India

FOR THE

No. 82. New Series. No. 176. Old Series.] WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, JULY 28, 1899. [Registered as a Newspaper. Price..... 2d By Post, 2½d.

NOTES AND NEWS.

A TELEGRAM from Simla which was published in yesterday's (Thursday's) papers announces that 10,000 soldiers can be spared from India to fight the Boers :—

The question whether it would be expedient to draft British troops from India to South Africa in the event of a non-peaceful settlement of the Transvaal question has been fully discussed between the Indian and Imperial Governments. It is understood that the Indian Government decided that the situation of the country would permit 10,000 men to be temporarily detached at the cost of the Home Government. The transport arrangements and equipment are complete, and the force could be despatched without the least delay.

When one of the Indian members of the Imperial Legislative Council suggested in the recent debate on the Indian Budget that the British army in India might be reduced for the sake of economy, Lord Curzon retorted with a flourish that so long as he remained in India the army would not be reduced by a single soldier. He is now ready to reduce it by 10,000. The advocates of retrenchment will not fail to note the fact.

In 1894 the rulers of Great Britain and Japan were "equally desirous of maintaining the relations of good understanding which happily exist between them by extending and increasing the intercourse between their respective States." So, on July 16, a "treaty of Commerce and Navigation between Great Britain and Japan" was signed in London. In spite of the common desire said to animate both parties, the treaty was not to take effect "until at least five years after its signature;" and that is why it came into operation only the other day. It is to remain in force "for twelve years from the date it goes into operation." The stipulations are to be "applicable so far as the laws shall permit to all colonies and foreign possessions of her Britannic Majesty excepting to those hereinafter named." Those "hereinafter named" are India, Canada, Newfoundland, the Cape, Natal and the Australasian Colonies. Her Britannic Majesty bears among her titles as one of the "High Contracting Parties" the title of "Empress of India." Yet India is excepted from the privileges of the instrument, as if there were some doubt whether the happy relations of good understanding between the two States would be fostered by "extending and increasing the intercourse" between India and Japan. There is some need for explanation here. There is, however, a provision for the extension of the treaty to any of the excepted colonies or foreign possessions by a notice from her Majesty's representative at Tokio to the Japanese Government within two years from the date of the exchange of ratifications of the treaty (August 25, 1894), as in the cases of conventions with Roumania in 1892 and 1893, and of a like treaty with Servia in 1893. India, we presume, might thus get grudging admission by a back-door, if she knocked loud enough and persistently enough during the next two years. Yet it does seem strange that India should have been scheduled as an exception at all. Why was it done?

The main provisions of this lopsided treaty are personal and commercial. The subjects of each of the High Contracting Parties "shall have full liberty to enter, travel, or reside in any part of the dominions and possessions of the other Contracting Party, and shall enjoy full and perfect protection for their persons and property," shall be equal before the law, shall hold "possession of goods and effects of any kind," and shall have free disposal of their property of any sort lawfully acquired. And there shall be reciprocal freedom of Commerce and Navigation between the dominions and possessions of both Parties. Practically it all means that all English subjects (excepting those of the excepted possessions) are now free to go and reside and trade in Japan under the general laws of Japan, and not under the consular jurisdictions. The question arises, what is the position of a British subject of an excepted possession travelling and trading in Japan? He, we take it, remains in the same position as he occupied before, precisely as if the Treaty of 1894 had never been made and brought into operation. That is to say, like all other foreigners, he will enjoy the same civil rights as are enjoyed by Japanese subjects, excepting such rights as are specifically denied to foreigners by the Japanese Civil Code.

Still, our interpretation of the position, say, of a British Indian subject in Japan may not be correct. We should hope, therefore, that the Foreign Secretary will take a very early opportunity of making the point clear. The matter is of real importance, to traders especially. For instance, the Japanese Civil Code prohibits foreigners from holding land in the country; presumably, then, a British Indian merchant will be unable to own the site of his own warehouse in Tokio, or elsewhere in Japan. If the Treaty means anything at all, it must differentiate against him, and in favour of Englishmen, his "fellow-subjects." Why is this? Surely the commerce and industry of India is not so rampantly flourishing in comparison with British that any such differentiation should be established to prevent India from waxing too fat. Or is it that Japan is to be expected to follow the example of the Australasian and South African Colonies, and to get ready exclusive and restrictive laws to crush the rivalry of Indian traders in the country? It is most difficult to understand why the extension of Indian trade and commerce with Japan should not be good for both countries, just as the extension of British and Japanese trade intercourse is anticipated to be so good a thing for these two countries. We do not pretend to see the crux of this conundrum of a treaty. But, whatever be the meaning of it, the Government cannot too soon explain to British Indian traders the position they will now occupy in their intercourse with Japan.

As the old cock crows the young one learns. The Berlin correspondent of the *Times* reports that Major Leutwein, the Governor of German South-West Africa, recently issued an edict stringently prohibiting the extension of credit to natives. This edict took the form of the Roman *Senatusconsultum Macedonianum*: it simply prevented the creditor from legally recovering his debt. The *Deutsch-Ostafricanische Zeitung* says the ukase is directed against British Indian immigrants, who are alleged to have "reduced the natives on the coast to a state of dependence by means of usurious dealings." There is more than this, however; there is a heavy *Gewerbsteüer*, or tax on commerce—300 rupees a year—which is said to have "already frightened away several of the Hindu intruders." "Intruders" is good—as good as "undesirables." After all, the Germans are but taking a leaf out of our own stupid "Imperialistic" book, and it hardly lies with us to be surprised that they better the instruction.

In the course of a somewhat severe review of Mr. Morison's book, "Imperial Rule in India," the *Pioneer* makes some interesting remarks on the subject of representative institutions in India :—

It is not possible to give a Western education and at the same time withhold representative institutions of some kind. . . . . We have never been enamoured of representative institutions in India, nor

have we concealed our opinion that they were introduced prematurely and in a hurry, but it is too soon to pronounce judgment upon them, and the need of them will soon probably be felt if, as we believe, there is an era of commercial development for India in the near future. In any case it is no longer practicable to retrace the steps that have already been taken.

In regard to the "increased acerbity" between Hindus and Mahometans, our contemporary cruelly suggests that it is less due to the introduction of the elective principle than to the propaganda of the famous college at Aligarh, "with which Mr. Morison himself is so honourably connected."

One point urged by the *Pioneer* is based on the old fallacy, which INDIA has so often exposed, of the similarity of the British Empire in the East with the Empire of Rome. It says:—

What was it which so long held together the Roman Empire but the trained civil service and the centralisation introduced by Augustus?

As an answer to Mr. Morison's reliance on personal loyalty alone to the disregard of organisation this is well enough; but if it means that there is any analogy between the centralisation and the officials of Rome and those of British India it is incorrect. In the Roman Empire the centralisation was quite consistent with the existence of free municipal government throughout the provinces—only recently introduced into India with numerous checks and safeguards, and now threatened almost with extinction. And in the Roman Empire the Civil Service, so far from being almost exclusively recruited from one race for whom all the highest posts were reserved, was open to men of various races—in the end to all the races of the Roman world; and so far from the higher posts being reserved for Romans, Spaniards and Gauls, Cretan and Illyrians sat with honour on the Imperial throne.

The *Pioneer* is very outspoken on the subject of the recent riots in Southern India:—

It is now tolerably clear that the riots in the Tinnevelly district were made possible by the almost culpable ignorance of the local authorities; but it is probably more from luck than from good management that similar disturbances do not take place in other parts of India. The fact is that under our present system not only do the district officials know very little of the feelings of the people, of their customs and their habits, but owing to the frequent transfers that take place they have little or no opportunities of gaining that knowledge.

This is a serious indictment—all the more so if, as is asserted, the missionaries, who are exceptionally strong in Tinnevelly district, warned the authorities of the approaching outbreak. The remedy proposed is to allow the officials to get more into touch with the people by keeping them longer in one district. But this will be of little use, if "the growing tendency amongst young civilians to keep themselves to themselves is not checked." Localisation without sympathy would be a very slight advantage.

It is interesting to find that such different papers as the *Pioneer* and the *Hindu* take very much the same view on the subject of the riots, and the responsibility of the Government. The *Hindu* says:—

The main drawback of the British Government is its want of touch with the people. The Government pushes up to the charge of Districts young civilians who cannot differentiate a Hindu from a Mahometan and one sect from another.

A favourite excuse, according to our contemporary, is to throw the blame on some rich Zemindar or Rájá for not having afforded the Government material and moral support, and this in spite of their having neither civil nor criminal jurisdiction. But it is only in times of trouble that the influence of such men is thought worthy of being utilised.

In this connexion we may well record a passage from the admirable speech which Field-Marshal Sir Donald Stewart made on Wednesday when he was distributing the prizes at the Royal Engineering College, Cooper's Hill:—

Let the students shrink from no duty, however humdrum or disagreeable, and make the best of circumstances however adverse, and ultimate success would be assured. (Cheers.) Above all, it was necessary that Englishmen should recognise that there were as clever people in India as in England. *He advised those students who were going out to India to treat the Natives as they would their own countrymen, and they would find that the people of India were a very charming people.* Personally, he was deeply grateful for all that the natives of India had done for him.

That is well said. The *Times*, by the way, accidentally omits from its report the sentence which we have italicised. But it is a great improvement on Lord George Hamilton's remarks about "civilising savages."

"The strong conviction that the British soldier in India wants more careful management and more thorough training than he has been getting of late years," says the *Times of India*, "is one of the most important lessons which have been learnt during General Sir George White's term of command." Certainly Sir George's term of command has opened up not a few ugly vistas, and this is one of the ugliest. It is something to learn that "towards the attainment of thorough training active steps have been taken during the last twelve months." Such steps may possibly do something to reduce the mischief resulting from sheer idleness and loafing. On the side of "more careful management" the *Times of India* suggests that the soldier must be better fed. "If the British soldier is to get good, pure food, the Native barrack cook with his objectionable habits must be absolutely removed, and the cooking done by the soldier himself." This is really a fine stroke of divination—to trace the rampant boisterousness and homicidal playfulness of the British soldier to the diabolical cookery of Native artists in food. We have certainly more hope in the exorcism of physical exercises, though some modification of the character of the food—not the cooking of it—might reduce the fever in the warrior's blood. But the "careful management," as we pointed out recently, will not be particularly effective unless it goes a considerable way beyond the substitution of European for Native cookery. The question lies with the individual regimental officers. Will they take the trouble?

There are too many reports of Waziri robberies with violence, which the papers dignify with the title of raids. Every other week a convoy is attacked or a party is waylaid and harassed. Why is this? Of course, we shall be told that it is all owing to the innate devilry of the Waziris. But one would like to know what is the state of their country since our last invasion. These tribesmen do not usually interfere with our people or our territory when they have enough to eat at home, and when we leave them unmolested. But are we leaving them unmolested? Certainly not. We have occupied a strong position in their country, much to their annoyance, and it seems more likely than not that these recurrent troubles are connected with this imprudent arrangement. We say "their country," but the "*Times* Atlas" paints Waziristan red, and apparently the result of Sir Henry Fowler's little war was to make it British territory. However that may be, one can understand that the Waziris will not readily take that view. We hope that these too frequent "raids" are not premonitory of another expedition, now that rupees are more plentiful at Calcutta. It is uncomfortable to sit on that "cactus hedge," and a correspondent of the *Times* gathers from the Simla telegrams that "in spite of flying columns and border police the Waziris are determined to force upon themselves that retribution which hitherto (!) they have escaped." Just so. Yet obviously enough it is not the Waziris that are to blame. What on earth have we to do in their country?

The *Pioneer* gives the following succinct but hardly favourable account of the Afghan policy of the Empire:—

On a review of our dealings with Afghanistan it is clear that cold calculating foresight has never yet guided our policy. The nation has time after time allowed small men in a hurry, and in a position to achieve results immediately advantageous to themselves or their party, to force on a line of action inimical to the permanent interests of India, and therefore to the Empire.

It is discouraging to find that the *Pioneer* believes our policy will be as ill-guided in the future as it has been in the past. It believes, however, that events have dealt the forward policy a deadly blow.

The *Pioneer* gives the details of a case from Gorakhpur which corroborates all that has been said on the subject of confessions being extorted by the ill-usage of the police. A sum of Rs. 437 which had been collected as Government revenue was stolen from a village near. In three days' time the local police had discovered the money hidden in the ground, had arrested three men, and had obtained confessions from them, corroborated by a witness, in which they not only confessed their own share of the crime, but implicated the Zemindar of the village. Remanded for a day, the prisoners stuck to their confession and the

Zemindar was arrested. But, unfortunately for the local police and their beautifully constructed case, on the very next morning, the very man who had had charge of the missing money was arrested with the identical sum of Rs. 437 and the identical bags in his possession as he was trying to cross the ferry into Gorakhpur. On this the three original prisoners retracted their confessions and said that they had been tortured and beaten by the sub-inspector of police and two constables, which was corroborated by marks on their bodies where they had been beaten. It further appeared that the money found had been taken from the Zemindar by the police, and buried where they afterwards discovered it. The sub-inspector and his two subordinates have been suspended while enquiries are being made.

But that this is not an isolated case may be seen from the recent trial of two sub-inspectors and a constable at Fyzabad, two being sentenced to five years' rigorous imprisonment each, and a third to three years'. The facts as reported in the *Tribune* were these. A robbery having taken place at Major Hill's bungalow, two of his servants were taken to the Thana and forced to sit in the courtyard looking at the sun. Then one of them, a lad of eighteen, was made to stand with outstretched limbs and was beaten. At night chillies were put in his ears and he was hung up by the legs. They were then allowed to return home, but as they were threatened with further tortures the lad tried to commit suicide. It is almost incredible that it was urged in extenuation that "such things happen daily and some pressure is always necessary to obtain a clue and get a confession." Of course such an argument did not weigh with the judge, or induce him to pass a lenient sentence, but it is painful to read that he said: "I am very much afraid that this is not the only solitary instance of torture."

According to the *Tribune* a carpenter named Shama who was employed at the charitable dispensary at Shillong lately had the temerity to resign. The doctor, a European, thereupon sent for him and ordered him to resume work. He refused to do so, as he considered his wages insufficient. Thereupon the doctor ordered his men to take hold of him, which they did by the legs. He escaped and was chased along the public road till he met the police inspector, whose protection he sought, but apparently in vain, for the doctor coming up at the moment, heated no doubt by the pursuit, flogged Shama publicly in presence of the inspector. Shama then went to the deputy commissioner, and having showed him the marks of the beating was advised to bring a case against the doctor. We await further developments.

From a recent issue of the *British Medical Journal* we are glad to find that medical reform in India finds its proper place on the agenda for the forthcoming meeting of the British Medical Association, which is the chief medical body in Great Britain, with hundreds of branches scattered over the Empire. Dr. Sarat Mullick will move :—

> That having regard to the fact that persons possessing no knowledge of medicine are by law allowed the same right to practice in India as fully qualified practioners, this Association considers it advisable that there should be a system of registration to protect the public from the mischievous machinations of charlatans; and further undertakes to do all in its power to carry the resolution into effect.

We have little doubt that a proper solution of the term "qualified" will be found. Dr. Sarat Mullick does well to call attention to the fact that the Indian public have a right to be protected by a law which prevails in every civilised country except India. Dr. Nair will bring before the meeting the fact that at present all high medical posts in Indian are filled by army doctors. He will carry on the agitation initiated by the late Dr. Bahadurji of Bombay, whose name should not be forgotten in connexion with this matter.

The *Spectator*, in an article with the awkward title "White Baboos," indulges in strong and perhaps too sweeping denunciation of that "over-centralisation and over-writing" which it describes as "the special dangers of the Indian bureaucracy." These evils—or excesses, shall we say?—have long been the theme of Anglo-Indian journalists. Our weekly contemporary dilates on the natural history of the abuse; but after all there is something in the *Spectator's* review of that "necessarily crude presentment of the matter" which affords little help towards effectual remedy. The fresh inducement to seek after reform is afforded by recent statements, alternately vague and extremely explicit, to the effect that the new Viceroy has with ingenuous spirit taken off his coat, or at least turned up his cuffs, to deal with the chronic excess of administrative zeal. One cannot but wish more power to his elbow; but India is a great peninsula in which reforms work slowly, and there are two conditions needed for ultimate success in his task. First, he will need the sage counsel of some of the centralising bureaucrats themselves, at least one for each Presidency, to pilot him through the "crude presentment" of this all-pervading abuse; second, his lordship, having made up his mind to see the thing through, must also be willing to work at it during the whole period of his Viceroyalty.

This is a large demand, and the *Spectator* does its part in the last two paragraphs of the article to proffer discriminating counsel to his Excellency in support of his courageous resolve. Very sage is the remark that he should "remember the importance of keeping the Indian bureaucracy open to liberal ideas." This is indeed sage counsel—reaching far beyond any details of office re-organisation—and the new peer may well sigh, on reading it, "Where is the genius who could work out this miracle?" So we can only touch on two considerations that bear on the practical side of the problem which Lord Curzon, greatly daring, has set himself. One special element of strength in Indian administration consists in its continuity of record. This also ensures the tie of personal responsibility. Hence it must have its minutes, its reports, and its "critical supervision"; but if this method be overdone by its own excess, as is now undoubtedly the case, responsibility becomes diluted, and the vital purpose of district record is frustrated. The very excess and cumbrousness of the habit of over-writing defeats its purpose. So it comes to this, there is no royal road to the reform imperatively required. The remedy must be found in more direct control. But there is a more permanent and practical method which it would require all Lord Curzon's determination to work out. This is that there must be a far larger utilisation of the competent men amongst the people of India themselves in the details of administration all round.

How little the world knows of its greatest men! "A twelvemonth ago," as the *Pioneer* says, "the name of Mr. Clinton Dawkins was hardly known out of special circles; now, not only do we find India and America contending for his possession, but the Indian authorities ready to disregard precedent and all minor considerations for the sake of getting his services for one year, while a great financial magnate would rather wait a year than take any other partner." Mr. Pierpont Morgan, a total stranger to Mr. Dawkins, a year ago invited him to become partner in the London house of J. S. Morgan and Co., in place of the late Mr. Walter Burns, and this after consultation with "certain members of the Ministry" and "the authorities of the Bank of England." Curiously enough the Government—actually "the Government"—in spite of their desire to give Mr. Dawkins to India, "considered it still more important that he should meet the wishes of Mr. Morgan;" and so they contented themselves with a year of him at Calcutta! What ridiculous piffle all this is, to be sure. If the Government wanted—or rather could bear—a thorough overhaul of the Financial Department at Calcutta, there is one name in London finance that might very readily occur to them, and a namesake of his was once sent out there already, with results that might easily be repeated if the financier had a free hand. We shall be interested to know whether Mr. Dawkins has carried out, or inaugurated, any great enterprise of Indian finance. Anyhow, he has got canonised.

It is with much regret that we note the Bombay reports of a partial failure of the monsoon, from the North-West Provinces through Central India and the Deccan to Kathiawar on the western coast. "The situation throughout western India," it is stated, "is already critical." It is impossible for those that have no personal experience of Indian conditions to realise the gravity of such an outlook as this implies, whether for the immediate present or for the rest of the year. One can only hope that the forecast is unduly gloomy, and that the refreshing and vital rain will soon dispel the present anticipations of coming disaster.

BRITISH SOLDIERS AND INDIANS.

IT will be in the memory of our readers that Lord Stanley of Alderley had already in the present Session asked a question concerning outrages committed on Native Indians by soldiers of the British army. Although the terrible murder of Dr. Sirkar at Barrackpur was still fresh in the public mind, it could not have surprised those accustomed to official ways to find that Lord Onslow treated the question as unnecessary and the alarm as exaggerated, and altogether declined to believe that these outrages were either many or grievous. But time has only too well justified Lord Stanley, and the case of the Burmese woman at Rangoon has awakened not only the public opinion of England and India, but even the Indian Government itself, to the necessity of putting a stop to this plague spot, which defiles the record of our Imperial rule. Lord Stanley in now returning to a painful subject, and in disdaining the abuse to which his outspoken criticism may expose him, has shown true civic courage. It may well be that some will be found to turn upon him as a calumniator of the British army; but those who really love and honour our soldiers will be the first to see that the removal of this stigma, and the suppression of this rock of offence, would be the greatest kindness that can be done to them. We have seen in a neighbouring nation what has come of upholding "the honour of the army" at the expense of truth and justice. To try to hide the outrages of British soldiers in India would be as futile and as disastrous as have proved the attempts to protect the general staff in France. Those are the real defenders of the good name of the British army who strive that at all costs the conduct of that army in its relations with the people of India may be true to the best traditions of military honour and civic justice. If we recur to this subject it is with no desire to reopen old wounds, to punish again those who have been already punished, or to increase the distrust with which the Indians look on the English soldiery. It is not our intention to enlarge upon the details of outrages, or to make that appear blacker which is too black already. Our object is rather to consider the causes of all this, and to see if nothing can be done to eradicate an evil which is at once dishonouring to our army, ruinous to many individual soldiers, dangerous to the peace of the country, and a blemish in the British government of India.

The first and most obvious, though not perhaps the most deep-seated, cause of the evil lies in the inadequate punishments imposed for the offence. It is perhaps inevitable that European judges and jurors will lean to the side of mercy where a British soldier stands charged with crime upon an Indian, but to acquit in the face of the most complete evidence of guilt, almost invariably to find the prisoner guilty of a minor offence, where he is found guilty at all, and to give ridiculous sentences of a few rupees fine in cases where life and limb have been lost or endangered, is to shake the confidence of the whole people in British justice. In the Barrackpur case the Chief Justice of Bengal, worthily supporting the great reputation of the judges of the High Court, openly said that in giving a verdict of grievous hurt only the jury took a merciful view of the case; and yet this verdict, though a more serious one would, in the Chief Justice's opinion, have been more correct, was hailed throughout India as an unexpected triumph of the law.

Another cause has been suggested in the relaxation of military discipline in India. It is difficult to decide if any real relaxation has taken place, but there must be many forces acting in that direction—the greater freedom accorded to the young in England; the difficulty of getting recruits, and therefore the desire to make the service as pleasant as possible; and perhaps a certain sympathy with the dulness of a soldier's life in India which makes his superiors view his faults very leniently. For, whatever may be the case in England, soldiering in India when the the first novelty has worn off cannot be otherwise than dull. After the excitement of the journey out, and the novelty of the change of scene, there comes the stagnation of life in one place, with no friends or interests outside of the regimental quarters. In the civilisation around them, when its novelty is worn off, they have not sufficient intellectual resources to take much interest. The varied amusements that meet them at every turn in a great English city are absent, and that in an age when all classes are more than ever bent on being amused. Outside of their quarters they find little to attract them other than a shooting expedition or a drunken debauch, and from recent experiences it is not easy to decide which is most fatal to the Indians that come in their way. Nothing certainly can be more likely to lead to disorder than dull inaction; adventurous lads with the young life pulsing in their veins will soon find mischief enough to do if their hands are idle. If to this be added a much higher rate of pay than they have been accustomed to when serving in Europe, it is obvious that to the young soldier the temptations of life are great.

And yet these remedies of harsher punishment and stricter discipline only touch the surface. To pluck up the roots, we must go much deeper. In England our soldiers, if they sometimes distress the thrifty and shock the precise, are still eminently good-humoured and companionable; and if they sometimes get drunk, they do not therefore amuse themselves by murdering their fellow-citizens. The true root of the evil, the bias which renders juries untrustworthy and officers lenient, is that scorn of the Indian which is so deeply rooted in the Anglo-Indian mind. The outrages by soldiers have their parallel in outrages by civilians, as deadly and as inadequately punished. And it cannot but lessen our sense of the guilt of the rough soldiers who give their brutality free play to find that men of position and education display an equal callousness to the rights and the feelings of the people of the country. Nay, the very officers, whose influence must always count for so much with their men, are far from blameless. It is not only that they talk with insolence of a people whose civilisation was ancient when their own ancestors were savages; it is not that they talk openly and loudly in disrespect of those who are subjects and servants of their own Queen. It is that the very officers themselves commit outrages — trifling it may be in their effect, compared with others, but when their position and education are considered even more serious. The soldiers only translate into acts of violence the common speech and gestures of their officers, and sometimes the officers themselves throw off all restraint. Within the last few months we have had the assault on the young Moslem civilian, Mr. Ashgar Ali, the disturbance late at night at Chintalapudi, and the attack on the Mahometan at Dum Dum Junction, because he had the impertinence to ask a British officer the time. How can it be expected that the rank and file will treat the Indians well, when examples such as these are given by officers holding her Majesty's commission? Reform, if it is to be effective, must begin from the top.

And indeed, if we look at the matter more closely, we must go still higher, and passing over the Anglo-Indian community, and the officers commanding the British troops in India, we must fix our attention on no less a personage than the Right Honourable Lord George Hamilton. When the Secretary of State for India is ready to hold up the administrators of our Indian Empire to the admiration of his constituents in a context about civilising savages, is it wonderful that our soldiers, who are men of ready action rather than of delicate perception, treat the people of the country as being outside the amenities of civilised life? Why should they respect those whom Lord George Hamilton insults? Why should they trouble themselves to behave with decency to those whom the Secretary of State, in spite of all the restraints of his high position, does not blush to flout. The problem cannot be solved with reference to the soldiers alone. The reform, if it is to be effectual, must run through every rank of Anglo-Indian. All must recognise that a sympathetic and respectful attitude towards the people of India is a duty required alike by the honour of the nation and the interest of the State. Even Lord George Hamilton must learn that the great office which he holds requires him to set a worthy example, and to leave talk about "savages" to the poets of Empire.

It is a painful task to compare the sentences on Indians for assaults on Europeans with those on Europeans for assaults on Indians. But an increase of sentences by itself will have little effect. The conviction of the murderers of Dr. Sircar, even on a minor count, was rightly held to be a victory for justice; but it is little

compensation for the loss of such a life, for the stopping of that merciful heart and skilful hand, that three young soldiers should pass long years in misery. The true remedy must lie in eradicating from the minds of our soldiers in India that contempt of the Indians which has such fatal results, and to do this effectively, it must be eradicated from the minds of all the English in India. Nay, there is possibly something else which must be done, the driving out of the belief in their own unapproachable superiority which is held by the mass of the English people.

ESSAYS ON INDIAN ECONOMICS.[1]

MR. JUSTICE RANADE'S essays were thoroughly worth reprinting, and should have the attention of all serious students of Indian economics both in India and England. The appellation of "the dismal science," if it cannot be said to be deserved by the subject matter of political economy, has been fairly earned by the treatment which many of its professors have applied to it. It is not an appropriate term for the subject as we have it treated here—with the life and well-being of the nation kept constantly in view, and with a clearness of presentment which is nothing short of remarkable when we remember that the writer is using an acquired language. The opening essay is a masterly review of the history of political economy in England, and of the change in the direction of greater elasticity that has been silently accomplishing itself within recent years. Condensed as it is into a few pages, the review reveals a wide acquaintance with the literature of the subject, a competent grasp of the intricate problems involved, and a singular power of summing-up the essential points with brevity and clearness. Mr. Ranade's historical survey shows how gradually but surely English economists have been compelled to recognise that propositions which they imagined to be as universally true as the axioms of mathematics were not by any means to be applied universally. The older English political economy arose naturally out of the conditions ruling in England at the time of its birth. Its assumptions are many of them only partially true of the England of to-day; they are still further from the truth when applied to an Oriental society that has never taken the step (to use Sir Henry Maine's phrase) "from status to contract." The assumption that man is "an economic animal" is obviously not true of such a society at all. Even in Europe the "economic animal" is an abstraction, and not an abstraction that it is always wholesome to make. What is economically best for the individual capitalist is not necessarily best for the moral well-being of the nation as a whole.

The points in which Mr. Justice Ranade proclaims revolt against the old-fashioned political economy are these, (1) He refuses to recognise the justice of the so-called "territorial division of labour," by which the duty of producing raw materials is assigned to the torrid zone regions of Asia, and the task of transport and manufacture allotted to the temperate zone countries of Europe. He maintains, on the contrary, that the producing of raw material to be sent thousands of miles to the manufacturer and then sent back again is not an ideal arrangement; that the assumption that agriculture is the best occupation for India overlooks the uncertainty of rain and the consequent risk of famine, and besides condemns the country to reliance upon an industry which is subject to the law of diminishing returns; and he recalls the success of India in past ages in producing skilled manufactures for European markets. (2) He contends that the "unearned increment" theory does not apply to rent in India, where land changes its owners with much greater rapidity than in England. (3) He holds with the modern school of economists that the State is justified in interfering between landlord and tenant to secure fixity of tenure for the latter and to limit the increase of rent. (4) Generally he is in favour of extending the province of State interference and control, so as to restore the good points of the old mercantile system without reproducing its absurdities.

The view of the State which confines its functions to the maintenance of law and order has been practically abandoned of late years by almost all serious thinkers. The members of the Liberty and Property Defence League merely perform (as was wittily said by Mr. Sidney Webb a few years ago) the useful function of the stakes set in a glacier by scientific observers; they show how fast we are moving. Nearly all of us would agree with Mr. Justice Ranade that "the question is one of time, fitness, and expediency, not one of liberty and rights."

The remaining eleven essays of the volume are so many practical applications of the principles advanced in the first to Indian questions. They are mostly a claim for the help of the State: first, in reducing the ruinous rate of interest which the private borrower has to pay, by interposing its guarantee, and so re-organising the whole credit system of India; secondly, in encouraging manufactures; thirdly, in assisting emigration; fourthly, in extending local self-government; fifthly, in the emancipation and relief of the agricultural classes; and lastly in simplifying the law of land sale. The essays abound in practical details. One gives a history of what has been done during the past fifty years for the organisation of real credit in the European countries of Hungary and Austria, France and Italy, Belgium and Switzerland. Another recounts the various attempts that have been made, so far unsuccessfully, to develope the iron industry in India. Among the reasons for the failure of these attempts suggested by Mr. Ranade are "the oscillations of purpose shown by the Government which made them impatient of results" and "the delays caused by red tape, and the unwillingness of Government to subsidize or guarantee interest during the experimental period of the concern." Even if this final difficulty should be got over, it must be remembered that "the delays caused by red tape" are almost inseparable from Government machinery. That more might and ought to be done by the State in the directions indicated by Mr. Ranade is undoubtedly true, and we trust that his essays will be widely read and bear fruit. On the other side his own wise words, spoken at the Industrial Conference held at Poona in 1890, cannot be too carefully borne in mind: "State help is, after all, a subordinate factor in the problem. Our own exertion and our own resolution must conquer the difficulties which are chiefly of our own creation."

[1] "Essays on Indian Economics." A Collection of Essays and Speeches by M. G. Ranade, C.I.E., Judge of her Majesty's High Court of Jurisdiction, Bombay. Bombay: Thacker and Co.

THE SAGES OF INDIA.

ONCE in a while it is well to turn aside from the hurly-burly of mundane struggle and strife and listen to the still small voice of sage contemplation on the realities beyond the phenomena around us. Mr. Max Müller, who has achieved so much for Western knowledge of the thought and literature of the East, has just published with Messrs. Longmans an admirable popular summary of the half-dozen leading systems of philosophical speculation in India.[1] Dip into the pages where you will, you are at once in another world, as different from political and commercial spheres of influence as the silent forest of the Sanyasi is from the racket of Fleet Street and Cheapside. There is all the charm of romance in suddenly lighting upon kings and nobles and sages in deep conference, not over territorial boundaries or administrative dispositions or military preparations, but over philosophical questions penetrating to the ultimate interests of humanity. At the beginning of the *Svetâsvatara-upanishad*, it is written: "Whence are we born? Whereby do we live, and whither do we go? O ye who know Brahman, at whose command abide we here, whether in pain or in pleasure? Should time, or necessity, or chance, or the elements be considered as the cause, or He who is called Purusha, the man, the Supreme Spirit?" True, the warrior class, the Kshatriyas, had their popular heroes; true, Indra, the most popular god of the Vedic hymns, was a warrior. Yet even the warrior of these early times had a marked tinge of the

[1] "The Six Systems of Indian Philosophy." By the Right Hon. F. Max Müller, K.M., Foreign Member of the French Institute. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co. 18s.)

pale cast of thought; and "from the time of the Upanishads to the time of Hiouen-thsang's sojourn in India"—say during the seventh century before Christ—"one dominant interest pervaded the whole country, the interest in the great problems of humanity here on earth." It is a strange and hard saying. Still, we must transport ourselves into the actual environment. We must dissociate intellectual life from cities and universities, from museums, libraries, and laboratories, and settle ourselves in the sleepy villages and the shady groves of the great forests.

As far back as we can trace the history of thought in India, from the time of King Harsha and the Buddhist pilgrims back to the descriptions found in the Mahâbhârata, the testimonies of the Greek invaders, the minute accounts of the Buddhists in the Tripiṭaka, and in the end the Upanishads themselves, and the hymns of the Veda, we are met everywhere by the same picture—a society in which spiritual interests predominate and throw all material interests into the shade, a world of thinkers, a nation of philosophers.

Not even then, be it observed—not even more than 2,500 years ago—a nation of "savages."

The formation of anything of the nature of a system is necessarily a process long subsequent to the existence of speculative activity and the accumulation of masses of floating opinion. We have to think also a mnemonic literature handed down from generation to generation through many centuries, at least till the systematic arrangement of the philosophical Sûtras, and in large part lost. What was saved by the introduction of writing can only be regarded as the last form of a long series of elaborations. There must be some vital force in systems that have held their ground through more than twenty centuries in the midst of a great multitude of philosophic theories. The six philosophers and the works ascribed to them, with which Mr. Max Müller deals in the present volume, are these:—

1. Bâdarâyaṇa, called also Vyâsa Dvaipâyana or *Krishṇa* Dvaipâyana, the reputed author of the Brahma-Sûtras, called also Uttara-Mîmâṁsâ-Sûtras, or Vyâsa-Sûtras.
2. *Gaimini*, the author of the Pûrva-Mîmâṁsâ-Sûtras.
3. Kapila, the author of the Sâṁkhya-Sûtras.
4. Pataṅgali, also called *Sesha* or Phaṇin, the author of the Yoga-Sûtras.
5. Kaṇâda, also called Kaṇabhuṅ, Kaṇabhakshaka, or Ulûka, the author of the Vaiseshika-Sûtras.
6. Gotama, also called Akshapâda, the author of the Nyâya-Sûtras.

Of course, as has been indicated, "the philosophers to whom our Sûtras have been ascribed cannot be considered as the first originators of Indian philosophy"; nor can anyone suppose that they "were more than the final editors or redactors of the Sûtras as we now possess them." There is serious difficulty also in regard to the date of origin of these works. Mr. Max Müller, however, concludes that "we cannot be far wrong if we assign the gradual formation of the six systems of philosophy to the period from Buddha (fifth century) to Asoka (third century), though we have to admit, particularly in the cases of Vedânta, Sâṁkhya, and Yoga a long previous development reaching back through Upanishads and Brâhmaṇas to the very hymns of the Rig-veda." The relative position of the systems is also very difficult to fix, seeing that they all quote each other. The relation of Buddhism to the six orthodox systems has been much contested. Some have held that Buddha, or his disciples, actually borrowed from these Sûtras. Mr. Max Müller holds, with more caution, that "all we can honestly say is that schools of philosophy handing down doctrines very similar to those of our six classical or orthodox systems are presupposed by the Buddhist Suttas." As to the touchy question whether the Greeks borrowed the first elements of their philosophy, and especially logic, from the Indians, or the Indians from the Greeks (through the Græco-Macedonian kingdom of Bactra), Mr. Max Müller rejects the views both of Görres and of Niebuhr, and regards Greek and Indian philosophy as independent products. He persists, rightly, in refusing to trace the Alexandrian Logos to an Indian source. As the facts stand, he would cautiously "derive from the striking similarities of Indian and Greek philosophy this conviction only, that in philosophy also there is a wealth of truth which forms the common heirloom of all mankind, and may be discovered by all nations if they search for it with honesty and perseverance."

It is out of the question to attempt here to set forth even the main points of these six systems, much more so to institute a comparison of them with each other or with any of the Western systems. The reader must be referred to Mr. Max Müller's simple and lucid exposition, which itself is but introductory to the original texts. It is very pleasant to find a Pundit of his eminence so frankly awarding praise to the work that has been done, and is doing, in this department not only by English and German, but also by Indian scholars. On Indian scholars in an especial degree is laid the duty of bringing forward fresh texts and expounding the true meaning of the ancient sages; and we trust they will show by their labours, more and more, that they place a proper value on their great inheritance of thought and of literature. But, though it is impossible to enter into particulars, we must note that the careful reader will find important points on which Mr. Max Müller deliberately sets the Indian philosophy above all the systems of the West. Admitting flaws in the Vedânta—especially the supersession of morality (for which, however, there is not lacking some considerable strength of argument)—Mr. Max Müller pays it this remarkable tribute:—

It is surely astounding that such a system as the Vedânta should have been slowly elaborated by the indefatigable and intrepid thinkers of India thousands of years ago, a system that even now makes us feel giddy, as in mounting the last steps of the swaying spire of an ancient Gothic cathedral. None of our philosophers, not excepting Heraclitus, Plato, Kant, or Hegel, has ventured to erect such a spire, never frightened by storms or lightnings. Stone follows on stone in regular succession after once the first step has been made, after once it has been clearly seen that in the beginning there can have been but One, as there will be but One in the end, whether we call it Atman or Brahman. We may prefer to look upon the expansion of the world in names and forms as the work of Sophia or as the realised Logos, but we cannot but admire the boldness with which the Hindu metaphysician, impressed with the miseries and evanescence of thi world, could bring himself to declare even the Logos to be but the result of Avidyâ or Nescience, so that in the destruction of that Avidyâ could be recognised the highest object, and the *summum bonum* (Purushârtha) of man. . . . Other philosophers have denied th reality of the world as perceived by us, but no one has ventured t deny at the same time the reality of what we call the Ego, the sense and the mind, and their inherent forms. And yet after lifting th Self above body and soul, after uniting heaven and earth, God and man, Brahman and Atman, these Vedânta philosophers have destroyed nothing in the life of the phenomenal beings who have to act and to fulfil their duties in this phenomenal world. On the contrary, they have shown that there can be nothing phenomenal without something that is real, and that goodness and virtue, faith and works, are necessary as a preparation, nay, as a *sine quâ non*, for the attainment of that highest knowledge which brings the soul back to its source and to its home, and restores it to its true nature, to its true Selfhood in Brahman.

To the Western mind, it is true, these flights of speculation have generally seemed fanciful, and unworthy of the name of philosophy. But the Western mind is rather apt to plume itself upon being the only mind worth consideration; and it would be none the worse if it were to put aside prejudice, as Mr. Max Müller properly does, and yield a patient consideration to the attitude of the Eastern mind. Certainly, Vedântism "represents a phase of philosophic thought which no student of philosophy can afford to ignore." Mr. Max Müller himself advances a long way beyond that position. The following declaration will be exceedingly interesting in India, though it may exercise the minds of some good people in England:—

I quite admit that, as a popular philosophy, the Vedânta would have its dangers, that it would fail to call out and strengthen the manly qualities required for the practical side of life, and that it might raise the human mind to a height from which the most essential virtues of social and political life might dwindle away into mere phantoms. At the same time I make no secret that all my life I have been very fond of the Vedânta. Nay, I can fully agree with Schopenhauer, and quite understand what he meant when he said: "In the whole world there is no study, except that of the original (of the Upanishads), so beneficial and so elevating as that of the Oupnekhat (Persian translation of the Upanishads). It has been the solace of my life, it will be the solace of my death."

Vedânta "is clearly the native philosophy of India"—"the first growth." For the rest, it is only desirable to note here Mr. Max Müller's confessed admiration of the Indian philosophers because "they never try to deceive us as to their principles and the consequences of their theories." "They are *bona fide* idealists or materialists, monists or dualists, theists or atheists, because their reverence for truth is stronger than their reverence for anything else." Every system, however imperfect the style, is elaborated with "straightforwardness and perfect freedom"—"the very perfection for the treatment of philosophy." There is no Indian Mrs. Grundy, no heresy-hunting, no Inquisition. Really, the Western world has yet something to learn, and this volume should do much to open the eyes and broaden the view of the peoples that dwell west of Suez and care aught for the things of the mind.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

(FROM A PARLIAMENTARY CORRESPONDENT.)

I SAW a significant though not very polite heading to the Parliamentary report in a great provincial paper the other day. It was "The Dregs of Parliament," and though as I have said this may not be very polite it is extremely accurate. This Session has been the tamest and poorest Session I have ever seen. The little majority led by Mr. Gladstone in the closing years of his career did more in a week than this large majority can do in a Session. Indeed the size of the majority has a benumbing effect on the party, and the whips have the greatest difficulty in keeping the men together. I don't know what the Government will claim to be the big Bill of the Session—probably the London Government Bill. But beyond all question the measure which has excited the most controversy has been what is called the Tithes Bill. As I have explained previously this is the scheme for further endowing the Church of England out of the public purse, rewarding the parsons for their friendly services to the Conservative cause at the general election by making the taxpayer hand over a big dole. Well this Bill has gone through its last stage in the House of Commons since I last wrote, that is to say it passed its third reading, and Mr. Birrell seized the opportunity of giving it a parting kick or two. He taunted the Chancellor of the Exchequer for having kept silence throughout the whole debate—and the taunts were made all the more effective by the fact that everyone knew that in secret Sir Michael Hicks-Beach detests the Bill. It was pleasant, therefore, to hear Mr. Birrell describing the Chancellor as no longer the stern and impartial guardian of the public purse, but as "the mere paymaster of greedy and mercenary bands." "His is the hand," continued the hon. member, "which turns the tap of the public Exchequer from which this clerical pail is filled." I have referred to this occasion more particularly as it illustrates my contention that either the majority is too lazy to respond to the crack of the party whip or the Tories are already sick of this Bill, for when the third reading was divided upon the numbers were 182 to 117—or a majority of only 65. That is considerably less than half the normal majority, and the tale so general on such occasions about a snatch or surprise vote cannot be trotted out here, as everyone knew that the vote would be taken, and the usual whips were out on both sides. Indeed it was the last word of the Commons on the most contentious Bill of the Session.

Even in the House of Lords there was a debate and a division on this subject. Of course there, with the careful and watchful assistance of the prelates, the Government was secure of a big majority. Only one thing about the debate attracted my attention. It was the interesting spectacle of the Archbishop of Canterbury pleading against the terrible burdens which oppress the poorer clergy. The most reverend prelate receives £15,000 a year, and the use of two palaces, so that he can have but little personal acquaintance with financial hardships. As he was speaking I noticed that in front of the throne, in the space reserved for Privy Councillors, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Long and Sir William Harcourt stood chatting and laughing. Whether these distinguished men were laughing at the Archbishop or not I cannot say—but it is to be hoped not.

A wearisome Bill has been dragging its slow length through the Commons during all the week—I refer to the Food and Drugs Bill. Night after night I have looked in upon the faithful Commons and have found a little band of earnest men discussing the differences between margarine and butter. So far as my casual visits have enabled me to perceive, I believe margarine to be Liberal Unionist butter—a show or shoddy form of a good thing. This eternal war of grease has been broken in upon by interludes on milk and cream and bacon and eggs. One night I found Mr. Caldwell endeavouring to persuade the House to leave out the word "impoverished" before the word "milk." What the effect of that omission might have been in the law of the land I don't know, but the Government was sternly in favour of "impoverished" remaining in and it had its way. Another evening there was for a few minutes absolutely a crisis about skim-milk, and Mr. Long had to compromise in a hurry to prevent a disaster. There would have been something sweetly appropriate in this Government having to go to the country on skim-milk! But out of such dreary trivialities as this it is difficult to extract information or amusement for the reader.

And while things have been humdrum and commonplace here, there has been the consciousness that all the time a bigger game has been played in the Transvaal. I think I have never known anything more unscrupulous or disgraceful than the tone of the Rhodesian press both in this country and at the Cape. The lusting after a war, or rather after that which these men think a war would produce, has been open and unashamed. The tales told about the grievances of the Uitlanders, and especially about their yearning for the franchise are of course the merest moonshine, the facts being that a certain clique or gang want to capture the Rand and its profits. In order to do this it would be necessary to plunge South Africa into a war of races, the disastrous effects of which would be felt for generations. Such conduct would be iniquitous enough in mere irresponsible adventurers, but it has been approved and furthered by Sir Alfred Milner out there and Mr. Chamberlain at this end. Yet in spite of all these powerful agencies working for war the peace has been preserved thanks not to our diplomatists and statesmen, but to President Kruger, Mr. Schreiner, Mr. Fischer and Mr. Hofmeyr. Now that the war-mongers see that they are beaten they are spreading rumours to the effect that President Kruger has resigned! I believe that nearly all these false and unsettling messages are concocted for Stock Exchange purposes. To urge a country on to war even when the motive is some mistaken notion of glory is bad enough; but to risk the peace of the world, the blood of one's fellow-countrymen here, and the white population out in South Africa, so as to send up or down the prices of certain shares, is at once a monstrous and a contemptible crime.

Meantime the House of Commons has not yet had an opportunity of debating these things. On Friday—before this is seen in print perhaps—the Colonial Office Vote will come on. But even then I do not expect much will be said, for of course the Government will be able to plead that it cannot give full or detailed information as negotiations are still going on. The fact is Mr. Chamberlain wants the recess to bring its sweet oblivion, its rest from weary questionings, and its sense of having a free hand so dear to a pushful minister. Then, he thinks, we shall see what we shall see.

These are days of Peace Conferences, but still our expenditure on navy and army increases, enormous though it has been in the past. Last Friday night millions upon millions were voted for the navy, and about the only matter really discussed was the merits or the demerits of the water-tube boiler. This form of boiler has a gigantic and deadly foe in Mr. William Allan, a big engineer from Sunderland, who sits for Gateshead. On every possible occasion he takes up his parable against this iniquitous invention and thunders against it until the House reverberates with his roars. On Friday he was at it again, but he did not succeed in converting either the Government or the House entirely. They are still determined to stick to the water-tube boiler in some form, but Mr. Allan can have this consolation at least—he has succeeded in extracting an official confession that the Belleville boiler is not all it should be. When he began his crusade Mr. Goschen and the rest of the official ring were fervent in their eulogies of this particular pattern of boiler. Now they have had to confess their error. If Mr. Allan keeps on with his steam-hammer arguments perhaps he will one day be able to exorcise the water-tube boiler fiend in all its shapes from her Majesty's navy.

When the criticism had ceased on the navy it began on the army. Mr. Arnold-Forster is as untiring about the weakness of our army system as Mr. Allan is about our boilers. I am not one of Mr. Arnold-Forster's admirers, and I have heard his speech on the army so often as to be a little tired of it. At the same time such men are no doubt useful to jog the elbow of officialdom every now and then. For instance he said, and apparently proved from figures, that during the last five years we have after strenuous efforts increased the number of our men in the army by exactly twenty-four. During the same period the expenses have gone up by millions upon millions! It is no good discussing or attempting to discuss a definite statement of this sort by vague disapproval of the general assertion that "the service is going to the dogs."

CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

THURSDAY, July 20.—In the House of Commons, Mr. Chamberlain, at the invitation of Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, read a telegram confirming the news that the Volksraad of the South African Republic had agreed to a seven years' qualification for the franchise. Mr. Chamberlain added that he had no official information as to redistribution, but that it had been stated that the Transvaal Government proposed to give seven new seats to the districts which were chiefly inhabited by aliens. If this report was confirmed there would be reason to hope for a settlement of the question on the lines laid down by Sir A. Milner at the Bloemfontein conference. The Government, however, observed that a number of conditions were still retained, which might be used for the purpose of taking away with one hand what had been given with the other, and it would also be easy by subsequent legislation to change the character of the concessions. But the Government felt assured that President Kruger would be prepared, if necessary, to reconsider the details of his scheme and would not allow his concessions to be nullified by future alterations of the law or by acts of administration.

The Peace Conference's No. 1 Commission voted on asphyxiating shells and expanding bullets. Great Britain and the United States voted together in favour of both against all the other nations represented.

FRIDAY, July 21.—The correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* at the Hague sent an account of the proceedings at the Peace Conference in connexion with the use of asphyxiating shells and expansive bullets. The First Committee agreed unanimously to the prohibition of the dropping of explosives from balloons. The use of projectiles emitting asphyxiating gases was condemned by the representatives of all the Powers except Great Britain and the United States. On the third point of M. Karnebeek's report, dealing with expanding bullets, Captain Crozier (United States) proposed to substitute the following for the proposal in question:—"The use should be prohibited of bullets which inflict unnecessarily cruel wounds, such as explosive bullets, and in general every kind of bullet exceeding the limits necessary to put a man immediately *hors de combat*." A long discussion ensued, but on a vote being taken Captain Crozier's motion was rejected by seventeen votes against eight, and the proposal as it stood in M. Karnebeek's report was adopted, all the delegations voting for it except those of Great Britain and the United States, who voted against it, and the Portuguese delegates, who abstained from voting.

It was stated that Mr. Clinton Dawkins would remain the financial member of the Viceroy's Council for another year and then become senior partner in the London house of J. S. Morgan and Company. As he could not accept this position at once it was to be kept open for a year until he could be spared by the Government of India.

SATURDAY, July 22.—A meeting of the Afrikander Bond was held at Graff Reinet on Saturday to consider the new franchise proposals adopted by the Volksraad in the Transvaal. A resolution was adopted expressing joy and satisfaction at the reasonable and liberal conditions conceded, and the conviction that if there was no interference in the internal affairs of South Africa a good and friendly understanding would be arrived at. The meeting also thanked Mr. Schreiner and his Cabinet, and Mr. Hofmeyr and Mr. Fischer for their endeavours to bring about a satisfactory solution, and expressed their loyalty to the Queen. Reuter's agent at Capetown was authorised to give an absolute denial to the statement, published in London, that Mr. Schreiner telegraphed on Wednesday last to President Kruger exhorting him not to yield any further as a document from the Imperial Government would reach him on the following day. Mr. Schreiner did send a telegram to President Kruger with a view to prevent the premature passing of the franchise law before a communication from the Imperial Government had been received, but the interpretation placed upon it in the London telegram was completely erroneous.

MONDAY, July 24.—A report from Pretoria made it appear that President Kruger had quarrelled with the Volksraad over the dynamite monopoly and had offered his resignation. The report was, however, emphatically contradicted.

The Peace Conference was now discussing the final results of its labours and was expected to close by the end of the week. There was a general feeling among the delegates that they had accomplished more than most of them hoped for, and that even the abortive disarmament proposals would do good.

Rain was badly wanted throughout Western India and a drinking-water famine was feared in various places.

It was officially announced that the Dreyfus Court-martial would begin on August 7.

The body of the late Tsarevitch reached St. Petersburg after a solemn journey of 1,800 miles.

The government was handed over by the British to the local authorities at Candia. The British flag on the Palace was hauled down, and the Cretan government began.

TUESDAY, July 25.—In the House of Lords, Lord Kitchener of Khartum, who was introduced by Lord Roberts of Kandahar and Lord Cromer, took the oath and his seat, with the usual ceremonies, on his elevation to the peerage. Subsequently Lord Cromer, who was introduced by Lord Peel and Lord Cross, took the oath and subscribed the roll on his advancement to the dignity of Viscount.

The Peace Conference adopted the proposal that, whenever war seemed likely to break out, the Powers concerned should be reminded by the other Powers of the existence of a permanent Court of arbitration. The United States agreed to this with a reservation declaring that they did not desire to depart from their traditional policy of not interfering in the politics of other nations.

The London County Council heard the chairman's annual address. Lord Welby touched upon all the work done by the Council, and called special attention to the serious increase in the number of lunatics for whom asylums had to be provided. As matters for congratulation, he referred to the great increase of London's open spaces, to the financial success of the working of municipal tramways, and to the fact that the county rate was being kept down. Lord Welby concluded by a hopeful word on the London Government Act, and said the Council would wish to co-operate heartily with the new authorities created by it. Some extensions in the Council's tramway system were agreed to, and a resolution passed expressing the opinion that the National Telephone Company's licence ought not to be extended in the county of London beyond 1911.

Mr. Chamberlain attended the annual meeting of the Colonial Nursing Association, and moved a resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Asquith and carried, supporting the committee in their endeavour to raise a fund of £5 000. Mr. Chamberlain spoke of the work of the association—the tending of the sick in far-off parts of the Empire—as one bound to appeal to all who had friends and relations abroad. The Colonial Office was satisfied that the work wanted doing and was well done, and it would support the association in every way it could. Mr. Asquith pointed out the reasons which made an endowment a necessity to such a society.

WEDNESDAY, July 26.—The Old Age Pensions Committee reported in favour of pensions of at least 5s. a week for all needy and deserving persons over 65. They proposed that half the cost should be paid from local rates and the other half by the Exchequer. Boards of guardians were suggested as the authorities to administer the fund, with help from representatives of other local bodies. Mr. Chaplin drafted the report, which was supported by nine and opposed by four members of the committee.

No further developments of the situation of any great importance were reported from the Transvaal. A Pretoria correspondent said, however, that the Volksraad did not seem likely at present to make more concessions in the Franchise Bill.—The services of nearly 2,000 of the New South Wales Defence Force had been offered in case of war. It had been decided by the Indian military authorities that 10,000 troops could be spared from India if they were needed in South Africa.

The dismissal of General de Négrier from the Supreme Council of War was now known to be due to a speech in which he said that after the Dreyfus court-martial the Supreme Council would call upon the Government to punish those who attacked the army, and that if the Government refused the Council would act. He had also instructed the commanding officers under him to make the same statement to their subordinates.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

[FROM AN INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

BOMBAY, July 8.

The full text of the speeches on the Sugar Act in the House of Commons is now being criticised in the Press in India. The tone and temper of criticism is vastly different from that of a few weeks ago. The Blue-book was a revelation in itself. It made many an organ of opinion pause. Many more which had been clamant in praise of that philistine piece of legislation have now become silent.

Some time ago three letters under the *nom de guerre* of "Indian Economics" appeared on the question in the columns of the *Times of India*. These have been now collected and reprinted in the form of a pamphlet. None can dispute the ability of the writer, though few may agree with the views propounded in the first letter. The second is more or less discursive. But in the third the writer has been at some pains to show how far the sugar industry in the Bombay Presidency, insignificant as it is compared with that of the North-West Provinces, the Punjab and Bengal respectively, has suffered from the action of the executive of the Excise Department. Everywhere the by-products of sugar are allowed to be employed in other processes without restraint or oppressive tax. The most useful and profitable of all the by-products is rum. But the wisdom of the Excise Department of Bombay, intent on making revenue out of anything, would not exclude sugar rum from paying its tax. This embargo was laid on it by Sir Charles Pritchard; and it has been a material blow at the

sugar-refining industry in the Deccan where some enterprising capitalists were previously prospering. The Poona Industrial Conference some seven years ago referred to this matter, but to no purpose. The sugar controversy has revived the by-issue and "Indian Economics" earnestly draws the attention of the Indian and British public to the affair with a view that the embargo may be removed. This is a legitimate grievance. If the Government honestly means to help the indigenous industry, there is no excuse for continuing the excise tax on sugar rum in this Presidency where no such tax oppresses refiners in any other part of British India.

Another side issue to which Indian public opinion has referred is that *both* the great parties in the House of Commons treat India as a stalking-horse for their own party fights on the platform or in Parliament. Indian opinion on any given topic, whether for or against, is trotted out as may best suit their exigencies for the time. On the present occasion Lord George Hamilton and his party tried to make the most of the so-called "unanimity" of Indian opinion. But that "unanimity" was nothing compared with the solid, compact and unbending unanimity at the time of the passing of the Press laws. If unanimity on the Sugar Bill was a plea in its favour, how was it that unanimity in the case of the Sedition Bill was of no consequence? Are we to understand that public opinion in India is only to be thought of as a kind of mistress to be embraced or spurned according as it may suit the purposes of the two great parties in England? Where, asked the *Madras Standard*, was Sir Henry Fowler during the debate on the Press laws? Where were all the Liberal leaders? Surely, they cannot deny that India was unanimous against the Gagging Act, so fatal to the cause of freedom of speech and thought of which the Liberal party is the standard bearer? The Liberals have always been in the van of those who have sought to rescue struggling nationalities from their oppressors. But when freedom in India was suppressed, as it was not suppressed even before 1835, these standard-bearers were nowhere. This is an ugly feature of English political life. So far there is not a pin to choose between the Liberals and the Conservatives, though India remembers with the greatest gratitude the repeal of the odius Vernacular Press Act of 1876, which the freedom-loving spirit of Gladstone was foremost in obtaining. Will the Liberal party of to-day promise Indians that, on returning to power, it will wipe off the stain on British Indian history by repealing the Sedition Act and the sugar legislation designed to benefit the planters of Mauritius?

The annual report of the Local Boards in the Bombay Presidency has just been published. It is an interesting State paper, albeit dry to the "general reader." The front page announces the fact (for the first time in the history of Blue and Green books emanating from the Bombay Secretariat) that a copy can be had of seven booksellers in London, five on the Continent, and three in this country. Is it not wonderful that India, with a population of 300 millions, should have only three booksellers to sell this book—the country *most* interested in its own local management? Even the Continentals have five, though their population save Russia, does not equal India's. Inscrutable are the ways of the Indian bureaucracy and notably of Bombay. But let me give the broad facts. There are 217 district and taluka boards whose total area are 122,790 square miles and whose total population is 17,407,226. There are 789 officials and 2,745 non-officials upon these boards. The attendance of the former averages 2, while that of the latter averages 5. Their combined receipts amounted to 45 lakhs, whilst their expenditure came to 47½ lakhs. That is to say, the poor Boards exceeded their income by 2½ lakhs. The expenditure had to be incurred chiefly in connexion with plague. The deficit was almost wholly met out of the surplus cash balances. These at the opening of the year stood at 21·19 lakhs, whereas at the close they stood at 18·86 lakhs. It is a pity that the Imperial Government should be so ungenerous as regards the plague expenditure incurred by local bodies. Perhaps the next Legislative Council meeting will tell how far these balances have been restored. Local Boards cannot make bricks without straw. But this is the miracle the Government expects them to achieve, while shirking its own fair share of the contribution; and when the Boards fail, the bloodhounds of the Anglo-Indian press pursue them, and we are told that these local bodies are ghastly failures and need to be swept away.

INTERVIEW WITH MR. PARANJPYE.

A representative of INDIA who was present at Mr. and Mrs. W. S. Caine's "At Home" in honour of Mr. Raghunath Purushottam Paranjpye on Wednesday, July 19, obtained from Mr. Paranjpye the following interesting account of his early education and surroundings:—

I am the son of Purushottam Keshaw Paranjpye and was born on February 16, 1876. My father and elder brothers are all small farmers in a village called Murdi of about 300 inhabitants in the Ratnagiri district of the Bombay Presidency. There is no great variety of occupation at Murdi, for everybody is engaged in the cultivation of rice, betel nuts, cocoa nuts, etc. Our village has twenty-five families of high-caste Brahmans, all the others being Shudras, or low-caste. All the men of the Brahman families can read and write, but very few others can do so. The whole population is Hindu, there is not a single Mahometan in the place. Nor is there even an elementary school in the village. Neither of my parents was ever at school, and my mother, like most Indian women, neither reads nor writes. I was, however, at the age of six sent to a Marathi day school (there are no residential schools in India) in the neighbouring village of Anjarla, which is large compared with Murdi, having a population of 2,000. I remained three years at this school. Many of its inhabitants, as indeed of all the neighbouring villages, go to Bombay to work in the mills, become clerks, and some to occupy very high positions.

The Brahmans of this part of the Bombay Presidency are called Karkanastha Brahmans and are indisputably the cleverest caste in the Presidency. It is wonderful to see how many famous Hindus come from this part; they are all quite poor. It was they who all but conquered India before Englishmen. They excelled as rulers and administrators, whilst the lower castes did the fighting. The Peishwas, rulers of more than half India during the last century, came originally from a village about fifteen miles distant from my own, and their betel-nut garden is still shown to all visitors. Here also education is very backward except among the Brahmans.

To return to my own education. My cousin, Professor Karve, of Fergusson College, Poona, removed me from Anjarla to his village, about five miles from Murdi, for a year, after which I attended the S. P. G. Mission School at Dapoli for about two years when I began to study English. In January, 1888, my cousin took me to live at his house in Bombay and there for four years I attended the Maratha High School, a private school owned by Mr. R. R. Bhagwat, Professor of Sanskrit at St. Xavier's College, Bombay. It was from here I matriculated at Bombay University, coming out at the top.

Just after this my cousin was appointed Professor of Mathematics at Fergusson College, Poona. This college arose out of the development of the New English School, founded in 1880 by three or four gentlemen to facilitate and cheapen the means of education among the people. Fergusson College was opened in 1885, and at first it only prepared for the first year's examination; but it was fully recognised by Bombay University in 1895 in the Arts course. The professors of the College work for very small pay—just enough for bare maintenance—and are pledged to carry on their work for twenty years. At present their salary is about Rs. 70 per mensem, or about £56 per annum. All the professors are men of remarkable ability; they have all come of very poor families and have had great difficulty in obtaining higher education, winning in the end high degrees in the University. The first Principal of Fergusson College was Professor V. S. Apte, a most distinguished Sanskrit scholar, author of an excellent Sanskrit dictionary and a grammar. Unfortunately he died at an early age in 1892. He was succeeded by Mr. Agarkar, the greatest champion of social reform in our part of the world and editor of a paper called *The Reformer*. He also died in 1895. The present Principal is Mr. Gole, Professor of Natural Sciences. Amongst the members of the staff are Professor Gokhale, who teaches English, History, and Political Economy; and also Professor Rajwade, who resigned an appointment of Rs 350 per month to take the chair of Sanskrit on the death of Mr. Apte. My cousin, Mr. Karve, is Professor of Mathematics. He is the son of my father's sister and his people are also very poor. He educated himself by undertaking tuition during his spare time when a student at college. Just after taking his degree, he undertook to educate me, knowing well the difficulties of obtaining higher education, as well as its value. Although none of us had any claim on his generosity, he educated three other youths, two of whom have unfortunately died. My cousin became Professor of Mathematics in 1892 when Mr. Tilak, one of the founders of the College, resigned in 1892, owing to a difference of opinion between him and some other professors. His name is well-known on account of his prosecution for alleged sedition two years ago. After I went to Poona I passed my previous examination in 1892, first examination for B.Sc. in 1893, and second B.Sc. in 1894; in all of which I was the only man who got a first-class.

I was then appointed to a fellowship in the College, which is not unlike a student-teachership. I passed my intermediate examination for B.A. in 1895 at the top of the first class and in June, 1896, I was appointed Government of India Scholar. The scholarship is worth £200 per annum, and requires the studies of the holder to be continued at Oxford or Cambridge.

Having a taste for mathematics, and St. John's (Cambridge) having turned out the greatest number of Senior Wranglers, and also because most of the books I had read in India were written by Johnians, I decided to join that College. I was elected a foundation scholar in 1897, and was first in two college examinations and second in two others. My private coach was Mr. R. R. Webb of St. John's. On an average, I have worked seven hours a day, and so far from my health having suffered, it has improved remarkably since I came to England.

It is my intention to return to India two years hence, and join the staff of Fergusson College. Like all Indian boys, I was married when I was sixteen to a girl of eleven. My wife can just read and write in my language. C. S. B.

Imperial Parliament.

Thursday, July 20.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

BRITISH INDIANS IN NATAL.

Mr. DILLON asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he was aware that there were 50,000 British subjects from India in the Colony of Natal who were denied the franchise and had no share in the government of the Colony:

Whether the children of these people were to a large extent excluded from the Government schools:

And, whether he had taken or proposed to take any steps to insist on the franchise being granted in Natal to these British subjects.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: By the law of Natal (No. 8 of 1896) natives of countries which have not possessed elective representative institutions founded on the Parliamentary franchise are not entitled to the franchise unless they obtain an order from the Governor in Council exempting them from the operation of the Act, and British Indians are embraced in this category. There is no rule, I understand, excluding Indians from Government schools. The Government supports special schools for Indians in centres where there is any considerable population. The answer to the last question is in the negative, and I may remind the hon. member that I have no power to insist in the case of a self-governing Colony.

Mr. DAVITT asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether British subjects from India settling in Natal were as such entitled to the franchise and were allowed to exercise it:

If he could state approximately the proportion of the 50,000 Indian British subjects in the Colony who were thus privileged:

Whether any provision was made by the laws of the Colony for the education of these subjects in their own language:

And, if he could state how much of the taxes to which these people contributed was devoted to this purpose.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: I have already given the answer to the first paragraph in reply to the question put to me by the hon. member for East Mayo. As to the second paragraph, I am not aware of the exact number, but it is small. In answer to the third paragraph, I believe not, and I am not aware of any demand for such instruction of Indians, but in the special schools for Indian children, numbering about thirty, which receive grants from the Government, a number of Indian teachers are employed. The Government grant-in-aid of Indian schools for the last financial year was £2,200.

Monday, July 24.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

OUTRAGES UPON INDIANS BY EUROPEAN SOLDIERS.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY had the following question upon the paper:—To ask her Majesty's Government what measures they intend to take to prevent outrages by soldiers in India and the Colonies such as that which caused the death of Mr. Talwattee; and to ask the Under-Secretary for India whether on February 14 last the India Office was entirely ignorant of the following cases:—

January 16, 1898: Poona, Arjuna shot by Gunner W. E. Piper.—*Times of India.*

February 27, 1898: Poona, Private MacQuillan, Royal Irish Rifles, cut the throat of a dooly bearer.—*Champion.*

March 23, 1898: Satara, Mr. Rowecroft, a military officer, slapped on the face for insufficient salutation Mr. Sohoni, first assistant master Satara High School.—*Maharatta.*

April 10, 1898: Poona, two soldiers, Durham Light Infantry, drove through the cantonment firing an air gun, hit a tailor, and a woman, and a man.—*Times of India.*

April 24, 1898: Allahabad, H. L. C. Killick, East Surrey Regiment, out shooting pea fowl with another, with Lee-Metford rifles and bullets. Killick cut Janak Singh's arm with a hunting knife, he bled to death.—*Pioneer.*

May 7, 1898: Karachi, five soldiers committed to Sessions for wounding a policeman on duty.—*Jagat Samachar.*

June 5, 1898: Kussowlee, two European soldiers demanded liquor of a carter, on refusal, threw cart, bullocks, and whiskey down the cliff.—*Champion.*

October 2, 1898: Nasirabad, a punkah coolie attached to sergeants' mess of Royal Fusiliers thrown into a well by two soldiers, September 25.—*Champion.*

January 28, 1899: Punjab, Asghar Aly, magistrate and civil servant, assaulted on Punjab Railway, December 31, 1898, by four commissioned officers.—*Moslem Chronicle.*

And to ask if the Indian Government will amend or remodel the Indian Government Resolution No. 4,625, of August 31, 1897, and the Bombay Government Resolution No. 1,507, Judicial Department, of March 2, 1899.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

BRITISH INDIAN TRADERS IN GERMAN AFRICAN POSSESSIONS.

Sir MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE asked the Secretary of State for India, whether his attention had been drawn to the statement that the Governor of German South-West Africa had issued a very stringent edict prohibiting the extension of credit to Natives:

Whether this edict and the introduction of the German Gewerbsteuer, or tax upon commerce were specially directed against British Indian traders in the German African possessions:

Whether he was aware that, in consequence of the imposition of the Gewerbsteuer, two Hindu firms had been recently driven to withdraw their operations from German South-West Africa:

And, whether he intended to move her Majesty's Government to take immediate steps to represent to the German Government the injury inflicted upon a large number of British subjects engaged in trade in German possessions.

Mr. BRODRICK: No information has reached her Majesty's Government on the subject. Inquiries will be made in Berlin as to whether anything is known of this edict.

Tuesday, July 25.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PRINCE RANJITSINGHJI.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India, why the Indian Government, contrary to the formal and legal settlement made with the assent of the Government by the Jam Sahib of Nowanagar in 1878, refused to acknowledge the title of Kumar Shri Ranjitsinghji Vibhaji, commonly known as Prince Ranjitsinghji, to the Gadi of Nowanagar:

Whether a memorial, in which the grounds of Prince Ranjitsinghji's claim to the Gadi in accordance with law and Rajput custom, and the terms of the above-mentioned settlement were set forth, was addressed to the Secretary of State in 1898, with a petition for enquiry:

Why no answer had been returned to the memorial:

And, when one might be expected.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I am not aware of any formal or legal settlement under which Kumar Ranjitsinghji has any claim to the State of Nowanagar. But since the matter has formed the subject of a question, I propose to state briefly the facts of the case. The late Jam was permitted by the Government of India to disinherit his son by a Mahometan lady, who was his natural heir. Having thus no natural heir he selected Kumar Ranjitsinghji as his son by adoption and as his eventual successor on the express understanding that, if any of the Ranis should give birth to a son, the said Ranjitsinghji should have no claim to succeed. In August, 1882, one of the recognised wives of the Jam, a Mahometan lady, gave birth to a son, Kumar Jarwant Singh, and the Jam applied to the Government of India to recognise him as his natural heir and successor.

The Government of India, after full consideration and enquiry, did so, and the Secretary of State confirmed their decision. From that time Kumar Jarwant Singh was treated as the heir, and on the death of the late Jam he succeeded his natural father.

It is true that in 1899 I received through the Government of India a memorial from Kumar Ranjitsinghji setting forth his claim and asking for an enquiry; and on March 16, 1899, I addressed the Government of India declining to reopen the decision passed by my predecessors and requesting them to inform Kumar Ranjitsinghji.

I have ascertained that these orders were passed in due course on to the Government of Bombay, but that as yet, owing to Kumar Ranjitsinghji having left India, they have not been formally communicated to him. This will now be done without delay.

OUTRAGES ON BRITISH INDIAN PILGRIMS.

Mr. YOXALL asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the Governments of Bombay, Bengal, and Madras had represented to the Viceroy of India the serious outrages by brigands to which British Indian pilgrims were subjected when travelling between Jeddah, Mecca, and Medina in Turkish Arabia:

Whether the Viceroy had requested the Imperial Government to adopt energetic measures for securing protection for British travellers in Arabia:

What steps had been taken by the India Office to remedy the grievances brought to notice:

And, whether, having regard to the facts that 30,000 British and Egyptian pilgrims annually visited the Mahometan shrines, and that 80 per cent. of the transport service was carried on by British shipping firms, her Majesty's Government would consider the expediency of stationing a gunboat at Jeddah, and increasing the number of armed cavasses at the Consulate for the purpose of accompanying the British caravans travelling in Arabia and protecting the pilgrims from murder, outrage, and robbery.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The Government of India is, I believe, kept fully informed as to the conditions under which British Indian Mahometans have to perform their pilgrimage. The Viceroy has made no recent representation to her Majesty's Government on this subject; but, as was stated by the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs in this House on June 22, her Majesty's Government have taken and will continue to take all steps in their power for the pro-

tection of Indian pilgrims. Since then, £1,700 has been paid by the Turkish Government to certain British Indian subjects as a compensation for outrages committed by Bedouins during the pilgrimage. A British ship-of-war occasionally visits Jeddah, but I am not disposed to think that it would be advisable to adopt the measures suggested in the question. It should be remembered that any direct interference on the part of her Majesty's Government with the Mecca pilgrimage would be distasteful to the Moslem community.

Thursday, July 27.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE PROPOSED SEPARATION OF JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he had received a memorial, signed by Indian judicial authorities of the highest position, urging the separation of judicial from executive functions in the Indian administration:

Whether he would state what action he proposed to take on this memorial:

And, whether, looking to the fact that the Government of India anticipated a surplus of Rx. 4,759,400 for 1898-9, and of Rx. 3,932,600 for 1899-1900, the time was opportune from a financial point of view for dealing with a reform which had been long prayed for by the Indian community.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The memorial to which the question refers has been received, and I propose to forward it to the Government of India, requesting them to consider it and to report to me the conclusions at which they may arrive. Until I shall have received their reply, I can say nothing as to the desirability of the proposed change or as to the views of the people of India on the subject.

INDIANS AS CHIEF JUSTICES.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether Mr. Justice S. Subramana Iyer had been appointed to officiate as Chief Justice of Madras:

And, whether there was any legal objection to such appointment being confirmed.

Lord G. HAMILTON: My answer to the first question is in the affirmative.

As regards the second question, I am advised that section 2 of the High Courts Act, 24 and 25 Vict., cap. 104, requires that the person appointed Chief Justice of a High Court (otherwise than in a temporary vacancy under section 7 of the Act) must be a barrister, a qualification which the officiating Chief Justice does not possess.

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS FOR BENGAL.

Mr. HENRY J. WILSON asked the Secretary of State for India, why the agricultural statistics for Bengal were incomplete or wholly wanting, as stated on page 119 of the Blue-book on Moral and Material Progress in India.

Lord G. HAMILTON: Over the greater part of Bengal the land revenue is permanently settled, and the revenue establishments in the interior are slender. Consequently full and accurate agricultural statistics are not and never have been available for the province. Where the cadastral survey has been carried out information is being collected. On the page mentioned in the Parliamentary Paper the only figures absolutely wanting are those relating to live stock and to the irrigated area. Under all other heads approximate figures for Bengal, based on the best available information, are given.

THE LAND REVENUE SYSTEM IN MADRAS.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether the correspondence with the Madras Government regarding land revenue defaulters was now concluded; and if so whether he would lay that correspondence upon the Table as agreed in June, 1896.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The correspondence is concluded, and I will lay it on the Table if the hon. baronet will move for it.

OPIUM SMOKING IN CALCUTTA.

Mr. HENRY J. WILSON asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had any information that opium smoking shops still flourished in Calcutta and carry on an illicit business quite openly:

And what action he proposed to take in the matter.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have to thank the hon. gentleman for the newspaper cutting he sent me, but I have not otherwise received any information that the Calcutta Opium smoking shops are carrying on an illicit business quite openly. No licenses for such shops are granted in Calcutta. The subject of the hon. members question will be brought to the notice of the Government of India.

NOTICES OF MOTION.

On going into Committee on East India Revenue Accounts:—

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN: To move, That under the existing procedure the superintending authority of Parliament over Indian affairs is not effectively exercised; that the salary of the Secretary of State for India should be placed on the Estimates; that the debate on the Indian Budget should be appointed for an earlier day in the Session; and that, with a view to the more effectual discharge by this House of its existing duty to the unrepresented Indian tax-payer, the East India Accounts should each year be referred to a Select Committee with instructions to report on any special features deserving the attention of the House.

Mr. WYLIE: As an amendment to Sir William Wedderburn's motion, line 1, leave out from "That," to end of Question, and insert "this House approves of the administration of Indian affairs and of the present system of administration." [*An early day.*]

Sir MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE: To move, That this House highly approves of the policy advocated by his Excellency Lord Curzon of Kedleston to further the development of industrial and technical education in the Indian Empire, and trusts that immediate practical effect will be given to that policy by the establishment of scientific and technical departments in the existing schools, and of polytechnic institutions, in the larger towns of India, as well as by holding out special facilities to industrial projects.

Mr. KIMBER: To move, That, having regard to certain petitions from the late Chief of Arnowli and from several thousands of the inhabitants of the Cis Sutlej territory in the Punjab presented to Parliament and praying enquiry, and having regard to the printed Return, dated February 11, 1895, to an Address and to the facts recorded therein, this House is of opinion that the Government of India should be advised by the Secretary of State for India to restore the Chiefship of Kythal in the person of the present head of the Bhaikean family (the eldest son of the late Chief of Arnowli), with territory sufficient to maintain that Chiefship in its former rank as one of the four principal Cis Sutlej States.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS.

Captain JESSEL: To ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether the Cavalry Depôt is to furnish drafts only for regiments serving the Colonies and Egypt; and, if so, whether he will explain how drafts will be supplied during the ensuing trooping season for regiments in India. (*Friday, July 28.*)

Mr. PICKERSGILL: To ask the Secretary of State for India, what is the distance between Wano, in the Waziri country (the place to which the baggage train of Mr. Watson, the Indian Government's Political Officer, was proceeding when attacked by Waziris on the 21st instant), and the western frontier line of British India;

What is the distance between Wano and Dera Ismail Khan;

What is the number and status of Indian Government troops now stationed at or near Wano, and at other points in the Waziri country;

What political and civil officers are being maintained by us in that foreign territory;

And is there any near prospect of these forces and officers being withdrawn from Waziristan, in accordance with the recently indicated policy of the Government to reduce our occupation of Afghan tribal territory. [*Monday, July 31.*]

Mr. PICKERSGILL: To ask the Secretary of State for India, whether it is in contemplation to establish a Chief Court in Burma: and whether, before that step is taken, an opportunity will be afforded to this House to pronounce upon the desirability of establishing a High Court instead of a Chief Court in that country. [*Monday, July 31.*]

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL: To ask the Secretary of State for India, if he is yet able to give a reply to the complaint submitted on behalf of the Church of Scotland as to difficulties experienced in several instances by Presbyterian chaplains of the forces in India in obtaining the use of Government churches for public worship. [*Tuesday, August 1.*]

SOME INDIAN SUCCESSES.—In connexion with the remarkable success of Mr. Paranjpye in being bracketed Senior Wrangler the following note is interesting: A fact which is not generally known is that this gentleman has promised the service of his genius to the Poona Fergusson College, which is staffed by a noble band of self-sacrificing Indians, who give tuition free of emolument, claiming as their sole reward the advancement of the intellectual and moral welfare of their pupils. Mr. Paranjpye's success calls to our mind that of some other Indians. Not long ago Mr. Atul Chatterjee beat all his English rivals and topped the list in the Indian Civil Service Examination—the stiffest examination in England. In medicine we find Dr. Sarat Mullick has followed up his brilliant university career by being elected to a distinguished place on the staff of the London National Hospital for Heart and Paralysis. He has quite recently received the unique honour of being the only Indian to be elected a fellow of the London Medical Society, the oldest medical society in London. On turning to law, we find Mr. Sadlir Lal has gained honours in the final examination, and has carried off the Barstow Scholarship. In science we have a good example in Professor S. C. Mahalanobis, who is now Lecturer and Examiner in Physiology in the University of Wales. Turning from the intellectual to the physical side, we find the brilliant feats of "Ranji" on the cricket field have made him the most popular man in England. Lieutenant Suresh Bisivas, who by his personal bravery saved the State army in Brazil from rout, is a living proof against the too often repeated calumny that the Bengalee is not fitted to command. When we reflect that all these gentlemen have had to contend against more than the ordinary difficulties of language, early education and racial prejudice, we stand amazed at their success which under the circumstances is doubly honourable. With such brilliant specimens selected off-hand within the last two or three years, we have every reason to be proud of India, so fittingly described as the "brightest jewel on the British Crown."—From *The News* (July 14).

Messrs. Longman have in the press "The History of Lord Lytton's Indian Administration from 1876-1880." compiled from letters and official papers, edited by Lady Betty Balfour. Also a volume by Professor Max Müller, entitled "Auld Lang Syne," being recollections of Indian friends and correspondents.

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 Papers; from MR. ELLIOT STOCK, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C., and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 & 85 Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.