

India

FOR THE

No. 78. NEW SERIES.
No. 172. OLD SERIES.]

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, JUNE 30, 1899.

[REGISTERED AS A {PRICE.....2d
NEWSPAPER. {By Post, 2d.

Notes and News	317	Chronicle of the Week	323
Indian Public Opinion	320	Notes from Bombay	324
The Bombay Government and Higher Education.—III, by the Hon. C. H. Sefalvad, J.L.B.	321	Indian Senior Wrangler: Dinner at Cambridge	324
Our London Letter	322	India in Parliament: The Sugar Duty Act:	324
The Congress and the Currency Committee: Letter from Sir W. Wedderburn to Sir H. Fowler	323	Speeches by Mr. Chamberlain and Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman	325
		Advertisements	331-332

NOTES AND NEWS.

THIS week we have the pleasure of publishing a full report of the principal speeches delivered at the dinner given by the Cambridge Majlis in honour of the first Indian Senior Wrangler. Nothing could be more handsome than the terms in which Dr. Taylor, the Master of St. John's, proposed the health of Mr. Paranjpye, and nothing could exceed the modesty of the Senior Wrangler's reply. The occasion was a truly Imperial one, in the best sense of that much abused epithet. Dr. Taylor's generous tribute will be read with intense satisfaction in India, and will do much to illustrate the true spirit in which the best part of the nation regards the relations between the two countries.

Just as we go to press we have received the following telegram from our Calcutta correspondent:—

"Two cases in which Europeans were the accused and Indians the complainants have just been disposed of. In one of the cases, a man named Ambler was charged with causing the death of a coolie youth. He was originally fined ten rupees for simple assault. The High Court, on the motion of Government, having ordered a retrial, Ambler has been convicted of causing simple hurt, and fined two hundred rupees. In the other case, another European, named Hazel, has been convicted of causing grievous hurt and fined sixty rupees. Yet the magistrate described the offence as a cowardly assault on a defenceless old man, and observed that Hazel should not be lightly punished; and under the law he is required to inflict imprisonment. The cases excite great indignation."

It is satisfactory to find that the authorities can no longer be accused of any want of energy in the matter of the Rangoon outrage. The Burma Government has offered a reward of 1,000 rupees, and the Viceroy has ordered that no expense be spared in bringing the perpetrators to justice. Meanwhile, the Military Court of Enquiry has not been without result. Private Sullivan has implicated seven of his comrades of the West Kent Regiment, four of whom have pleaded the woman's consent, while the other three deny that they were in any way concerned in the outrage. As to the four, they have been brought up at the Cantonment Magistrate's Court and remanded in the custody of the police, in spite of an application by the military authorities that they should remain in military custody. Private Sullivan complains that he has been assaulted by men of his regiment—an indication of the temper of these English warriors. A report has been presented to the Government, drawn up by a well-known magistrate, from which it appears that the woman's whole life is spoken to by a number of respectable Burmese officials, and that her good character is beyond dispute.

The *Pioneer* discusses the Rangoon outrage under the significant heading, "A Blot on the Scutcheon." Among other subjects that necessarily come within the scope of the enquiry instituted by General Prothero, our contemporary mentions the following:—

On the Sunday in question it seems that the regiment had been confined to barracks and the immediate environs in consequence of a smallpox epidemic; yet we have some 30 or 40 men all more or less under the influence of drink at noonday. Where did they get the drink? It is not easy to see how they could have had liquor conveyed from the bazaar or the city, and yet one can hardly believe that half

a company were allowed to get drunk in the regimental canteen on a Sunday. Moreover, the disturbance lasted more than an hour, and it is odd that no officer or non-commissioned officer appears to have come on the ground. It will also be necessary to enquire whether all the sentries were at their post at the time, since, if so, it would appear that one of them must necessarily have overlooked the scene of the outrage.

The enquiry into such a flagrant outrage, committed under such circumstances, could not be too searching.

We print in another column an important letter from Sir William Wedderburn to Sir Henry Fowler, the chairman of the Indian Currency Committee, setting right a misapprehension of Mr. J. E. O'Connor in his evidence before the Committee. Mr. O'Connor does not say explicitly, but speaks in such a way as to suggest, that the Currency Resolution passed by the last Congress was influenced, if not inspired, by a telegram from Manchester passed on through Calcutta. The suggestion has caused a considerable amount of annoyance, and even indignation in India; and it is especially felt that an official holding the important position of Director-General of Statistics ought to have been more careful in the matter as well as in the manner of his communications. Sir William's letter points out how completely at variance with the suggestion is the established and well-known mode in which the resolutions of the Congress are invariably drawn up and settled. The draft is circulated for approval to the various Congress circles throughout India some two months before the date of meeting, and then considered and, if need be, revised by the Subjects' Committee in the light of the various reports. The usual procedure, as a matter of fact, was strictly followed in the case of the Currency Resolution; and the Manchester telegram had nothing whatever to do with it. In fact, the resolution was discussed and carried before the telegram came into the hands of the President of the Congress. It is much to be regretted that Mr. O'Connor was not more careful in his statement; and the least that can be done to remedy his mistake is to place Sir William's letter in the Appendix to the proceedings of the Committee.

One is glad to observe that the Calcutta Mahometans have offered hospitality to the next annual meeting of the Mahometan Educational Conference in December, and that the Conference has replied with a cordial acceptance. This is said to be the first time in a dozen years that the Conference has received an invitation from co-religionists outside the Punjab and the North-West Provinces. The Aligarh correspondent of the *Bombay Gazette* discerns in it "a good sign, as it shows that the Mahometans of the different provinces recognise the necessity of united action in the matter of education and progress." This is no doubt the right view, and a hopeful view it is.

Mr. Chamberlain, as will be seen from our Parliamentary report, has explained, in reply to a question put by Sir W. Wedderburn, that Sir Alfred Milner, on his return to Capetown did endeavour to do something for the alleviation of the grievances of the British Indians resident in the Transvaal. The Transvaal Government, he states, "declined to make any arrangement unless her Majesty's Government were prepared to surrender certain rights of the Cape boys and other coloured persons." Nay, Sir Alfred Milner made a further attempt. In the beginning of May he was instructed "to ask in a friendly way"—does he not always "ask in a friendly way"?—"for the favourable consideration of at least the better class of Indians, if not of all, suggesting the possibility of creating an Asiatic quarter within each town, and pointing out that the sanitary considerations on which the law is based cannot be applicable to all Indians without distinction." By this time, however, the Transvaal Govern-

ment had issued orders for the removal of the Indian traders to locations by July 1. But such orders have been flexible for many months past; and the hardening of them is coincident with the rougher handling of President Kruger by British diplomacy. Mr. Chamberlain's conclusion is not particularly hopeful:—

With a view of obtaining equitable treatment of the Indians, her Majesty's Government have used every friendly means open to them by their predecessors' acceptance of the law of 1885, by the indefinite terms in which that law is couched, and by the difficulty and uncertainty of the result of appeals to the Law Courts of the Republic. It is but too true that Mr. Chamberlain has been seriously hampered by the law of 1885 and the amending Act, as well as by the feeling and the practice of the British colonies in South Africa. Yet it is difficult to believe that everything might not have been set right by this time if President Kruger had been judiciously dealt with.

Lord George Hamilton was perverse enough to quarrel with the terms of Mr. Herbert Roberts's question (June 16), "whether in view of the frequent occurrence of such conflicts in India" as the shooting case at Meerut in December last, "due to the practice of British soldiers carrying firearms whilst off duty, he would consider whether more stringent regulations were required in the interests of the public peace." We have already seen that, notwithstanding the opinion of the Government of India last year "that there was no ground for special measures," yet the Commanding Officer in Bengal issued instructions that were not readily distinguishable from "special measures." Something of the like sort would seem to be equally necessary elsewhere—in Burma, for example. One never knows where the mischief is to break out next. But Lord George Hamilton could not refrain from having his return shot at Mr. Roberts. "The hon. member," he said, "is mistaken in supposing that cases of collision between British soldiers and Natives are of frequent occurrence." It is useless to quibble about words. Such collisions have become only too frequent subjects of newspaper reports, and are openly commented upon as a public scandal.

The unfortunate spirit that led to tampering with the Calcutta Municipality appears to have extended its malign operation to the neighbourhood. We observe that a member of the Cossipore-Chitpore Municipality requested the chairman to produce to a meeting of the members certain correspondence that had passed between him and Government on the subject of filtered-water supply to rate-payers. One might have supposed that the tabling of the correspondence would be a matter of course. Not a bit of it. The Chairman, who is at the same time a Government official, refused, stating that the correspondence contained private matter, and that he could not produce it unless he were authorised by the magistrate of the district to do so. If this extraordinary conduct be sanctioned, it is not very easy to see how the other members are to do their municipal duty satisfactorily, or to be held accountable if things go wrong. Again, there is a project afoot for dividing the first-class municipality of Barangore into two—one to be a reduced Barangore, the other to be a new Kamarhatti municipality. Barangore is now a pretty large place—some six square miles; it may, indeed, be unwieldy; but there does not seem to be any public evidence that such a division is an administrative necessity in view of any failure or incompetence. Barangore has now 14 elected and 7 nominated commissioners. The reduced Barangore is to have 6 elected and 3 nominated; the new Kamarhatti is to have 12 nominated, and not one elected. So the repression of local self-government proceeds. We should like to fathom the action of the mill-owners in this disruption of the existing system.

The *Maharatta*, on the authority of Professor Welinkar, tells an almost incredible story of that gentleman's rupture with the Free Church Missionaries. After being connected with Wilson College for eleven years, he was without any previous intimation told to cease his attendance at the College, and was thus not even given an opportunity of taking leave of his pupils. And what was his offence? He had asked that the Native Professors might be allowed to wait in the same room as their European colleagues—a practice which is said to obtain in

every other College in the Province, but which is apparently not included in the idea of Christian Brotherhood as professed by the Missionaries of the Free Churches. It is hardly matter for surprise after this that Indians doubt whether such missionaries are likely to make good teachers of morality.

We have already referred to the question of prisoners' confessions, and to the pregnant remarks thereon of the Sessions Judge at Umballa. A still higher authority, Sir Lawrence Jenkins, the new Chief Justice of Bombay, has again called attention to this glaring abuse. Not only does he endorse all that has been said about the pressure brought to bear on the prisoner to confess; he further lays stress on the injury that is done to the public, as well as to the accused:—

Not only may a great wrong be done to the accused, but proper efforts to trace the crime must almost necessarily be slackened. The consequence is that when the case comes to be tried, the confession is again withdrawn, and those materials are wanting on which alone the crime should be properly established.

So that the efforts of the police to obtain confessions may very well end in the escape of the guilty.

At a time when so many attacks are being made on Indian municipalities, it is pleasant to find that the official report on the working of those in the Punjab is very favourable, although that Province has usually been considered backward and one in which the system of Local Self-Government is less familiar to the dominant races than it is in Bengal. The *Friend of India* judges that one great cause of this municipal success is to be found in the attitude of the majority of the Punjab officials—"since nothing conduces more to efficiency on the part of local bodies than the knowledge that they are being watched with friendly interest by those in authority." In only four cases has any serious cause of dissatisfaction been reported, and three of these related to a single resolution in each case. On the other hand, while Lahore "has improved," Delhi and Simla continue to do their work well, and in several other places, notably Hoshiapur and Umballa, still stronger praise is given. One of the three resolutions complained of was a vote of Rs. 600 for the expenses of four members to present a loyal address to the Viceroy at Simla, from which it would seem that Eastern and Western municipalities share the same weaknesses.

Mr. Cotton continues his endeavours to hold the scales even between European and Indian. He has ordered a new enquiry into the Rungliting case, in which Mr. Cummins, the manager of a plantation was fined five rupees for assaulting a coolie boy who afterwards died. The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* gives a still more striking instance of the determination of the Chief Commissioner of Assam. Here is the story as told by the Shillong correspondent of that paper. A European official had a Bengali gentleman flogged "because the latter had the audacity to apply for a copy of an order passed by him." The man who was flogged made an affidavit to the Deputy Commissioner of Cachar, who forwarded it to Mr. Cotton. As a result, the erring official has been degraded. The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* makes the following comment:—

We thank Mr. Cotton for the courage he has shown in punishing a subordinate in this manner. For subordinates in almost all the provinces have now the privilege of doing anything they like with impunity.

The Rev. H. Whitehead, bishop-designate of Madras, in presiding over the Annual Meeting of the Church Aid Association at the Church House, Westminster, the other day, took notice of the suggestion that the clergy of the Church in India should be supplied from India itself. The bishop-designate answered this by stating that if the clergy were to be supplied from India, they must be drawn from the Eurasians, "who unfortunately did not avail themselves of the higher education which the Natives availed themselves of." It does not seem obvious, if Christianity has been making the progress it claims, that this is the only possible source. We have seen in Africa not only negro clergymen, but even negro bishops. The bishop-designate's remark seems to lead to the supposition either that the progress of Christianity in India is less than is asserted, or else that the Indian Christians, like the Eurasians, do not avail themselves of the higher

education. Christianity, in spite of all the work of clergy and missionaries, still outside the main current of Indian life, and must long remain so.

Rangoon is a town with a considerable population of resident Europeans, but, like almost all Europeans in India, they are engrossed in their own concerns and more eager to hasten the moment of their departure for "home" than to spend time in improving their place of exile. According to the *Rangoon Gazette*, at a recent bye-election for a European Commissioner, even the quorum of twelve voters necessary as nominators failed to turn up at the Town Hall to register their votes. The *Madras Times* sensibly remarks on this that "it is all very well to find fault with Native Commissioners, but unless we can bring men to the scratch, the fault-finding falls rather flat." And *Power and Guardian* contrasts with this indifference "the loyal service of the rate-payers of Calcutta." Yet it is to the increase of the European element that the framers of the Calcutta Municipal Bill look for the improvement of the city. It is to be feared that they are leaning on a broken reed.

The *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, discussing a recent article in the *Pioneer*, declares its belief that the present race of officials is in no way inferior to their predecessors. If there has been a falling-off in good results, our contemporary is inclined to look for it in other circumstances. Formerly the Anglo-Indian rulers had some respect for the Indians, and the East India Company was afraid of Parliament and its periodical investigations. "There is now very little to restrain them except their own sense of justice." The art of government has been rendered easy, and thus they are inclined to meet all problems in the easiest, though not always the best way. Thus, if a district be disturbed, the favourite method is to quarter a punitive police force there, by which means, no doubt, order is preserved, but at the cost of punishing the innocent with the guilty. As it is no longer necessary to find the best possible way out of any difficulty, but only the easiest, India has "ceased to be a school for the training of Englishmen in the art of government."

Mr. Aston, who presided at the annual Durbar held at Poona on the Queen's birthday, said some hard things about the Mahratta newspapers, which by their seditious writings were making the young Mahrattas disloyal. Lest the public should take this too seriously, it is well to remember that this is the Mr. Aston who sentenced the editor of the *Pratod* to penal servitude for life as a punishment for an article in which he had the hardihood to declare that he preferred the Canadian Constitution to that of his own country. This sentence, which even Lord George Hamilton did not venture to defend, was reduced by the High Court to eighteen months. As the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* says:—

Mr. Aston himself no doubt created feelings of deep loyalty in the minds of the Indian public by transporting an editor for life for saying some foolish things in his paper.

From this example of Mr. Aston's restraint and sense of proportion when acting in a judicial capacity the public may judge of the weight to be assigned to his utterances when he is addressing the Sardars of the Deccan.

Some time ago Rajani Ghosh and others were convicted by Mr. Heron, Joint-Magistrate of Midnapur, of having snatched away cattle in the charge of men employed by Messrs. Watson and Co., with whom the defendants were already on bad terms. The accused were sentenced to imprisonment and bound over to keep the peace. On appeal, the District Judge set aside the order to furnish security, and for the terms of rigorous imprisonment substituted fines of Rs. 20, or a month in default. The Judge, in passing judgment, said "the offence does not merit the severe sentences inflicted," and he commented thus on the Joint-Magistrate's conduct of the case:—

I may note here that the lower court's memo. of Rajani's examination is an insufficient and somewhat misleading record of what Rajani really said.

The *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, which takes this account of the case from the *Medini Bandha*, points out that if the Government warns a young magistrate who is found to be careless of the liberty of the subject it not only helps to

make British rule popular, but "does a real service to the offending official himself." Indifference makes "wrong-headed officials more reckless and defiant."

The *Friend of India* continues to advocate an Imperial guarantee of the Indian debt, and it looks upon the recent declaration of the Chancellor of the Exchequer as a hopeful sign. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, it will be remembered, said that he was willing so to extend the scope of the Local Loan Fund as to include not only English municipalities but India and the Crown Colonies—thus giving a new investment for the Post Office Savings Bank and enabling the Indian Government to borrow at half or three-quarter per cent. per annum cheaper than is now possible. The *Friend of India* concludes thus:—

The Indian Government is likely to be in the position of a borrower, intermittently, for many years to come, and therefore the cheaper the Government can get the capital it requires, the better for the Indian taxpayer.

Readers of INDIA will remember that Mr. A. J. Wilson takes a different view of the question.

One of our evening journals, in noticing the rumour that "Indian troops" were being sent to Natal, went on to remark: "Indian troops we assume to mean white troops . . . but, if so, is it certain that we can spare white troops from India . . . unless their place is immediately to be taken by others from England? We should like to have an answer to that question from experts who know the needs of India, and what hangs upon her small white garrison." These remarks fairly represent two or three widespread and persistent misapprehensions. India has not "a small white garrison," but a very large one in proportion to the real "needs of India" herself. Only very few of our public men are aware, and most of these habitually forget, that there is constantly quartered in India nearly one-third of the whole British army—at present about 74,000 men. This large force costs the British taxpayer nothing; all the charges incurred by it, from recruiting at one end to pensions at the other, being defrayed by India alone.

As to "the needs of India and what hangs upon her small (?) white garrison," this opens up questions, in two distinct branches, on which widely different opinions may be fairly held according to the standpoint taken. If the term "garrison" be regarded in its proper sense, defence of "the external frontier of her Majesty's Indian possessions" together with maintenance of internal order, then our opinion is distinctly that 20,000 fewer of British troops would amply suffice for the "needs of India" in that respect. In 1875-6, the last year of Lord Northbrook and before the revolutionary policy set in, the number of Europeans in the Indian armies was considerably under 60,000. Since then, by reason of better and more expensive equipment, and still more in consequence of railway extension, that number might be reckoned as the equivalent of 74,000; and *pari passu* this present number, as compared with the garrison in 1875-6, is equal to, say, 90,000. So it is quite a misconception to speak of India's "small white garrison"; and it must be noted that our Native Indian army has largely increased since that period, and its efficiency has been enhanced by similar causes to those mentioned above.

It is another question when we leave that of "the garrison" and take account of the revolutionary policy that set in with the second Afghan war, and which, still going on, dominates not only the military situation in India but the whole Indian problem financial, political, and social. But the policy is "Imperial" and factitious. It is forced on India from without, mainly through our War Office and Horse Guards. There reign supreme the precious "experts" to whom the journal quoted proposed to appeal in respect of this incidental question of sending British troops from India to crush the South African Republic. As to these "experts," their cry is that of the horse-leech, "Give, give"—so long as the British Treasury is not called upon for a shilling in aid of this bastard, destructive "Imperialism" for which helpless India has to pay in its already enormous "white garrison," and that if the said "experts" have their way may be inflated to any extent.

INDIAN PUBLIC OPINION.

INDIA, it is not to be disputed, is a country of many peoples, who speak many diverse tongues, who inherit various and chequered histories, who hold diverse creeds, and who live and move and have their being under widely varying conditions. Upon this obvious fact has been founded one of the readiest platitudes of the obscurantists—that it is absurd to talk of “the people” of India, or of the “public opinion” of India. It is well, therefore, to find so eminent an authority as the Secretary of State for India expressing himself in the contrary sense, and recognising not only the “people of India,” but also the high value of their “views.” In his telegram of January 24 to the Viceroy, cited by Sir Henry Fowler in the debate on the Tariff Act, 1899, Lord George Hamilton said:—“Recognising that circumstances of Great Britain and India differ, I shall ascribe great importance to views which people of India hold on this matter.” It does not appear, indeed, that in the particular case he waited for the ingathering of any full and impartial representation of such views; but the fact remains that he has acknowledged their existence and their importance. Another Minister, moreover, undertook to specify the various organs whereby the public opinion of India is authentically made known. “The only persons,” said Mr. Chamberlain, “who are authorised, or are in any way qualified, to represent Indian opinion,” are “the Indian Native Press, the English Press of India, the Council for India in this country, and the Legislative Council for India.” The enumeration is scarcely complete, but then India is not Mr. Chamberlain’s official province, and for a mere excursionist into the subject it may pass. The main points of immediate interest are the definite recognition accorded by both Ministers to Indian public opinion, and Mr. Chamberlain’s express acknowledgment of the Indian Native Press. In the present case, it so happens that the Native Press has largely, perhaps mainly—in the first instance at least—declared for the policy of the Government. But, if the Native Press is important when it supports the Government, it cannot hereafter be admitted to be less important when it criticises the action of the Government adversely. The Native Press must now count as a distinctively important factor in the counsels of Calcutta and Downing Street.

Whether it was intentionally or accidentally that Mr. Chamberlain gave the place of honour to the Native Press matters nothing; the Native Press unquestionably takes first rank. It is on the spot everywhere. In spite of deportations and gagging Acts and Press Committees, it has flourished exceedingly. No one would contend that there are no exceptional sheets which have not even yet learnt to use their freedom without abusing it. But such occasional confusion of the bounds of liberty and licence, in a period of national transformation, is perfectly natural, and need not jar on the well-seasoned British nerve; in any case, the outbursts are comparatively rare and wholly unimportant. We have always to remember that the great men of past generations, who built up the British Indian Empire, showed themselves indifferent to attacks for which the authors would now be deported or locked up. No British official was ever more badgered by the Press than Lord William Bentinck, and yet Lord William Bentinck openly declared that he derived more information from the Indian Press of the real state of the country than from all the Councils, all the Boards, and all the Secretaries by whom he was surrounded. This acknowledgement puts to shame the authors and maintainers of the Sedition Acts. Nothing could well be more preposterous than to shut off the very best means of information about the thoughts and feelings of the people, especially when all the subordinate sources have been so assiduously dried up. It is this very lack of trustworthy knowledge, from which officialdom has been diligent in debarring itself, that is at the root of the baneful retrogression recently developed in the art of government in India. Yet it will have been noted that Mr. J. E. O’Conor stated in his evidence before the Indian Currency Committee that “we examine the Native Press with the greatest care in India from week to week”; and

no doubt “those wretched Press committeemen” do their work with efficient assiduity. Clearly enough, the Government looks after the Native Press. The Native Press, on its part, hampered and menaced as it is, actively looks after the Government. “The Native Press,” again said Mr. O’Conor, “always makes itself promptly heard if there is any kind of grievance or dissatisfaction, and the subject is kept permanently before the public.” Sir Richard Garth, it will be remembered, paid a most handsome tribute to the Native Press. “I read Native papers myself, week after week,” said Sir Richard, “and never see anything there at all approaching sedition, or even disloyalty, or disrespect to English rule. What I do find there, and what I rejoice to find, is thoroughly well-deserved censure of the arbitrary conduct of many of the Government officials.” It is for the Native Press to proceed with its difficult, yet highly important, work, encouraged by the close attention of the official bureaucracy, and stimulated by the high approval of the learned ex-Chief Justice of Bengal. There is not a word to be said for insolvency, violence, or misrepresentation; but such qualities are now confined to inconspicuous and negligible sheets. The victory will lie with solid fact, logical argument, and the insistent support of every reasonable and judicious claim. The past progress of Native journalism is a guarantee for powerful developments in the future.

The English Press in India unfortunately contains elements at least as dangerous to British rule as heady Native journals. The independent English papers in India, whose editors set before their eyes the standard of the best government on the principles of the Proclamation of 1858, are performing a noble task under severe difficulties; and it is superfluous to praise their self-sacrificing efforts. The danger emanates from journalists that have taken to India the bias of home party spirit, and that foster the prejudices of the Indian Government, and support its policy to extreme issues. Even for these, however, it is to be said that they do at times draw the line against the most extravagant follies of the Government; for example, in their second thoughts on the North West Frontier policy, and on the treatment of the Brothers Nattu. Examples like these illustrate most effectively the supreme importance of the Native Press and of the independent English journals in India. The most critical papers, indeed, are the very best friends the Indian Government has; they constitute the strongest barrier in existence to prevent its autocratic spirit from hurrying it to perdition. As for the India Council in this country, the less said about it the better. The main purpose it serves is to find reasons for additional pensions to retired Anglo-Indians. It is a mere drag and obstruction, when it is not a positively malign influence. It is a receptacle for ancient prejudices of Anglo-Indianism. It lives in the past; it is out of touch with the quickly-changing present; it seldom has been in real touch with the modern life of India. It is awaiting summary abolition at the hands of some strong Secretary of State, capable of discerning the signs of the times. True, it is “authorised” to represent Indian opinion; but is not “in any way qualified” to represent other than Anglo-Indian opinion. It always was an anachronism; now it is a nuisance and a political danger. As for the Legislative Council in India, that, too, is unhappily far from representative of Indian opinion. The passing remarks of Sir Henry Fowler and Mr. Courtney show clearly that there are English statesmen who perceive how very unsatisfactory it is in this fundamental respect. It is so encrusted with personal interest and envied by scheming flatteries that it is only by accident that the truth of facts can find an entrance. The real representatives of Indian opinion are carefully excluded from the inner circle of official work, and they studiously exclude themselves from social relations through which true opinion might find access to the centre of authority. The Legislative Council, with all its secretarial adjuncts, lives in the clouds. It awaits the overhauling of that strong Secretary of State, who will be the man to put India and the British Empire on a sure footing of relationship.

In any enumeration of the authentic organs of Indian public opinion, we at least may claim some mention of the Indian National Congress. The Congress, without any doubt, is the most representative public body in the country. It may not count for much in the thoughts of Ministers that decline to look at it otherwise than through a false medium, or that really know next to nothing about

it. But it is there all the same. "The Congress," said Sir William Hunter in 1888, "has outlived the misapprehension that it would become the tool of any single race or class and has vindicated its claim to its title as an Indian National Assemblage." That was true eleven years ago; it is still more thoroughly true to-day. In 1895 Sir Richard Garth wrote:—

The Indian National Congress consists of delegates from every part of India, who are duly elected at a number of divisional headquarters. We are told that, at the Congress meeting in Allahabad in the year 1888, fully three millions of men took a direct part in the election of these delegates, who themselves numbered no fewer than 1,248. The constitution of this important body was thoroughly representative; it consisted of Princes, Rajas, Nawabs, fifty-four members of noble families, members of Council, honorary magistrates, chairmen and commissioners of municipalities, Fellows of Universities, members of local boards, and professional men, such as engineers, merchants, bankers, journalists, landed proprietors, shopkeepers, clergymen, priests, professors of colleges, zemindars, and others. I should also say that they were thoroughly representative as regards religion, as well as rank and profession.

Sir Richard wrote in deprecation of Sir George Chesney's "utterly unfounded statement" that the Congress is largely made up of "pleaders in the Law Courts, of ex-students from the Government colleges, and the class which works the Native Press;" so that those who carp ignorantly at the Congress may now revise their views. As Lord George Hamilton said recently, "when people get more accurate knowledge on a subject, they sometimes change their opinions." Of course, no one imagines that Indian public opinion is on all fours with English public opinion. But we may say with the late Mr. James Routledge: "I do mean the power of great bodies of people to perceive a fact from some common stand-ground, and to make that fact the basis of united action." Or with Sir William Hunter (1890):—

English rule has created a new nexus for the intellectual elements of the population; a nexus which is beginning to be recognised as a bond between man and man and between province and province, apart from the ties of religion, of geographical propinquity, or of caste; a nexus interwoven of three strong cords—a common language, common political aims, and a sense of the power of action in common—the products of a common system of education.

Well may Ministers watch and weigh Indian public opinion. It is our own creation; it cannot be ignored or repressed; it can only be guided. It is the force that will make—or break—the British Empire in India.

THE BOMBAY GOVERNMENT AND HIGHER EDUCATION.—III.

BY THE HON. C. H. SETHALVAD, B.A., LL.B.,
(Late Member of the Bombay Legislative Council, *Syndic in Law and Fellow of Bombay University, Advocate of the Bombay High Court, etc.*)

I FIND that since I wrote my second article there have been further questions put in the House by Sir William Wedderburn about the refusal of the Bombay Government to sanction the affiliation of the private College of Law at Bombay. The answers now given by the Secretary of State reveal a most extraordinary state of things.

In my first article I stated that some of the members of the syndicate who were against the affiliation of the said college, but who were in a minority, based their opposition on the ground that they were afraid that sedition might be taught at the proposed institution. I, however, gave the Bombay Government credit for better judgment and discretion, and when they issued their resolution I thought I was justified in giving such credit to that Government; for however indefensible their decision was on other grounds they never attempted in that resolution to rely on the danger of the proposed institution being perverted to improper uses. The resolution on the other hand speaks of the members of the managing board and the professional staff of the proposed institution as representative men and leading lawyers. They further invited two of the members of the managing board to advise them on the reconstitution of the Government school, and recently offered to two of the professors of the private college chairs on the professorial staff of the Government school, and invited Mr. Justice Tyabji to be a member of

the visiting board of the Government school. And the only reasons that they give for their refusal are, as I have already stated, that as they want to improve the Government school by means of enhanced fees they cannot afford to allow any of the students to be diverted to another institution, and that if the Government school was made efficient a second institution was not needed.

Under the circumstances no body could have in the least suspected that the Bombay Government were all the time very artfully concealing the real reason that determined their decision. For Lord George Hamilton now tells us that the question of fees had nothing whatever to do with the decision of the Bombay Government, and read an extract from a letter to him which shows that they refused to sanction the affiliation solely on the ground that they considered that there was danger of legal instruction being perverted to political uses. Lord Curzon in one of his speeches, I think at Lahore, is reported to have found fault with certain people who according to him, are talking nonsense about the condition of India at a safe distance of six thousand miles. It would interest his lordship to learn that that failing is not the monopoly of private individuals, but is also shared by people high in authority, with the difference that, while private individuals talk openly and freely what they believe to be true and others choose to call nonsense, people in authority confide their nonsense (of course the soundest truths in their view) to their superiors in England with little or no chance of detection or contradiction except by accident, as in this instance.

It is impossible to reconcile the resolution of the Bombay Government with the information now given by the Secretary of State. While on the one hand they were persuading the Secretary of State to support their decision to refuse to sanction the affiliation of the proposed college by raising the bugbear of sedition, they on the other hand were practically telling the public in India: Oh! the promoters of the proposed college are admirable men, there is no possible suspicion about the honesty of their motives, but as their scheme cannot be carried out without depriving us, the Government, of a part of the funds by which we want to put our house in order, we cannot allow them to start their institution. The Bombay Government could not with any decency in Bombay say there was any danger of an institution with which men like the Hon. Mr. Justice Tyabji, the Hon. Mr. Chandavarkar and others were connected working on any improper lines; but they could of course safely at a distance of six thousand miles make the Secretary of State believe anything about it.

The statement that there is danger of legal instruction in India being perverted to political uses is too absurd to require any serious consideration. In Bengal, as I have already pointed out, legal instruction has been almost wholly in private hands for the last many years. I understand in the North-West there are private law colleges. In the Mofussil of Bombay legal instruction for the F.L.L.B. examination is given at private colleges. But besides this, law students who appear for the High Court and District Court Pleaders' examination, and who are far greater in number than those going up for the University Law degree, are trained entirely at private institutions in Bombay and the Mofussil centres like Poona and Ahmedabad. But all these years there has never been any complaint in India that legal instruction was perverted to political uses.

Where then was the danger of this particular institution—admittedly under admirable guidance—becoming a centre of sedition? Moreover, the control of higher education in Arts in Bombay is mainly in private hands. And it is never said that instruction at those institutions is perverted to improper uses. Where is then the special danger of legal instruction being perverted to political uses, the fundamental dissociation of law from politics, in the words of the Bombay Government, notwithstanding. How absurd to suppose that, if there are people badly disposed, they would get no other opportunity of teaching sedition but would be forced to retail it openly in lecture-rooms while teaching law! The more one thinks of it one staggers at the ludicrous way in which the Bombay Government have apparently succeeded in frightening themselves out of their wits by phantoms. It is really unfortunate that the authorities in India should so misunderstand and distrust the educated classes who must be and really are—by their education, by their training, even by self-interest—the most loyal portion of the population,

OUR LONDON LETTER.

(FROM A PARLIAMENTARY CORRESPONDENT.)

THE world of English politics has been by no means devoid of interesting incident since I last wrote. Indeed this Session of Parliament resembles in one respect the last Session—it has been dull and lifeless almost beyond endurance, and certainly beyond description, until the end is almost in view, and now there are signs of a more lively time. First of all, the Government is losing popularity every day, and as a necessary consequence the Opposition is beginning to pull itself together. The new members for Edinburgh who took their seats the other day had a roaring welcome, for the Liberal victory there had been unusually complete. Two vacancies had occurred in one city almost simultaneously, and in one case the Liberals had captured a seat from the Tories, while in the other they retained the seat they held previously by a majority increased nearly fivefold. Singularly enough, on the day after these two new members took their seats the Government Whip announced two vacancies at Oldham, one caused by the death of Mr. Ascroft, and the other by the resignation of Mr. Oswald, and so two seats held precariously by the Tories are exposed to attack. I have very little doubt that the Liberals will capture the two. The Tories are not in the ascendant anywhere just now, but I should think they are worse off in Lancashire than anywhere. In that county and in London they had a fictitious triumph last election, a triumph purchased by false promises and the most reckless pledges. There has been no attempt to redeem most of these, and the constituencies are as wroth as are most victims of the confidence trick.

So much for the general situation in English politics; now for one or two particular incidents. I think I explained in this column recently that the House of Commons had decided that women were to be eligible to serve as councillors and aldermen on the new municipalities in London. There were two divisions in each of which the champions of the ladies triumphed, and on a third occasion the other side did not dare to divide and had a hostile amendment negatived without a division. It was then that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, one of the most stolid Tories in public life, advised his friends in the Commons to leave the case in the hands of the other House, and then there would no doubt be cause once more to thank God we have a House of Lords. Monday's doings in the Lords showed that the Chancellor had not misplaced his confidence. A big night in the Lords is worth seeing for many reasons. When a frantic Whip is sent out by the reactionaries of the peerage, all sorts of titled old gentlemen of the greatest obscurity emerge from their remote haunts and come to Westminster. The police at the doors have the greatest difficulty in knowing whether some of them have any real right in the place or not. I remember when the last great Home Rule debate was on in the Upper House a policeman said to me quite pathetically, "How can I tell whether some of them are peers or pickpockets?" I replied that it was possible for a man to be both, a remark which shed quite a flood of new light into the mind of the custodian. On Monday there was quite a crowd of these mysterious peers known as "Lord Knows-Whos" coming from Heaven knows where.

Perhaps the best thing about that House is the fact that they allow the peeresses to sit in the side galleries, instead of huddling them away out of sight as is done with ladies in the Commons. On Monday there were more than 70 peeresses arrayed in all the finery of summer attire, and a brilliant margin of colour they gave to the chamber, as they sat there with a background of dark oak panelling. But what gave the chief interest to the proceedings was the fact that Lord Salisbury pleaded strongly for the admission of women to the new municipalities. There was something really fascinating in hearing the cynical Premier, who generally treats any question involving sentiment with grim irony, arguing earnestly in favour of this somewhat revolutionary change. Nor did the interest end there, for no sooner had he finished than up rose his colleague in the Cabinet, the Lord Chancellor, and opposed him bitterly and with the utmost energy. The Duke of Devonshire also went against his leader with as much emphasis as can be commanded by so indolent and yawning a politician. It was evident enough that Lord Salisbury was going to be

defeated in his own Chamber, a Chamber which he can generally command whether he is in power or out of power. And so it turned out, for the Premier was beaten by 182 to 68. I do not often find it possible to say a good word for the prelates, but on this occasion the two Archbishops and all the other bishops present, some six or eight, voted on the right side, while the Archbishop of York made by far the most sensible contribution to the debate. He pointed out that they were not deciding that women shall sit on the new bodies, but that the public shall have a chance of voting for them. If people do not want them they need not vote for them. In vain, however, was the voice of common-sense raised; the peers acted after their kind.

Interesting as that scene was, it was as nothing when compared with the proceedings in the Commons on Tuesday, when the Government's Parsons Relief Bill came on for second reading. Feeling ran high, the Liberals were flushed and radiant for the Government has with the most crass stupidity forced up a question which has united the Opposition as one man, and this Bill aims at conferring an unjust advantage at the expense of the general community upon a very unpopular class. And the Liberals went for the unhappy forlorn measure tooth and nail, as the saying is. Mr. Asquith attacked it in a speech of great brilliancy, though it struck me as being too obviously prepared and learnt off. Mr. Birrell was as amusing as ever, mixing up sound sense with true humour. That unfortunate minister Mr. Long had treated the House to one of the most amazing examples of that last infirmity of feeble minds, the *tu quoque*, which I have ever heard. The Liberals had blamed the Government for plundering the Local Taxation Account for the purpose of relieving the parsons. Mr. Long retorted, "What did you do in 1893? When you wanted money to compensate the owners of diseased cattle which had been compulsorily slaughtered, you went to this very fund!" Of course Mr. Birrell pounced on this and made merry over the recondite connexion between diseased cattle and distressed parsons! One of his best passages was the helplessness of parishioners as regards the choice of a parson. "He appears in a parish owing to circumstances over which they have no control. They accept him as some great natural phenomenon, say the weather. If he is bright and clear, so much the better; if he is dull and cloudy, they have to put up with him."

Everything in the debate was however eclipsed by the speech of Mr. George Whiteley, a Conservative member, who attacked his own leaders with a wealth of scorn and invective which few Governments have ever had to endure before from either friend or foe. Mr. Whiteley said they had introduced into English politics the worst elements of American public life—they had preached the doctrine of the spoils to the victors. Turning on them savagely he said, "You are pauperising the Church. You are dragging it through the mud, whipping it at the cart tail, for the sake of a paltry, petty and pitiful amount of £87,000." He traced this policy of bribing certain favoured and petted classes at the expense of the public ever since the Government came into power. All along, he said, they had betrayed and surrendered the interests of the towns to those of the counties. The Agricultural Rating Bill of 1896 was the first instance of this. "We were beginning to forget that," he went on, "for in the towns we have short memories; we were going to gloss the matter over on the platform and talk about your foreign policy." But now you are raking it all up again. You want let us forget it. I for one will not cry 'Peace, Peace' when there is no peace. I will not pretend that everything is for the best in the best of all possible worlds. So sick and sore do I feel at this continual surrender of the rights of the town taxpayer and of the ratepayers of the whole community for the benefit of one or two particular classes that there is no course open to me but to resign my seat." I need not say that this candid friendship created an immense sensation. The Liberals cheered uproariously while the Tories sat glum and restless. Politicians of all parties recognise that this speech and the dramatic resignation will have a most disastrous effect on the chances of the Tory candidates in Oldham. If the Liberals are wise they will reprint this damning speech and take good care that every elector in Oldham has a chance of reading it. Thus I end, as I began, by saying that there are lively times ahead during the closing weeks of this Session.

THE CONGRESS AND THE CURRENCY.

MR. J. E. O'CONOR CORRECTED.

SIR W. WEDDERBURN TO SIR H. FOWLER.

The following letter has been addressed by Sir William Wedderburn to Sir Henry H. Fowler, Chairman of the Indian Currency Committee:—

To the Right Hon. Sir H. H. Fowler, M.P.,
Chairman of the Indian Currency Committee,
India Office.

Sir,—The statements contained in Mr. J. E. O'Connor's replies to Questions No. 12,015 and 12,016 in the evidence of the Indian Currency Committee have excited much comment in India; and I have been requested by Mr. D. E. Wacha, Hon. Joint General Secretary of the Indian National Congress, to point out to your Committee that Mr. O'Connor is under a misapprehension as regards the origin of the currency resolution passed last Christmas by the Indian National Congress. Mr. O'Connor appears to be under the impression that this resolution was prompted by a telegram sent by the Chairman of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce expressing a hope that the Congress would protest against the gold standard. Had this telegram been received while the Congress was preparing or discussing the resolution the communication would no doubt have received the respectful attention due to so high an authority. But such was not the case. As a matter of fact the telegram did not reach the hands of the President of the Congress until some time after the speeches on the Currency question had been made and the resolution carried.

But irrespective of the date on which the telegram reached the Congress, it is evident that Mr. O'Connor was ignorant of the procedure according to which the resolutions are drafted for submission to the Congress. Before any resolution is submitted to the Congress the draft is circulated for approval to the different Congress circles in all parts of India. This is done about two months before the date of the Congress, and the opinions thus obtained are considered by the Subjects Committee and the draft is revised and, if necessary, amended before submission to the Congress. This was exactly what was done in the case of the currency resolution. The topic had become inevitable owing to the proceedings of the London Currency Committee, and the whole subject had been freely discussed in the Indian community and the Press months before the date of the Congress. Looking to these facts, it is evident that Mr. O'Connor's suggestion that the Congress resolution was prompted by a telegram received from Manchester at the last moment could not possibly have been true; and it is much to be regretted that a gentleman who holds the office of Director General of Statistics, and appeared as a witness on behalf of the Indian Government, should have permitted himself to make such a reflection upon an important representative body without first ascertaining the correctness of the facts upon which his inference was based.

Such being the case, Mr. Wacha is naturally anxious that the real circumstances should be known, and I shall esteem it a favour if you will communicate this letter to your Committee with a view to its appearing as an appendix to the final proceedings of that body.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

W. WEDDERBURN.

Chairman, British Committee Indian National Congress.

Office of the British Committee, Indian National Congress,
84, Palace Chambers, Westminster.

June 22, 1899.

CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

THURSDAY, June 22.—A deputation, including Sir Clements Markham, Sir Joseph Hooker, Lord Kelvin, and other eminent scientific men, waited on Mr. Balfour to ask him, on behalf of the Royal and Royal Geographical Societies, for the assistance of the Treasury in the equipment of the proposed Antarctic expedition. Mr. Balfour expressed his full recognition of the importance and the desirability of such an expedition, and thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be able to give substantial aid to the project.

At Commission No. 1 of the Peace Conference, the United States delegate pointed out the unreasonableness of interdicting the use of asphyxiating gas while permitting the more cruel and wholesale destruction of human life by the employment of submarine torpedo-boats; but he was voted down. The British and United States delegates were also left in a minority on the question of the prohibition of the Dum-Dum bullet.

M. Waldeck-Rousseau formed a new French Ministry. He himself is Premier and Minister of the Interior; M. Delcassé remains at the Foreign Office, General Galliffet takes the portfolio of War, M. de Lanessan that of Marine, M. Millerand that of Commerce, M. Decrais that of the Colonies, and M. Caillaux that of Finance.

The Tsung-li-Yamen refused the demand preferred by the

British Legation in Peking for the immediate removal of the Governor of Kwei-chau on account of his failure to punish the murderers of Mr. Fleming, the missionary.

The Tasmanian House of Assembly passed a Federal Enabling Bill. In Victoria and South Australia there was expressed a strong feeling in favour of the early passing of a Federal Enabling Bill by the Imperial Parliament.

FRIDAY, June 23.—The Prince of Wales laid the foundation stone of the new buildings of the Royal School of Art Needlework at South Kensington.—The Duke and Duchess of York opened four new houses at the Colony of the National Society for the Employment of Epileptics at Chalfont St. Peter, Bucks.

Mr. George McCrae, the Radical candidate for East Edinburgh, was returned by 4,871 votes, against 2,961 recorded for Mr. Younger, the Unionist candidate—a majority of 1,930. The majority of Mr. Robert Wallace, the late member, was only 449.

A deputation from the Aborigines' Protection Society submitted to Mr. Chamberlain the alleged grievances of the Natives of Ceylon in connexion with the recent land ordinances and the general administration of justice in the island. Sir J. West Ridgeway, the Governor, who was present, replied that almost every item of the statement on which the Society was acting was without foundation. Mr. Chamberlain hoped that the Society would avoid giving a party character to their representations. He insisted that the object of the Government in the legislation impugned had been to protect the Natives, vindicated in detail the land ordinances, and accepted full responsibility for the action of the Government of Ceylon.

The Russian proposals for restraining the increase of armaments were submitted to Commission No. 1 of the Peace Conference. The special correspondent of the *Times* reported that there was not the faintest chance that they would be adopted.

The Allahabad correspondent of the *Times* stated "on good authority" that the Currency Commission had reported almost unanimously in favour of the maintenance of the 16d. rupee, and of a gold currency with gold as legal tender.

SATURDAY, June 24.—The Prince of Wales laid the foundation stone of the new central offices for the Post Office Savings Bank at South Kensington.—The Archbishop of Canterbury unveiled a statue of Tom Hughes, the author of "Tom Brown's School Days" at Rugby. Lord Cross, who had been in the sixth form at Rugby under Dr. Arnold, also spoke.

At the Peace Conference, the Russian delegates submitted the text of a proposal for the limitation of naval armaments. The United States delegates issued a statement dealing with the exemption of private property from capture at sea.

The Government of the South African Republic emphatically contradicted the rumour that it was purchasing war material. It was stated to have submitted to Sir Alfred Milner a proposal for granting the franchise to Uitlanders after six years' residence, the measure to be retrospective, and the present naturalisation clause to be deleted. The Free State had voted £76,000 for war material. Meetings were held through the week in Cape Town and Cape Colony in support of Sir Alfred Milner's policy. The military authorities were displaying activity in view of contingencies.

MONDAY, June 26.—The Queen reviewed 14,000 troops at Aldershot Camp.

Mr. Chamberlain delivered an important speech on the Transvaal question at the annual meeting of the Birmingham Liberal-Unionist Association. He traced the history of our relations with the Transvaal for the last eighteen years in order to show that the country had again and again dealt with the Republic with magnanimity and forbearance; that four times, at least, the aggressions and intrigues of the Boers had brought us to the verge of war with them; and that their persistent refusal of political and civil equality to the Uitlanders was not merely a wrong to them, but a standing menace to the peace of South Africa and to the British position as paramount Power there. The Government were unanimous, and they would see this thing through. He devoutly prayed that a satisfactory settlement might be reached by peaceful means, but patience must not be allowed to degenerate into weakness.

An International Congress of Women was opened at Westminster, Lady Aberdeen, President of the International Council of Women, in the chair. Delegates in large numbers assembled from all parts of the Continent, from many British colonies and possessions, from the United States, the Argentine Republic, Iceland, Palestine, Persia, and China.

Sir Thomas Lipton's yacht, the "Shamrock," specially built to contest the American Cup, was launched at Millwall. Lady Russell of Killowen performed the christening. The "Columbia," which was built in America to defend the Cup, made her first trial trip in Narragansett Bay the day before (Sunday).

Commission No. 1 of the Peace Conference had under consideration the Russian proposals relating to military effectives and Budgets. Colonel Schwartzhoff declared distinctly that Germany could not enter into any engagement not to increase her naval and military effectives. The Commission referred the Russian proposals to naval and military sub-committees containing experts of the Great Powers.

Mr. Fischer, a member of the Executive of the Free State, was in Pretoria. It was understood that he had submitted to Mr. Kruger certain proposals with regard to the conferring of the franchise on the Uitlanders.

TUESDAY, June 27.—The Duke and Duchess of York opened the new building of the Royal London Ophthalmic Hospital in the City Road.

At the sitting of the first Commission of the Peace Conference, the Russian proposals for the limitation of military armaments were declared to be unacceptable. None of the other States represented at the Conference considered it consistent with their interests to suspend their existing practice.

WEDNESDAY, June 28.—The 61st anniversary of the Queen's Coronation was commemorated.

Mr. Fischer's mission at Pretoria terminated. The Pretoria correspondent of the *Times* telegraphed that all announcements as to the basis of the new franchise proposals are premature. The Uitlanders' Council at Johannesburg declared the draft franchise law to be unacceptable unless modified so as to confer full citizenship at the moment of taking the oath of allegiance. It also urged that the fact that the law is not retrospective constitutes a fatal objection.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

[FROM AN INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

BOMBAY, June 9.

The principal topic of the week, which seems to have attracted the attention of the entire Press, English and Indian, is the report broadly prevalent about Lord Curzon's reform of the Imperial and Provincial Secretariats. It is stated that his Lordship is busy elaborating a scheme with the double object of curtailing the vicious practice of swelling report after report on a given subject, and relieving the hard worked district officials of much of the useless paper-work so persistently demanded of them by the Secretariats. The evil which the Viceroy seems determined to eradicate is certainly of a long standing. It is undoubtedly true that a considerable portion of the time of district officials, which should be employed in looking after district wants and requirements, is frittered away in preparing long reports and answering incessant and trivial queries for the Secretariats. When each official simply reiterates or paraphrases what his subordinate has written, the papers on any subject grow to voluminous thickness. One *précis* by a single superior authority is enough. The Viceroy's disposal of the matters pending before him would be greatly facilitated. So far, then, the projected reform finds universal favour.

The *Englishman*, however, sounds a warning note which is certainly opportune. Writing on the 27th ultimo, it enquires whether Lord Curzon's reform will be faithfully carried out. Will he have sufficient strength and perseverance to overcome the passive resistance which vested interests will offer? "It is one thing to issue Imperial ukases; to ensure their execution is quite another matter." The writer enjoins his lordship to bear in mind a few points. Firstly, the Simla Clique, which has monopolised all power, should be curbed, and its dominating influence greatly diminished. Secondly, appointments in the Secretariats of the empire, should be limited for a prescribed period only. Thirdly, enquiry should be made into the antecedents of aspirants to secretariate appointments. Fourthly, competent men, wherever found, should be appointed, but Punjab or Bengal alone should not be kept as a monopoly for appointments. Lastly, the *Englishman* would suggest that the practice of allowing provincial heads of administration to go on furlough during the tenure of their satrapy should be rigidly put down. It will be readily admitted that all these suggestions are practical, and need to be carried out, for a thorough reform of the present recruitment of officers in the secretariate.

Another matter of imperial importance is the development of Assam. Only the other day Mr. H. J. S. Cotton, the able Commissioner, succeeded by sheer force of argument, based on personal knowledge and experience, in bringing round to a limited extent the Imperial authorities in the matter of land revenue assessments. Bearing in mind the immense area of waste land which could be well utilised for cultivation and for thus stimulating the economic products of the province, Mr. Cotton, than whom few civilians understand better the agricultural condition of the whole empire, especially of Bengal, advised the Imperial Government to have the land revenue settled on a more or less permanent basis. He fought hard to get the central authorities to agree to his proposal, and eventually succeeded in getting a hundred thousand acres placed on a permanent tenure, with certain limitations. And now while Mr. Cotton is doing his best to improve the condition of Assam, the Government of India in one breath proclaims that it is most solicitous to promote indigenous enterprise and in another breath it directs railways to purchase all their timber from the Forest officer! Why so? Surely, we have not forgotten the magniloquent State despatch of 1896 in which Lord Elgin laid

down the principle that the primary object of the State was the conservation of forests and not making money out of them.

The *Birthday Gazette* is always a fruitful theme of discussion in the Press. This time the crop of honours has been very limited. Some say the honours list is judicious; some say it is as bad as ever; while some seem to think it is neither bad nor good. The fact is, honours have been made so cheap since the degenerate days of the Imperial Assemblage at Delhi, that the State has actually demoralised the people and the officials alike. There has been next to no discrimination in the distribution of the honours twice a year. Flattery, backstairs influence, and elements of an equally abhorrent nature have been more at the bottom than intrinsic merit. Judging from the general criticism appearing in the Press, it may be said that the honours list excites no enthusiasm. If at all, it creates unpleasant controversy, which is not at all flattering to those who are popularly supposed to be the fountains of honour. The recipients are more commiserated than congratulated. The sooner these orders are allowed to remain fallow for some years to come the better. Or better still, abolish them. "Remove that bauble" is uppermost on the lips of many.

The Blue-book on the Sugar Act has completely unmasked its authors, while the supporters of the measure seem to maintain rigid silence. Not a word has been said in reference to the many misstatements and incomplete statistics in which that book abounds. The bad logic of the writer of the despatch of the Government of the North-West Provinces is so obvious that one wonders how in the teeth of it the legislators rushed hastily forward to pass the Bill? Another matter to which attention may be drawn is the omission from the Blue-book of the Report of the Board of Revenue of Madras. The *Madras Standard* openly refers to its contents and alleges that the omission is surprising, bearing in mind the fact that the Board openly tells the Government that the Madras sugar industry has in no way suffered by the bounty-fed importation. Perhaps it may be interesting to interpellate the State Secretary on the omission of this important paper. Are we to understand that all documentary evidence which tells against the legislation has been suppressed?

Lastly, the railway signalers' strike continues. The men are as obdurate and firm in the justice of their demand as the company is firm in its refusal to admit it. Popular sympathy is entirely with the men, who meanwhile are enduring the greatest hardship and privation. The fund started for their partial relief is said to have reached about Rs. 7,000. What is generally observed by the Native Press is this: That the company is fighting against these poor wights with the monies of the public.

THE INDIAN SENIOR WRANGLER.

DINNER AT CAMBRIDGE.

SPEECHES BY THE MASTER OF ST. JOHN'S AND MR. R. P. PARANJPYE.

A complimentary dinner was given at the "University Arms" hotel, Cambridge, on June 20, by the Indian Majlis, in honour of Mr. R. P. Paranjpye, who was bracketed Senior Wrangler. Mr. Balak Ram presided. In the motley assembly were seated together Parsees, Hindus, and Mahometans, with Englishmen and Scotsmen. Forty different castes were counted around the table. Prince Ranjitsinghji was cricketing at Eastbourne and could not come, but he telegraphed: "Please convey congratulations on brilliant academic success. We must all feel proud of the distinction." Among other gentlemen whose inability to attend was much regretted were Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Sir William Wedderburn, Bart., Professor Cowell, H. H. the Thakore Saheb of Gondal, and Sir Gerald FitzGerald, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., of the India Office. Mr. Cowell, learned Professor of Sanskrit, who was confined to the house by his doctor, sent a Sanskrit verse expressing his sincere congratulations to the following effect:—

Thy native land, methinks, at this glorious time,
Feels a proud thrill of joy, as though the breeze
Wafted the breath of flowers from some new clime,
In unknown continents beyond the seas.

DR. TAYLOR'S GENEROUS TRIBUTE.

The toast of "The Queen and the Royal Family" having been honoured with enthusiasm,

The Master of St. John's College rose, amid loud cheers, to submit the toast of Mr. R. P. Paranjpye. He esteemed it an honour, he said, not only to himself but to the college which he represented, that it should have fallen to him to propose the toast of the evening, the health of the distinguished guest and former president of the Indian Majlis, who shared the highest place in the Mathematical Tripos of his year. (Cheers.) The occasion was unique, absolutely unique—(hear, hear)—and it was one unsurpassed in interest in the educational annals of the University. (Loud cheers.) Out of four wranglers who headed the list, one was English by birth and education, one was born and bred in our distant colonial city of Melbourne. (Cheers.) Another, born in London, was educated in that same city of Melbourne. One, whose startling success had taken the world by

surprise—(loud cheers)—was a native of India—(renewed cheers)—educated in Poona, and examined by the Bombay University. Never before did the Cambridge Honours List so reflect the unity and diversity of the British Empire. (Hear, hear.) It justified their boast that when a man was born in east or west, in England or in the Antipodes, he would have fair field and no favour. (Cheers.) If a man aspired to the highest intellectual distinction, let him come to the University of Cambridge, where, if he merited the highest place, that incarnation of impartiality and sound judgment, the Cambridge mathematical examiner, would place him there. (Laughter.) He thought that this toast came most fitly next after the toast of the Queen—(hear, hear)—for he was sure that to no one would this success of India won by Mr. Paranjpye be more welcome than to the venerable Empress—(loud cheers)—Empress of India, who was known to take so deep an interest in the welfare of its peoples, and was not unacquainted with one at least of its languages. It was for her, they might say, a precious birthday honour. (Cheers.) It was also

A TRIUMPH TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

(Hear, hear.) Paranjpye, he understood, came with an Indian Government scholarship. It was a testimony to the complete success of their great schemes for education in India. It showed that one born there and educated there in its schools and colleges might be fitted to hold his own in the severest competition against the world. (Loud cheers.) Mr. Paranjpye was declared equal first, but he thought it undeniable that while the Englishman and the Indian were bracketed the achievement of the Indian was clearly the greater. (Loud and prolonged cheers.) Had the examination been held in his native language Mr. Paranjpye would have been first and the rest nowhere. (Loud cheers and laughter.) Before he could go to this examination with any chance of success, Mr. Paranjpye had to learn a language quite different from his own, not to learn it in a slight and superficial way, but so as to use it with the freedom and speed required in such an examination. That so heavily handicapped he should have run a dead heat in the race was a truly great accomplishment, and it made his Senior Wranglership

A VERIFIABLE DOUBLE HONOUR.

(Cheers.) This epoch-making event led him to reflect for a moment on the beginnings of science. Historians told them that there was a beam of light in the East while Europe was in darkness. One came down to the great movement of the Middle Ages; whatever the West failed to accomplish, at any rate it brought back new culture and science and intellectual life from its aggressive contact with the East. Now they saw East and West bracketed in peaceful rivalry, henceforth to think and to work as one for the enlightenment and prosperity of the Empire and the human race. (Cheers.) He understood that it was Mr. Paranjpye's ambition to go back after a time to his country and to give back there what he had learnt there and here. It needed no special gift of prophecy to predict with assurance that he would find an open door, and that he would find men of the rising generation ready and anxious to learn from him the way to that great height which he had himself attained, and perhaps before many years there might be some disciple of Professor Paranjpye—(loud cheers and laughter)—repeating his triumph of to-day. If he gave his genius also to the direct advancement of science by original research, no doubt Mr. Paranjpye would be successful in that also, and perhaps about the middle of next century he might be receiving honours such as had lately been accorded with acclamation to the latest successor of Newton in the Lucasian Professorship of Mathematics. (Loud cheers.) He gave them the toast of "Professor Paranjpye" (laughter) and he wished him long life and enjoyment of the supreme academic honours which were now fresh upon him. (Prolonged applause.)

MR. PARANJPYE'S REPLY.

The SENIOR WRANGLER, in acknowledging his vociferous reception, said that any person who had just received that honour must be surely proud of such a day. (Hear, hear.) Much more so, therefore, a man like himself, of whom anybody prophesying twenty-three years ago what had now happened would have been put down as a downright idiot. (Cheers and "No, no.") Because they were all members of this great University they were assembled there that night. But admire the University as they might—and he yielded to nobody in admiring this University—he had one little fault to find with the University, it was that the University made a far greater fuss over the Senior Wrangler than he really deserved. ("No, no," and laughter.) Any amount of instances could be mentioned in which the Senior Wrangler had been a complete failure in after life, and so on. The contrary, people who had passed very badly in their University exams had made a mark on the history of the world—(hear, hear)—while persons who had shone most brilliantly in intellectual spheres had oftentimes had no university education at all. But supposing such an honour was due to the Senior Wrangler, and supposing the Senior Wrangler was the best in his year, which he was perfectly certain was not so in his case, he did not see why this Mathematical Tripos should be so specially selected in this University. His hon. friend from Christ's was far more entitled to this honor than he himself; not only was he the only one in the First Class, but he had done so brilliantly well that there was nobody even in the Second Class. (Laughter and cheers.) Whatever success he might have had was due wholly and solely to his teachers. First and foremost of his teachers he must place his cousin, Professor Karve. He was thinking what he would have been if his cousin had not taken charge of him; so far from there being an occasion like the present he would have been ploughing the fields just as his father had done before him. Mr. Paranjpye then turned to the pleasant duty of offering his heartiest thanks for the consistently kind treatment which he had received in Cambridge from his teachers here and from his college. When he came to Cambridge Mr. Tanner helped him to buy all his furniture. About Mr. Webb, his guide, philosopher, and friend, vulgarly called a "coach," he would not say anything more than that if he had to live his undergraduate days over again he would not change him for anybody else. Referring to the history of mathe-

matics, Mr. Paranjpye said that he had been struck with the irony of fate when he remembered that 800 years ago India was the home of many branches of mathematics, and that its mathematical learning was brought to the western world by Arab invaders. He used to look with reverence upon the many books in the college library which were not required for the examinations in Bombay, and which, consequently, nobody was competent to teach. When he had no idea of joining St. John's College it was a good omen that the book which chiefly struck him was the standard treatise on conic sections by the Master of St. John's College. Reference had been made to his decision to return to Fergusson College. On that point he claimed neither generosity nor heroic self-sacrifice. He

CONSIDERED IT HIS DUTY

to afford the facilities for higher education which were given to him so miraculously by his cousin. He felt it his duty to lighten the difficulties which prevented many young men who had great abilities from prosecuting their studies further. There was also a personal element in his resolve to join Fergusson College. He felt that he would be more in his element if he devoted his energies to the imparting of knowledge. He did not feel himself equal to the more active duties of a Government servant, nor did he feel the ardent forensic abilities required for a career at the bar. (Laughter and cheers.) He did not belittle the attainments of the other gentlemen who were bracketed with him for the Senior Wranglership. When he knew that Mr. Birtwistle was the son of a poor ironmonger, and that he had raised himself to his high position by his own exertions, in getting scholarships and prizes, he felt that Mr. Birtwistle's attainment was far greater than his own. (Cheers.) The attainments, too, of Mr. Chatterjee in the Indian Civil Service examination, and of Prince Ranjitsinhji in the cricket field completely eclipsed anything that he had done. (Cries of "Question.") He felt that this occasion marked a growing sympathy between the different classes in India and their rulers in England, and that the separation of the different castes and of the people of different provinces was soon going to end. He saw this by the fact that he had been so enthusiastically honoured by his Hindu friends as by his Mahomatan friends, and by his Parsee friends. (A voice: "And by Christian friends, too," and cheers.) He had been honoured most enthusiastically by his friends of whatever religion they might be, and an event like that showed that the good day of India was not far off. (Prolonged cheers.)

The subsequent toasts of "The University" (Mr. G. A. Khan and Mr. W. H. Wheatcroft), "Fergusson College, Poona" (Mr. B. C. Ghosh and R. N. Narayan), "England and India" (Mr. J. Baptista and Mr. Chalmers and Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal), and "The President" (Mr. E. M. Nanavutty and Mr. Balak Ram), were honoured with great enthusiasm. The proceedings were wound up with three hearty cheers for the worthy Master of St. John's.

Imperial Parliament.

Thursday, June 15.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE SUGAR DUTY ACT.

MOTION TO DISALLOW.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN ON "FREE TRADE."

THE MOTION REJECTED.

[Continued from last issue.]

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Mr. Speaker, it is rather a curious fact that the last two speakers, although their conclusions have been very different, have this at least in common—both of them have spoken against the views of the party to which they belong. The only difference is that the hon. baronet the member for Glasgow performs that operation very infrequently, while with my right hon. friend the member for Bodmin it is altogether usual. (Laughter.) I think I shall not shock my right hon. friend if I say that sometimes his speeches cause some irritation to his friends. That is not because he differs from them, that is not because he is a candid friend, because I can assure him he occupies that position so admirably that the Unionist party is proud to have so conspicuous a specimen of the genus in their midst. (A laugh.) But the feeling is due to a different cause to that cause which operated in the case of the New Zealand medicine man, as to whom the chief of his tribe said that he gave them so much good advice that they were pleased to put him away. (Loud laughter and cheers.) Now, my right hon. friend in the course of his speech, spoke of his desire—a most natural and creditable desire on his part—to purge the mental confusion of foreign legislatures. (Laughter.) That is an extension of his ordinary rôle; his ordinary rôle is to purge the mental confusion of domestic legislation. (Opposition cheers.) Yes, as with so many other great benefactors of his species, I am afraid the people he is supposed to benefit are not sufficiently grateful. The right hon. gentleman has contended to-night that a bounty differs from a protective duty, that it is not so bad as a protective duty, because a bounty is a benefit to the country receiving it and an injury to the country giving it. I take issue on both those statements. The right hon. gentleman appears to think that a bounty given by a foreign country to introduce its products where they could not naturally go is equivalent to a rather extreme hypothesis he raised—namely, the possibility that heaven might shower twopenny leaves upon us. There is a difference between heaven and foreign government. (Laughter.) The bounty of heaven is more free; it is less interested. If heaven ever does shower twopenny leaves upon us it

will not be because it has gone into the bakery trade. (Laughter.) I think the comparison is altogether unfair. But I take exception to his first statement that a bounty is a benefit to the country receiving it. It is, I think, a mental confusion on the part of the right hon. gentleman which I desire to purge—(laughter)—that a bounty is the cause of cheap sugar. No doubt if the fact that sugar at the present time is half the price it was so many years ago were due entirely to the bounty system, I admit we should have to consider very carefully before we did anything to prevent that system. But nothing of the kind is the case. (Hear, hear.) The low price of sugar is due principally to the reduction in the cost of production, and the reduction in the price of sugar is not much, if any, greater than the average reduction of other commodities and other necessities. Therefore it is not due to the bounty, and when I come a little later to consider more carefully the question of cheapness I think I shall be able to show that very little of the reduction in price, if any, is due to the giving of a bounty. Therefore I deny that the concession of a bounty is an advantage to the country receiving it. It is a distinct disadvantage in this respect—that it artificially destroys trades and occupations which are natural to the country—(cheers)—and which once destroyed it is very difficult to replace. (Hear, hear.) But then my right hon. friend goes on to say that it is an injury to the country giving it. Does my right hon. friend suggest that every other country is a fool in regard to its own business? (Hear, hear.) I have a sort of idea that some of these countries, at any rate, know their business as well as we do, and if they have given bounties for now something like twenty or thirty years, and if they have continually increased those bounties perhaps they have found some profit in doing it. (Hear, hear.) I would point out to my right hon. friend, as it appears to have escaped his attention, some profits which they have eminently gained thereby. The production of sugar in Germany, for instance, and in France has been enormously extended and improved owing directly to the bounties. The bounties were given in accordance with the production of sugar per ton of beet, and the result has been that the production, which was for many years five or six per cent., has now been raised to eleven or twelve per cent. (Hear, hear.) If that stood alone it might be held by foreign economists to be some justification for the expense they had been put to in the production of the sugar. There is one general remark I would make here of the whole argument of my right hon. friend. If bounties are an advantage to this country, why do I want to remove them? (Hear, hear.) I admit I could not quite follow his argument. (Opposition cheers.) No doubt hon. gentlemen opposite were more fortunate than myself, but if I understood him correctly what he said was that if he considered the matter in the light of the interests of this country he would not wish to abolish bounties, but as he takes a wide, a general, a magnificent, a cosmopolitan view of the situation—(laughter)—he wishes that bounties should be removed for the advantage of foreign countries to the injury of his own. I think I have rightly understood my right hon. friend's argument.

Mr. COCHRAN. Quite true.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. A philanthropy which takes in the whole world and leaves out of account its own country is one to the heights of which I confess I am quite incapable of attaining. (Cheers and counter cheers.) I gather that hon. members opposite are able to sympathise with my right hon. friend. (Opposition cheers.) Whether that may make them more popular in the country—(laughter)—to which they belong, but whose interests they are willing to sacrifice to the interests of the whole world—(Opposition cries of "Oh," and Ministerial cheers)—whether their universal philanthropy will really be more acceptable than my own misplaced patriotism—(laughter)—I must leave to the House to decide. (Cheers.) One other remark about the speech of my right hon. friend. He professed to believe that the prevalence of beet over cane was due to a sort of natural selection and to the fact that beet sugar can be produced more cheaply than cane sugar. That is entirely opposed to the figures of the case which have been submitted to me by the authorities in this matter. The cost of cane sugar under the most favourable circumstances is less than the cost of beet sugar also under the most favourable circumstances, and I would submit to my right hon. friend, who shakes his head—perhaps his knowledge of sugar production is greater than mine—(laughter)—that if it is not as I state there is no occasion for a bounty—(hear, hear)—for the export of earth-shaking quantities of cane sugar to foreign countries give a bounty in order to force their beet sugar into our country and other countries if, naturally and without any bounty, beet sugar would be cheaper than cane sugar? (Cheers.) It is evident that the course of this debate has run upon two questions—the question of principle and the question of expediency. The question of principle covers the whole question of bounties. It covers bounties so far as they affect the West Indies, Queensland, and Mauritius; it covers countervailing duties so far as they affect this country as well as the colonies. The question of expediency is the question of expediency—that is to say, that, getting countervailing duties may be properly applied in particular cases, yet when we have to consider the merits of each particular case. There of course a distinction might be drawn between the case of the West Indies and the case of India, or of any other country. I trust this debate will result in a clear issue and a decision, by an undoubted and overwhelming majority, which will give us the opinion of all at events this Parliament in regard to the question of principle. (Cheers.) Our opponents in this debate and generally claim that their principles, when they associate with the doctrine of Free Trade, absolutely preclude the consideration of countervailing duties or prohibition. They base the general view of the situation on the authority of what my right hon. friend the member for Wolverhampton calls the high priest of the order, among whom, much to my surprise, he names myself. I can assure him he does me too much honour. (Opposition cheers.) I was never a high priest at all. It is not my line. (Laughter.) But they base this conclusion in the first place on the authority of the high priest, and in the second place upon a theory which they, as I shall endeavour to show, have evolved themselves, that Free Trade consists in the doctrine that cheapness, by whatever means obtained, is the

great object of our legislation. Now, sir, we say, on the contrary, that countervailing duties are not opposed to Free Trade. (Hear, hear.) We absolutely deny it, and we allege that bounties are the very worst form of Protection—(cheers)—because they protect the foreigner, not in his own market, for which there might possibly be some sort of justification at all events in exceptional circumstances, but they protect the foreigner in our market, in which he has no claim whatever to protection. (Hear, hear.) And we say, in the second place, that cheapness is not, and never has been in the view of the high priests of Free Trade, the primary object of Free Trade; and our contention is that we can counteract bounties by countervailing duties or procure their abolition by prohibition without in the slightest degree derogating from our character of orthodox Free Traders. (Cheers.) In the course of the last twenty years or so we have discovered a new Liberalism and a new Radicalism, and now there is a new Free Trade doctrine of which the originators of Free Trade were absolutely ignorant, and which I believe they would have repudiated. (Hear, hear.) I think Lord Macaulay, in his very eloquent speech he made on one occasion, warned his hearers not to give the sanction of religion to abuses which were not religion, because, he said, if you do in the fall of the abuses the religion may go too; and it seems to me that if you connect in the minds of the people the consequences of one of the abuses which have followed from Free Trade with the original principles of Free Trade you will be creating the only danger from which Free Trade has ever suffered. It is very dangerous to teach the people of this country that Free Trade is inseparable from gross injustice and from unfair attacks on their employment and occupations. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member for Cardiff was during the last session of the Government to go to their constituents and say that in given circumstances they would be prepared to propose countervailing duties in this country. I should not be at all afraid to go to my constituents and propose them. (Cheers and laughter.) I think there is, on the contrary, a growing feeling in the country, which to a certain extent alarms me, that injustices have attended Free Trade which ought not to have attended Free Trade and which are not due to Free Trade; and the pressure of those injustices has produced so great an impression on the working classes in the manufacturing centres—(cheers)—that I am alarmed lest they should go a great deal further than I do, and lest they should resort to the remedy to remove the abuses which Free Trade doctrine and principle—Free Trade—(Hear, hear.) I think that is a real danger and worthy of some consideration. I think Free Trade is therefore in danger from its friends. Free Trade is a political religion, and it has had to endure the hard fate of all religions. Since it was promulgated in its original purity it has suffered from the work of annotators and commentators and false prophets—(laughter and cheers)—and as a result the doctrine of Free Trade has become a dogma and the religion a fetish, and I think we had better go back to the original foundation and try, if we can, to clear this religion of the corruption which has been imposed upon it and to remove from it all the result of the fanaticism of certain subsequent professors like my old friend Lord Farrer. It would be absurd to answer in a debate of this kind without alluding to Lord Farrer, who may be said to be the *font origo* of it. (Laughter.) Every argument used on the other side of the House has been taken from Lord Farrer. He is one of the ablest of our public servants—(cheers)—and, as I have reason to know, he has done more than any other man to maintain bounties and prevent their abolition. During the last twenty years he has been full of arguments and facts and statistics, and I am ready to admit that in 1881, the year in which I made the utterances quoted by my right hon. friend the member for Wolverhampton, I was greatly influenced by what he said. (Laughter and cheers.) I will not say that he was the cause of my being a subject of merriment, but I am proud of having been influenced by so able and experienced a public servant—(cheers)—by his statements, by his knowledge, by the facts which he produced; and I will go further and say that I was led to believe in the predictions he then made, every one of which has been falsified by the event. (Laughter and cheers.) I am still ready to believe in his facts, I am still ready to believe in his statistics; but never again will I believe in his prophecy. (Laughter.) Lord Farrer represents the extreme of Free Trade fanaticism; he is the Torquemada of Free Trade. I maintain that there is no justification whatever in the writings or speech of the great Free Traders of the doctrine that countervailing duties are opposed to the principle of Free Trade. (Cheers.) That is a challenge. Mr. Cobden gave two definitions of Free Trade. He defined it as being the abolition of protective duties. Countervailing duties are not protective. A countervailing duty, as its name implies, is a duty strictly confined to countervailing the advantage given by a bounty; it does not go beyond that and it does not protect the industry to which it applies. Another definition that Mr. Cobden gave was that Free Trade was to enable the consumers in every country to obtain what they desire in the cheapest—(Opposition cheers)—yes, and the best market. Yes, but that is not all. That is where you stop. But Mr. Cobden added, "at its natural price." (Ministerial cheers.) That is what hon. members opposite have forgotten. (Cheers.) They have remembered the cheapness but have forgotten the natural price. Now the main object of the great Free Traders was to secure the natural course of production and of exchange. That was the argument again and again elaborated. Their ideal was that each country should produce what it was naturally best fitted to produce and to exchange it without artificial arrangements. The great Free Traders denounced all artificial arrangements which turned their trade into unnatural channels. They disapproved of Protection whenever it turned labour and capital into operations which might be considered to be artificial and unnatural, and which would be uneconomical under ordinary and natural conditions. But they advocated countervailing duties in cases where it was necessary in order to restore equality. (Cheers.) Now, I am going back to the original founder of Free Trade—to Adam Smith. Mr. Cobden said to Mr. Bright that he would take Adam Smith in his hand and would go up and down the country preaching, with the "Wealth of Nations" for his text-book, the

doctrines of Free Trade, and so convert the nation. Adam Smith in his "Wealth of Nations" argued against protective duties and in favour of Free Trade, but he said there were certain cases in which a nation might impose duties to protect their home industry. The first case was nothing to do with the present discussion. The second case in which it might be advantageous to lay some burden on the foreigner for the encouragement of domestic industry is when some tax is imposed at home on the produce of the latter; in this case it seems reasonable that an equal tax should be imposed upon the like produce of the former. By what reasoning does he arrive at this suggestion? Adam Smith did not contemplate bounties as we understand them, but you will find his reasoning applies equally to countervailing duties. "This tax would give a monopoly of the home market to domestic industry, nor would it turn to a particular employment a greater share of the stock of labour of the country than would naturally go to it." That is true of countervailing duties. "It would only hinder any part of what would naturally go to it from being turned away by the tax into a less natural direction." Substitute "bounty" for "tax" and you have the exact argument. (Cheers.) Reference has been made to the spirit duty and other duties which we impose as compensatory to the home tax. It is not that it has been noted—it is rather a special point—that we have actually put a countervailing duty upon West Indian rum to prevent the producers of the West Indies from having an advantage in this market, at the same time refusing to West Indian producers to put them on an equality with regard to their other productions. Then there is the case of the Indian cotton duties. In the case of the Indian cotton duties—the case of a protective duty put on cotton from this country—the right hon. gentleman opposite indicated it to be his intention and desire to place the cotton industry on exactly equal terms in Bombay and Manchester, and he put on an excise duty which was intended to produce equality. When equality is what we are striving at? But if equality in cotton and rum, why not equality in sugar? (Cheers.) Remember that in all these cases the result has been to increase the price to the consumer. If the excise on rum were taken away the English consumer of rum would get it 5d. per gallon cheaper, and if the excise duty on Indian cotton were taken off the Indian consumer would get it 5 per cent. cheaper. Therefore, according to the doctrine of the right hon. member for Bodmin and the inconsistent doctrine of the right hon. member for Wolverhampton, these surtaxes ought never to have been imposed because they add to the price of the consumer and interfere with the privileges of the great god cheapness, which they all actually put on. (Laughter and cheers.) Let us consider this question of cheapness more fully. How many consumers do we gain by the bounties in regard to cheapness? I think he got very little. I have been considering this question lately in the light of further information, and I think I and others have been mistaken in attributing a large proportion of the reduction in the price of sugar to the influence of the bounties. Now let me make it clear to the House. Suppose that the cost of cane sugar is 28, and that the cost of German beet sugar is 29. Suppose the German bounty is 30s. That enables the German to undersell the cane sugar. In the first place 10d. of this bounty goes to cover the increase of cost of the beet sugar. That leaves 10s. which the German producer has at hand, and he may give it if he likes to the English consumer, or he may be a fool? All that is necessary for him is to give a trifle above the cane price. If he can sell his sugar at 27 19s. he would cut out the sugar which would come in at 28, and all that he has to give away is 1s. a ton. The rest either goes to meet the difference in the natural price between the beet and cane, or it goes into the pockets of the producer. I challenge my right hon. friend the member for Bodmin, or any one else, to prove that out of a bounty of 30s. more than an infinitesimal proportion ever goes into the pockets of the consumer in this country.

Mr. COULTER: The producers compete among themselves.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: The competitors are not quite so rabid as my right hon. friend has suggested. They are not so foolish. In the competition cuts his price down more than is necessary. They manage among themselves in such a way as to cut down the price sufficient to enable them to cut out the cane sugar. I wish here to quote Lord Farrer on this question. In his last pamphlet—his pamphlets follow each other very quickly—(laughter)—Lord Farrer said:—"How far the abolition of sugar bounties would raise the price of sugar to the consumer appears to be very doubtful. My own impression is that the effect of the bounties has been much exaggerated." I think that the effect of the bounties to the consumer has been much exaggerated, but not so in regard to the producer. In spite, however, of his opinion that the effect of the bounties has been much exaggerated, Lord Farrer still maintains that a certain increase of price will result from the abolition in the shape of countervailing duties, and on that account chiefly he is opposed to it, because he says that cheapness of price to the consumer is the main object to be attained. I think that hon. members seem here to confuse two things. They divide the community into two classes. On one side are the consumers, and on the other the producers. As a matter of fact, the consumers are generally producers, and the only class of consumers who are not producers—the only class therefore benefited by legislation which is directed solely to the interest of consumers—are not so foolish. The interest of producers is that class which "nail their colours to the mast" (Laughter and cheers.) Is it not a strange inversion of *roles* that hon. gentlemen opposite should be directing the whole of their energies to securing special benefit for that extremely limited class? (Hear, hear.) Mr. Cobden has been already quoted by the hon. baronet the member for Glasgow in opposition to this theory that cheapness is really the object which Free Traders should have in view. I should have liked to quote Mr. Gladstone to the same effect, but I am afraid of curtailing unduly the time which remains. (Cries of "Go on.") On the first question of principle, the I think that our position is that countervailing duties are matters of expediency to be judged in each case on their merits, and that there is nothing in Free Trade which would exclude them. (Hear, hear.) Then I come to an important matter. I do not like the tone of hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to this Indian question. It is an Indian question; and I

agree that it is to be considered entirely from the point of view of Indian interests. But that is not the position taken by my right hon. friend the member for Bodmin and others.

Mr. COULTER: Oh, yes it is.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: No, sir, he is going now to vote against the practically unanimous opinion of the only persons who can represent India. (Laughter and cheers.)

Mr. COULTER: That is not the point. The right hon. gentleman says that I do not look at this question from an Indian point of view. I do.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: My right hon. friend sets himself up as knowing better what is good for India than the only persons who are authorised or are in any way qualified to represent Indian opinion (cheers)—that is, the Indian native Press, the English Press of India, the Council for India in this country, and the Legislative Council in India. (Cheers, and cries of "Oh.") My fear is that there is a tendency on the part of some hon. gentlemen to return to that mercantile system which was the curse of our colonial Empire. It was that system which lost us the United States of America and estranged from us many of our most promising colonies. And what was that mercantile system? It was that the interests of our colonies should be subordinated and put on one side in favour of the interests of British consumers and producers. (Cheers.) It is based on the subordination of colonial interests and opinion to British interests and opinion; and it seems now that there are persons who hold that the interests of the East Indies, of the West Indies, of Mauritius, and of Queensland are comparatively of no importance; that the local opinion of these places is to be sneered at; and that when the planters say they are going to be ruined they are to be told that they do not know what they are talking about, and are making fortunes as hard as they can go. That is the line taken in deference to a number of pedantic economists, and in the supposed interests of the working classes. (Cheers.) We are told that we should be same Imperialists. That is not same Imperialism. That is not same Imperialism, whatever else it is—(cheers)—and it tends to produce a state of feeling between us and the colonies which I for one exceedingly regret. In the present case, as I have said, the public opinion of India is practically unanimous. I am quite astounded to hear my right hon. friend the member for Wolverhampton minimise this opinion by saying, what of course is true, that you have not a public opinion in India such as you have in this country. Why, sir, my right hon. friend came down here some years ago to defend his policy in respect of the cotton duties; and he himself appealed to this opinion of the native Press, the English Press, and the Council of India, and above all he made most eloquent defence of a particular official, who he said was one of the ablest Indian and ever known, and to whose opinion he attached great importance. He complained that my noble friend Lord James of Hereford (then Sir Henry James) had appeared to slight the value of that opinion. Who was this Government official whose opinion was to be taken without criticism? It was Sir James Westland. (Cheers.) It was a member of the Legislative Council who now, in an admirably reasoned speech, has defended these countervailing duties. It is his opinion that my right hon. friend would set aside as of no importance at all in comparison with the views of English economists. (Cheers.)

Sir James Westland: There has been a change of opinion. I have every respect for the opinion expressed by Sir J. Westland in May, 1898, and I believe that everything that has happened since has confirmed that opinion. (Cheers.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: My right hon. friend is not justified in saying that there has been any such change of opinion. Where is the speech of Sir J. Westland in regard to that former decision? What that former decision amounted to was that the Government were not prepared to consider these countervailing duties at that time. It is not a reasoned argument against them, but a decision merely for the moment, which was probably influenced. (Hear, hear.) All this local opinion which was applied in relation to the cotton duties was expressed in a still more marked degree in favour of the course we have followed. Now it is a strange thing—and I am almost ashamed to refer to it—it is a strange thing, but the hon. member for Cardiff made a speech earlier in the evening in which he attacked the Government with considerable feeling, and especially myself. He seemed to think that, whether the Government policy was good or bad, it must certainly be bad if prompted by the Colonial Secretary. (Laughter.) He has Colonial Secretary on the brain; I am to him what King Charles's head was to Mr. Dick's memorial. (Laughter.) But I cannot get out of why he attacks me with this feeling. (Hear, hear.) He makes a profession of loyalty to his party, and I am sure with perfect sincerity, yet he never speaks but to attack some representative member of the party. For a long time I was totally unable to make out why. I knew it could not be a personal feeling against myself, for I do not think I have ever spoken to the hon. member—(laughter)—therefore he could not have any quarrel with me. (Laughter.) Then I thought it must be from some great question of principle, but fortunately the hon. member himself relieved my mind, for some time ago I observed some of his constituents were imprudent enough to ask why he, a supporter of the Government, so often attacked members of the Government. We, he said, had got to be proper dressing—(laughter)—and he explained afterwards to a reporter in an interview, a report of which appeared in his own newspaper published in Cardiff, that he was not influenced by any personal feeling towards the Government or the Colonial Secretary, but that he was in the position of a man looking through the keyhole into a banquet room in which the Liberal Unionist party were eating, enjoying themselves, and making merry. (Laughter.) Well, looking through a keyhole is an undignified position—

Mr. MACPHER: I beg the right hon. gentleman's pardon; let us be accurate. What appeared in the paper was descriptive of the general character of the party, and did not apply to myself in any way.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: I do not know on what authority the hon. member applies it to other members of the party; but at any rate I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that the process he describes so graphically is apt to produce distorted vision. (Laughter.) Now,

what is his point about the Colonial Secretary? My noble friend has explained with absolute accuracy what took place; but what an extraordinary idea the hon. member must have of the power of the Colonial Secretary. He says the Colonial Secretary first forced the hand of the Secretary of State for India, that he then hypnotised Lord Curzon. (Laughter.) By some similar process he influenced the whole of the Council in India, not a man of whom he had ever heard, and, lastly, in the same occult, mysterious and pernicious way he influenced the India Council in this country. (Laughter.) Well, really the hon. member pays me a compliment I do not deserve. I am Colonial Secretary, and when a colony appeals to me as Mauritius did, reporting that its trade is in a perilous or sad condition, or will be seriously endangered unless something is done in the shape of legislation in India, it is my duty to convey the information to the Secretary of State for India. (Hear, hear.) I said at the time that the interest of India would dictate the decision of the Secretary of State in Council, but that, so far as I was concerned, I hoped the condition of Mauritius would be sympathetically considered by the Government. (Hear, hear.) There are two or three objections taken which I will deal with in a few minutes. It is complained that the Indian Government and Council decided without completing the enquiry which they had undertaken. Well, as my noble friend has pointed out, in the interval he had information that led him to believe that if he did not act rapidly his object would be frustrated by a large importation of bounty-fed sugar. But after all the enquiry upon which he was engaged could not add much information that would affect his decision, for all the enquiry would show was the effect of the importation of sugar in this time, but it is admitted that interference before it became a matter of great importance, was no serious effect anticipated up to that time; they were preventive steps. The same reply also answers the objection that it was unnecessary to interfere because the amount was small. Yes, it was small up to the time importation took place; but it was growing rapidly, and there was not the slightest doubt there would have been an enormous introduction of sugar diverted from the United States to India but for the wise policy adopted. It is said the true policy of the Indian Government was not to put on countervailing duties, but to encourage better methods of production. (Hear, hear.) That has often been said about the West Indies and other colonies, but it is an absurd argument, and it shows entire ignorance of the situation. You cannot encourage better production, you cannot introduce new energy and capital, unless you can give stability to the industry. (Hear, hear.) What is my position at this moment? Have I not been for months—I might almost say for two years—considering night and day methods for bringing prosperity to the West Indies by which the fatal effects of bounties may be removed? My efforts have been directed, among other things, largely to secure the introduction of fresh capital and energy. I know people who are interested in the West Indies, and who are in this country, who have the possession of the largest capital and have shown the greatest energy, and at this moment I have a statement by one of those parties to the effect that he would to-morrow engage to invest a million sterling in the production of sugar in the West Indies if the Government would guarantee him against an increase in the bounties that are now given by foreign countries. (Hear, hear.) It is said if you propose countervailing duties foreign countries will retaliate. They will retaliate, no doubt, if it is to their interest to do so, but it is not to their interest to do so. They take from us nothing now—they take nothing from India—that they can help taking. They take the raw materials for their own manufactures; they would injure themselves much more than India and us if they retaliated by refusing to buy from us. They cannot refuse cotton, they cannot refuse seed, they cannot refuse jute and other products of India to which the right hon. gentleman the member for Wolverhampton referred; and under these circumstances in my opinion there is no practical fear whatever that they will retaliate in any way by the increase of duties. I will say, in conclusion, that it appears to me the issues before us are simple. In the first place, we have to decide whether or not there is such an overwhelming, overmastering principle, either in connexion with Free Trade or anything else, as to put countervailing duties out of court and prevent their consideration on their merits. In the second place, we have to decide whether we are willing to give the clearly expressed opinion of the authoritative representatives of Indian interests, and whether we are to do that virtually in the interests—the very indirect interests, as I consider—of the British consumer. Those are the two principles, at any rate, that are to be decided by our vote to-night. But I go one step further. I would say also that in my opinion, even if we thought the view of the Indian Government to be wrong, we should still hesitate before we overrule it. (Hear, hear.) But, sir, the Government hold, and they are perfectly willing to accept the responsibility for that opinion, that the policy of the Government in India was right. (Cheers.) They hold that the Government of India was right in relieving the burden imposed by this most pernicious system of bounties, in securing to one of the staple productions of India equal opportunity with its foreign competitors, and in neutralising the arbitrary advantage which the foreigner is seeking to obtain in a market in which he has no natural claim. (Cheers.)

SIR HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: We have listened to two speeches of extreme interest from my right hon. friend the member for Bodmin and from the right hon. gentleman who has just stepped down; they were lectures on the subject of Free Trade dealing with the theory and the facts of Free Traders, and it will be somewhat of a relief to the House to know, especially with the scanty time at my disposal, that it is not my intention to inflict upon the House a third essay upon that subject. My right hon. friend the member for Bodmin spoke with his usual warmth and enthusiasm. I cannot rise myself quite to the heights of the economical philosophy to which he attained, but in the main I agree to his doctrines and agree with his conclusions. The noble lord the Secretary of State for India in the early part of the evening, when he rose to address the House, began by asking those

of his hon. friends who had put down amendments to this motion not to move the amendments which stood in their name. I heard this appeal without surprise, because on looking at the paper it was evident that the amendment showed how far this question reaches, how far it goes beyond the mere question of India and the Mauritius, and of their relations to the bounty-fed sugar-producing countries, and displayed really the motives and intentions which underlie the policy in the minds of many of those who support it. But I need not have formed this estimate of the noble lord's motive, because the moment he began his speech it was apparent, and it has become still more apparent in the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, that the main part of their policy, which they are now seeking to apply to India, it is their intention to apply at a more convenient time to this country itself. (Cheers.) The noble lord invited my right hon. friend to go to the country in defence of the system of bounties, but the noble lord must know perfectly well we are as much opposed to the system of bounties as he is. (Cheers.) Bounties are merely another form of protective duties; we need not speculate as to which is the worst of the two. These bounties appear to me to be bad, to disturb and hinder trade, and above all to punish the very nations which employ them; so that I do not know what there is to be said in favour of them. There is no quarrel between us on that score at all; where we differ is as to the remedy to be applied. The noble lord spoke of himself as an old Free Trader. The right hon. gentleman who has just sat down has told us that there are new doctrines of Free Trade. The Secretary of State for India is a good judge of new doctrines. I have heard that for my part, if doctrine is to be developed, I prefer that it should be developed in a forward rather than in a backward sense, and if it was a new development of the old Free Trade principle I should not be afraid of it on that account. But when he states that what is called countervailing duties, but what I prefer to call retaliatory duties, were accepted and were advocated in certain cases by the old orthodox Free Traders, I cannot but call to mind a maxim which is constantly quoted and which is, I think, one of the standing maxims on this subject—the words of Sir Robert Peel when he said he would "fight hostile tariffs by free imports." (Hear, hear.) That was the way in which old Free Traders—the high priests of Free Trade—used to deal with such questions. We have known before us, I prefer the old method to the new. Mr. Speaker, and when the noble lord challenges us to go to the country, as he did, as the advocates of bounties, my reply is in the first place that we are not advocates of bounties, and in the second place I would invite him on his part to go to the country with the cry of retaliatory tariffs and dear sugar. (Cheers.) There is much interest taken in the relation of these two Cabinet Ministers to each other. There was a suspicion engendered by the Blue-book which is before us that the noble lord the Secretary of State for India was acted upon, driven into this policy, and is not obliged to make himself the obedient servant of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. I am bound to say that there is nothing in this which seems *a priori* improbable. (Laughter.) But one thing cannot be denied—that it is at the very moment that the Secretary for the Colonies appears upon the scene that activity is shown in the India Office in pushing this new policy. Evidently there was no positive action taken before his influence came along. And one thing is certain—and it is a very remarkable fact—that the proposals for these new duties did not originate in India, wherever they did originate. I have not time to go over the list of dates which was given by my right hon. friend the member for Wolverhampton, which proves conclusively that the Government of India not only expressed a contrary opinion a few years before the present, but that contrary opinion was not an opinion contrary to the adoption of that policy at that particular moment, as the right hon. gentleman says, but an opinion contrary to it in general terms—but they had also engaged in an elaborate enquiry which, oddly enough, was initiated by the very department of the Government over which Sir James Westland presides—which is some proof that he was not so fixed in his opinion as the right hon. gentleman represented. They engaged in an enquiry to ascertain the opinion of the different provincial Governments and to get the facts from them, and that enquiry was not concluded and the reports had not been received at the time the decision of the Government was taken. So that the decision was taken upon English information, and not upon Indian information. The noble lord said, and the right hon. gentleman repeated it, that they had information which led them to believe that there was serious danger impending. What was that information? If it was Indian information it must have been in the possession of Lord Curzon when he told us, in the month of January, that he was himself instituting a fresh enquiry in order to ascertain the effects of the duties. I wish to bring before the House one or two figures, which bear upon this supposed danger to the cultivation of sugar in India and to the sugar industry in India. I will confine myself to the question of bounties. It was said that the imports from the best-sugar countries had reached alarming proportions, and that they were interfering with the imports from Mauritius. The figures are that in the average for the years from 1890 to 1895 the imports from Mauritius were 71,600 tons; in 1896-97 they were 83,300 tons; in 1897-98 they were 88,900 tons; and in 1898-99 they were 105,280 tons—a steady, wholesome, healthy increase year by year, showing no falling off and no tendency to fluctuate. But from Germany and Austria there came, in the average of 1890 to 1895, 17,800 tons; in 1896-97, 43,750 tons—a very great increase; in 1897-98, 107,500 tons—again a huge increase; but in 1898-99, which is a critical test, they have fallen down to 73,400 tons. So that there was actually a falling off in the very imports which were the cause of the danger. I have here the figures of the exports of sugar from Germany to the United States during the last three years. In 1897 the exports amounted to 778 millions of pounds. Then there were countervailing duties imposed in the United States with the result that in 1898 the exports were only 40 millions of pounds. (Ministerial cheers.) Yes, but in 1899—the year which had just concluded—the exports amounted to 658 millions of pounds. (Cheers.) So that the United

States is the quarter to which have been attracted the large overstocks of German sugar which so frightened the Secretary for India; and these stocks have gone to America despite those countervailing duties which the noble lord thinks will work wonders in the case of India. (Cheers.) The salient facts of the situation, then, are the falling off in the exportation of sugar from Germany to India; and the steady increase in the exportation of sugar from Mauritius to India. I leave it to the two right hon. gentlemen opposite to decide, if by this measure they succeed in excluding bounty-fed sugar from competition, which country is to benefit? Is India, according to the glowing picture of the noble lord, to develop her sugar industry so as to supply not only her own wants but the wants of the world? In that case, what is to become of Mauritius, the prosperity of which is so dear to the Colonial Secretary? (Laughter and cheers.) On the other hand, if Mauritius is to flood the Indian market with its sugar, where is the benefit to the Indian trade? (Renewed cheers.) We say do not, in correcting the financial errors of other people, commit any of your own. If this policy is good for India it is good for this country. We are opposed to it in both. The Government ought honestly to say whether they intend to extend the policy to this country. The noble lord thought he would place us in a difficulty by bringing up the small duties put on cotton and the surtax on foreign spirits. But the answer is that we have no objection to these duties for revenue purposes. It is to these duties imposed for protective purposes that we object. (Hear, hear.) Sir James Westland, who was referred to in terms with which I agree as to his eminence and great career, emphatically pronounced in the debate that this measure opens up an entirely new chapter in our fiscal history. That is why we support the motion. (Cheers.) Where is that chapter to be closed, how is it to be closed, and what will be contained in it before it is closed? (Cheers.) We adhere to the old-established policy under which Great Britain and India have flourished. It is a matter of common knowledge that the nations of Europe are becoming tired of bounties; that Germany and Austria are willing to abandon them if France would do it at the same time. Let us hope they will see the mischievous effect of their bounties upon themselves; and by the pursuance of our remonstrance against the course they are pursuing we are more likely to achieve our end than by a departure from the sound financial practice of this country. (Cheers.)

For the motion	152
Against	293
Majority against	141

The announcement of the numbers was received with cheers.

Friday, June 16.

HOUSE OF COMMONS. THE MEERUT SHOOTING CASE.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been drawn to the shooting case in which four privates of the Commaught Rangers came into collision with some Natives near Meerut in December last, and which had aroused considerable interest in India:

And whether in view of the frequent occurrence of such conflicts in India due to the practice of British soldiers carrying firearms whilst off duty he would consider whether more stringent regulations were required in the interests of the public peace.

LORD G. HAMILTON: I have seen, with much regret, a newspaper report of the occurrence referred to, and have observed that it was found by the High Court of the North-Western Provinces that the soldiers acted in self-defence.

As regards the second part of the question, the Government of India were consulted by me last year and were of opinion that there was no ground for special measures. In this opinion I concur. The regulations for the grant to soldiers of shooting passes, which were revised in 1892 and 1895, are already very stringent. The hon. member is mistaken in supposing that cases of collision between British soldiers and Natives are of frequent occurrence.

THE RANGOON OUTRAGE.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been called to the disgraceful outrage upon a Burmese lady, which was committed by from twelve to sixteen men of the West Kent Regiment at Rangoon on April 2 last:

Whether the civil authorities were powerless to discover the culprits because the soldiers refused to give evidence:

Whether he was aware that some forty men were either witnesses or participants in the outrage, and that the regimental authorities had so far made no arrests:

And whether he would cause an immediate enquiry to be made into the matter.

LORD G. HAMILTON: On Monday last I fully answered this question in reply to the hon. member for South Mayo, and I must refer the hon. gentleman to that answer.

THE CALCUTTA MUNICIPAL BILL.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would state whether the Select Committee of the Bengal Legislative Council had submitted their Report upon the Calcutta Municipal Bill; and, if so, whether any alteration had been made in section 8 of the Bill, which reduced the representatives of the elected Commissioners from five to four to a minority of four in the proposed Executive Committee of twelve:

And whether he would state what course he intended to adopt with respect to the measure.

LORD G. HAMILTON: No report on the subject has yet reached me, and until I receive the report and the views of the Government of India upon the subject I cannot state what course may be taken.

Tuesday, June 20.

HOUSE OF COMMONS. THE RESULTS OF INOCULATION.

SIR CHARLES CAMERON asked the Secretary of State for India whether he could lay upon the Table of the House any official reports on the results of inoculation in India against cholera, typhoid, and the plague.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The hon. member is aware that a Commission has for some time past been investigating the whole question of the plague in India, including that of the various forms of inoculation. I hope that their report may shortly be ready for publication; and I should be disposed to await it, before presenting any other papers on the subject to which the hon. member's question refers. I should add that, as regards inoculation against typhoid fever, no official reports are as yet available.

Thursday, June 22.

HOUSE OF COMMONS. THE RANGOON OUTRAGE.

MR. MACNEILL asked the Secretary of State for India whether the woman who was outraged at Rangoon by sixteen soldiers of the West Kent Regiment was dead:

Why was the fact of her death, which was announced in the *Star* of May 31, and the *Bombay Champion* of June 4, withheld from the knowledge of the Secretary of State:

And whether the West Kent Regiment were still stationed in Rangoon.

LORD G. HAMILTON: I have ascertained that the woman who is alleged to have been outraged at Rangoon is not dead. The outrage is stated to have happened on April 2, and at the trial of Private Horrocks on May 10 the woman gave evidence in Court. The West Kent Regiment is still at Rangoon.

MR. MACNEILL: And is the regiment to be allowed to remain at Rangoon.

LORD G. HAMILTON: I think it would be most unwise to remove the regiment until we are in possession of all the facts.

MAHOMETAN PILGRIMAGES.

MR. MACNEILL asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what steps had been taken, or were about to be taken, by her Majesty's Government to secure the safe conduct of British Indian subjects between Jeddah and the cities of Meccah and Medina whilst on the customary pilgrimages to the Mahometan shrines.

And whether compensation had been demanded, or would be demanded, by the British Government from the Porte for outrages committed upon British subjects in Arabia in the years 1895, 1896, 1897, and 1898, whilst performing religious duties in the Hedjaz.

MR. BRODRICK: Her Majesty's Government have taken, and will continue to take, all steps in their power to ensure the protection of the British Indian pilgrims. As regards paragraph 2, demands have been made for compensation for robberies committed between 1892 and 1898, and some progress appears to have been made towards an arrangement.

BRITISH INDIANS IN THE TRANSVAAL.

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he had received a petition, dated May last, from British Indian traders in the South African Republic, complaining that they had been ordered to remove, by July 1, to locations at a distance from their places of business; whether the alleged necessity for such removal was sanitation; whether he would cause enquiry to be made whether this removal was really required on sanitary grounds; and, if so, whether the removal was being effected in the way least liable to cause hardship and loss to these traders.

And whether Sir A. Milner made any representation regarding the grievances of British Indian traders at the recent Conference with the President of the South African Republic.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: I have not yet received from the High Commissioner the petition, of which a copy has been placed in my hands by the hon. baronet. The facts are as follows:—A law was enacted in the South African Republic in 1885 with the consent of her Majesty's Government which empowered the Government of the South African Republic for sanitary purposes to assign streets, wards, and locations for habitation by Asiatics. A difference arose between her Majesty's Government and the Transvaal Government as to the scope of the law, and they referred the matter to the arbitration of the Chief Justice of the Orange Free State, who decided that the Government of the South African Republic were entitled to carry out the law subject solely to the interpretation of the Courts of the Transvaal. Her Majesty's Government accepted the award, but reserved the right to make friendly representations to the South African Republic with a view to more generous treatment of the Indians. No action was taken by the Government of the South African Republic pending the decision by the Court of a test case which was to settle whether the Government had the right to assign to the Indians places for business as well as for residence. The decision was given in August last, and was in favour of the Government of the South African Republic. Sir Alfred Milner, when he returned in February last, was instructed to endeavour to effect some arrangement favourable to the Indians, but the Government of the South African Republic declined to make any arrangement unless her Majesty's Government were prepared to surrender certain rights of the Cape boys and other coloured persons. Sir Alfred Milner was then instructed at the beginning of May to ask in a friendly way for the favourable consideration of at least the better class of Indians, if not of all, suggesting the possibility of creating an Asiatic quarter, with each town and pointing out that the sanitary considerations on which the law is based cannot be applicable to all Indians without distinction. Notice had, however, in the meantime been issued by the Government of the South African Republic requiring the Indian traders to remove to places assigned to them by July 1.

The latest information shows that these locations have been assigned inside the towns and twenty-two places in the Republic, but that in Pretoria and Johannesburg the Government intend to compel the Indians to live in locations outside the town, but propose that a block of ground shall be set aside for a certain number of them for trading purposes inside the town. With a view of obtaining equitable treatment of the Indians her Majesty's Government have used every friendly means left open to them by their predecessors' acceptance of the law of 1885, by the indefinite terms in which that law is couched, and by the difficulty and uncertainty of the result of appeals to the Law Courts of the Republic. The matter is one of a number in which the views and wishes of her Majesty's Government and that of the South African Republic are not in accord, and which would have been brought forward by Sir A. Milner at the Bloemfontein Conference had the discussion proceeded beyond the question of the franchise.

THE INDIAN STAFF CORPS.

Colonel WELBY asked the Secretary of State for India with reference to the regulation that candidates for the Indian Staff Corps must not be more than twenty-five years old, and must have served at least one year in a European regiment, whether he could see his way to extending the age limit by two or three years in the case of officers promoted from the ranks, as that regulation shut out the greater number of these, owing to the length of time they had to serve in the ranks before obtaining a commission.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The maximum limit of age for admission to the Indian Staff Corps was adopted in the general interests of the service, and I do not think it expedient to extend it in order to facilitate the admission of a particular class of officers, which would have the effect of excluding officers of a more suitable age. There is an ample supply of officers under the present conditions—in fact, there is considerable competition for admission to the Indian Staff Corps.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether he would state when the Indian Budget would be taken.

Mr. BALFOUR: The financial statement has just been received from India, so that it will be impossible to take it before the usual time—namely, about the end of the Session.

Friday, June 23.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

REVENUE-PAYING LAND. ACREAGE UNDER SUGAR CANE.

Sir HENRY FOWLER asked the Secretary of State for India what was the acreage of land in India paying land revenues:

What was the amount payable in 1898 and in 1899:

What was the extent of land under sugar cane in those years, and what was the amount of land revenue paid in respect of such land:

And was there any difference in the rate of land revenue payable in Bengal.

Lord G. HAMILTON: (1) The acreage in British India assessed to land revenue was, according to the latest returns (for the year 1896-97), 307,000,000 acres.

(2) The amount of land revenue payable in 1897-98 (actual accounts) was Rs. 25,684,000; and in 1898-99 (revised estimate), Rs. 27,679,000. These figures do not include the revenue credited to the irrigation department. The receipts of 1898-99 were swollen by the payments of revenues suspended during the famine.

(3) The area under sugar cane in British India during 1897-98 was 2,675,763 acres. I have not yet received the sugar area figures of 1898-99. The returns do not give separately the amount paid in respect of this area, but the latest approximate estimate by the Government of India put that amount (independent of irrigation returns) at 640,000 tons of rupees.

(4) There is from year to year no material change in the amount or rate of the land revenue payable in the province of Bengal, where most of the land is permanently settled.

PORTS IN THE PERSIAN GULF.

Sir MAXWELL BROWNSBOROUGH asked the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether her Majesty's Government had any information, official or otherwise, confirmatory of a statement that the Governor of Bandar Abbas had received a letter from Tcheran intimating that that port was to be ceded to or otherwise placed in possession of Russia:

Whether the Island of Karagh, or Karak, thirty miles north-west of Bushire, which was once under British occupation, was still in our possession:

And whether the British Government retained any lien on the port of Bassadore, formerly a station of the Indian navy, situate at the north-west extremity of the Island of Kishin, near Ormuz.

Mr. BROWNE: The answer to the first paragraph is in the negative. British troops were withdrawn from the Island of Karak after the conclusion of the Persian Gulf Treaty of Paris of March 4, 1857. Since the withdrawal in 1857 of the Indian troops stationed at Bassadore the Indian Government's buildings at that station have been maintained under the charge of a British Indian subject paid by the Government of India.

REGIMENTAL HONOURS.

Major RASCH asked the Under-Secretary of State for War whether the regiments which were on active service on the North-West Frontier in 1897 and 1898 would be permitted to bear on the colours and appointments the names of the engagements in which they took part.

Mr. GEORGE WYNDHAM: No recommendation to this effect has as yet been received from the Commander-in-Chief in India.

ALLEGED WAZIRI RAID.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had received any information as to the reported raid on Sunday last of a force of Waziris upon cattle in the Lower Kuram, and as to the encounter which took place between these tribesmen and a pursuing party:

And whether any further developments were expected to arise out of this incident.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have received no official information on the subject of this incident, and I am therefore disposed to believe that no political importance is attached to it. The conditions of this part of the Indian frontier are such that raids of this kind are not an unusual occurrence.

THE DUM-DUM BULLET.

Mr. DILLON asked the Secretary of State for India how soon he would be able to lay papers upon the Table of the House giving grounds on which the Dum-Dum bullet used in recent Indian campaigns was adopted, particulars of experiments on animals carried out before it was decided to issue the bullet to troops, the surgical reports as to effect of bullet on the human body, particulars of experiments now being conducted with the new bullet which was to be substituted for the Dum-Dum, and Professor Brims' experiments with the Tübingen bullet:

And whether he would procure specimens of the original Dum-Dum, the Tübingen bullet, and the bullet which it was proposed to substitute for the Dum-Dum in India, and have them placed in the tea room for the inspection of members.

Lord G. HAMILTON: In reply to the first part of the question the papers which I undertook to give have been some days in print, and will shortly be circulated, but they relate only to experiments with the Dum-Dum bullet.

An inspection of bullets such as is suggested would be quite useless, as no one by looking at a bullet before it is fired can estimate the injury it may inflict when fired.

Mr. DILLON said it had been denied that the bullet experimented upon was the Dum-Dum, and he thought if it were placed for inspection in the tea-room members would be able to say whether it was the same bullet or not.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I very much doubt whether the hon. gentleman could. Certainly anyone with a knife could convert the ordinary bullet into a Dum-Dum bullet in a very few seconds.

Mr. DILLON asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether Sir John Ardagh recently read a paper at the Peace Conference setting forth the reasons why, in the opinion of her Majesty's Government, the Dum-Dum bullet should not be condemned as an unlawful projectile; whether Sir John Ardagh was authorised to state that as the view still held by the British Government; whether the Dum-Dum bullet was condemned by a full meeting of the first commission with only two dissentients; and whether it was the intention of the Government to lay papers giving a report of the proceedings of the Peace Conference and to give the House an opportunity of discussing them before the end of this Session.

Mr. BALFOUR: As regards the first four paragraphs, I can really add nothing to what I said to the hon. gentleman in reference to a previous question on the same subject of the Peace Conference. Nothing can be communicated by the Government to the public until that Conference is over. As regards the last paragraph, no doubt papers will be laid with reference to the Conference, but how soon they will be laid it would be impossible for me to say.

Mr. DILLON pointed out that since the right hon. gentleman gave the answer to a previous question the delegates to the Conference had altered the rule and allowed a considerable résumé to be published in the papers.

Mr. BALFOUR: I was not aware of that fact, if a fact it be.

BANDAR ABBAS.

Sir H. MEYER-THOMPSON asked the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs whether her Majesty's Government had an agent on the Persian littoral of the Persian Gulf; and, if so, whether they had received, or expected to receive, any information from him concerning the reported lease for a term of years to the Russian Government of the port of Bandar Abbas.

Mr. BROWNE: Yes; her Majesty has a Consul-General at Bushire. They have not received and do not expect to receive from that officer any confirmation of the report in question.

Thursday, June 29.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE BROTHERS NATU.

Mr. DAVITT asked the Secretary of State for India, if the Nattu brothers were still imprisoned as a consequence of the late disturbances at Poona:

If he could state where they were confined and how they were treated: Whether in the trials of the men who had been executed for the murder of a British officer any evidence of any kind implicating the Nattus was given:

And, whether, if the Government of India did not see its way to release men who were imprisoned without trial, an opportunity would be given to them to prove their innocence before some tribunal.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The Nattus are not imprisoned, but restraints upon their liberty of movement continue to be imposed for the reason stated by me in this House on April 21, 1898, and on other occasions, namely, that the Government of Bombay is not yet satisfied that the public tranquillity and order will not be endangered by their withdrawal. The Sardars are living in the district of Belgau, subject to no restriction except the disability to leave that district.

The Nattus are not charged with abetment of the murder referred to, and the answer to the third clause of the question is in the negative.

As regards the continuance of their detention under Regulation 25 of 1827, which is only applicable in cases where judicial proceedings are not deemed advisable, I have already stated in this House that I do not propose to interfere with the discretion of the Government of Bombay, who are primarily responsible for the maintenance of order and tranquillity in their province.

Mr. DAVITT: May I ask the noble lord whether, as these gentlemen are British subjects, they ought not to have a right to a fair trial? No answer was given.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

OFFICERS IN INDIA.

PRESIDENT (elected 1898):
ANANDA MOHUN ROSE.

GENERAL SECRETARY:
A. O. HUME, C.B., ROTNEY CASTLE, SIMLA; and THE CHALET,
UPPER NORWICH, S.E.

JOINT GENERAL SECRETARY (in India):
D. E. WACHA, 84, HORSLEY ROW, POMFAY.

STANDING COUNSEL:
Bengal, W. C. BONNERJEE;
Bombay, PHEROZSHAH MEHTA;
Madras, RAI BAHADUR ANANDU CHARLU.

BRITISH COMMITTEE.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN, Bart.,
M.P., Chairman.
W. S. CAIRNE.
RUSTAM K. R. CAMA.
G. B. LAKE, M.P.
A. O. HUME, C.B.
J. SNEYOUR KILAT.
SARAT MULLICK.
DADABHAI NAROGJI.
J. HERBERT ROBERTS, M.P.
C. E. SCHWANN, M.P.
ROBINSON SOUTHAIR, M.P.
NILKANT B. WAGLE.
ALBERT WEBER.
W. MARTIN WOOD.
OFFICE: 84 AND 86, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER,
LONDON, S.W.

TELEGRAPHIC ADDRESS: "INCAS, LONDON."

NAME OF CIRCLE.	JURISDICTION.	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SECRETARY OR SECRETARIES.
1. Calcutta ...	Presidency, Burdwan and Chittagong Divisions (except Murshidabad District) Assam & Orissa	Bupendra Nath Bose, Esq., and J. Ghosh, Esq. (Prithwis Chandra Roy, Assist. Sec.), 62, Bow Bazar Street, Calcutta.
2. Dacca ...	Dacca District ...	Babu Sarat Chandra Bose, Pleader, Bazar Deory, Dacca.
3. Maimansingh ...	Maimansingh District ...	Babu Anath Baidya Gha, Sec., Maimansingh Association, Maimansingh.
4. Faridpur ...	Faridpur District ...	Babu Ambica Churn Moudar, Pleader, Faridpur.
5. Barisal ...	Bakarganj District ...	Babu Awasini Kumar Dutt, Pleader, Barisal.
6. Rangpur ...	Rangpur District ...	Babu Satis Chandra Chakraborty, B.L., Pleader, Rangpur.
7. Dinajpur ...	Dinajpur District ...	Babu Lalit Chandra Sen, B.A., B.L., Dinajpur.
8. Pabna ...	Pabna District ...	Babu Harendra Narain Roy, B.L., Pabna.
9. Bogra ...	Bogra District ...	Babu Peary Sunker Das Gupta, L.M.S., Medical Practitioner, Bogra.
10. Jalpaiguri ...	Jalpaiguri District ...	Babu Umagati Roy, Jalpaiguri.
11. Rampur-Beanlah ...	Rajshahi District ...	Dr. Chandra Nath Chowdhry, Rampur-Beanlah.
12. Berhampur ...	Murshidabad District ...	Babu Bishun Nath Sen, Berhampur, Dist. Murshidabad.
13. Bhagalpur ...	Bhagalpur Division (except Purneah District) ...	Babus Siva Sankar Sahai and Surya Prasad, Bhagalpur.
14. Purneah ...	Purneah District ...	Babu Jogendra Nath Mukerji, Pleader, Purneah.
15. Chutia-Nagpur ...	Chutia-Nagpur Division ...	Rai Jodu Nath Mukerji, Pleader, Hazaribagh.
16. Behar ...	Patna Division (excluding the Muzaffarpur and Gaya Districts)	Babu Banwari Lal, Patna City.
17. Muzaffarpur ...	Muzaffarpur District ...	Babu Preet Nath Mukherji, B.L., Vakili, Muzaffarpur.
18. Gaya ...	Gaya District ...	Babus Nand Kishore Lal and Upendra Chandra Mitta, Gaya.
19. N.-W. Provinces ...	North-Western Provinces ...	Secretary, Standing Committee, Johnstonganj, Allahabad.
<i>Sub-divisions of the N.W.P. for the purpose of distributing "INDIA."</i>		
Name of Sub-division. Jurisdiction.		
Gorakhpur ...	Gorakhpur Division ...	A. Nundy, Esq., Gorakhpur.
Benares ...	Benares Division (except Mirzapur District)	Pandit Channu Lal, Benares City.
Mirzapur ...	Mirzapur District ...	Babu Sri Ram, Mirzapur.
Cawnpur ...	Cawnpur District ...	Pandit Perthi Nath, Cawnpur.
Bareilly ...	Bareilly District ...	The Secretary, Congress Committee, Bareilly.
Moradabad ...	Moradabad District ...	N. C. Bose, Esq., Moradabad.
Saharanpur ...	Saharanpur District ...	Babu Anand Swarup, B.A., LL.B., Vakili, Saharanpur.
Meerut ...	Meerut District ...	Babu Phahad Singh, Meerut.
Aligarh ...	Aligarh District ...	Hafiz M. Abdur Rahim, Esq., Aligarh.
Agra ...	Agra Division ...	Pandit Tulsi Ram Misra, Bareilly.
Allahabad ...	All places in the N.W.P. not above enumerated	Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Sec. for the N.-W. P. Circle, Allahabad.
20. Oudh ...	Oudh ...	Munshi Gangs Prasad Varma, Office of the Advocate, Lucknow.
21. Punjab ...	The Punjab ...	Lala Juhli Ram, Secretary, Congress Committee, Lahore; Babu Chetan Anand, Mullian; Bhagat Ram, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, Jalandhar City; Lala Murlidhar, Pleader, Ambala City; Babu Kedar Nath, Pleader, Delhi; and Pandit Perthi Nath, Pleader, Peshawar.
22. Bombay ...	Bombay Island, Colaba, Thana & Ratnagiri Dist.	D. E. Wacha, Esq., Presidency Association, Bombay.
23. Sind ...	Sind ...	Tahirul Khushdud, Esq., Pleader, Karachi; Himatsing G. Advani, Esq., Shikarpur and Hiranand Khemsing, Esq., Haidarabad.
24. Ahmedabad ...	Ahmedabad, Kaira and Panch Mahals Dis- tricts, Cutch and Kathiawar, Rajkot	Rao Sahib Kesavalal Motilal, Gopalrao Ramchandra Dahbholkar, Esq., B.A., LL.B., and Maganlal Gheblahar Mehta, Esq., B.A., LL.B., Pleaders, Ahmedabad.
25. Surat ...	Surat and Broach Districts, with Baroda	Hardevram Nambhai Haridas, Esq., and Bhagubhai Dayabhai, Esq., Surat.
26. Sholapur ...	Sholapur District ...	Visham R. Lale, Esq., Sholapur.
27. Bijapur ...	Bijapur District ...	Srinivas Krishna Bakshi, Esq., B.A., LL.B., Pleader, Bijapur.
28. Dharwar ...	Dharwar District ...	Narayan Guranath Karagudi, LL.B., Dharwar.
29. Satara ...	Satara District ...	Raghunath Pandurang Karandikar, Esq., High Court Pleader, Satara.
30. Ahmadnagar ...	Ahmadnagar District ...	Mohanlal Hirmlal and Kashinath Vinayak Bhawe, Pleaders, Ahmadnagar.
31. Poona ...	Poona, Nusk, & Khandesh Districts ...	Laxuman Raghunath Gokhale, Esq., Pleader, Poona.
32. Ishalkaranji ...	Southern Mahratta Country ...	Sadasaibh Ramchandra Apte, Ishalkaranji, near Kolhapur, S.M. Country.
33. Bar ...	Bar ...	R. N. Madhobkar, Esq., and B. H. Karandikar, Esq., Pleaders, High Court, Amraoti.
34. Nagpur ...	Central Provinces M.A., Morris College, Nagpur	Kesava Gopal Tamhane, M.A., Morris College, Nagpur.
35. Madras ...	Madras, Chingleput, N. and S. Arcot, Nellore and Native States	M.rr.y. V. Byru Nambiar, High Court Vakili, Madras; M.rr.y. S. H. Belgrami, Barrister- at-Law, Madras, Secs., Mahajana Sabha.
36. Madura ...	Madura and Tinnevely ...	M.rr.y. G. Srinivasa Row Garu, Pleader, Madras; M.rr.y. K. R. Gurusami Iyer, District M.rr.y. S. Ramachandra Iyer Aol, High Court Vakili, Tanjore; M.rr.y. K. Vasudeva Iyengar, Minstrid, Srirangam; M.rr.y. N. Vysianadiah Iyer, M.A., Kumbakonam; M.rr.y. P. Balasa Subapathy Pillai, Pleader, Negapatam.
37. Tanjore ...	Tanjore and Trichinopoly ...	M.rr.y. Srinivasa Row Garu, B.A., Pleader, Bellary; M.rr.y. Dhone Subba Row Garu, Pensioned Deputy Tahsildar, Kurnool; Hon. Rai Bahadur C. Jambulinga Mudaliar, B.A., M.L.L., Cuddapah; M.rr.y. P. Kesava Pillai, Pleader, Coovely.
38. Bellary ...	Bellary, Anantapur, Cuddapah, and Kurnool	Hon. C. Sankara Nair, Poonamali Road, Egmore, Madras; M.rr.y. K. C. Manavikraman Raja, Secretary, Kerala Mahajana Sabha, Calicut; M.rr.y. T. Viraswathi Iyer, Pal- ghat; M.rr.y. T. C. Naraina Kurup, High Court Vakili, Tellicherry; Rao Bahadur N. Shiva Row, Pleader, Mangalore.
39. Malabar ...	Malabar and Kanara ...	Hon. C. Vijayagaya Chariar, B.A., Pleader, Salem.
40. Salem ...	Salem ...	M.rr.y. C. M. Padmanabha Chariar, B.A., B.L., Coimbatore.
41. Coimbatore ...	Coimbatore and Nilgiris ...	M.rr.y. V. Ramesam, High Court Vakili, Vizagapatnam; M.rr.y. C. Rungachariar, High Court Vakili, Musulipatnam; M.rr.y. D. Subramaniam, Pleader, Coonada.
42. Ganjam ...	Ganjam, Vizagapatnam, Godavari, and Krishna	

TO SUBSCRIBERS.—Intending Subscribers to "INDIA" should communicate with the gentleman whose name appears as Secretary to the Congress Committee for the district in which they reside, or with the London Office. All the gentlemen so named are in monthly correspondence with England, and receive a certain number of spare copies of "INDIA" to enable them to obtain new Subscribers, and are authorised to receive subscriptions to the Journal, which are payable in advance. They will also from time to time transmit to London the names of Subscribers who have paid, so that all such Subscribers may receive their copies direct from England every week. Subscribers are requested in giving notice of any alteration in their address, to quote the number on the covering wrapper of their copies of "INDIA."

TO ADVERTISERS.—Intending Advertisers should apply for terms to any of the following: The Manager, "INDIA," 84, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W.; The Secretaries, Calcutta Congress Committee Offices, 62, Bow Bazar Street, Calcutta; D. E. WACHA, Esq., Presidency Association, Bombay; The Secretaries, Mahajana Sabha, Madras; JAISHA RAM, Esq., Secretary Congress Committee, Lahore; Secretary, Congress Committee, Johnstonganj, Allahabad.

Vol. I.—To Concentration of Army on Frontier.

SECOND AFGHAN WAR. 1878-79-80.

By Colonel H. B. HANNA,

Formerly in Punjab Frontier Force and late Commanding at Delhi,
Author of "An Indian Problems," etc.

FALL MALL GAZETTE.—"Colonel Hanna's tremendous care, completeness and clearness, with his intense conviction, make him a very powerful writer."
ATHENÆUM.—"The ability with which his case is presented is considerable and it is probable that in his main line his view is a well founded one."
MORNING LEADER.—"Colonel Hanna is peculiarly well fitted to handle the multiplicity of questions—political, military, and social—that arise in connection with the Second Afghan War."

A. CONSTABLE, 2, WHITEHALL GARDENS, LONDON.
Price, Net—10s.

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. (*Trübner'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 BEADON 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, Chills, etc.

I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvāra-Hārī." Both in India and Africa I have found it the best REMEDY FOR FEVER.
C. E. WOOD, Capt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.
"Jvāra-Hārī" 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. NARAYANA ROW.

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

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I am much pleased in stating that your 'Omum-Carpoor' was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage."
Prices of "JVĀRA-HĀRĪ" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 annas, 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.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the MANAGER of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. DOUGLAS HALL.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from MR. ELLIOT STOCK, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

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,

SORO 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.—31st March, 1889.

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