER: The hon. member was not merely doing that. He was proceeding to argue in favour of the accuracy of his figures against the accuracy of the statement made by the Secretary of State, and that could not be permitted in a question. (Ministerial cheers.)

Mr. MACLEAN: I was not proceeding, sir, to argue. (Ministerial cries of "Oh, oh," and "Order," and interruption.) If the Speaker orders me to sit down I can sit down, or I can go over to the other side if hon. members here object. (Ironical Ministerial cheers, upon which the hon. member crossed the floor of the House to the front Opposition bench below the gangway, amid cheers from the Opposition and some laughter from the Ministerialists.) Continuing, he said: I do not wish, sir, to argue, but with all respect to you, I have the figures here certified by the Custom House in London, certified by their official stamp, which I took many hours yesterday to secure, and the noble Lord has contradicted those figures. (Cries of "Order" and Opposition cheers.)

Lord G. HAMILTON: No, I beg your pardon; I did not.

Mr. MACLEAN: Well, he threw a suspicion upon them. He is quite right in saying that his figures are correct according to the Board of Trade returns, but—

The SPEAKER: Order, order. I must point out to the hon. member that he is raising a discussion upon the answer given, and that cannot be done. If the hon. member has any further facts to bring before the House he can put down a question upon the paper, but he cannot proceed to argue.

Mr. MACLEAN: May I, after questions, have leave to move the adjournment of the House on this subject?

No answer was given, and shortly afterwards Mr. Maclean walked out of the House.

THE CHITRAL RELIEFS.

Colonel MILWARD asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he was able to give the House any information with relation to the countermanding of the annual reliefs to Chitral.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The Government of India are considering certain proposals which by means of changes of position and of defensive works would enable them to reduce the existing garrison at Chitral. Pending a decision they have postponed temporarily the usual reliefs.

RUPEE PAPER AND THE NEW STAMP DUTIES.

Mr. KENNEDY asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer, whether the new stamp duties of a quarter per cent. on Foreign and Colonial securities would apply to Indian securities; and if so, whether they would be imposed on Rupee Paper.

Sir M. HICKS BEACH: I conceive the resolution passed by the Committee will include Indian securities, but the question of rupee paper may present some difficulty, and I shall be glad if my hon. friend will communicate with me on the subject.

Friday, April 21.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INVESTMENT OF SAVINGS BANK FUNDS.

Sir HENRY FOWLER asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer, whether the Savings Bank funds could legally be invested in Indian Government securities or in the debentures of Indian Railways, the principal and interest of which were guaranteed by the Secretary of State for India.

Sir M. HICKS BEACH: The answer to the question of my right hon. friend is in the negative. The powers of investment by the National Debt Commissioners are restricted by statute to Parliamentary securities.

Sir H. FOWLER asked the right hon. gentleman whether he was aware that this week the Bank of England issued one million three per cent. debentures of the East India Railway Company guaranteed by the Secretary of State, principal and interest; that these were issued something like a few shillings under 101—he thought that the average was £100 15s. Did not the right hon. gentleman think that an investment of that character, guaranteed by the Secretary of State for India, charged on that gigantic institution, the East India Railway System, and paying three per cent., repayable at par, was a better investment for the Savings Bank funds than Consols at a premium of 10 or 11, with a reduction of interest at ½ per cent. in three or four years, and the possibility of repayment at par in 1925?

Sir M. HICKS BEACH: It is a matter of opinion. The right hon. gentleman is asking what the law is. The law does not at present permit the investment.

THE SUGAR DUTY ACT.

Sir HENRY FOWLER asked the Secretary of State for India, what were the amounts and values of the raw sugar and refined sugar imported into India during the last year, and the Customs duties paid on such sugars.

Lord G. HAMILTON: Complete figures for 1898-9 are not yet available. For the year 1897-8, the figures were:—Imports into India: raw sugar, 373,000 cwt., *Rx.* 76,000; refined sugar, 4,235,000 cwt., *Rx.* 4,709,000. Customs duty realised on imported sugars at five per cent. *ad valorem*, *Rx.* 240,000.

Mr. SEALE-HAYNE asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he could give the House particulars of the importations of sugar into India of a later date than March 31, 1898, and state how those later importations compared with the importations during a similar period in the previous year.

And, whether he would state, for the guidance of traders, what it was the intention of the Government to treat as a bounty in respect of which a countervailing duty might be imposed.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The importations of refined sugar into India for the ten months ending January 31, 1899, were:

	1898	1899
	Cwts.	Cwts.
Mauritius	1,140,986	1,388,859
Austria	653,821	745,619
Germany	854,420	305,093
Other Countries	595,240	397,386

Total 3,244,467 2,896,957

In addition to this the total importations of unrefined sugar were, for the same periods; 325,660 and 258,950 cwt.

The Government of India have issued a notification specifying the countries which grant bounties, direct or indirect, on exportation of sugar, and the amount of the countervailing duties to be levied in each case. This notification will be found in the forthcoming Blue-book.

Mr. LAMBERT asked the Secretary of State for India, whether, subsequent to the large importations of German sugar into India in the year 1897-8, the average price of sugar in India fell; and, if so, by how much?

And, whether the German sugar so imported was sold at a greater or at a less price than other imported sugar or than sugar produced locally.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The falling off in prices during the last three years at Cawnpore (which is the largest market in Upper India) was stated by Sir James Westland at about 12 per cent. The figures contained in the papers which will, I hope, be distributed in about a fortnight, appear to bear out this statement.

According to the statistics in my possession, German refined sugar appears to fetch about the same price as Indian sugar, and a higher price than other imported sugar.

ACCOMMODATION FOR LASCAR SEAMEN.

Mr. MENDEL asked the Secretary of State for India, whether any complaints or representations had been made to his department by port sanitary authorities, medical officers, Board of Trade officers, or from any other source, as to the insufficiency of accommodation provided for Lascar or other Asiatic seamen on board British ships.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The only representations on this subject which

have been received, so far as I am aware, by my predecessors or by myself, are three in number—namely, one from a medical officer of the Port of London in 1891, another from the Bombay Port Health Officer in 1892, and a third from the Shipwright Surveyor of the Port of London in 1894.

Monday, April 24.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE SUGAR DUTY ACT.

RETURN GRANTED.

On the motion of Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN a Return was granted showing for each of the years 1882-3 to 1898-9, inclusive: (1) the quantity and the value of imports of sugar into India from Germany, Austria, and Mauritius; (2) the acreage of sugar cane cultivation in the several Provinces of India; (3) the quantity of refined Indian sugar exported from Bengal and the North-West Provinces to other Provinces in India and to the Native States; and (4) the quantity of Indian sugar, refined and unrefined, exported to Ceylon, to the United Kingdom, and to other countries.

LIGHTS IN THE RED SEA AND THE GULF OF ADEN.

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON asked the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he could state the cause of the prolonged delay in arranging for the provision of lights in the southern part of the Red Sea, now dangerous to navigation.

Mr. BRODBRICK: Her Majesty's Government have submitted proposals to the other maritime Powers that lightships or lighthouses should be established by the Egyptian Government in the southern part of the Red Sea. The Governments so addressed have accepted these proposals with the exception of France and Russia. The French Government stated in February, 1898, that they could not support the scheme, as they had already approached the Porte with a view to the construction of lighthouses. No result has been obtained hitherto from the French negotiations at Constantinople, which have now lasted for more than twelve months, but we have not yet succeeded in obtaining the consent of the French Government to our proposal that the lighthouses should be constructed by the Egyptian Government with the consent of the Sultan.

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON asked the President of the Board of Trade what was the reason of the delay in erecting one or more lighthouses for the safety of navigation at the eastern end of the Gulf of Aden, in view of the terrible wreck of the "Aden" steamship in 1875, and of other casualties detailed in a Return made to this House in 1877.

Mr. RITCHIE: As I stated in my reply to the right hon. baronet last year, Her Majesty's Government are of opinion that it would not be advisable to approach other Governments on the subject of lights in the Gulf of Aden until some settlement has been arrived at with respect to the Red Sea lights. I understand that negotiations as regards the Red Sea lights are still proceeding, though so far without any satisfactory result. It is hoped, however, that some progress may shortly be made.

THE SUGAR DUTY ACT.

Mr. J. M. MACLEAN asked the President of the Board of Trade if he could explain why, in the trade returns, it was the practice to classify confectionery and jams under the head of pickles; and whether he would change a practice which misled all persons except experts as to the real extent and value of the sweetmeat trade.

Mr. RITCHIE: It is true that confectionery and preserved fruits are enumerated along with pickles and condiments in a joint heading in the trade accounts, but it is not possible to show separately the exports of every article without an amount of labour and cost which could not be justified. It is, therefore, the practice to group together articles of secondary importance as regards aggregate value, the composite headings relating so far as possible to the articles dealt in by a single trade. This practice has been followed in the present case; but in view of the interest taken in the exports of articles containing sugar, the question of the classification of these exports will be referred to the Committee for the Revision of the Trade Accounts which meets in the autumn. (Mr. Maclean: Hear, hear.)

Sir H. FOWLER asked whether the House could not, for the purpose of the forthcoming discussion, have a return of the amount of confectionery exported to India during last year.

Mr. RITCHIE: I should think it possible we might be able to get that out; it would be of great interest, and I will endeavour to see if it can be done.

THE MUSCAT "INCIDENT."

PAPERS STILL WITHHELD.

Sir CHARLES DILKE asked the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, whether the discussion of the Muscat incident had now closed:

And, when the papers would be laid before Parliament.

Mr. BRODBRICK: Some local details are not yet definitely settled, and I cannot at present say when the papers on the subject will be presented.

Tuesday, April 25.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE SUGAR DUTY ACT.

Captain SINCLAIR asked the Secretary of State for India, whether, in addition to the new countervailing duties, German and Austrian sugar would still be subject to the general five per cent. impost duty: And, what relation, at present prices, this duty bears to German and Austrian bounties.

Lord G. HAMILTON: All sugar imported into India since 1894 has paid five per cent. *ad valorem* duty; and bounty-fed sugar will not under the recent Act become free from this duty. In reply to the

second part of the hon. member's question, I can only give a very rough estimate; but the bounties on sugar imported into India from Austria and Germany may be taken on the average to be one-eighth of the value of the sugar; and, on this assumption, the five per cent. *ad valorem* duty would be about five-thirteenths of the amount of the bounty.

Thursday, April 27.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE SENTENCE ON SATYANATH MAHAPATRA.
COMBINATION OF JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been drawn to the sentence of two years' imprisonment recently passed, under section 417 of the Indian Penal Code, upon Satyanath Mahapatra by the Deputy-Commissioner of Singhbhum, who himself instituted the prosecution:

Whether he was aware that the Judicial Commissioner of Chota Nagpur had, on being appealed to, set aside the conviction and directed a re-trial of the accused, on the grounds that the maximum punishment under the section referred to was one year's imprisonment; that the accused had not been given an opportunity of claiming a transfer of his case to another court; and that such a case should be tried by some competent magistrate other than the Deputy-Commissioner:

And whether he would enquire into the circumstances of the case. Lord G. HAMILTON: I have received no information on the subject of the case to which the hon. member's question refers, nor have I observed any reference to it in the public Press. It would appear from the terms of the question that if any judicial error was committed, it was set right on appeal; and I do not propose to take any action in the matter.

THE AGITATION FOR A "PASTEUR INSTITUTE" IN INDIA.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether it was the case that between July, 1898, and March, 1899, thirty-three soldiers had been sent from India to the Pasteur Institute at Paris to be treated for hydrophobia; and if so, at what cost to the State and with what result:

And, whether he would obtain the figures showing how many cases of death from hydrophobia had been reported in the Indian Army during the last ten years previous to these dates.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The reply to the first part of the hon. member's question is "yes." The payments in this country on this account were about £10 a man, and the results have been, so far as I am aware, very satisfactory. I have no information as to the total payments in India.

In the ten years from 1888 to 1897 there were 23 deaths of British soldiers in India from hydrophobia.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he was aware that Buisson baths had been established at various centres in India for the sudorific treatment of persons bitten by dogs supposed to be suffering from rabies:

And, whether a trial had been given to these baths by the Indian medical authorities; if so, with what result.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I am aware that Buisson baths have been established in India; but the opinions of the Indian medical authorities, so far as they have been received, are not favourable as to the efficacy of this form of treatment of hydrophobia.

PUBLIC MEETINGS ON INDIAN QUESTIONS.

THE WORK OF THE BRITISH COMMITTEE.

Elsewhere in the present issue of INDIA will be found a report of the meeting addressed by Mr. Dadsabhai Naoroji at Dewsbury on April 20.

On April 17 a lecturer on behalf of the British Committee lectured at Bedlington on "India and its people." Mr. Wharrier presided over a good attendance. The lecture was illustrated with lime-light views.

On April 18 a public meeting was held at the Town Hall, Morpeth, to hear addresses from Dr. Spence Watson and Miss Alison Garland. Representatives came from all parts of the division, and the meeting was a great success. Miss Garland (a lecturer on behalf of the British Committee) devoted the whole of her speech to Indian politics, and dealt with the reforms advocated by the Indian National Congress. Dr. Watson took up the thread of her discourse, and commented on the new law of sedition. "As an empire," he said, "we ought to be an organic whole, and no man who was fond of liberty should allow liberty to be trampled upon in any part of the empire." Dr. Trotter presided.

On April 19 a lecturer on behalf of the British Committee addressed a large audience at Rastrick, Yorkshire, the large room being filled to overflowing. The lecture was illustrated by lime-light views, and was entitled "India and its people."

On April 20 a lecturer on behalf of the British Committee gave an address at Guidepost, Northumberland, on "The Agricultural problem in India." Mr. Holmes presided over a fair attendance.

IN 5 VOLS.

Vol. I.—Introductory to the Overthrow of the English in the Spice Archipelago (1623).

With 4 Maps, 8vo, 18s.

A HISTORY OF BRITISH INDIA.

BY
Sir WILLIAM WILSON HUNTER,
K.C.S.I., M.A., LL.D.,
A Vice-President of the Royal Asiatic Society.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LONDON.

ROMESH C. DUTT'S WORKS ON INDIA.

1. MAHA BHARATA, condensed into English verse (*Temple Classics Series*). Cloth, 1s. 6d., Leather, 2s.
2. The Same Work, Illustrated Edition, with an Introduction by the Right Hon. Max Müller. Cloth, 12s. 6d.; Parchment, 15s. PUBLISHERS: DENT & Co., LONDON.
3. ENGLAND AND INDIA: 1785 to 1885. Price 2s. PUBLISHERS: CHATTO & WINDUS, LONDON.
4. LAYS OF ANCIENT INDIA, Selections from Indian Poetry rendered into English verse. (*T. O. Series*). Price 7s. 6d.
5. CIVILIZATION IN ANCIENT INDIA, 2 Vols. (*Trubner's Oriental Series*). Price 21s. PUBLISHERS: KEGAN PAUL & Co., LONDON.
6. CIVILIZATION IN ANCIENT INDIA, People's Edition, complete in one volume. Price Rs. 5. PUBLISHERS: ELM PRESS, 29 BRADON STREET, CALCUTTA.

N.B.—The above Works can be obtained in India through any Indian bookseller.

"INDIA," 1898.

VOLS. IX. AND X.

NOW READY.

Bound in Cloth (post free)
7/6 each net cash.

To be obtained at the Offices,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

A limited number of Volumes V. (1894), VI. (1895), VII. (1896), VIII. (1897), can also be obtained. Price 8/6 each, post free. Remittances should accompany order.



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. North Haglan Barracks, Devonport.
I know G. E. WOOD, Capt. 2nd North Staff. Regt.
"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. G. L. NARSIING BOW.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.
Cuddalore Municipal Councilors' Office.—"I have much pleasure in stating that your 'Omum-Carpoor' was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage.

Price of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. 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.

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 be also 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.

LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY.

DADABHAI NAOROJI, Esq., PRESIDENT.

Above Society on receipt of 5 anna stamps will give information regarding course of study and cost of living in England. Gentlemen will be met at London, Edinburgh, Oxford, or Cambridge stations on giving fortnight's notice.

Apply, Dr. MULLICK,

SOHO SQUARE, NATIONAL HOSPITAL, LONDON, 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, Hoarseness, 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.—Sist March, 1889.

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