

# India

FOR THE

No. 84. NEW SERIES.  
No. 178. OLD SERIES.]

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, AUGUST 11, 1899.

[PRINTED AS A PAPER, 2d  
NEWSPAPER. (By Post, 2d.)

Notes and News	65	Letter to the Editor:	
The Debate on the "Indian Budget"	65	Colonel Hanna on Lord Curzon's	
Lord G. Hamilton's Financial State-	69	New Frontier Policy	72
ment		Indian Affairs in Parliament: The	
Back to Lord Lawrence	70	"Indian Budget" Debate: Special	
Our London Letter	71	Report	72
The Calcutta Municipal Bill: Tele-	72	Advertisements	80
gram			

## NOTES AND NEWS.

SIR HENRY FOWLER'S speech on Tuesday had the effect of taking thirteen Liberal members of the House of Commons into the lobby with eighty-two regular supporters of the Government in opposition to the amendment of the Indian Parliamentary Committee. Six of these Liberals (Mr. R. K. Causton, Sir Walter Foster, Sir H. Fowler himself, Mr. Herbert Gladstone, Mr. Seale-Hayne, and Mr. W. McArthur) were members of the late Ministry. There is more ground for surprise in the fact that seven independent Liberals (Mr. Augustine Birrell, Mr. F. A. Channing, Mr. Sydney Evershed, Sir F. Mappin, Mr. S. F. Mendl, Mr. R. W. Perks, and Mr. W. Runciman) should have voted with the party which believes that the existing mode of administering the affairs of India is perfect in itself. The members who voted for the amendment were:—

Abraham, W. (Cork, N.E.).  
Ashton, T. Gair.  
Bolton, T. D.  
Caldwell, James.  
Cameron, Robert.  
Clough, W. O.  
Colville, John.  
Curran, T. B.  
Curran, Thomas.  
Dilke, Sir C. W.  
Edwards, O. M.  
Griffith, Ellis J.  
Hogan, J. F.  
Horniman, F. J.  
Lambert, G.  
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid.  
Lewis, J. Herbert.  
Lloyd-George, D.

MacAlcose, D.  
Maddison, F.  
Molloy, B. C.  
Morgan, J. Lloyd.  
O'Connor, A.  
O'Connor, James.  
Palmer, Sir Charles M.  
Pickersgill, E. H.  
Pirie, D. V.  
Price, R. J.  
Randall, David.  
Ricketts, J. Compton.  
Roberts, J. Herbert.  
Steedman, W. C.  
Sullivan, Donald.  
Warner, T. C. T.  
Williams, J. Carrivill.  
Wilson, Henry J.

The Official Whips were "tellers" for the Government and Sir W. Wedderburn and Mr. George Harwood for the Amendment.

How little in accord with Liberal opinion Sir Henry Fowler's vehement speech was, may be gathered from the remarkably unanimous criticisms of the Liberal Press. The *Daily News* said:—

There is perhaps a little of the Pangloss about Sir Henry Fowler. The best of all possible governments in the best of all possible worlds is his idea of the Indian Council and the Council of India. The House of Commons, he says, takes a proper interest in Indian affairs. We should be glad to think so, but it really is not true.

The *Daily Chronicle*:—

Surely nothing could be more reasonable than the proposal originally made three years ago by Sir William Wedderburn, and moved this year by Mr. Caldwell and seconded by Sir William, in a speech moderate in tone and convincing in argument.

The *Manchester Guardian*:—

The Anglo-Indian creed blocks the way, and even so good a Liberal as Sir Henry Fowler, Secretary for India in the last Liberal Government, went so far last night as to declare that the House has already "a perfect supervision" over Indian affairs, and to hint that the Secretary of State's Council, composed of retired officials, was much better able to exercise control over the Indian bureaucracy than the House itself. There can scarcely be perfect supervision when the Indian Budget debate is, year after year, purposely postponed till the very last working day of the Session. Nor can we reconcile the theory that Parliament is incompetent to discuss Indian grievances with the ordinary view of its powers; presumably Parliament knows as much about India as it does about China or the Transvaal, whose affairs have been discussed fifty times as often during the past few Sessions as any question relating to India.

The *Westminster Gazette*:—

We have the greatest respect for the India Office and for the magnificent official apparatus on which Sir Henry Fowler pronounced

so glowing a eulogy. But if the Indian Budget is to be submitted to Parliament at all, is it not absurd and inconvenient to hold it over to the last day of the Session when the House is empty and exhausted? Of course, if the object is to limit Parliamentary criticism of Indian affairs to the smallest possible compass, the end is ingeniously achieved by these means. For our part we confess we would rather it were achieved by some other and franker method.

The *Star*:—

The whole thing is a ludicrous farce, and the spectacle of Sir Henry Fowler falling on Lord George Hamilton's neck in a paroxysm of mutual admiration is a little too much for Liberals who have not entirely lost the old Liberal habit of saying what they think.

The *Morning Leader*:—

On such a matter we confess that we prefer the general verdict of unofficial observers and the strong testimony of experts like Sir David Barclay and Sir Auckland Colvin to the personal likes and dislikes of an ex-Minister who has more than once denounced Parliamentary "interference" in Indian affairs, and who—in the matter of Waziristan and simultaneous examinations—showed that he had the courage of his convictions.

A well-informed correspondent who was present at Tuesday's debate writes:—"After the Indian famine of 1897, the Indian authorities attempted by rigorous economy, and equally rigorous collection of taxes, to show a large surplus, and Lord George Hamilton laboured for over an hour to prove this was a sign of the prosperity of the famine-stricken population. When he referred to the opinion of the Famine Commission that a large section of the Indian people are now in a more helpless state than ever, he tried to explain it by the exploded myth of the undue and unchecked increase of population in India. His figures will not bear a moment's scrutiny. Lord George stated that the population of India has increased by 70 millions within the last 30 years. He did not state how much of this addition is due to the extension of the British Empire in Burma and Baluchistan; and he did not stop to explain that the first census taken was necessarily hasty and careless, and that succeeding censuses show a large increase, not because the population has increased fast, but because the censuses have been more careful. Every census officer in India knows this, and is aware that probably one-half of the apparent increase within the last 30 years is due to this cause. Taking, then, the real increase to be somewhat over 30 millions in a country with a population of nearly 300 millions, the increase is a little over 10 per cent in 30 years. How does this increase compare with the increase in a European country like England or Germany? Yet these facts are never placed before the British public, and the growing impoverishment of the people of India, due to inordinate taxation and an unjust drain on the revenues of India, is complacently attributed to a mythical cause—the increase of population.

"Sir Henry Fowler was lost in admiration of the perfection of the present system of Indian government, and had not a single word to say from the Liberal Front Bench in sympathy with the aspirations of the people of India for a larger share in the administration of their own country. Truly the people of India have fallen upon evil times. The motion submitted by Mr. Caldwell and ably and eloquently seconded by Sir W. Wedderburn was of course lost. Mr. Pickersgill's arguments for the separation of the judicial and executive services in India were cogent and unanswerable; but argument and reason have little weight in a House where the Government boasts a majority of 130. Mr. Herbert Roberts pleaded for the municipal self-government of Calcutta before empty benches. Lord George Hamilton himself did not remain in his place to hear all he had to say, there was not one single member on the Front Opposition Bench, and there was a time during Mr. Roberts's speech when only ten members were present in the whole House, five on each side. Such is the interest taken in Indian affairs by the Parliament of the United Kingdom—an interest which Sir H. Fowler vindicated



in one of the highest flights of his indignant eloquence. But facts are stronger than eloquence. The work of the Currency Committee was of course lauded to the skies, and there was little beyond an exchange of compliments between the present Secretary of State and the late Secretary of State for India. And when Lord George Hamilton said he could give no hope for any alteration of the scheme of municipal administration in Calcutta which Lord Curzon has proposed, he dealt a death-blow at the hopes and loyal aspirations of the patriotic citizens of Calcutta who have for the last twelve months fought for the defence of their existing rights—in vain."

Lord George Hamilton's controversial methods are peculiar. He ignored the topics raised by Sir William Wedderburn in his speech on Tuesday, but brought a sweeping charge against this journal. According to Lord George Hamilton we "circulate the grossest falsehoods, which go out to India and come back repeated a hundred-fold in the Native Press." We challenge Lord George Hamilton to produce a title of evidence in support of this cowardly accusation. He sought in his speech to justify it by a garbled reference to our criticism of some remarks of his thirteen months ago. Let us recall the remarks in question, which then as now we quoted in full from the *Middlesex County Times* of July 2, 1898:—

If he turned to the department for which he was responsible—India—he thought they might congratulate themselves and the Indian Government on successfully surmounting plague, famine, war and sedition. There was one thing he was not good-tempered about. He did not care for personal attacks upon himself, as he had been long enough in politics to know the exact value of personalities of that character; but he could not stand the attacks made upon their fellow-countrymen in positions of tremendous responsibility, who, at great risks to their lives, were striving to maintain the prestige of the British flag. If their Empire abroad was extending to an immeasurably greater extent than that of any other country, one of the main reasons of that advance and progress was that there were any number of young men who, at any moment when they were called upon, were ready to go to a savage, foreign country, taking their lives in their hands, and by force of character and foresight they were enabled in an immeasurably short time to establish humanity and civilised order. These men were entitled to their respect and their consideration, and if they heard that under the most trying circumstances they had committed an error of judgment or had done something which upon reflection seemed better not to have been done, still they should take into consideration the extreme difficulties which surrounded them, and they should be thankful they were able to obtain such a body of young gentlemen ever ready to maintain the prestige of England at the risk of their lives, and to bring about the extension of the Empire in all parts of the world.

Upon this passage we commented (July 15, 1898) as follows:—

It will thus be seen that Lord George Hamilton claims a respectful consideration for Anglo-Indian officials because of the dangers they run in extending the empire and in civilising savage countries. Now it will naturally be asked, What has this glorious extension of empire to do with the Indian Government? How does it touch the Indian Civil Service? Is it pretended that this is their chief duty; that the true sphere of their labours is beyond the North-West frontier; and that any errors committed throughout India are to be condoned because of the great services rendered in civilising the Africa? Or does he mean that the great deeds done by Englishmen in Africa throw such a halo of glory over their countrymen in India as to wipe out all offences? But if neither of these meanings be his, how can the extension of the empire affect our judgment on the actions of the Indian Government? Again, Lord George Hamilton tells us, as an answer to troublesome and seditious critics, of the number of young Englishmen—or should it be "young gentlemen"?—who are ready to go to a "savage foreign country" to establish civilised order. Does this mean that India is a savage country which is only becoming civilised by the efforts of the English—India, which, presented an aspect of ordered civilisation to the soldiers of Alexander the Great, the contemporary of Aristotle; a civilisation which was already ancient when the ancestors of the English were still nomads, and which has endured unbroken to the present day? The people of India have their faults, like other peoples; but who ever, before this, thought of them as savages? And yet if India be not one of the savage countries to which the Secretary of State refers, how does the readiness of young Englishmen to go to savage countries help the case of the English in India? How is it an answer to attacks—whether well or ill-founded—on abuses in India to point to what Englishmen have done on the Niger or the Nile? Either Lord George Hamilton believes that India is a savage country or he can only defend the doings of the English in India by turning attention to what they have done in Africa, which, whether it be good or bad, is beside the question.

Lord George Hamilton may think—though we could not agree with him—that this criticism was unduly severe. But whether it can fairly be described as a "gross falsehood" we are well content that our readers should decide.

Lord George Hamilton's reply to Mr. Pickersgill on the

proposal to separate judicial from executive duties was as follows: "He did not deny that theoretically there was a great deal of force in the hon. gentleman's contention; but on the other hand, he was assured by very competent civilians that the present system did not work badly and that the proposals he had put forward would entail a very heavy expenditure. He must wait until he got somewhat fuller information from the Indian Government before he gave an expression of opinion on the subject." A reply in similar terms has been received by the Indian Parliamentary Committee who recently submitted a memorial on the subject:—

India Office, Whitehall, London, S.W.

August 3, 1899.

Gentlemen,—I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th ultimo, with which you forward for Lord George Hamilton's consideration a Memorial urging the separation of judicial from executive functions in the Indian administration.

In reply, I am to say that the Memorial will be transmitted to the Government of India for their consideration.

I am, Gentlemen,

Your obedient servant,

(Signed) A. GODLEY.

Sir William Wedderburn, M.P.  
J. Herbert Roberts, Esq., M.P.

The *Bengalee*, dealing with the new proposals of the Government of India for the municipality of Calcutta, strongly opposes the reduction of the members elected by the ratepayers to 25, the official nominees and others not representing the ratepayers remaining 25 also. It believes that the ratepayers' representatives will only be able to elect four of the twelve members of the general committee; for the Government nominates four, and the two sections of the Municipality will each elect four, which is different from the case of the Bombay Standing Committee. The control over the Committee which is to be vested in the Corporation is considered an improvement, discounted to a great extent by the probable official majority. On the other hand, the *Englishman* warmly congratulates the Government on the new proposals, which it considers meet the chief objections to the old Bill. The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* on further information withdraws such approval as it gave to the new measure. It declares that "under the proposed arrangement the Corporation will be a purely Government institution."

Sir Alfred Lyall delivered two addresses last Friday and Saturday to the University Extension students at Oxford on "The Progress of India during the Queen's Reign." In his first address he dealt with the relations of England and Russia in Central Asia, and Sir William Hunter, who presided, helped to give impressiveness to Sir Alfred's views by telling his hearers that he was "the wise and trusted councillor of Viceroy in the direction of the foreign policy of the Indian Empire." Unfortunately these views were anything but helpful. What did this "wise and trusted councillor of Viceroy's" impart? England's policy, he said, was to uphold the buffer system as long as it would last, but he doubted whether it would last long. We had gone up on our side and Russia had come down on her side; "the difficulty was to find the settled frontier beyond which we need not move." That "scientific frontier" of Lord Beaconsfield's and Lord Lytton's has not proved so scientific after all; "at this moment our statesmen were still in search of the promised borders whose margin faded always and receded before them as they followed it." Now we seem to have stumbled upon the explanation of the strange reluctance of the India Office to let us know where the North-West frontier of India lies. Nobody seems to know. Well, the great policy is simply to follow the mirage line described by Sir Alfred, well knowing that it is essentially elusive. Strangely enough it does not appear to have dawned upon this "wise and trusted councillor of Viceroy's" that we have a very admirably effective border provided by nature herself—a triple and impenetrable defence of mountain, desert and river.

Shutting his eyes firmly, then, to this most obvious series of mutually supporting barriers, Sir Alfred pointed out to those callow students that "the chief problem now before us in India was how to maintain the integrity and independence of Afghanistan." What then? Ah, well—really nothing. For, truth to tell, "it was impossible to foresee the future course of events or to lay down what



policy we should pursue." Surely, the *Times* report must do Sir Alfred injustice here. He cannot be so blankly helpless when he counsels Viceroy. The only course he can suggest is "some friendly and reliable understanding between England and Russia in Asia." But, so far as we remember, there is difficulty on the points of friendliness and reliability, which find instructive illustration in the diplomatic records. The first address, then, is represented as singularly barren and inconclusive. The second, judged from the *Times* report, looks like a mass of platitudes; but the report is too short to form the basis of a judgment. Sir Alfred is made to recognise "a perceptible tendency among the leading classes to a kind of political fusion." He has probably heard tell of the National Congress. His conclusion was, apparently, on the lines of a peroration; "the permanent consolidation of the union between Great Britain and India," he said, "would demand all the political genius, the sympathetic insight, as well as the scientific methods of England combined with the goodwill and growing intelligence of the Indian people." Yes, it is here, rather than in Afghanistan, that one finds the chief problem now before us in India. And that problem becomes an appalling riddle of the Sphinx when one attempts to assess the apparent means available for its solution. Where is the political genius? Where is the sympathetic interest? Witness the Indian Budget debate!

It was officially announced on Wednesday that the Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of Sir James Westland, K.C.S.I., to be a member of the Council of India, and of Mr. Arnold White, Advocate-General at Madras, to be Chief Justice of Madras, in succession to Sir Arthur Collins, Q.C., who has resigned the office. It is to be hoped that Sir James Westland will not repeat the mistake of adding up Rs. and £ sterling as if they were the same denomination.

The *Pioneer* calls attention to the confusing titles under which Indian reports are often presented to the public. If officials are sometimes subjected to undeserved criticism this is often the cause. The misconception is due "to the form and substance of the reports in which the various departments of the administration persist in exhibiting, or rather concealing, the result of each year's working. Moreover, the placid and dignified optimism with which the reports are written conceals the real difficulties officials have to encounter and so leads the public to judge too hardly those who make mistakes or fail in the accomplishment of their purposes. But there is another and a prior disadvantage—that it renders it difficult for public opinion at home to form a judgment on Indian affairs; though this may to the official mind more than compensate for the other disadvantages of the system or want of system, and may possibly soften the regrets of the *Pioneer*."

In an article on "Police Work in Assam," the *Pioneer* contrasts the hopes with which young police officers go out from England with the dull reality. Imagining that their days will be occupied with rides after dacoits and attacks from hostile tribes, they soon find that they are employed in much more tedious work.

As it is, the newly joined assistant superintendent longs during his first year for something more exciting than police diaries. In his second year he tries to write all the reports and keep all the registers himself. In his third year he leaves them to his head clerk, and contents himself with the daily routine of calling upon sub-inspectors to show cause why they should not be punished, and wondering why the magistrates will acquit accused persons.

This is true of Assam, though something more exciting might be expected there, as more than half the police are military.

The *Madras Mail* comments on the backward state of Pariah education in spite of the many efforts made by the Government to encourage it. Of course the main obstacles are to be found in the people themselves. Ages of servitude have left them indifferent to such things, and grinding poverty makes them anxious to keep their children at home to work. Nevertheless, the *Mail* believes that the Government themselves are not free from blame. Their regulations require the same instruction in all schools, whatever standard the children will probably reach; and all teachers must be "qualified." If the teacher is unqualified, 75 per cent. of the grant is with-

held, even though the children pass well. Not only do qualified teachers require a higher salary, but many will not live in a Pariah village at all. If the present policy is persisted in the Missions will probably give up Government recognition and the schools become strictly denominational, which the *Mail* believes will be more disastrous than the recognition that in Pariah schools the full grant can be gained if the children pass, whatever be the qualifications of the teacher.

The Chief Commissioner of Assam has lately had to decide whether a college should be established in that Province. He has declared against this and proposes instead to found a hostel for Assamese students at Calcutta, some of whom hold scholarships from the Assam Government. Besides practical reasons, local and financial, there is another which has swayed Mr. Cotton. He says:—

The Province cannot prosper in isolation, and I attribute the slowness of its progress in large measure to the unwise fostering by the Assamese among themselves of a policy of national exclusiveness.

In other words, he declares for the policy most favourable to Indian unity. This alone would secure the support of the Indian Press; but there is another remark of Mr. Cotton's which is sure of an even warmer reception—his request for public criticism of his scheme, before final orders for it are passed in September next. Here at least is an Anglo-Indian statesman who is not afraid of Indian nationality, and who is ready to listen to the opinion of Indians.

The *Tribune* (Lahore) protests against the proposed compulsory segregation of lepers in India, and against the tone of some of the speakers at the recent meeting of the London Society of Arts. It denies the truth of Dr. Simpson's statement that the compulsory segregation of lepers would not be opposed in India. This it speaks of as a deplorable want of information in a man who has been Health Officer of Calcutta. The *Tribune* also denies that in the higher Hindu families lepers are "shunned and ill-treated." The *Hindu* (Madras) says that "any attempt at compulsory segregation of lepers of well-to-do Hindu families will be as vigorously opposed as the segregation of plague patients was."

The *Tribune* gives an account of two curious cases, in one of which an officer and in the other a soldier was concerned. A European military officer asked a police constable on the Mall Road at Murree to get him a horse. The constable being on duty refused and was so severely thrashed in consequence that he had to be taken to the hospital. In the second case, which the *Tribune* gives on the authority of its Abbottabad correspondent, a European soldier from the road shot a boy who was cutting grass on a hill. The boy was wounded in the arm. Both cases are being investigated, but in neither is the result of the enquiry known.

In a Parliamentary paper issued on Wednesday dealing with the circumstances under which the contract for the Athara Bridge was given to an American firm, Lieut-Col. Gordon, who managed the purchase of the superstructure of the bridge, states that the whole question was one of quick delivery, price being practically not considered. Tenders were called for from four English and two American firms. Only one British firm made an offer, the Patent Shaft and Axle Company. The Pencoed Company, of Philadelphia, offered delivery of a suitable bridge in six weeks, and this offer was accepted, a director of the English firm acknowledging that they could not possibly compete against such quick delivery. He also doubted whether any firm in the United Kingdom could make as good an offer as they had made. Colonel Gordon further states that the whole material for the bridge was inspected by a representative sent from England, from whose report, adds the Colonel, "it will be seen how thoroughly the work has been carried out." Meanwhile, an American bridge is being supplied in a similar way for India. The Harrisburg (Pennsylvania) Steel Company shipped on Tuesday morning eighteen more cartloads of material for the great viaduct at Gokteik.

Sir Arthur Cotton's estimate for his proposed Tumbudra reservoir was £100,000 not £10,000, as printed by mistake on page 51 of our issue last week.



## THE DEBATE ON THE "INDIAN BUDGET."

ON Tuesday last the annual debate on India took place in the House of Commons. As our readers know, only one amendment can be voted on, and this year priority was obtained by Mr. Caldwell, who proposed that in order to make the control of Parliament over Indian affairs more effective the salary of the Secretary of State should be voted by the House, the debate on the Indian Budget should be brought on earlier in the Session, and a committee should be appointed to examine Indian accounts. Sir William Wedderburn, who seconded, had no difficulty in showing that in the days of the Company the authority of Parliament was much more freely exercised than it is now, both by reason of the wholesome jealousy with which the Ministry and the House of Commons regarded so powerful a chartered monopoly, and also because of the careful investigation which was made before each renewal of the charter. Nor was it less easy to show that the House is now very slack in its treatment of Indian affairs. Sir Henry Fowler, who undertook the defence of the Government with great vigour, proved rather too much for his case. While he insisted on the frequency of Indian debates and the interest members took in Indian affairs, he nevertheless declared that it was the fault of members, owing apparently to their lack of interest, that successive Governments had placed the Indian Budget so late; and while he proclaimed that the members of the House of Commons were representatives of India, he did his best to show that the Constitution of India was so excellent as to make their interference scarcely ever necessary. Lord George declared his responsibility to the House, but did not agree that the House should exercise its control, as in the case of other ministers, by voting his salary. He preferred that it should be exercised by so strong a measure as a vote of censure, should the Government condescend to give a day. Sir Henry, while agreeing that the members of the House had a duty to perform to India, thought that that duty could be well performed at the very end of the Session, when the great majority of members are away.

There were two points in Sir Henry Fowler's speech, or rather in the first of his speeches, which call for some notice. One was his extravagant praise of the Indian Secretary's Council. That that body is composed of men who have filled high official positions and done good service, who have all a great knowledge of India, and some of whom have a deep sympathy with the Indian people may be granted; but that a body of ex-officials is an impartial tribunal for the redress of grievances may well be doubted. And the members of the Council are not only officials, they are officials whose days of service in India are past, and they are therefore (if we put aside men of exceptional character) inclined to be more opposed to a progressive policy than those who are still in the prime of life and activity. Such a body—at once official and reactionary by its very constitution—is ill-adapted for the impartial consideration of the errors of officials. Nor can the existence of such a council relieve the House of Commons of any of its obligations to safeguard the good government of India.

The other noticeable point in Sir Henry's speech was his heated declaration that he would never make a party question of the affairs of India. Now if by making Indian affairs a party question he means that he will not oppose the Government when he thinks it in the right surely the declaration was unnecessary. Surely Sir Henry Fowler does not mean that on those questions which he does treat as party questions, he is in the habit of opposing measures which he thinks just, and of denying his principles, because those measures have been proposed or those principles have been professed by the leaders of the Conservative party. We imagine that the electors of Wolverhampton who have sent Sir Henry Fowler to represent them at Westminster were under the impression that there were such things as Liberal principles, and that the Liberal party existed to give effect to those principles. This may be provincial simplicity. But will Sir Henry admit the only alternative—that the Liberal party exists to oppose the Conservatives, right or wrong, except in a few cases such as that of India, where the effects of such a policy would be too disastrous? If Sir Henry does not admit this, what is the meaning of his loud asseveration that he will keep India outside of party? It can only mean that

he will not view Indian affairs from the standpoint of Liberal principles. The very gravamen of the charge against Sir Henry Fowler is that he is too much inclined to decide Indian questions in accordance with the views of officials rather than with the principles of the Liberal party. We are very far from thinking that Indians should ally themselves exclusively with either party, or that there is not much in Conservative principles which should lead members of that party to take an interest in the redress of Indian grievances. But the Indians may at least demand that those who profess Liberal principles should not lay them aside when they come to deal with India.

One effect of the course taken by the late Secretary of State for India in undertaking the defence of the Government was that Lord George Hamilton found it unnecessary to speak to the Amendment, and the division was taken immediately after Sir Henry's speech. And, as no further vote could be taken, the discussion then became, as usual, somewhat desultory. Two speeches alone were of importance—those of Mr. Pickersgill and Mr. Herbert Roberts. The former brought forward the question of the separation of judicial and executive functions. He showed not only that the expense of the separation was much exaggerated but that the union was attended by actual injustice, quoting cases in which the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council had strongly commented on the miscarriage of justice which resulted from this unnatural union. Mr. Roberts dealt with the Calcutta Municipal Bill, and urged further enquiry. As he pointed out, even if the effect of the new proposals was to give Calcutta the same municipal constitution as Bombay, yet this was a retrograde measure, the substitution of a less for a more liberal arrangement. And he met by anticipation Lord George Hamilton's "bold" contention—his lordship would give it a stronger name in his adversaries—that "it was generally admitted" that the Calcutta Corporation needed reform by quoting an official eulogy of that body. Even so devoted a follower of the Government as Sir Mancherjee Bhownagree pre-terested against the pitting of Europeans and Indians against each other as is done in the attacks on the Calcutta Corporation.

As for the opening statement of Lord George Hamilton, it was made up of many figures, some ancient errors and much fallacious optimism. The old fallacy of stating the number of millions by which the population had increased, and then asking the world to take note of so enormous and unprecedented a growth was resorted to, although if the proportionate increase had been stated, it would have been found to be .94 per cent per annum for British India excluding Burma, an increase which so far from being unprecedented has been equalled in Japan and exceeded not only in some countries of Europe but in several of the Native States of India itself. Sir Henry Fowler was guilty of a similar fallacy when he stated as a proof of the lightness of Indian taxation the sum paid per head of the population, without taking account of the small average income of the people of India. Lord George Hamilton was naturally jubilant at the large surplus after years of deficit; but he was hardly justified in deducing therefrom that India had recovered from the famine with extraordinary rapidity, thus affording a proof of the soundness of her economic situation. In his own speech he mentioned several facts which are scarcely consistent with this optimistic view. The details of his financial statement are dealt with in another column; but two or three general considerations may be adverted to here. In the first place, as soon as the stress of famine is over the excess of exports over imports begins to rise. In the year ending with last March it amounted to Rs. 30,000,000, "a figure which has only been previously exceeded in three years." If India has begun again to be prosperous, she has soon to part with some of her new wealth. Secondly, Lord George is surprised that the revenue has increased in spite of the country having so recently recovered from famine. But is not this increase in part due to the effects of the famine rather than to the recovery? The yield of income tax is increased by famine because wealth tends to pass from the peasantry, too poor to pay this tax, and to accumulate in the hands of money-lenders and grain-dealers, where it is taxable. The yield of land-tax also is said to be greater in this year which succeeds the famine, because of the collection of arrears, even at the risk of forcing the cultivators still further into debt. Thirdly, Lord George Hamilton made two ominous quota-



tions from the Famine Commission Report. One, that among the farmers, from whatever cause, the hoarding of grain as a provision against famine, had decreased, and the other that the poorest class of all, with no greater power of resisting the effects of famine, is increasing. It is to be feared that the growing prosperity of India is a delusion.

As for Lord George Hamilton's closing speech, there was nothing in it to call for special reference except the attack on this journal with which it ended. He thought proper to charge us with circulating the grossest falsehoods, but all the evidence he offered in support of this sweeping and offensive accusation was a criticism in which we had founded our remarks on a report of a speech of his given by the leading Conservative newspaper in his own constituency, and had printed the passage from the report in order that our readers might judge whether our remarks were well or ill-founded. Lord George Hamilton did not think proper to refer to the case of the Natus, ably presented in the course of the discussion by Sir William Wedderburn; nor did he attempt to reconcile his own contradictory statements, nor to defend the continued detention in Belgium of those unfortunate men. He preferred to attack us. We leave it to those who have watched his treatment of the Natus to say whether he is an authority on the correct way of treating a political opponent.

#### LORD G. HAMILTON'S FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON'S exposition of the financial situation in India during the debate on Tuesday last was one of the weakest displays of which even he has been guilty. To hear him on these occasions raises an almost invincible presumption that he has but the smallest possible acquaintance with what he is discussing. The official word of Simla and Calcutta has recently been making merry over "manuscript eloquence." Here was "manuscript eloquence" with a vengeance, but it was of the kind which neither gods nor men can be expected to forgive. Certainly Lord George ambled through his wearisome statement—like a schoolboy with an ill-learned lesson—with little encouragement from any part of a thin and sorrowful House. It was the very dullest Indian financial statement made within recent years, and those who have heard the present Secretary of State for India on former budget nights will appreciate what an exacting standard of dullness he has set up. It was a veritable triumph of incompetence.

The main course of the Secretary of State's arguments is as clear as it is erroneous—as simple as it is foolish. He began by saying that there were two conflicting theories with reference to Indian famines: (1) that they came because British rule is bleeding India to exhaustion, and (2) that British rule has mitigated their severity, by its skilful solicitude for the taxpayers and by its enterprising prosecution of railways, irrigation, and famine insurance schemes. We do not accept Lord George Hamilton's two alternatives as exhausting the possible theories on the subject. But taking them for what they are worth let us see how he deals with them. In 1897-8 there was a deficit of Rs. 5,350,000, in 1898-9 there was a surplus of Rs. 4,200,000—the former was the worst and the latter the best ever known since India came under the British Crown. Therefore, argued Lord George Hamilton in his convincing way, we have striking proof of the recuperative power of India, of the latent strength of the Indian system of public finance, of the suitability and easiness of Indian taxation, of the splendour and the economy of British rule, etc., etc., in a long *crescendo* of patriotic fervour. Now all this glorification of Indian administration was based on the omission of one all-important fact—and that is the part played by Exchange. In an article at p. 53 of our last week's issue we showed the exact effect produced by the great rise in Exchange since 1894-5. Briefly, here is the situation. Compared with 1894-5 Exchange was better for the Government of India in 1898-9 by Rs. 5,800,000; a similar saving will be effected in 1899-1900 under the more recent estimate (announced on Tuesday) that Exchange will be taken in the Budget at 16d. instead of 15<sup>7</sup>/<sub>16</sub>d. as stated at Calcutta in March. Deduct these six millions from the surplus of four millions, and what remains? A deficit of about two millions. But there was war and famine in 1897-8?

Certainly, there was; and the part which these have played requires attention. They simply postponed the realisation of the present surplus. Not only did the famine reduce revenue and increase expenditure but, aided by four millions of war expenditure, it consumed some five millions of savings effected by the rise in Exchange between 1894-5 and 1897-8. Hence this result of a rising Exchange has not been so strikingly apparent until last year.

Here then this plea of Lord George Hamilton about recuperation, etc., falls to pieces. The so-called "recuperation" is the result of a turn of fortune's wheel in the form of a rise of 3d. in the Exchange value of the rupee, hidden until last year by war and famine, and now conveniently but not ingenuously ignored by politicians of the stamp of Sir James Westland and Lord George Hamilton. Had Exchange remained at the level at which it stood in 1894-5, and had revenue and expenditure in India remained just as at present, instead of a surplus of four millions there would be a deficit of nearly two millions. Yet just as many rupees would have been paid into the Indian treasuries, and just as good evidence of recuperation would have met the innocent gaze of Lord George Hamilton and his financial advisers. But with a deficit of two millions, would he or they have ventured to babble of "recuperation"? We think not. The figures upon which we rely are available to all; they appear in a table headed "Charge for Exchange" at page 17 of the Explanatory Memorandum of the Secretary of State for India (Parliamentary Paper, C.—9,399). We challenge Lord George Hamilton to deny that the rise in Exchange since 1894-5 has saved the Indian Government nearly six millions tens-of-rupees (six crores), and that without this saving, everything else remaining the same, the expenditure of the Government of India would largely exceed the revenue.

With this destruction of his "recuperative" plea, we pass to the consideration of the other chief point in his financial statement—that is, the refusal to remit taxation in spite of an annual surplus of four millions. In announcing this refusal he was, of course, only repeating what Sir James Westland said at Calcutta in March. But we looked for an amended list of reasons for this unusual and impolitic course. We looked in vain. The Secretary of State for India refuses to part with any portion of his great surplus for the benefit of the Indian taxpayers because the Indian Government

(1) wishes, with its usual thrifty instincts, to make good past losses,

(2) proposes to carry out some interesting but expensive experiments in currency reform, and

(3) desires to prosecute with as little borrowing as possible those public works, which rather than the happiness and contentment of the people it rules are invariably put forward by official apologists as its chief claim on the favourable verdict of contemporary opinion.

These pretexts are soon dealt with. The second is the only one that really counts. The Indian Government is bent upon a gold standard, and therefore because its establishment will cost many millions it appropriates the taxpayers' money taken from them during the last few years on its urgent plea of a ruinous exchange, but now set free in the spendthrift hands by the recent appreciation of the rupee. Of course this transaction constitutes a cynical breach of faith as between governors and governed, but the latter by bitter experience are hardened to the process, and in any case are powerless to protest effectively. With regard to pretexts (1) and (3) the interesting point to note is that they are to a large extent mutually destructive. In any case a famine deficit of Rs. 5,350,000 leaves no change out of a surplus of Rs. 4,000,000; and similarly a railway programme of Rs. 8,800,000 cannot be financed by a surplus only running to half that amount. As a matter of fact, while there is the best evidence in the world of the intention of the Government to spend the surplus on public works, on currency experiments, and—who knows?—perhaps on "urgent administrative reforms" (always excepting the separation of judicial and executive functions in India)—though there is plenty of evidence of the Government spending, there is absolutely no evidence of the making good of past losses in accordance with the first specious reason for not remitting taxation. Lord George Hamilton seems to think that the avoidance of



borrowing for public works by using up fortuitous surpluses is tantamount to "making good past losses"—that to abstain from creating new debt is the same thing as paying off old debt. Can official disingenuousness further go?

### BACK TO LORD LAWRENCE.

WHEN Lord Curzon went out to assume the Viceroyalty of India, we were prepared for surprises, though it was impossible to foresee in what direction to look for them. The one certain principle to which we pinned our faith was that, come what might, Lord Curzon would not allow his policy to be shaped for him so as to imperil his success. From that principle we have not yet observed any very obvious departure. It will be remembered that Lord Curzon, in his day of greater freedom and less responsibility, roundly declared that the policy of Lord Lawrence on the North-West Frontier was "dead"—"dead, and cannot be revived." To those who have not seized Lord Curzon's fundamental principle it will come as a surprise that he has just issued an edict enjoining a direct return towards the policy of Lord Lawrence, and we observe with amused interest how the *Times* is exercised over this sign of the times. The new measures, cautions this oracle, "are not to be regarded as measures conceived in a different spirit, or as abandoning anything that the previous exertions of the Indian Government had secured. They are different in character because the circumstances are different, but the aim is unchanged." This deliverance is general enough to be safe in any event; but the facts, all the same, have evidently taken the pluck out of the *Times*. Let us look at the facts.

What was the attitude of the Government of India when Lord Curzon took the helm of affairs? We shall escape even the suspicion of unfairness if we adopt the description telegraphed to the *Times* by its Simla correspondent on August 6:—

When Lord Curzon arrived, the Government of India was committed, in some cases tentatively, in others positively, to a policy which involved the construction of large fortifications and the maintenance of an unreduced garrison in the Chitral Valley, to the expenditure of several lakhs on the construction of a new fort at Lundi Kotal and other fortified works on a large scale in the Khaibar, to building or laying the bed of a Khaibar railway, to considerable additional expenditure on the forts and garrisons on the Samana range, and, as regards the Tochi Valley, to maintain a large permanent garrison of regular troops, to establish a central cantonment at Miranshah, and there and elsewhere to acquire sites for the accommodation of the proposed garrisons. Similarly, Wana was to be maintained with a regular garrison to guard the Gomal route and Waziristan.

This survey, though of course by no means complete, may serve as a general conspectus of the situation. But now, as the same writer proceeded to point out, "the measures recommended by Lord Curzon and accepted by Lord George Hamilton involve a wide departure from these plans." The most marked alteration is the one that is least dwelt upon. The *Times'* Simla correspondent huddles it away in a single final sentence. It would be a pity if such a pregnant statement were passed over without due attention, and we must do the writer the justice of according it to bold advertisement. After explaining the Chitral portion of the plans, he says:—

The Khaibar policy involves a similar abandonment of the schemes for new and costly fortifications, with the substitution of a reorganised Khaibar Rifle Corps for the regulars, the remainder of whom will be withdrawn as soon as the new arrangements have been completed.

There is very serious matter for reflection in that solitary sentence. The existing serai at Lundi Kotal and the smaller posts in the Pass are to be patched up a bit, but there is no significance whatever in that, beyond a certain appearance of sticking to guns that have been in fact abandoned. The bold lunacy of a Khaibar Pass railway has passed away; and though the railway may be run up to Jamrud—may be "not improbably"—it is not there yet, nor is any other railway route to Afghanistan proposed in definite form. On the Samana and in the Kuram "an entirely new scheme is contemplated." The regulars are to be withdrawn, giving place to militia with English officers, supported by a movable column stationed in the Miranzai Valley; and "early railway connexion with Kohat is also contemplated," but only contemplated. "Similar arrangements are intended for the northern and southern lines of access to Waziristan, no permanent or prolonged occupation by regulars either of Tochi or Gomal

being necessary politically or strategically." At Chitral the garrison is to be reduced, and the proposal for extensive fortifications is quashed; the strengthening process being applied lower down at Upper Drosh, and even there only in the form of "a frontier fort of the usual type for the accommodation of the reduced garrison." With the co-operation of that very trustworthy gentleman the Mehtar of Chitral, a levy is to be ingeniously organised to guard the route from the Lowari to Chitral; the Gilgit-Chitral route is to be improved as an alternative route in the last resort; and the Nowshera-Dargai railway is to be pushed on immediately from the left bank of the Kabul river. With a bold and deliberate face the Government of India prepares for retirement of English troops all along the line of the bloody frontier. It is well.

Now what are the principles that are said to actuate the Government of India in taking these remarkable steps? The *Times'* correspondent at Simla, who may safely be taken to know the mind of the Government, marshals three principles of policy, which however resolve themselves substantially into one, and that one a very significant one indeed. First, he says the Government wants to save expense and to rectify the permanent weakening of the Indian army which results from the stationing of large bodies of troops in tribal territory far away from the base. Second, he states that the Government has discovered that it can meet all its engagements on and beyond the frontier in the way of "providing for the proper protection of these regions" without keeping up the present "great expenditure," and "at the same time can do the generous deed of enlisting the tribes in the defence of their own country." Third, he points out that "adequate military security for the positions from which military garrisons are to be withdrawn" can be provided "by the maintenance of camps or movable columns at neighbouring points within or upon the administrative border of India," with the support of railways connecting them with the military bases of British India. And he sums up the new policy in these terms:—

The results of these measures, if successfully introduced, will be a net annual saving of many lakhs to the Indian Exchequer, the restoration to the offensive strength of the Indian army of the very considerable quota now habitually lost by service in advanced garrisons, and the conciliation of the tribes by the offer to secure to them well-paid employment in the defence of their own country.

In a letter which we print to-day in another column, Colonel Hanna sums up the new policy in a single sentence. "The proposed changes," he writes, "involve a return, along a great portion of the North-West Border, to the old Lawrence policy, with such modifications as it would have undergone in the course of the years that have elapsed since its abandonment." We are free to congratulate the Government of India on the access of courage that has enabled it at length to take the first steps in retracing the disastrous course on which it has for many years been bent. There is a great deal beneath the surface which has not been exposed in the careful summary of the *Times'* Simla correspondent, but meantime we are content with the progress that the Government of India has now made towards the foreign policy that we ourselves have consistently advocated. We will not even be so ungracious as to enquire how far the change is due to high grounds of policy and how far to reasons of compulsion. It is rather noteworthy indeed that the argument of economy should be put forward with such distinctive prominence at the very moment when the official hierarchy is in ecstasies over the biggest surplus that has gladdened their eyes for many years. Still we are glad to note that the spirit of squandering is restrained even when the treasury is overflowing. The rupees could not in any case be put to a worse use than to be scattered over the trans-frontier rocks and sand. The Khaibar reductions are all in the right direction, and the old state of peace and security may by and by be restored, though the confidence of the tribesmen may take some time to win back after the recent shaking. The germs of trouble are still far from being extirpated in the Samana, but under the new arrangements we shall be entitled to anticipate a cessation of the too frequent attacks on convoys and parties of troops, which have recently pointed to a smouldering danger. We agree with Colonel Hanna in regretting that Chitral has not been definitively abandoned; and though the immediate situation on the Chitral route may seem to require the strengthening of troops and the support of railways, the whole of the expenditure on a permanent



source of irritation and weakness might have been peremptorily cut off by the greater courage of a prompt withdrawal. At the same time we are thankful for so much, involving as it does the promise of more. For it is only the toughest perversity that can persistently maintain itself in the face of the teaching of the past twenty years, and especially in the teeth of the experience of the recent Mohmand and Tirah campaigns. Let the Government of India gild their pill as suits their fancy; all we are concerned for is that the pill go down. The sole hope of peace beyond the frontier and prosperity within it lies, in the first place, in the definitive withdrawal of every irritating element from the hills and valleys of the tribesmen.

## OUR LONDON LETTER.

(FROM A PARLIAMENTARY CORRESPONDENT.)

I HAVE just come from watching the debate on the Indian Budget on the last day of the Session. The average English journalist I notice generally singles out this occasion for a display of clumsy wit on the emptiness of the House and the general indifference displayed by the vast majority of the members. There is no doubt about the emptiness of the House and the display of indifference, but I for one fail to perceive the humour supposed to be contained in all this. On the contrary I know no occasion more full of pathos approaching tragedy than this annually recurring farce. For a farce it is, so far as any practical result is concerned. Lord George Hamilton recited or read a huge type-written document, which he evidently did not completely understand, concerning the finances of India. The point which he and his friends will doubtless enlarge upon chiefly will be the surplus of nearly 5 millions of tens of rupees. But Lord George did not tell the House what was the chief element in that surplus. The rupee having declined in value to 1s. 1d., the Government put on special taxation in consequence. The value of the rupee has since risen again to 1s. 4d., but this special taxation is not withdrawn, nor is there any reduction in taxation of any sort. Surpluses are easy on such terms. And when talking about surpluses it would be more conducive to a thorough appreciation of India's financial position if Lord George had enlarged upon the present amount of the debt rather than talked about a surplus.

But by far the most striking incident in the whole sitting was the overdone and impassioned defence of our present system of government in India to which Sir Henry Fowler treated the House. Lord George Hamilton and the few other Tories present beamed with approval and delight, and well they might, for the "Liberal" statesman went beyond anything that could have been said by the Tories themselves. I have no right to suppose that Sir Henry is not sincere in his views, but I confess I cannot understand how a man who has had Sir Henry's experience can honestly entertain those views. I need not explain here at any length the points upon which the debate turned as they will be found in full in another part of the paper, and I gave last week the terms of the amendment prepared by the Indian Parliamentary Committee. In brief, the Indian party contend that Parliament does not effectively exercise its control over Indian affairs. And what was Sir Henry Fowler's attitude? To begin with he took up his usual line about the necessity of making these Indian debates non-party in character. It sounds a very fine sentiment, but it won't stand a moment's examination. For it comes to this—the Tories cannot vote on such an occasion against the Secretary for India, as that would mean going against and imperilling the Government. Nor must the Liberals vote against the Indian Secretary, according to Sir Henry, as to do so would be unpatriotic and partisan. That is to say, the Government must govern and the Opposition must not oppose, and the result is something known as a non-party debate.

Again Sir Henry Fowler had the courage to maintain that the Secretary for India, though his salary, unlike that of other Secretaries of State, is not on the Estimates, is really subject to more criticism and parliamentary control than those others. He said "Cannot members ask questions?" Of course they can, just as Glendower could call spirits from the vasty deep; but they can no more

insure real answers than could Glendower make sure of the spirits coming in obedience to his call. Sir Henry instanced a debate here and there on some leading and sensational point of Indian policy, and said "who can contend in face of these examples that India is neglected?" But what is the good of picking out a subject like the Sugar Bounties or the Cotton Duties, or one of our wars? The matters dealt with in the Budget are those every-day, hum-drum but by no means unimportant affairs of the life of our unrepresented fellow-subjects in India. Such matters are discussed day after day, sometimes for weeks together, in connexion with an English Budget—but it is unpatriotic to do anything of the sort for India. Or let me take another object lesson—the debate on the Colonial Office vote the other night. It was late in the Session, but the House was full and there was every sign of liveliness and interest during the whole sitting. Why? Because votes might be won or lost, and because the Minister for the Colonies could be directly impugned as his salary is placed on the Estimates. But with the exception of a faithful few in the House nobody really cares about India, that is to say no one with those few exceptions takes an intelligent interest in India's needs.

Another of Sir Henry Fowler's contentions was that the Secretary for India had not the free hand which his critics described, as he was subject constantly to the controlling criticism of the India Council. The names of the members of that Council Sir Henry recited in tones of choral rapture, appending to each a little biography of glowing eulogium. I have heard him do it before. Indeed by this time Sir Henry must have eulogised nearly every leading member of the Indian Civil Service by name in the House of Commons. In no other department of the State is this the custom. To add zest to the performance not a few of those praised were sitting under the Gallery on Tuesday, "attentive to their own applause". You could follow the progress of Sir Henry's panegyrics by the broad smile of satisfaction which travelled along the distinguished gentlemen's faces like sunlight on the sea. It was all very touching, but when Sir Henry Fowler asks one to believe that these gentlemen exercise a careful control over the Secretary for India, in the interests of the native population, it is well to ask who and what are they? Distinguished men, I doubt not, men of cast-iron principle and sterling honesty. But ex-Anglo-Indian officials, every one; men imbued with the very spirit which some of us think requires checking in our Indian Secretaries. And these are the men who are held up by Sir Henry Fowler as the remorseless watch-dogs who defend the rights of the natives!

Well might Mr. Harwood declare that though the Indian Budget had been called a solemn farce it struck him as not dignified enough to be called solemn and not sufficiently amusing to be called a farce. There were moments of relief, however. For instance no one could help laughing at Colonel Milward's little adventure. He plunged into the debate with all the intrepidity of a soldier. He had been to the Khaibar Pass, and when there he had gazed at the white line clearly marked against the blue sky of Heaven. The House sat entranced while the Colonel went on to explain how as he went on gazing at the white line and the blue sky he thought of the railway that would one day there be made. The good Colonel was just approaching the climax of his rapture when the cold voice of the Speaker was heard remarking "Order, order," and it was courteously conveyed to the gallant Colonel that the subject before the House was not what he foresaw in vision when musing in the Khaibar Pass!

Nor could I help feeling amused at Sir M. Bohnagregree's contribution to the debate. He indulged in an outburst of elementary praise of everyone connected with the Government of India. He had an approving word for Lord George Hamilton, another for Sir Henry Fowler, and then he came to Lord Curzon. By this time Sir Mancherjee had almost exhausted his stock of approving epithets, and for a moment he hunted about for the right word to apply to Lord Curzon. At length he found it, and it was—"intelligent!" I felt almost sorry for the Viceroy when I heard such inadequate praise and from so undistinguished a man. It reminded me of a remark by a Tory friend of mine who prided himself on being broad-minded, and who in a burst of candour owned that Mr. Gladstone was (on some points) rather a well-informed



man. The amendment submitted by the Indian Parliamentary Committee was rejected by 95 to 36. The figures are in themselves as eloquent as anything said in the debate, for added together they come to 131, and there are 670 members altogether. Towards the end of the sitting Lord George Hamilton indulged in a bitter and insulting attack on Sir William Wedderburn personally and upon this paper in general. I do not know what Sir William Wedderburn thought about the matter, but I, for one, regard insults from that quarter as compliments.

### THE CALCUTTA MUNICIPAL BILL.

REFERRED TO A SELECT COMMITTEE.

RUSHING THE MEASURE THROUGH.

ALARM IN CALCUTTA.

[By Cable, from our own Correspondent.]

CALCUTTA, August 9.

The Bengal Legislative Council on Monday discussed the proposals of the Government of India with regard to the Calcutta Municipal Bill.

A motion was submitted to refer the Bill to a Select Committee for report within two weeks.

An amendment was moved in favour of inviting the opinion of public bodies and the Corporation upon the Bill, and of extending the period within which the Committee must report to six weeks.

The amendment was lost. The non-official Indian members of the Legislative Council voted for the amendment and strongly condemned the Indian Government's proposals as subversive of local self-government. The people here are alarmed at the Bill being rushed through.—By *Indo-European Telegraph*.

### LETTER TO THE EDITOR.

#### LORD CURZON'S NEW FRONTIER POLICY.

TO THE EDITOR OF "INDIA."

Sir,—You ask my opinion as to the proposed Indian frontier arrangements. One may be inclined to smile at the Government's anxiety to teach the tribes to defend their territories, remembering how much their stubborn resistance to our occupation of their hills has had to do with our present readiness to withdraw from them. But the fact that the authorities have at last grasped the truth of the frontier situation and are showing the courage to adapt themselves to it must be hailed with the deepest satisfaction.

The proposed changes involve a return, along a great portion of the North-West border, to the old Lawrence policy, with such modifications as it would have undergone in the course of the years that have elapsed since its abandonment. It is indeed a matter of regret that a withdrawal from Chitral should not be included in the scheme—if retained the garrison ought to be strengthened rather than weakened—and military railways to support moveable columns that will soon cease to have any occasion for moving are obviously absurd; but experience, which has taught so much, may be trusted to teach a great deal more; and we may look forward confidently to the recall of the last battalion from Chitral and the relinquishment of schemes for lines which time will show to be as useless when made as difficult and costly to make.

Whether having once turned his face in the right direction Lord Curzon will go yet further remains to be seen; but I cannot help hoping that the success which I believe will crown his present concession to good sense, good finance, and good strategy will encourage him to apply his new policy to the Kakar and Zhobe districts, after which only Quetta and Gilgit will remain to remind us of the mistakes of the last twenty-three years and the heavy price India has had to pay for them.

I am, yours obediently,

H. B. HANNA, Colonel.

Ashcroft, Petersfield, August 8, 1899.

## Imperial Parliament.

Thursday, August 3.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN INDIA.

Mr. H. D. GREENE asked the Secretary of State for India whether, having regard to the importance of her Majesty's Indian Empire, and to the fact that certain bishops of the Church of England in the Colonies had recently adopted and assumed the style of Archbishop, her Majesty's Government would take steps to amend the statutes affecting the Church of England in the East Indies, so as really to confer on the Bishop of Calcutta, as statutory Metropolitan Bishop in India, the style and precedence of an Archbishop.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I am well aware of the nature of the position of the Bishop of Calcutta, as Metropolitan of India, and the suggestion contained in the hon. member's question is not new to me. But there are many important considerations involved, and it is impossible for me at present to give any undertaking on the subject.

Friday, August 4.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

ENGLAND AND AFGHANISTAN.

Sir ANDREW SCOBLE asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he was aware that Sultan Muhammad described as an Afghan General, and a near relative of the Amir of Afghanistan, resident in England, had been recognised as the official representative of the Amir?

And, whether there was any truth in the statement.

Lord G. HAMILTON: There is no representative or relative of H.H. the Amir in this country. The gentleman referred to is a British subject, who was once in the Amir's service, but is not known to have held any office in the Amir's army.

POLICE TORTURE IN INDIA.

Mr. HAZELL asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he was aware that during the year 1897 four charges of torture were preferred against the police force of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh, all of which ended in convictions; and that it was officially reported that during the same year the conduct of the police force in the Province of Coorg was unsatisfactory?

And, whether, owing to the low rates of pay offered, it was difficult to get suitable recruits to join these forces; and, if so, whether the Government of India was taking any steps to improve the position of these men and so attract a better class in order to avoid a recurrence of the scandals referred to.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I am aware that in 1897 four cases of police torture ended in conviction of the Police of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh. In two of these cases the torture appears to have been inflicted under the orders of a superior and well-paid officer. As regards Coorg, which is a very small district, I find that for 1897 the Chief Commissioner in his review mentions "a decided improvement" as having taken place in police work, and also that he is preparing a scheme to remedy what he considers the disadvantage of insufficient pay.

That cases of misconduct by the Police should occur is a matter for very great regret; but there is reason to hope that a gradual improvement in this respect is taking place. The subject of improving the position and quality of the Police generally has constantly occupied the attention of the Government of India, and large sums of money have been devoted during recent years to this purpose.

Tuesday, August 8.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

Imperial Institute (Indian Section).—Return presented—relative thereto [Address July 17; Sir Mackenzie Shownagregg]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed [No. 349].

Madras Land Revenue.—Return presented—relative thereto [Address July 31; Sir William Wedderburn]; to lie upon the Table.

INTERNATIONAL TELEGRAMS.

Sir CHARLES DILKE asked the Secretary of State for India, if it was possible to lay before Parliament any agreements and correspondence between the Government of India on the one side, the Eastern Telegraph Company, the Indo-European Telegraph Company, and the Eastern Extension Australasia and China Telegraph Company, or any of them on the other part, relating to the establishment or subsequent modifications of a joint-purse agreement for dealing with international telegrams and settlement of accounts between the parties to the joint-purse agreement?

What was the actual cost at which the Indian Government transmitted telegrams over their lines from Karachi to Bushire and Fao?

And, what transit rate under the existing joint-purse system the Indian Government would charge over the same portion of their lines for messages to or from England handed to them by any English company not represented in the joint-purse agreement.

Lord G. HAMILTON: It would be necessary to obtain the consent of several companies mentioned before the agreements referring to the joint-purse arrangements could be made public, and I am therefore at present unable to undertake to lay papers on the Table.

2. The transit rates over the Indian Government cables between Karachi and Bushire or Fao are as follows:—

	On messages exchanged with India.	On messages exchanged with countries beyond India.
Between Karachi and Bushire..	Fcs. 1'455	Fcs. 1'09
Between Karachi and Fao ..	„ 1'905	„ 1'39



3. These rates are laid down in the International Telegraph Convention and are the same for all classes of messages whether handed over by any English company belonging to the joint-purse agreement or by any other company or Foreign Government Administration. The rates can only be altered with the consent of the States interested who are parties to the International Telegraph Convention.

SIR EDWARD SASSON asked the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, whether, in view of the facts now being made for a reduction of Foreign, Colonial, and Indian telegraphic charges, her Majesty's Government would request her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople, her Majesty's Minister at Teheran, and Lord Cromer to procure from the Turkish, Persian, and Egyptian Governments, respectively, copies of all concessions granted to, and all agreements made with, either the Eastern Telegraph Company, the Indo-European, or the Telegraph Construction and Maintenance Company, or the agents of all or any of them, and with the Indian Government.

MR. BROWDER: In reply to the two questions of my hon. friend, I have to say that her Majesty's Government would not feel justified in publishing or obtaining for publication, as seems to be suggested, from one of the parties without the consent of the other, copies of the arrangements referred to. The arrangements between her Majesty's Government and Turkey and Persia have already been published.

#### LAND CULTIVATION IN ASSAM.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India whether, out of 63 million acres of land capable of cultivation in Assam, not more than 1½ million acres were under cultivation:

Whether he would state what was the area of land and what were the main conditions under which it was proposed to offer it for cultivation under the scheme for opening up a large tract of this province recently submitted to the Government of India by the Chief Commissioner of Assam:

Whether he would further state to what extent and under what conditions the Government of India had seen their way to sanction this experiment:

And whether, in view of the pressing importance of finding new outlets for Indian capital and labour, he would present Papers in reference to the question alluded to.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The areas mentioned in the first clause of this question are I believe correctly stated.

The Chief Commissioner of Assam has laid certain proposals for the colonisation of that district before the Government of India, who, though not in complete accord with the Chief Commissioner, have agreed to consider any scheme which he may submit for the colonisation of a large tract in Assam on the general lines which he advocated.

At present I am not in a position to give any detailed information on the subject, but if the scheme assumes a practical shape I shall no doubt receive a communication from the Government of India, and shall then be prepared to consider whether papers dealing with this question can be presented.

### THE "INDIAN BUDGET".

#### LORD G. HAMILTON'S FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

##### "RECUPERATION" AND "SURPLUSES".

##### MOTION BY THE INDIAN PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE.

##### SIR HENRY FOWLER'S HEROICS.

On the order for Committee on the East India Revenue Accounts,

LORD G. HAMILTON said: The statement I have to make to-night refers to a triennial period which is one of financial oscillation and contrast. A comparison of the figures of the separate years is not only full of financial and statistical interest, but is a clearer index than any Budget statement I have yet made of the economic and material condition of India under British rule. The first year deals with the closed accounts of 1897-98; this was the last year in which the effects of the great famine disturbed the equilibrium of Indian finance. But famine was not the only disturbing element. Plague, earthquake, and a great frontier disturbance all contributed to shorten the revenue account and to augment the general expenditure of the country. I estimated last year, on the revised figures before me, that the deficit would be Rs. 5,283,100. The closed accounts give a somewhat larger sum—namely, Rs. 5,359,211—the net revenue being less by Rs. 214,191, and the net expenditure less by Rs. 138,000 than was anticipated. We now know the total cost of the famine of 1896-97 and 1897-98, both direct and indirect, to the revenues of India, and it is estimated to amount to Rs. 16,649,399. This is a somewhat lower estimate than that which I gave in June, 1898, and of this amount no less than Rs. 9,313,987 may be estimated as chargeable in the accounts of the year with which I am dealing. But this was not the only extraordinary charge. Frontier operations cost Rs. 3,887,000, and the cost of combating the plague and the effects of earthquake put on the revenues of that year further charges, all of which fell on the shoulders of this hapless financial year. I appointed, shortly after the conclusion of the famine operations, a Commission, of which I was fortunate enough to secure as chairman the services of Sir James Lyall, to enquire into and report upon the result of the procedure adopted. That report, which was issued at the beginning of this year, showed that, though here and there a mistake had been made, the campaign as a whole against famine was devised and carried through with presence, with resource, and with

success. (Hear, hear.) Yet, notwithstanding all the exertions of the Government, seconded as they were by private effort and voluntary subscriptions, there was very heavy mortality and widespread privation and misery over a vast tract of country affected by the scarcity of food and employment consequent upon the drought and its attendant evils. There are two theories current as to the cause and origin of this distress. There is a small but active body of propagandists who are never tired of complaining that British rule is bleeding India to death; that the distress of recent years, culminating in the great famine of 1896-98, was not primarily due to natural causes, but that it is the result of persistent over-taxation and heavy assessment which has so reduced the condition of the mass of the people, and that they are expiring of inanition. There is another school who maintain a wholly contrary opinion. They assert that from time immemorial famine, from want of rain, has been periodical and a regular scourge of India, and that under our rule, decade by decade, the effects of the famine are being narrowed and arrested, not only by the increased resources of the people assailed, but by a systematic and progressive scheme of famine protection which the British Government has created and is continuously improving. The figures I am about to cite will I think conclusively show which of those two theories is right. If it be true that, quite independently of famine, our system of taxation is so levied that the people are so reduced and so near the end of their resources that they were ready to collapse at the first touch of any abnormal visitation, their recovery when that visitation was passed would be so slow and their recuperative power so small that for years to come it would be scarcely appreciable. If on the other hand it be true that British rule has greatly increased the resources of the community, and that the suffering and relapse of the famine years were entirely due to the exceptional magnitude and scarcity of the visitation itself, then so soon as the visitation had passed away the community at large would at once show signs of recuperation and of rapidly making good the losses caused by the abnormal visitation. If no recuperation is shown then the bleeding to death theory may have some substance in it; but if that recuperation be immediate, rapid, and continuous, then it is the most perverse of mortals must admit that the theory is based on imagination alone. Now, Sir, let us test the merits of the two theories by turning to the next year of famine. In March, 1898, Sir James Westland estimated his surplus for the year ending April, 1899, at Rs. 891,000. A few months later, with fuller data before me, I expressed my own view that this figure would be largely exceeded. We have now the revised figures before us, and the surplus has grown to Rs. 4,759,400. (Hear, hear.) The first fact I wish to impress on the House is that this is the largest surplus ever realised in India in one year since our rule has been established there—(hear, hear)—but side by side with this fact there is another, scarcely less significant, to which I have already alluded—namely, that the year which immediately preceded this surplus was the worst famine year of the century. The House will, I am sure, appreciate the significance of this juxtaposition of extreme depression and of exuberant recuperation, for it is the annihilation of the bleeding to death theory. The figures of this financial year are really so remarkable that they are well worthy of examination and analysis, both on the expenditure and on the revenue side. This surplus is due not only to an augmentation of revenue but also to a large reduction in expenditure. We took the exchange value of the rupee at 15½d. The actual rate at which we were able to sell rupees was 15 7/8d., or approximately 16d., and this rise in the rate of exchange diminished by Rs. 1,070,000 the amount of rupees which had to be remitted. The rise in exchange is always a satisfaction, but the rise this year was associated with some unequal facts. Last year I calculated that I should be able to draw bills equivalent to £16,000,000 sterling, the rupee being taken at 15½d., and a good many thought I was too sanguine. The actual amount I was able to draw was £18,695,200, or £2,695,200 in excess of my estimate. It may be laid down as a general rule that the larger the number of bills drawn in the year the lower becomes the rate of exchange at which the individual rupee is exchangeable; but this year we drew the whole of this larger sum at a higher rate of exchange than in any year in which we resorted to the lesser sum, and the sum remitted for the year is the largest amount ever sent from India, and it has enabled us to reduce our estimated gold liabilities in this country by £2,695,000 in the course of the year. In addition to the reduction of the gold debt here, we were able during the year at the currency reserve to exchange rupees for gold to the amount of Rs. 2,616,000. (Hear, hear.) The next great item on the expenditure side is that connected with the railway and irrigation account. The receipts from both sources of productive works were the largest ever recorded in India, and they improve the railway account by Rs. 848,000 and the irrigation account by Rs. 225,000. There was also a saving on army expenditure of Rs. 620,800. This was due to the cessation of frontier operations, and there were a number of other minor savings and certain increases under other heads the aggregate result of which was a total net reduction, independent of exchange, on the expenditure side amounting to Rs. 1,973,000. On the revenue side it is noteworthy that there is an increase under every head of revenue, except for a small falling off in stamps and registration, and the total increase amounts to Rs. 1,658,200. Those who are familiar with Indian finance are aware that there is an elaborate arrangement between the provincial governments and the Imperial Government under which the provincial governments are quinquennially assigned certain portions of certain revenues, and as these revenues are assigned certain portions of certain revenues, and as these revenues are entitled to claim increase also. For these and other automatic reasons the provincial governments receive out of the augmented surplus Rs. 821,700 more than was anticipated; and if members of the House will deduct this amount from the gain in



revenue and the reduction in expenditure and exchange it will bring the surplus down to the figure I originally gave—namely, Rs. 4,759,000. (The Government of India, however, having had a successful financial year, naturally took into consideration the exceptionally heavy burden which recently had been laid upon the provincial governments, who have simultaneously had to face increased expenditure to combat calamities out of revenues either curtailed or whose expansion had been arrested by the very evils requiring this additional expenditure. The Indian Government, therefore, made them free grants which in the aggregate amount to Rs. 700,000, thus bringing down the available surplus to Rs. 4,059,000. Then the trade and treasure statistics of this remarkable year are also noteworthy. The exports from India, including treasure, exceed the figure of Rs. 120,000,000, being a crore and a-half over the highest amount of exports ever before recorded. (Hear, hear.) The imports including treasure, amount to upwards of Rs. 90,000,000, an amount which has only been exceeded in two preceding years. (Hear, hear.) The surplus of exports over imports was therefore upwards of Rs. 30,000,000, a figure which has only previously been exceeded in three years. The net imports of treasure amounted to Rs. 10,484,192, a figure which has often been exceeded, but of that amount no less than Rs. 6,500,000 represented gold, the highest amount of gold ever absorbed by India in any one year. (Hear, hear.) I quote these figures to the House, first, because I think they are interesting, and, secondly, because they show that from whatever standpoint we view the matter, whether from a financial or from a commercial or industrial standpoint, the results are far more satisfactory than the most sanguine could have anticipated last year. (Hear, hear.) We have faced and have succeeded in overcoming a great cumulative series of difficulties with far less loss of vitality than I could have believed possible; scars that I feared were indelible are being rapidly obliterated, and if we can only depend on normal phenomena for a few years I think a period of great development and great prosperity will dawn on the great mass of the inhabitants of India. (Hear, hear.) But there is one side to our rule in India which always causes anxiety to the Government of that country, and that is the enormous increase in the population which is the normal result of the rule, and which is growing heavily on the means of subsistence that in many districts it presses heavily on the means of subsistence. Some time back I appointed Sir James Lyall's Famine Commission. I thought that in the course of their enquiries and wanderings they would have very special opportunities of examining into the industrial and economic conditions of the populations through whose country the drought had passed; and I thought that a general opinion from a Commission so exceptionally circumstanced, with the traces of the recent disaster displayed before their eyes, would be of the greatest value in enabling us to decide how far during the last twenty years that have elapsed since the last great famine we have improved the material condition of the mass of the people, and how far we have offered resistance to exceptional distress. The most important of the conclusions which Sir James Lyall and the Commission arrived at are stated in the last paragraph of his report. It is somewhat lengthy, but I dare say the House will excuse my going into it in view of the importance of the subject. Sir James Lyall says:—"The general conclusions we are disposed to draw are that it may be said of India as a whole that of late years, owing to high prices, there has been a considerable increase in the incomes of the landholding and cultivating classes, and that their standard of comfort and of expenditure has also arisen. With a rise in the value of their tenures, their credit has also expanded. During the recent years of famine, as a rule, have therefore shown greater power of resisting famine, either by drawing on savings, or by borrowing, or by reduction of expenditure, than in any previous period of scarcity of like severity. Whether it can be safely said that they have much improved in thrift—that is, in the accumulation of capital—seems open to doubt. There is some evidence to the effect that the export trade and the improvement of communications have tended to diminish the custom of storing grain as a protection against failure of harvest, which used to be general among the agricultural classes." I may here state that the landowning and cultivating classes constitute 57 per cent. of the rural population of India. Sir James then passes on to the artisan class, as to which he says:—"The skilled artisans, excepting weavers, have also greatly improved their incomes and their style of living, and very few of them required relief. The commercial classes, whose numbers are relatively small, are not generally injuriously affected by famines of short duration. Beyond these classes there always has existed, and there still does exist, a lower section of the community living a hand-to-mouth existence, with a low standard of comfort and is normally sensitive to the effects of inferior harvests and calities of the season. This section is very large and includes the great class of day labourers and the lower class of the artisan. So far as from the evidence we have heard and the statistics placed before us, the wages of these people have not risen in the last twenty years in due proportion to the rise in prices of their necessities of life. The experience of the recent famine fails to suggest that this section of the community has shown any larger command of resources or any increased power of resistance. Far from contracting, it seems to be gradually widening, particularly in the more congested districts. Its sensitiveness or liability to succumb, instead of diminishing, is possibly becoming more accentuated as larger and more powerful forces supervene and make their effects felt, where formerly the result was determined by purely local conditions." It is estimated that the labourers of all sorts constitute 17 per cent. of the rural population, and it is with a portion of this body that I propose now to deal. The problem to be solved is not one of reduction of taxation or of cheapening of food. These poor people practically pay no taxes, and food is cheaper in India than in any known civilised country in the world. Even at the height of the late famine prices rose to a level so high as to make the importation of food into British India, except from Burma, unprofitable. We are face to face with the consequences of the long establishment of the *pes* *Ban* in India is the most prolific human nursery in the world. We have removed or restrained all the influences by which in the past this prolific-

ness has been counteracted. War and plundering are no longer permitted, and all the energy of modern science and of civilisation is devoted to the increasing and stamping out of those conditions which in the past played such havoc with human life. Sir Robert Giffen the other day estimated that since 1871 the population of British India had increased 70 millions, and that the annexations since that period form but a small part of this increase. It is the one unnatural law of nature that when population rapidly increases that section in which the increase is quickest is the one nearest to the brink of destitution. I am afraid that the residuum in India is expanding, and will continue rapidly to expand under our rule. We cannot reverse our past humane policy of protection to life, and we must therefore try and see how far we can otherwise ease the new economic and social difficulties we have irresolvably created. I see no other solution but in opening up the country by railroads and canals, encouraging private enterprise to develop the resources, and notably the practically untouched mineral wealth of the country—(hear, hear)—to attract capital from this country to multiply and vary the great stable industries of India, and to associate with this policy of industrial development a more practical and utilitarian system of education. Such a policy belongs to the future, and I will therefore turn to the Budget year 1899-1900, as it is associated with these ideas. For this year—the Budget year—our revenue was estimated at Rs. 62,477,000, and the expenditure at Rs. 58,544,400, giving a surplus of Rs. 3,932,600. The figures of this Budget closely approximate to the actual figures of last year, the aggregate revenue being taken at Rs. 59,000,000, and the expenditure showing a reduction of Rs. 472,800. There are also sundry adjustments in the receipts and expenditure of the provincial governments which affect the totals, but there is nothing specially noteworthy in the various items of expenditure of the revenue which necessitates my detaining the House, unless it be the estimate of railway receipts. The railway net receipts for the preceding year were exceptionally high; Sir James Westland put them somewhat higher for this year. On the other hand, he took a low rate of exchange for the remittance of rupees—namely, 15gd. I have recently received further information about the rate of the financial year, and I am glad to find that the railway revenue will be considerably less than the Budget estimate, but this loss is more than counteracted by the improvement under the principal heads of revenue and reduction of frontier expenditure. It is now estimated that the rate of exchange may be taken at 16d. This will give an improvement of more than 40 lakhs. The surplus this year may therefore be taken at Rs. 4,400,000. This is the last year for which Sir James Westland is responsible. His tenure of office has been one of exceptional anxiety, for he has had to contend with unprecedented difficulties, both as regards exchange and currency; and in addition he has had to find the ways and means of simultaneously coping with a great frontier outbreak, famine, and plague. He has throughout this trying ordeal shown perspicacity, courage, and judgment of a very high order, and it must be a gratification to him and his friends to know that, when he handed over his responsibilities to his successor, he was able to associate his retirement with the two highest surpluses of the century—(hear, hear)—and a few months after he had the gratification of knowing, by the approving report of the Currency Committee, that his efforts for the establishment of a gold standard and currency in India are within measurable distance of being fulfilled. I am glad to add that his services will not be lost to the public, for her Majesty has approved of his appointment to the Viceroyship of the Indian Council. (Hear, hear.) Those interested in India are aware that during the few weeks there has been considerable anxiety with regard to the monsoon. I requested the Viceroy to inform me periodically whenever he had reliable comprehensive information, and the latest telegram I have is dated August 3. It is: "Crop prospects. Rainfall in Northern India, Bengal, and Burma has been above the average, and agricultural prospects are satisfactory. On West Coast, in Central India, and in parts of Madras there has been a keen deficiency of rain, and there is some cause for anxiety, although a heavy rainfall in present month would still arrest serious scarcity." The latest telegram through the Press announces that rain has fallen in Bombay and other parts of Western India during the last few days. I am afraid that in any case there will be some scarcity. The National Finance Organisation, however, is in excellent order, and I can hardly think that Nature will so fall again as to seriously disturb the financial arrangements of the year. Independently of the partial failure of the monsoon, we desired to make good the financial losses of the two preceding years; and as we were about to advance another stage in our currency policy we were desirous of occupying during that phase as strong a financial position as was permissible without fresh taxation. But in addition to these reasons, sufficient and valued as they are in themselves, there was a further wish to carry on the prosecution of our public works policy with the smallest addition compatible with reasonable progress to our gold debt in this country. The practice of the Indian Government is to charge 4 per cent. interest on the public debt, and the capital supplied for reproductively public works, and this interest is charged against the railway and irrigation portion of the account. The capital so supplied comes partly from loans, partly from revenue. When it is supplied from revenue the amount so obtained is deducted from the ordinary debt which, but for this expenditure, would to that extent have been diminished. Under this system the larger the surplus the less the amount borrowed in the year for public works, and we shall be able for the forthcoming year to be able to devote a considerable proportion of the surpluses of the last two years to that object, thus avoiding borrowing. All sums borrowed for public works by the Government are raised upon the general security of the revenue of India, and though the strictest account is kept of the sums so obtained they are not earmarked so as to enable any outsider to distinguish between the debt liabilities for railway and irrigation and those incurred for other purposes. Every year in the explanatory memorandum of the Secretary of State there is a table of assets and liabilities of the Indian Government, and this table will be found at page 10 of my memorandum of this year. The assets include the capital value of the railways and irrigation constructed, of amounts



lent, and cash balances. The obligations, the debt, and other liabilities of the Indian Government for this year—our excess of liabilities—are estimated at £53,029,000 in Great Britain. In India we have an excess of assets over liabilities to the amount of £21,310,000. Taking the rupee at 16d., this sum is the equivalent of £21,340,000. Therefore the total amount of what I may call the unremunerative debt of India at the present moment only amounts to £31,689,000. I doubt if any other great government in the world could show so small an amount of indebtedness. (Hear, hear.) But the question naturally arises, Does our policy of public works annually tend to improve this balance-sheet? I therefore propose to compare the balance-sheet of the year with the balance-sheet of ten years back—namely, the year 1889. That decade has been one which has severely tried the finances of India. (Hear, hear.) We have had a heavy fall in the exchange value of the rupee, and we have had all the disturbing influences and elements of war and famine with which to contend in India itself, and therefore it might be assumed, taking these untoward events into consideration, that our balance-sheet at the end of the ten years would be worse than it was at the beginning. In 1889 there was an excess of liabilities over assets in India of £4,500,000. This at 16d. is equivalent to £3,000,000, and the excess of liabilities over assets in the United Kingdom was £3,514,000. Adding these two sums together, we get a total liability of £39,814,000, or a balance-sheet of £8,200,000 less favourable than that which we can show this year, and if we can only continue for the next thirty years to annually show such an improvement in our assets, at the end of that period there will be practically no unremunerative debt left. We are therefore able gradually to diminish by our public works policy the dead-weight interest charged on borrowed money, and side by side with this annual reduction to show an improving annual balance-sheet. Putting these two facts together seems to me conclusive justification, on financial grounds alone, for a vigorous prosecution of reproductive public works in India. (Hear, hear.) Some three years ago I sanctioned a railway programme of extension amounting to nearly £30,000,000 to be spread over the period named. Owing to the heavy expenditure connected with famine and frontier operations the Government found it necessary to reduce this amount to £25,200,000. The new three years' railway programme is estimated to cost £20,322,000, but owing to lapses through the engineering strike and other causes in 1898-99 there are arrears to the extent of £2,050,000. The total is, therefore, raised to £22,372,000, and of this amount £3,822,000 is comprised in the Budget for the present year. This includes all railway construction for which the Government undertakes the responsibility or guarantee, whether on State lines or those of the old Company, but is not to be further guaranteed; but it does not include outlay by Native States without a guarantee by the Government of India, nor does it include outlay on branch lines, nor on unguaranteed private enterprise. The House will recollect that in the course of last Session I obtained a loan Bill to the amount of £10,000,000, and at the same time the House gave their sanction to that increase in borrowing powers, the Secretary of State's powers had been reduced to £118,000. The total amount, therefore, which at this time last year was at the disposal of the Secretary of State for the purpose of raising funds was £10,418,000, and I proposed, as I informed the House at the outset, to raise a loan of £10,000,000, and to bring them into the account of the course of the year, to discharge considerable amounts of debentures and other debts which became due. So I am glad to be able to inform the House that at the present moment my borrowing powers amount to £29,377,000, or in other words I have been able to finance the requirements of the Indian Government and the sums necessary for public works by borrowing about one million sterling in the course of the year; and in India, although we estimated that it might be necessary to raise £3,000,000, our cash balances stood so high that our loan was reduced to £1,200,000. For the present year we do not propose to borrow either at home or in India, but the failure of the monsoon may alter that determination. The present year, in whose progress of work and in the initiation of the House, I am acquainted, has given close attention to the encouragement of private enterprise, so that side by side with Government expenditure railway promotion may be pushed by private individuals and private capital. When his Minister for Public Works came home on leave he took that department under his own supervision, mainly with the object of ascertaining whether he could not simplify and shorten the existing procedure for dealing with applications of this character. It is not very easy to so dovetail the prosecution of State railways and railways promoted by private means into one great system of railway progress and expansion. In this House we know how jealous any great company is of extension which might cut into their system or unduly affect their local profits, and when, in addition, powers of purchase over individual railroads is conferred upon the Government, as is the case with India, the value of the property they may ultimately wish to buy or of the property they may have themselves constructed may be considerably influenced by such extensions. It is, therefore, necessary to proceed with great caution and consideration before assent is given to any private enterprise where the railroad to be constructed might have that effect upon the railways in its vicinity. Still, making allowances for all such difficulties, there is room for accelerations and improvement in the procedure now existing for dealing with railway promoters. But it is not only in connection with railways that we wish to encourage private enterprise. The mineral wealth of India has scarcely been touched, with the exception of the working of coal, which is making great strides. I appointed an exceptionally strong Committee at the India Office to supervise and amend the existing restrictions. These regulations were sent to India and the Viceroy issued rules in accordance with the instructions he received, that have given general satisfaction. What we have done as regards mines is only typical of what we wish to do in connexion with the other undeveloped resources of India—encourage the *bona fide* promoter and reader, but try to get something like concessionary, who looks upon his concession only as something he can sell at a profit to others. Side by side with this material development of India we wish to make the higher branches of education

more practical and utilitarian. (Hear, hear.) At present we are annually turning out thousands of young men with a purely literary education and with no means of employment when their education is finished but to join the overcrowded ranks of the pleader and pressman. But if we wish to secure the thorough co-operation of enterprise and capital from this country in developing India we cannot more effectively achieve that purpose than by establishing a currency system which will closely link together the monetary and the commercial interests of the two countries. (Hear, hear.) And this naturally brings me to the currency report of the Committee over which the right hon. gentleman the member for Wolverhampton presided. Sir, the special thanks of the House are due to the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues for the time and consideration they gave to the complex subject referred to them. (Hear, hear.) And they have their reward in the almost unanimous approval with which it has been received. (Hear, hear.) It is a report characterised by lucidity of arrangement and language, and a natural sequence of statement, both of fact and argument, that renders it one of the most convincing and easily mastered papers that I have ever read upon any currency controversy. The report is, moreover, on all essential points unanimous, and this unanimity is, I think, due to the composition of the Committee. Sir, there are some persons who think that, whenever a difficult and controversial question is to be investigated by any tribunal of this character, the bulk of the enquiring body should be composed of the extreme partisan on both sides of the question with a sprinkling of impartial persons to keep the peace between them. (Laughter and "hear, hear.") Commissions so constituted invariably result in a minority as well as a majority report. The whole responsibility for any changes proposed rests upon the shoulders of the limited few who do not take sides. (Laughter.) I composed this committee on the opposite principle. (Hear, hear.) I selected the best men available who had not committed themselves irretrievably either one way or the other and whose judicial tendencies were such that they could be trusted to be influenced by the evidence before them. And not the least of the merits of the report is its self-evident fairness and freedom from bias. It perhaps would be convenient to the House if I were, very briefly, to recapitulate the present condition of currency in India and contrast it with the proposals of the committee. At present the mints are closed to the unrestricted coinage of silver; gold is not legal tender, though the Government receive it in favour of public debts. The rupee, by law, is the only coin in which payments can be made, though the Government have declared a rate at which they will exchange rupees for gold—namely, a rupee is 16d. The Committee recommends that the mints should continue to be closed to the unrestricted coinage of silver, but that they should be thrown open to the unrestricted coinage of gold; that gold be made legal tender and current coin; that Government be not bound by law to part with gold for rupees or for external purposes, but that it should be freely available for foreign remittances when foreign exchanges fall below specie point—namely, 16d. Now, Sir, these recommendations, in the aggregate, will result in establishing a currency system in India very similar to that which prevails in the United States and France, and the Committee point out, in paragraph 37, that if the United States and France were ever hereafter to come to a similar agreement with responsible proposals for an international agreement, India will be in a better position to consider such proposals than she was before. (Hear, hear.) But to my mind, the most valuable portion of the report of the committee is that in which they clearly prove that the establishment of a gold standard in India is as much for the interests of the Indian people as it is for the Indian Government. Attempts have been made to try and show that, although a gold standard might be beneficial to the Indian Government on account of the large gold obligations they have annually to meet in this country, yet it would be detrimental to the interests of the general community; that India was too poor a country for a gold standard; that India is an export country, and that a gold standard was beneficial to an export trade; and that if a gold standard was established, India could not hereafter compete with the silver-using countries who export commodities similar to those which India produces. I am glad to say I think the committee have finally and successfully exploded these fallacies. During the past few years the commercial world has been passing through a period of depression and fall in prices. The general price of commodities had fallen simultaneously with the exchange value of silver; therefore certain individuals argued that it was the demonetization of silver which caused the fall in the price of commodities, and that, unless silver was revalued, it was that, and not the fall of prices rising. Argentina was used as a familiar illustration of how a depreciated currency benefited a great exporting country. Argentina is a country with almost unlimited, undeveloped agricultural resources. Her Government borrowed largely to develop these resources, but that Government over-borrowed and was unable to pay the interest on their debt. Then to save their credit they issued wholesale a mass of paper money which became very heavily depreciated. Almost simultaneously with this heavy depreciation the result of previous outlay began to take effect and Argentina began to export largely; therefore certain gentlemen argued that this great expansion of exports was due to the depreciation of the currency. The same day, however, the gold premium in Argentina has continuously fallen, and her exports continue, simultaneously with the appreciation of her paper, to expand. The industrious statistician will always find in the commercial world coincidences, synchronisms and sequences which, if he be not master of his subject, he is apt to confound with cause and effect; but the Committee conclusively demonstrate that the volume of exports from India is not associated with or governed by a rise or fall in exchange. I have more than once challenged those who hold different views from my own to show how a depreciated currency benefits the majority of the community amongst whom it circulates. In India our great difficulties are that there wages, owing to the increase of population, are in many branches of industry too low. A depreciated currency raises prices, but there is always an interval between the rise of prices and the consequent rise of



wages, and during that period the employer gets the benefit. There are no Consular reports on trade more worthy of personal than those which emanate from the United States Consuls. The Consul-General for the United States at Calcutta, in his official report to his Government, puts the position with a force which is in my opinion for argument, quoting it: "From the best information obtainable, the merchants and large dealers in the products of the country would favour the re-opening of the mints, which would enable them to buy silver at the present low prices, have it coined into rupees, and use them in their business greatly to their advantage; and the raiyats and wage-earners would be the sufferers, as is always the case in a country with a debased and depreciating currency." In this country there has been of recent years a general crusade against the practice of what is known as "sweating." Sweating results from unscrupulous employers taking advantage of a congested labour market establishing a system of overwork and underpay. Let everybody understand, who advocates a depreciating currency as a benefit to the community, that he is supporting a system of currency that is nothing more or less than a legalised form of sweating. Ceylon is, as regards its currency, its trade, and its exporting power, a miniature of India, excepting that its export trade forms a much larger proportion of its general trade than is the case in India. I have here the latest official report on the financial and industrial condition of Ceylon. It is dated September 27, 1898, and it relates to that year in which the gold value of the rupee rose to a greater extent than has occurred for the last 30 years. According to certain theories this rise in exchange should have a depressing effect on an island which mainly depends for its prosperity on its export trade. The official report is, however, the official report: "The progress of the island during the year under review was very marked. The rise in the revenue, amounting to considerably more than Rs. 2,000,000, to use a popular phrase 'broke all previous records.' This satisfactory increase was in no wise due to increased taxation or any unexpected windfall, but to the general prosperity of the island, the people of which, in the year under review, imported more goods, travelled more, bought more Crown land, ate and drank more, wrote more letters and telegrams, and generally flourished more than in any previous year, to the no small gain of themselves and the Government." I never should have taken the interest that I have taken in this question or have exerted myself to try to bring about the establishment of a gold standard in India, unless I had realised myself that the establishment of such a standard would be one of the most effective instruments by which we could improve the industrial condition of the lowest-paid of the wage-earners of India. (Hear, hear.) The Committee in their report do not favour the idea of raising a great loan for the purpose of buying gold and thus accelerating the period at which convertibility would be commenced. I admit the strength of some of the objections urged against a policy of borrowing for the acquisition and accumulation of gold, and we are ready to forego for the present any intention of that kind, but subject to this understanding we intend to utilize all our powers and opportunities to push on the currency changes proposed by the Committee through the procedure suggested by the committee. We hoped, and we still hope, not to borrow this year, but if the failure of crops in the central and western portions of India becomes serious and exchange with India in consequence is upset, either as regards the rate or the amount of the bills tendered, we may find difficulty in providing the ways and means we anticipated, in which case we shall be compelled as on former occasions to fall back upon the existing borrowing powers. After the fullest consideration, and after an examination extending now over many years into the currency system of India, we have deliberately arrived at the conclusion that the attainment of a gold standard is desirable in the interests of the Indian people; and we shall not in any way be deterred from vigorously prosecuting that policy by all the means in our power merely because the next phase through which it has to advance may coincide with an abnormal and temporary failure of crops. But, while I am quite ready to forego for the present the idea of a special loan, there are two aids of a very different character to which we can legitimately have recourse, and which will undoubtedly accelerate convertibility. There is a most important suggestion to which the name of Mr. Hambro is appended. Mr. Hambro is a governor of the Bank of England and a financier deservedly occupying a position of high reputation in the city, and he speaks with authority when he points out that the insufficient banking facilities of India will be an obstacle to the realisation of the proposals of the committee, and undoubtedly banking in India has not kept pace with the growth of trade and commerce. The presidency banks do their work very well, but their capital is small, and, as regards their available cash balances, these are almost entirely applied by one account—namely, that of the Government. In a paper which was laid before the Committee, Sir James Westland points out that during the thirteen weeks of the busiest part of the year 90 per cent. of the available cash balances of the Bank of Bengal were derived from the Government account, and 80 per cent. of the cash balances of the Bank of Bombay were derived from the same source. The Government account forms a very much larger proportion of the cash balances of the Presidency banks in India than is the case here, for at times the Bank of England could almost dispense with the Government account and still carry on their business; and it must be remembered that the cash balances of the presidency banks in India form a far more important banking factor than do the Bank of England cash balances here, and that the flow and movement of cash in India is very much slower than is the case in England. I have certainly come to the conclusion from my experience that we are endeavouring to finance the export commerce and trade of India on too small a cash basis, or perhaps I should be more correct in saying too small a loanable capital basis. I believe there is room for a bank such as that suggested by Mr. Hambro, but in attempting to establish any such bank the rights of the Presidency banks must in no sense be prejudiced or overlooked. Some contend that there would be a difficulty in finding continuous employment for men that would be sufficient to justify the establishment of such a bank with a large amount of capital, but Mr. Alfred de Rothschild, who speaks with exceptional authority on this point, read an admir-

able paper before the Committee, which pointed to an opposite conclusion. The views which I have expressed are, I know, held both by the Viceroy and the Finance Minister in India; we are in complete agreement with the Indian Government on this point. Although I quite admit that there are very serious difficulties to be overcome they do not seem to be in any sense insuperable. If we can establish a financial institution of the kind suggested by Mr. Hambro, it would in subsequent years greatly facilitate the consummation of the policy we desire to establish. But there is another method by which we can accelerate convertibility, and the preliminary steps for giving effect to this idea have already been taken. The production of gold in Southern India is estimated to amount to the annual value of £1,500,000. This gold is all shipped to London, and freight paid up to by the exporter. We are under preliminary arrangement with the southern companies by which the Indian Government agree to annually purchase this gold in exchange for rupees, and thus we shall continue to annually increase our store of gold without in any degree interfering with or drawing upon the stocks of gold held in reserve in this country. Short, therefore, of raising a loan, we utilise all other powers and opportunities of giving effect to the policy laid down by the Committee, which is the consummation of the action taken in 1893 by the closing of the mints. We are now within a few months of the dawn of a new century. Let us hope that we may be able to associate the commencement of this new epoch with the establishment of continual financial surpluses in India, available either for remission of taxation or the development of the industrial resources of the country, and that we may combine these advantages with a currency system which will enable India to reap the fullest monetary and financial benefit from her connexion with the cheapest, the largest, and the most fruitfully money market in the world. (Cheers.)

MR. CALDWELL.

MR. CALDWELL moved,—"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 taxpayer, 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." As to the first point in his motion, he thought there could be no second opinion. They professed to be deeply interested as to the granting of the franchise in the Transvaal, but in India where was the franchise? Oh, but it was said, India prospered under British rule. If this country were under German or French rule, would it be much comfort to them to be told that the country was prosperous? The salary of the Colonial Secretary was placed upon the Estimates, and he thought the same course should be followed in the case of the Indian Secretary, especially as they were dealing in India with a civilised people who had no representation in the House. Indian affairs were supposed to be managed in that House, but the looker-on could gauge what interest was taken in those affairs when they saw the discussion relegated to the last day of the Session. The fourth point in his motion—the reference of the Indian Estimates to a Select Committee—was one which he could see nothing to prevent the noble lord from accepting. A similar proposal had been made with reference to the home Estimates, and if, as some of them thought, it would be a step in the right direction in this country, surely it was much more necessary in the case of India, where special knowledge was required. Such a system would impart greater interest to Indian affairs, and give the people of India more confidence in the administration. (Cheers.)

SIR W. WEDDERBURN.

SIR W. WEDDERBURN, who seconded the amendment, said: When the right hon. the member for Wolverhampton was Secretary of State for India he declared in this House that all the members of the House were members for India. The sentiment was received by hon. members with great enthusiasm, and I rejoiced that this was so, as showing that they recognised their responsibility towards India. At the same time, looking to-night at the empty benches, it must be confessed that the attendance is not what it would have been if the vital interests of British constituents had been in question. I will however gladly assume that this House sincerely desires to perform its duty of superintending Indian affairs and redressing Indian grievances; and my remarks will be of a strictly practical kind, showing how the machinery of this House fails to secure the object in view. I speak from sad personal experience. For during the last six years I have striven to get a hearing for the Indian view of Indian affairs, but in no case have I been able to obtain independent enquiry into any complaint nor the redress of any Indian grievance; whether that grievance is suffered by an individual, by a class, or by the whole Indian people. Even in this country serious grievances arise, although the supreme authority is in the hands of the representatives of the taxpayers. It will be readily understood that grievances are more liable to arise in India, where the taxpayers have no voice whatever in the choice of their rulers; where the whole power is in the hands of officials; and where those officials, though undoubtedly able and honest, are foreigners, imperfectly acquainted with the people, and dependent for information upon ill-paid and untrustworthy subordinates. Under this system serious grievances



must necessarily arise. The question is, what machinery exists by which the House of Commons, as the ultimate Court of Appeal, can secure the hearing of complaints and the redress of these grievances? The theory, of course, is that this can be done through the Secretary of State for India. He is supposed to be responsible to Parliament, and when dealing with Indian complaints he is supposed to occupy a position of judicial impartiality. But this is altogether a delusion. The Secretary of State for India, being backed by the Ministerial majority, is, in Indian matters, practically the master, not the servant of the House of Commons; and so far from being an impartial judge, ready to hear complaints and eager to afford redress, he is in reality the mouthpiece and champion of the official hierarchy, against whom the complaints are made. Deriving his views and information solely from the India Office, he becomes naturally the apologist of all official acts, and resents every complaint as a reflection upon the administration of which he is the head. Accordingly the regular routine is to refuse all independent enquiry; to refer complaints for report to the official complained against; and when that official pleads not guilty, to assure the House that no grievance exists. Unfortunately also this refusal of independent enquiry extends even to important questions of fact where there is no personal complaint against an official. For example, for the last forty years I have specially interested myself in the rayats, the peasant proprietors who form the mass of the Indian population. Now there exists an irreconcilable difference of opinion as to their condition. The India Office theory is that the rayat is a fat and comfortable person, increasing each year in prosperity pleasantly conscious of the blessings of British rule. On the other hand all Indian public opinion knows and asserts that he is a miserable starveling, hopelessly in debt to the money-lender; without store of food, money, or credit; living from hand to mouth, so that he readily dies from famine if there is a failure of one harvest. Here is a clear issue of fact; and again and again I have asked for a detailed village enquiry which would settle the point. (Hear, hear.) No expense to speak of need be incurred. All that is wanted is to select a few typical villages in each Province and ascertain the detailed facts of the rayats' condition, the enquiry being conducted by independent local Committees, including officials and non-officials, Europeans and Indians. The village community is the microcosm of all India; if we could find out how to make one village prosperous, we should have a clue to make prosperous the half million of villages of which India is made up. Three times in the last three years I have moved resolutions in this House asking for such an enquiry, and on each occasion it has been refused. I think I have said enough to show that the House of Commons cannot depend upon the Secretary of State for India to give a ready hearing to complaints; to make impartial enquiry; and to afford effectual protection to the weak against the strong. Failing him, what other machinery exists in the House of Commons for the redress of Indian grievances? There is the official Opposition and in all other departments the ex-Minister takes the lead in criticising the doings of his successor on the Treasury Bench. But this is not the case as regards India. The ex-Minister during his term of office has become so thoroughly saturated with the spirit and traditions of the India Office that he cannot emancipate himself when he crosses to the Opposition side; so that when Indian complaints are under debate he seldom comes forward and voice his dissent. It is generally to exchange compliments with his successor in office, and denounce the independent member who has brought forward the grievance. Unfortunately, also, the group of independent members who try to redress Indian grievances get little support or encouragement from public opinion in their uphill battle. As a general rule the Press seems to find some curious satisfaction and amusement in recording how the House empties itself when India is discussed, and instead of rebuking this neglect of duty, it calls the speakers on behalf of India bores and faddists, as if the "ancient tale of woe" of the Indian cultivator was a topic suitable for light and humorous treatment. One hundred and twenty years ago Edmund Burke lamented this corrupted condition of public opinion in England, when he said, "It makes all reform of our Eastern Government appear to officials and dignitaries." He pointed out that, "in such an attempt you hurt those who are able to return kindness and resent injury." "If you succeed you have those who cannot so much as give you thanks. Our Indian government is in its best state a grievance. But it is an arduous thing to plead against abuses of a power which originates from your own country, and affects those whom we are used to consider as strangers." Unhappily things are now much worse than they were when those words were spoken, especially in two particulars. In those days India was administered in the name of the East India Company, and there existed a wholesome jealousy, both in the House of Commons and the country, of a sheltered monopoly. That wholesome jealousy has been lulled to sleep since the Crown has openly assumed the administration. The other great benefit that India then enjoyed, and has now lost, was that every twenty years there was a full and impartial enquiry into the Indian administration, previous to the renewal of the Charter. Out of those enquiries arose all the most useful and progressive reforms by which Parliament has benefited India. Also the East India Company put its house in order and redressed grievances, when those enquiries were in sight. Now all those benefits are lost. Since 1856 there has been no such enquiry; no day of reckoning for the Indian administration; and the Indian people are quite powerless to obstruct that thorough and independent investigation into facts which used to come to them automatically and without effort once every twenty years.

Lord G. HAMILTON: Who gave evidence?

Sir W. WEDDERBURN: The House of Commons examined any person who was willing to give evidence.

Lord G. HAMILTON: They were all servants of the East India Company.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN: Now, fortunately, Parliament can get intelligent persons to give evidence who are not in that position. Well, I think I have now sufficiently shown that with the existing machinery Parliament is not in a position to redress Indian grievances. Indeed, our system does not even provide a hearing for complaints. The question is, what are the remedies? Our suggestions are of a mild and moderate kind which need frighten nobody. The first is that the Indian Budget debate should be brought on at an earlier date in the Session. An hon. member on the other side has put down an amendment to our motion to the effect that the present system is satisfactory. But I hardly think his approval will extend to the practice of postponing to the last day of the Session the financial affairs of our 250 million Indian subjects. I will not labour this point, for I know that in this matter I have the sympathy of the House. I have not yet found a member who did not consider this practice, which is common to all Governments, a scandal and a discredit. Our next proposal is that the Indian accounts should be referred to a Select Committee, to report on any special feature deserving the attention of the House. Surely this is a reasonable proposal, and in accordance with the practice of the House when it has to deal with any intricate and important matter. Three years ago I brought forward this proposal, but it was rejected by the noble lord the Secretary of State, who said that he was "convinced that it would be almost impossible to bring the members of a Committee of this kind together in sufficient numbers and sufficiently often to enable them to report with effect on a question of such importance." I submit that this is an undeserved reflection upon the industry and capacity of the House. One reason why at present an Indian financial debate is futile is because there are no clear issues for decision, and because no hearing is given to the case for the Indian taxpayer. This would in some degree be remedied if independent members of the Legislative Council in Calcutta had power to move amendments on the Budget, and divide the Council. These amendments would show the crucial points which a Select Committee should consider, reporting the result for the decision of the House. Our third proposal is that the salary of the Secretary of State should be placed on the Estimates, like the salary of the Colonial Secretary. This would be a piece of financial justice to India, which ought not to pay for the current business of the House of Commons. But it would also afford a constitutional opportunity for dealing with Indian grievances. I have sometimes occasion to bring forward grievances in other departments of the State, and have always received courteous treatment from Ministers, who give a ready hearing to complaints, never refuse enquiry, and generally discover some means of redress. I cannot say the same of Indian Secretaries of State, who are conveniently free from the ordeal of getting through votes on the British Estimates, while their own salaries are beyond the reach of the House of Commons, being taken direct from the Indian Exchequer. I am convinced that if the noble lord's salary had been on the Estimates, such a grievance as that of the Natus brothers would have been redressed long ago; as in the case of Dr. Lamont, who had to wait till the hon. baronet the member for Glasgow compelled attention by moving a reduction of the Scottish Secretary's salary. It is now more than two years since the Natus brothers were cast into prison, without trial, and without to this day knowing the real cause of their imprisonment. When questioned in the House the noble lord has given contradictory replies on this point. In August, 1897, he stated that they were imprisoned in order to unravel a murderous conspiracy. But the murderers of Mr. Rand and Lieutenant Ayerst have been discovered, tried, and executed.

Lord G. HAMILTON: All of them?

Sir W. WEDDERBURN: The presiding judge found that the crime was an isolated act of fanaticism, and that there was no murderous conspiracy at all. Next, in February, 1898, the noble lord said that the Natus were imprisoned because they worked against the plague regulations. But the published correspondence shows that Sirdar Natus acted zealously on the committee for carrying out the plague regulations, and that he did so at the personal request of the Governor of Bombay. Again, in April, 1898, a third and different reason was given, when the noble lord said that the Natus were detained because the public tranquillity was endangered. Upon this the comment of the *Times of India*, the leading Press supporter of the Government, is "The time has come for the Government either to bring the detention of these men to an end or to take the public more into their confidence in regard to it than they have yet done." And referring to the modified arrangement, under which the Natus are now detained at Belgaum away from their homes, this journal argues that "if so light a restraint as confinement within the limits of a spacious collectorate is sufficient to make these men harmless to the State they cannot now be very dangerous persons." We have heard much of the Dreyfus scandal, and rejoice that it is now being dealt with by the French Government. But in some respects the case of the Natus is worse. Captain Dreyfus had a court of trial, whereas the Natus brothers are absolutely refused a trial and do not even know the reason of their imprisonment. I submit that the good name of this House is involved in this case, and that the Natus brothers should be either tried or released. In seconding this resolution I appeal for support to independent members on both sides of the House. No revolutionary changes are proposed, but only constitutional methods of fulfilling our existing duty of superintendence and control over Indian affairs. Poor India has been suffering in the last few years from war, famine and pestilence. This need not be so. On the contrary, with an industrious and docile population, and a fine soil and climate, India ought under British rule to be the abode of peace and of plenty. (Cheers.)

COLONEL MILWARD.

Colonel MILWARD opposed the amendment that had been placed on the paper by several gentlemen opposite. He did not know any



means by which the salary of the Secretary of State for India could be placed on the estimates of this country, unless the people of this country wished to pay that salary for the sake of discussing Indian affairs. He agreed that discussion should, if possible, take place at an earlier date. With reference to the proposed Select Committee for the purpose of considering those accounts, he thought the House should consider whether it had not already quite enough to do in the consideration of the accounts of this country without embarking itself in the accounts of India. Apart from that, he understood that the Indian Government did not wish to have minute interference on the part of Parliament with the financial affairs of India. He opposed the resolution because he believed it to be inopportune. At this moment India was singularly prosperous, well governed, and was using her prosperity to create railways to open up the country to commerce, while at the same time she was largely diminishing the military expenditure which pressed so greatly on her people. It would be a slight to the officers and civil servants in India were the House to pass a resolution of this kind.

MR. G. HARWOOD.

MR. G. HARWOOD said they were familiar with the official presentation of things relating to India. He asked hon. members to look at the facts of the case. In the pages of romance there was nothing more wonderful than the fact of the government of India by the people of this country, the government of a country containing a quarter of the population of the globe—and that population different in race, condition, and language—by the white-faced people of the little island in the Northern seas more than 8,000 miles away. This was a fact which had charmed his fancy from his boyhood. If we so misgoverned India that we lost her, then farewell to the British Empire. That being so, he should have expected that the debate on India in Parliament would at any rate take place at a convenient time, and consequently would be attended by a full House. But what did he find? He found that this question, which concerned a quarter of the population of the globe, was relegated to the last gasp of the Session, when only a few wearied members could assemble with what intellect they had pretty well used up—(laughter)—and their energy pretty well exhausted. There was inconsistency somewhere. It made him doubt all the fine phrases about our Imperial instincts and our Imperial devotion when he saw what that devotion led to. Surely it was a sort of insult to these people whom we governed that we did not care to give more attention to their affairs than he saw that day. He echoed with the greatest possible pleasure all that had been said as to our great faith in our people and our government, for he did not think any country in the world ever produced a class of public servants such as this country were entitled to be proud of. But that was not the question. The question was a deeper one than that. Was it wise or right for us to hand over our responsibilities and to put all the load upon the backs of our public servants? It was not just to those public servants because their services were not understood and appreciated as they would be if Indian affairs were fairly discussed and considered in Parliament. It was not just either to the people whom they governed. What was the teaching of contemporary history and experience? It was the danger of bureaucracy. However good a Government might be, however honest and capable, it was not a wise policy for an enlightened country like this to adopt with regard to such a vast empire. It was said in some of the papers that the Indian debate was a solemn farce, but he questioned the accuracy of that expression. It was not dignified enough to be solemn, and certainly was not humorous enough to be called a farce. It was wanting in the elements of solemnity and farce. Putting the bare facts side by side—the one fact of this mighty empire, and the other fact of our responsibility and of the attention given to that responsibility—he said this was not a farce. It was a tragedy. It was a tragedy which made him ashamed of our loud-boasted empire. As to the suggestion that the debate could not take place earlier because the accounts were not made up till March 31, surely there was no law of the Medes and Persians to compel the making up of accounts to that date. If it were worth while, why could it be made up earlier, in time for a proper discussion. There was a deliberate attempt to do away with representative government in India, and this was but a link in the chain of bureaucratic government from which this country should free itself. The result of such a government was that we were making India the theatre of a great extent for experiments with regard to sugar bounties and economic business—of that kind which he emphatically said we had no right to make unless we were prepared to apply them to other parts of the empire. He believed that country he represented was unanimously in favour of the Government policy with regard to the currency. He was not quite clear that the arrangement with regard to silver—

The SPEAKER said the hon. member was going outside the question before the House.

MR. HARWOOD said that he would only make a few remarks about developing the resources of India, particularly as to coal and iron.

The SPEAKER reminded the hon. member that the only question now before the House was whether the mode of procedure by which the House superintended and controlled Indian affairs was capable of improvement or alteration. Indian policy could not be discussed on the amendment.

MR. HARWOOD said that he thoroughly supported the amendment on the ground that our present system, with the delay of the Budget debate, put the Secretary of State outside the effective criticism of the House, and was therefore a bad system for England and for India.

SIR H. FOWLER.

SIR H. FOWLER: There are half-a-dozen remarks I should like to make on the statement of the noble lord, but I must first say a word or two in defence of the Government of India, and the supervision of the Government of India by this House, and also in defence of the

House itself, after the somewhat romantic speech of my hon. friend to which we have just listened. My hon. friend has been in Parliament long enough to be familiar with its recent history so far as Indian matters are concerned, and I say with all respect to him that it is not correct to state here, and to let it go from here to India, that this House is indifferent to Indian affairs. (Ministerial cheers.) I venture to say that during the last ten years—I might go further back—there are no debates which have excited greater interest in all parts of the country than those upon Indian affairs. Members of all shades of opinion have spoken upon them, and attention has been drawn to them in every organ of public opinion in the country, and the decisions upon them—it is not for me to say whether those decisions were right or wrong—are the decisions of the House of Commons, representing for the time being the decision of the majority of the constituencies of this country. No man has a right to imply that this House is indifferent to Indian affairs. I go, however, to the gravamen of this resolution, and I join issue not only upon the remedies but on the allegations therein set forth. I say the superintending authority of Parliament over Indian Affairs is effectively exercised, and I say that, in my judgment, the modes proposed would not promote the more efficient discharge of that duty. (Hear, hear.) The Government of India is a statutory body. It is a Government regulated by Acts of Parliament, and Parliament alone would have the power to alter or modify that form of government. Now the Government of India is a Government unique in itself. We have no parallel for it elsewhere in the British Constitution, and we are liable to fall into error when we attempt to apply to it either the illustration of our Government at home or of our self-governing colonies or of our Crown colonies. It is not a self-governing colony, it is not a Crown colony, which is practically a despotism tempered to a certain extent by some local administration under the control of the Secretary of State. Parliament has constituted for India a legislative authority and it has constituted an executive authority, and it has put both those authorities under the control of a Cabinet Minister responsible to the House of Commons. The Secretary of State for India is as responsible to the House of Commons for every act of Indian policy as is the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs or the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Parliament has associated with the Secretary of State—and again there is no parallel for this in any part of the Empire—a Council, or Cabinet, or Select Committee. In these debates this Council is generally ignored or some offensive remark is made about it—as, for example, that it is an official hierarchy—but there is no more important body of public men discharging public duty than the Indian Council. (Ministerial cheers.) It is a Council which is always in session. It has no holidays. It is bound by Act of Parliament to meet every week. Its longest vacation is from Monday in one week to Saturday in the next. It sits in this way all the year round. It must be presided over either by the Secretary of State or by a Vice-President, who is chosen at the commencement of every year. We are told we want men of experience of Indian affairs—(laughter)—not ignorant Secretaries of State who come and go, and who, never having been there, know nothing about India. I will trouble the House with a few names. On the Civil side you have Sir A. Lyall. Will any man question Sir A. Lyall's knowledge of India in every aspect of its government, history, and administration? You have Sir James B. Peile, Sir Stuart Bayley, Sir Charles Crosthwaite, Sir Dennis Fitzgibbon—men whose names are written on the pages of the history of India—who know all about it, who have administered the largest Provinces under the British Crown, men who have spent their lives there, and who are as jealous for the honour of England in connexion with India—(Ministerial cheers)—who are as anxious to promote the well-being of the people of India, rich or poor, as any man in this House or in this kingdom. (Cheers.) Associated with these great administrators you have two distinguished judges, the late Chief Justice of the North-West Provinces and another distinguished judge who served in India. You have in a judicial capacity, Sir John Edge and Sir Philip Hutchins. Then, with a great military empire you require a military representation, and I think Field-Marshal Sir Donald Stewart and General Gordon will represent the Military Department on the Council. Added to these you have commerce represented by names of the greatest weight amongst the merchants of India and the City of London. Such are the men who form the Council of India, and I do not think the public really know how the government of India is carried on, and they cannot know it without appreciating the men by whom it is carried on. And you have these men classified in committees. You have these in the India Office. You have the Finance Department, the Military Department, the Political Department, the Industrial Department, Public Works, and Revenue Statistics, and in every one of these great departments you have the official hierarchy, distinguished permanent civil servants. You have the Council thus divided up into committees, constantly sitting, constantly overhauling. And when you say that grievances are not considered I give to that allegation the most positive contradiction of which the English language is capable. All grievances are considered by the Council and by its committees, and always by the Secretary of State personally. (Cheers.) I know no department where there is a more vigorous personal supervision in all its working than there is in the Indian Department. The Secretary of State being assisted by such distinguished men as I have mentioned, and his Parliamentary responsibility being unchallenged, what do we wait further in the way of superintending authority? (Hear, hear.) The Secretary of State has to undergo—and I know what it means myself—a daily



fire of questions. For myself I have always resisted any attempt to curtail the right of hon. members to ask questions in the House. I know no more effective control than the power of asking questions. Then I have known no Address for many years past in which there has not been an Indian amendment. Certainly the policies both of the past and present Secretaries of State have been submitted to the censure or approval of the House, and the House has dealt with them on a variety of great questions. I can go back to my own recollection. There was an important debate on the cotton duties. My action on that occasion was challenged, and the House did not see fit to sanction the motion. Then a very important question was raised with reference to the export question, and there was a full debate and a very large division upon it. Then there was another great question on which I acted with the full approval of the Prime Minister and his entire Cabinet. I refused to carry out the resolution of the House with reference to competitive examinations—(Ministerial cheers)—a resolution which in the opinion of Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues menaced the British power in India. (Ministerial cheers.) A deputation waited on me to remonstrate with me on my action, and I frankly admitted that I had done what they might be called an unconstitutional thing in disregarding a resolution of the House of Commons; but I told them that I should stand by my action, and that I was quite willing to take the judgment of the House upon it. Moreover, I said that if they desired to pass a vote of censure upon what I had done I would insist on the leader of the House giving a day for its discussion. But they never asked for a day. They never put a motion down, and I perfectly understood why, because a member of the deputation said, "If you did give us a day you would get a large majority." (Ministerial cheers and laughter.) I declined to accept a decision carried by a majority of eight on a Friday evening. (Hear, hear.) I am simply putting that to show that there is the amplest opportunity of challenging the conduct of the Secretary of State for India. (Hear, hear.) The present Secretary of State has been more subjected than I was to this mode of warfare. He has had to face a great debate on the retention of Chitral, as well as debates on Indian troops being sent to the Sudan, and upon the great question of policy in connexion with the sugar bounties. On all these occasions the House had opportunities of exercising its control over the Secretary of State, and my point is that the Indian Minister is subject to the same control as any other Minister of State. (Hear, hear.) Then it is said that the Budget is brought in too late in the Session. Well, there is an Act of Parliament which prevents the debate being taken before May 15. Within fourteen days after May the Secretary of State is bound to lay on the table a full statement of the Indian revenue and expenditure and of the moral and material improvement of India. If the House really wished the India Budget to come on a month or six weeks earlier, the matter is in its own hands, for no Minister would resist the feeling of the House on that point. (Hear, hear.) But the Secretary of State is in no way responsible in the matter. It rests entirely in the hands of the leader of the House, and leaders on both sides of the House take the same view, and put the Budget off to the last hours of the Session. But when the Budget does come on there is no automatic closure, the debate is unrestricted and is fully protracted to a late hour. I repeat the House of Commons cannot exercise adequate daily and hourly supervision of the Government of 300 millions of people. That would be an impossibility. If there is one thing the House is crying out for it is devolution, and I say there is no necessity for giving the heavy burden upon it. (Hear, hear.) Then it is proposed that the salary of the Secretary of State should be put upon the Estimates. The Chancellor of the Exchequer would have a word or two to say to that. It would mean putting the salary of the Viceroy in the Estimates as well.

Sir C. DILKE: A token vote.

Sir H. FOWLER: I do not know what my right hon. friend means by a token vote. It is a financial impossibility to put in the Estimates a vote even of 5s. if it is not to be paid out of the Estimates. (Hear, hear.) The Secretary of State has not a dominating power with reference to finance. He cannot spend a £5 note without the consent of the Indian Council and on questions of finance he has only one vote. The control of the Indian revenue and expenditure has been placed by Parliament in the hands of that Council. Then there is the alternative that there should be a Select Committee. To do what? (Hear, hear.) The Indian system of finance is not so simple as the English system. There are more than 1,000 treasuries in India, and there is a gigantic system of audit and control. I am quite certain that a casual Select Committee, meeting once now and again, could not exercise any effective control over Indian finance and that the effect would be only to introduce confusion and dissension. (Hear, hear.) Those are the grounds on which I object to this motion; but there has been an attack on the Secretary of State in his personal capacity, and it was clearly indicated that the attack did not refer solely to the noble lord but included the ex-Minister. It was said that these two officers were not impartial judges, that they were simply the mouthpiece of the official hierarchy of the Indian Council, that they resented all complaints and were guilty of personal discourtesy to hon. members with reference to Indian matters. I plead not guilty to every one of those charges, and I am sure the noble lord will also repudiate them. (Cheers.) If any man says that the Secretary of State is not impartial, I say he knows nothing of the facts of the case. (Cheers.) If I appealed to the other members of the Indian Council, they would say that the Secretary of State is the last man to act as the mouth of the Council, and I say that it is an unfair and unfounded attack to say that he would. (Cheers.) I will put it to the hon. baronet who has made this charge. Was there a single grievance which he brought to my notice that I did not personally investigate? Some grievances he brought to my notice were well founded and I did my best to remedy them. (Hear, hear.) One word more on a personal question. Fault has been found with me here and in certain organs of the Press because I will not make India a party question. I never will look at India through party

spectacles. (Ministerial cheers.) Our one salvation of India is to keep it out of party and to feel our individual and personal responsibility to India, not as members of the Conservative or Liberal parties, but as members of the House of Commons representing India. I believe that in the main that condition has been preserved to the present hour and that this House has always shown the greatest respect and sympathy for those members of the House, no matter on which side they sit, who have shown interest in Indian matters and have submitted to the House propositions of grave importance. I feel strongly upon this question, because I have a profound admiration for our system of government in India. I believe it is the only system of government which can weld India together and maintain the *pax Britannica*. (Cheers.) India consists of a large number of separate nations, of people of different creeds, races, and climates, and the exposed to different influences, and it would be impossible to weld them together as one nation. They never have been and they never will be. It is the one dominating power of the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland and Empress of India, which governs that vast mass of people, a people who have, as Sir John Strachey said, 50 different languages. I believe there is no greater difference between the Scot and the Spaniard than there is between the Bengali and Punjabi. A native of India! You might just as well talk of a native of Europe. In India we have got together a splendid system of government. Of course, the system has its faults. There are stupid men here and there, but I do not think that history has ever known so fair, so just, so equitable, so peaceful, and so successful a government as the government by Great Britain of the Empire of India. (Cheers.) I hope that this Parliament will never tamper with the outworks of that great system, but will go on doing its best, according to its own lights, to promote the true interests of India totally irrespective of party feeling. (Cheers.)

The House divided, when there voted—

For the amendment	..	36
Against	..	95
Majority	..	—59

SIR M. BHOWNAGREEE.

Sir M. BHOWNAGREEE congratulated the House upon the decision at which it had just arrived, and the right hon. gentleman the member for Wolverhampton upon having shown so succinctly and distinctly that Indian questions received proper and fair treatment at the hands of the British Parliament. India was to be congratulated upon the present satisfactory state of her finances. He congratulated Lord Curzon on the frontier policy he had recently announced. He saw in it not a change of policy on the part of the Government but an intelligent and statesmanlike grasp of the situation, since all danger was past and there was no longer need for strong citadels manned by permanent garrisons. The tribes would become friendly to our rule and there would be a great saving to the Indian exchequer. The frontier policy recently announced would commend itself to the public both here and in India, and he welcomed it because it did not prevent the Indian Government from safeguarding its frontiers by defensive measures if occasion arose. The one unpleasant aspect of the present situation in India was the failure of the monsoon rains in Western and Central India. But that day's news relieved them of much anxiety, and he hoped the resources which had been gathered into the Indian Treasury, and the experience of past years, as regarded the treatment of famine, (should any signs of famine appear) would enable the Indian Government and local governments in India to cope with it. He trusted that the Calcutta Municipal Bill would be so revised by the Bengal Government that a satisfactory settlement of the now conflicting interests, as regarded representation in the Calcutta Corporation would be arrived at. It had been his intention 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 in India, as well as by holding out special facilities to industrial projects." Since last Session much had been done on the lines suggested. From the time Lord Curzon stepped on the shores of India he had done all he could (which from his powerful personality and influential position was much) to give effect to the object of the intended amendment. It had been alleged against himself that he had been trying to aim a blow at higher education in India and to turn the young men of India into carpenters and bricklayers. But the people of India recognised that the development of industrial and technical education in the Indian Empire was a matter on which the future prosperity of that Empire depended. An education which was merely literary and academic was not sufficient; it must be more practical and useful. Hitherto the educational system of India had been exclusively literary and academic, with few exceptions. The time had come for giving facilities for education of an industrial and technical character. No violent changes would be necessary, but there should be a multiplication of such schools as those at Delhi and Madras. To give such institutions a chance of success the Government of India should secure for their students the same rewards and degrees as were obtainable at the ordinary Universities. Although much would depend on the people of India themselves, the initiatory step must come from the Government of India; and a great deal could be done by the Government showing unmistakably that they attached a high value to industrial and technical education. If the Government would make such study fashionable, the Native chiefs and rich men would come forward with the necessary pecuniary assistance. He hoped that from the House of Commons a message of approval would go to Lord Curzon and encourage him in the course which he had taken and in which he was likely to meet with much opposition.

[\* The conclusion of the report of this debate will appear next week.]



# SINGER'S SEWING MACHINES.

FOR CASH OR HIRE.

*Machines Exchanged and Repaired.*

DUPLICATE PARTS, NEEDLES, OIL, &c.,  
ALWAYS IN STOCK.

100 Offices in India, Burma, and Ceylon.

Instructions Free. Price Lists Free on application.

The SINGER } 5, CHURCH GATE ST.,  
Manufacturing Co. } BOMBAY.

## MAHA-BHARATA,

Condensed into English Verse by ROMESH DUTT, C.I.E.

Cheap Edition (Temple Classics Series) Cloth, 1s. 6d., Leather, 2s.

Edition de Luxe, with an Introduction by the RIGHT HON. PROFESSOR MAX MULLER, and 12 Photogravures from Indian Sources by Miss E. S. HARDY, Cloth 12s. 6d., Parchment 15s. PUBLISHERS, DENT & CO., LONDON.

May be had in India through any Indian bookseller.

### OPINIONS.

"The impression which his bold and striking leaves on the reader is certainly that something like what we here read in English may have been recited in India when the war between the Kurus and the sons of Pandu was first sung by the ancient bard of the country." *Prof. Max Müller's Introduction.*

"Mr. Romesh Chandra Dutt is the first scholar who brings to his task a life-long study of the original, with a perfect command of our own language. Put into vigorous verse the episodes which are still recited in the houses of caste hamlets, and handed on of crowded festivals." *The Times.*

"An interesting Epilogue by the translator further explains the history and scope of the work and furnishes an instance of the marvellous command of English acquired by educated Bengali gentlemen. The wisdom of the East is wonderfully presented in attractive blinding and pleasing." *The Standard Review.*

"If he had not been a European reader by his intrinsic merits, his noble moral courage, his cyclopaedic knowledge of Indian civilization in the remote past, his profound delineation of character, still his extraordinary popularity and influence, it is plain that the translator's eloquent 'Epilogue' should alone make us curious to learn something of the story of the Kurus and the God-like sons of Pandu." *The Manchester Guardian.*

## LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY.

DADABHAI NAOROJI, Esq., PRESIDENT.

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

Apply, DR. MULLICK,

SOHO SQUARE, NATIONAL HOSPITAL, LONDON, W.



## is what its name implies FEVER DESTROYER,

and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER more than I know. "Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is G. L. NARAYANA ROW.

## FOR INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office—"I have much pleasure in stating that your 'Ommu-Carpoor' was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage."

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMMU-CARPOOR" 8 annas, Rs. 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

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

## NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

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

THE MANAGER,

84 & 85, Palace Chambers,

Westminster, S.W.

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

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

## SECOND AFGHAN WAR. 1878-79-80.

By Colonel H. B. HANNA,

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

PALL MALL GAZETTE—"Colonel Hanna's tremendous care, completeness and clearness, with his intense conviction, make him a very powerful writer."

ATHENÆUM—"The ability with which his case is presented is considerable and it is probable that in his main line his view is a well founded one."

MORNING LEADER—"Colonel Hanna is peculiarly well fitted to handle the multiplicity of questions—political, military, and social—that arise in connection with the Second Afghan War."

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

Congress Addresses and Resolutions from the first to 1898.

## INDIAN POLITICS.

With an Introduction by W. C. BONNERJEE, Esq., Barr-at-Law.  
Price in India, Rs. 2; in England, 4s. (postage 4d. extra).

### PART I.—Original Articles.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS. EARLELY NORTON, Esq., Barr-at-Law.

ECONOMIC CONDITION OF THE PEOPLE OF INDIA. RAO BHADUR

B. N. MUDGOKAR, B.A., LL.B.

INDIAN ASPIRATIONS UNDER BRITISH RULE. ROMESH CHUNDER

DUTT, Esq., C.I.E.

INDIA AND THE CURRENCY QUESTION. DADABHAI NAOROJI, Esq.

THE PERMANENT SETTLEMENT QUESTION. JOHN ADAM, Esq., M.A.,

Barr-at-Law.

THE OVERTURE OF INDIA. ALFRED NORTON, Esq., Barr-at-Law.

THE JURY SYSTEM IN INDIA. SORAB PESTONJI N. WADIA, Esq.,

THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN INDIA. V. KRISHNASWAMI

NAIDU, M.A., B.L.

THE STATUS OF INDIANS ABROAD. G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAY, Esq., B.A.

RAILWAYS IN INDIA. G. SUBRAMANIAM AIVAR, Esq., B.A.

### PART II.—All the past 13 Congress Presidential Addresses.

### PART III.—All the past Congress resolutions.

In India—Apply to G. A. NATESAN & Co, Publishers, ESPLANADE, MADRAS.

In Great Britain—Apply to The Manager of "INDIA,"

84-85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

Remittances must accompany order.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

## PECTORAL BALSAM.

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

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

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

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

Ommu-Carpoor  
TRADE MARK