

India

FOR THE

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, JULY 27, 1900.

[REGISTERED AS A PRICE.....2D.
NEWSPAPER. BY POST, 24D.]

No. 134. NEW SERIES.
No. 228. OLD SERIES.

Notes and News	41	The Mansion House Fund	48
A National Famine Grant	41	The Investors' Review Fund	48
Mr. Naoorji's Victory	46	Mr. Naoorji at Plumstead	49
Our London Letter	49	Indian Affairs in Parliament	50
Notes from Bombay	47	Special Report	50
The Famine in India : 6,281,000 on Relief	47	Advertisements	55-56

* * An Index with Title-page to Volume XIII of INDIA (January—June, 1900) is now ready. A Copy will be forwarded gratis and post free to any Subscriber on application to the Manager.

NOTES AND NEWS.

WE print elsewhere a report of the extremely interesting debate which took place in the House of Lords on Friday last upon the Report of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure. The outcome of the discussion is a notable triumph for Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, as the Government announced their intention of accepting the recommendation by which India will be relieved to the extent of a quarter of a million sterling of the charges now annually met from her revenues. As we go to press (Thursday afternoon), the "debate on the Indian Budget," as the annual discussion is somewhat inaccurately termed, is proceeding in the House of Commons. Our report is necessarily deferred until next week. It may be mentioned, however, that in anticipation of the debate the British Committee of the Indian National Congress despatched to every member of the House of Commons a pamphlet containing the full text of Mr. Vaughan Nash's address on the famine which was reported in our last issue.

The *Times* (July 21) serves up the usual platitudes on the "Moral and Material" Blue Book. On the land revenue it says:—

What stands out from the returns for the last two or three decades is a fairly steady growth of the land revenue—a growth incompatible with deteriorating or stationary economic conditions.

The equally unthinking British reader accordingly accepts the economic conditions of India as perfectly satisfactory. Now, Mr. J. M. Maclean, M.P., admittedly knows what he is talking about when the subject is India, and this is what he said in the House on April 3:—

I looked at the statistical abstract yesterday, and I find that within the last twenty years the land revenue has increased by three millions a year, and except in times of extreme famine, it was never lower, and then only temporarily. That is a very bad thing for any Government to do. The State is the worst absentee landlord you can find anywhere. The State, which collects the land revenue, takes the revenue right away from the land and spends it in warlike operations or something of that kind. The consequence is that the farmers are impoverished by the abstraction of this enormous amount of money every year.

But the *Times* does not stop to enquire what is actually the effect of this enormous drain on the cultivators; it contents itself with a comfortable inference from the official figures. One cannot but wonder whether it has yet heard of Mr. Romesh Dutt's examination of the land revenue assessment in the various provinces, or of Lord Curzon's aroused interest in the subject.

We have always understood that the Government of India has consistently acknowledged that it was not taken aback by the onset of famine. Lord Curzon, for example, speaking in Council at Simla on October 20, 1899, said:—

If in our regrets at the ill-fortune that has attended us we may nevertheless recognise some grounds of legitimate alleviation, they will consist in the facts that we have had upon the present occasion long warning of the coming scarcity, and have in consequence been able to formulate our plans of campaign in advance; and secondly, that . . .

Here is a plain admission of "long warning," and of consequent preparation "in advance." Yet the *Times*, which has been looking over the recent papers on the famine and the relief operations, is unkind enough to say (July 21) that:—

It is only too clear that even well-informed administrators were taken by surprise and did not know that one of the greatest famines of the century was at hand.

Is it possible, then, that Lord Curzon or that his Government was only putting a bold face on a bad situation? We shall await with interest some further light upon this marked discrepancy between the professions of the Indian Government and the critical conclusions of the *Times*. A disagreement between these high authorities is distinctly refreshing.

The decision of the Viceroy to visit Gujerat, which is announced by the Simla correspondent of the *Times* (July 24), "shows how serious matters there are now becoming." Gujerat was one of the places mentioned in the Viceroy's latest telegram "where cultivation is at a standstill for want of rain and fodder is almost unobtainable;" and the special reference to it ran as follows:—

Number of relief works and gratuitous relief rising in Gujerat, where relief of all kinds has been greatly expanded and establishment strengthened in view of the prolonged drought and low condition of the people. Cholera still prevails badly there and famine campaign indefinitely protracted.

Compare with this the latest telegram from the Governor of Bombay:—

Rainfall as yet quite inconsiderable, and causes serious anxiety in North Gujerat, where the numbers demanding relief have continued to increase. Cattle mortality increasing, and unless rain falls within a short time and in sufficient quantities to admit of the ordinary cultivation being carried on, the consequences cannot fail to be serious.

The *Times*' Simla correspondent is of opinion that "this action (of Lord Curzon's) will inspire confidence among officials and people alike." No doubt, and such moral effect is not to be rashly undervalued, especially the effect upon the people. As for the officials, the main point is that Lord Curzon will probably relax a good few swathings of red-tape. But, after all, the fundamental question is: Does he carry money in his hand? What is wanted is money, money, money.

In view of the lamentable distress in Gujerat, it is a painful shock to happen upon a letter in the *Times* of India (July 4), signed by "A Gujerati," who says he is "a landholder, holding considerable lands in the Talukas of Anklesar, Orpad, and the Petha Mahal of Hansot," and is "intimately acquainted with the condition of the agriculturists of these localities." The writer points out that the unrecovered balances of revenue in the Branch Collectorate which stood at Rs. 313 at the end of 1893-94, had risen steadily to Rs. 1,94,417 at the end of 1898-99. Last year, in the Anklesar taluka alone, lands paying assessment to the extent of Rs. 10-12,000 were relinquished; and in the Petha Mahal of Hansot, lands yielding about Rs. 2,000 assessment. Again, lands were put up to sale last year in consequence of the non-payment of the Government demands—"considerable areas of lands in the villages of Sarthan, Telva, Piludra, Ravidra, Karmali, Sisodra, and Adadra"—but they found no bidders. What then? This:—

In August, 1899, Government asked the original holders to give security for the payment of revenue, and to take up the lands; but they did not take them up, and the lands remained untitled.

Then, naturally, there were "large numbers of distraints of the occupants' moveable property." In connexion with which there are alleged to have occurred not a few scenes that may well make a Briton blush for shame.

On this point we must state the case in the words of the writer himself. Thus he says:—

Though the law might have directed otherwise, the wearing apparel

of the occupant and his family, their beddings, their ploughs, the small quantity of grain that was needed for the maintenance of the agriculturists' family, were not saved from the distraint, the articles distrainted were not disposed of within a reasonable time after the distraint, but were allowed to remain for a considerable time at the village chora.

It is not surprising that there were "some complaints of decrease in the number or quantity of the articles distrainted during the period that they were so lying at the chora." Now to take a particular case:—

In one case, when in making distraint the officers found nothing in the agriculturist's house, they seized ornaments that were on the person of his wife worth 4 or 5 rupees; they took from her a sum of 8 annas that was tied to the end of her *sari*; and they made her change her clothes in their presence for the purpose of ascertaining that she kept nothing concealed on her person. In consequence of her complaint to the Collector, these things were some months after returned to her under the orders of some superior authority; but there was not even so much as an expression of regret for the indignity and insult to which she had been subjected.

This infamous example does not admit of adequate comment, but we hope that it will be brought before the House of Commons and made the subject of strict enquiry. Again:—

Among the other measures adopted were that Revenue Karkuns with Talatis and Patels went to villages, removed people from their houses, closed the doors, and had iron bars put to them to prevent the doors from being opened. Complaints with reference to these measures were made to the Commissioner, and it was after this that the iron bars were removed, and people were permitted to return to their houses. Till then they had had to wander about without shelter and protection. No indulgence was shown to people, even to persons suffering from an illness. One of the Patels of Sajod was suffering from an illness which confined him to his house; he was also removed under the orders of the Revenue Officers.

Yet another expedient was "to place watchmen at the village wells, and persons were prevented from taking water from these wells until the Government dues were paid." Why, "in some villages the floors of houses of poor people were dug up for the purpose of ascertaining if anything was kept buried under them; but nothing was found." Are these things really credible? Even then, the revenue cannot be collected. The country seems to be absolutely ruined.

The official case is that those who can pay ought to pay, and that there are some who can pay that scheme to evade payment. Yet surely better to let these mean fellows escape than to perpetrate such shocking things as "A Gujarati" recounts and vouches for, and perpetrate them in vain too. Anyhow the official view may be gathered from Lord Northcote's remarks at Poona (July 3) in answer to an address of welcome:—

There is no justification for excusing from their liabilities to the State people who are perfectly well able to meet them. There is evidence that many such people are using every effort to evade their obligations. There have been reported combinations—these combinations amount to conspiracy under the English law, but in this country revenue law—of people known to be wealthy to withhold the revenue; and valuable property, including crops which in this year are of abnormal value, has been removed and concealed to avoid attachment, while people who paid their assessment have been threatened with excommunication. In Ahmedabad, where nearly 10 per cent. of the cultivable area has been irrigated in the current year, only 19.6 per cent. of the revenue has been paid, and in Branch only 14.6 per cent., while in poorer districts, which have suffered not less severely, a large collection with little or no pressure. It is of course impossible for Government to yield to illegal combinations and organised opposition, and people who are subjected to coercive processes have only themselves to blame. As already stated, the district officers have explicit instructions to issue no distraint against occupants of whose ability to pay without borrowing they have reason to doubt.

We very much fear that the truth of these things will never be ascertained. The "reports" are conflicting. What chance is there of a Commission of Enquiry? In any case, these collections of revenue in the midst of unparalleled famine and general destitution, with or without the accessories of violence and insult, cannot but furnish bitter food for reflection in this country.

The special correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* (July 25) deals very fully with the expropriation of the rayat as a cause of famine. The burden of indebtedness has become universal, and where a man has land he has eventually to part with it to the money-lender, who tides him over his recurrent days of difficulty. How has the undoing of the rayat come about? By "Western ideas of property, individual freedom, land speculation, contracts

coupled with Western notions of a fixed and punctual revenue system." "It is we," says Mr. Vaughan Nash, "who have put the rayats into the moneylender's hands." And he goes at length into the facts and the methods of the land revenue system in support of his thesis. Then he comes to this:—

The cultivator of Bombay and the Punjab is made an outcast with the help of the law. To say that the tendencies I have been describing must in the nature of things make for famine is perhaps to labour the obvious. They make for famine at every step in the road from independence to serfdom. . . . Let it be said in passing that under these circumstances to call the rayat improvident is a little hard. . . . We ought to blame our lack of perceptiveness rather than the rayat's simplicity for the wreck of the old economy which has followed.

Will the moneylender, then, as master of the situation, open out a new chapter of prosperity? "Judged by facts, the answer is No, and yet again No." And Mr. Nash clenches his argument "with chapter and verse from the official side." The case is too painful for us to feel any elation at such independent confirmation of what we have been urging for years and years.

Naturally Mr. Nash turns to the Punjab Alienation Bill, whose significance, he says, "lies in the fact that it marks the determination of the Government to go to the root of the matter." Whether this be so or not, we cannot help feeling that this is not the most likely way to get to the root of the matter, and that in any case it is a roundabout way, involving not only delay but also the painful incidents of a questionable experiment. Anyhow we note Mr. Vaughan Nash's collection of "the lines of a remedial policy":

(1) The prohibition of land alienation to non-agriculturalists, which is the salient feature of the Punjab Bill. Under this proposal the creditor is permitted no more than a maximum of fifteen years' enjoyment of the mortgaged property, after which it lapses to the debtor.

(2) An elastic system of land revenue fluctuating with seasons and crops, collected at a convenient time, and based on an estimate of what the rayat may reasonably be asked to bear.

(3) The introduction of usury laws as indulgent to the debtor as, say, the Bill for the protection of English debtors which is now passing through Parliament.

(4) The creation of a system of Government credit adequate in point of personnel and finances to assist the agricultural classes in tiding over a time of shortened credit. The moneylenders of the Punjab are threatening a strike, and the people are clearly entitled to look to the Government to see them through a possible crisis.

(5) The extension to the moneylenders' victims of some such Tenancy Act as protects the cultivator of the North-west Provinces; with, ultimately, a scheme, on the lines employed by Lord Cromer in the case of the fellahs, to enable the rayats to buy back their land from the moneylender.

Obviously there is much debateable matter here, but it is well to have on convenient record for future use the conclusions of such an independent, clear-sighted, and judicious observer.

Mr. Justice Ranade recently (June 30) read a very elaborate paper before the Royal Asiatic Society at Bombay, by way of "Introduction to the Peshwas' Diaries." These diaries—or rather the selections from them which Mr. Justice Ranade has been studying for two or three years past—cover a period of over a century (1708–1816–17), and "furnish most valuable materials for constructing a true history of the people of Maharashtra during the most eventful period of their annals." They largely and usefully supplement the ordinary history on the social side, and reveal an amount of governmental activity in matters of social welfare for which the Mahratta State has got little or no credit. They "shed a flood of light upon the real movements, and the hopes and fears, the strength and weakness, of the people for over a century; and for purposes of instruction and guidance they far outweigh the value of narratives of wars and conquests, dynastic changes, and revolutions, which take up so much space in our ordinary histories." We hope that some scholar, with a competent development of the historic sense and of literary capacity, will promptly undertake to work up these materials in a fresh history.

The larger measures of statesmanship, constitutional, military and naval, are most interestingly illustrated. At the present moment it may be useful to note specially what Mr. Justice Ranade says on one or two points of the revenue system. Thus:—

The system of revenue management under Balaji Bajirao, Mad-

harao, and Nana Fadnavis, was, on the whole, careful. New sources of revenue were developed, and the whole improved. The land settlements made by the Peshwas during this period show that, while anxious not to oppress the rayats, every care was taken to insist on the rights of the Government. Whenever the country needed that relief, leases varying from three to seven years were granted on the terms of "istawas," i.e., gradually increasing assessments. The old "Kamal" figures (maximum amounts ever realised) of village and Pargana revenues were, of course, seldom collected, and were never meant to be realised. These amounts were reduced by the Government so as to suit the conditions of the population and general prosperity in fixing the "Tankha" or realisable revenue under the Mahometan rule, and the Peshwas made large reductions in the "Tankha" figures, whenever, owing to war or famine, enquiries showed that the complaints were reasonable. Wherever the Batai, or system of crop division obtained, the Government, after deducting seeds and other necessary charges paid by the rayats, left half or one-third of the crop to the cultivator, and took the rest for the State. In Shiwaji's time, the proportions are stated to have been three-fifths to the rayat and two-fifths to the Government.

Further, "large remissions were made whenever the seasons were found to be unfavourable." "The general impression left on one's mind by the study of the revenue portion of the record in these diaries," says Mr. Justice Ranade, "is, on the whole, very favourable, and it will be difficult to show that there has been, during the last eighty years, any decided improvement in this respect." It is also evident from Mr. Ranade's notes that the diaries contain illustrative matter of very high value on the various subjects of law and justice.

The *Hindu* draws attention to the extraordinary ignorance of Indian life shown by Lord George Hamilton when he compared the number of those on famine relief works in India with the number of paupers in England. Now, as Mr. Malabari has pointed out, it is impossible to succour all in need of help without having many more small local relief works; so that the number on relief, where only great central works exist, is no criterion of the number needing relief. Still more unfounded was the inference which his Lordship drew from the absence of pauperism in good years—the inference that India was an exceptionally prosperous country; for he thereby ignored the universal system of private charity which exists in India.

The real cause of the absence of pauperism in India is that there every man thinks it "a religious duty to support his poor relatives and dependents, and to give alms to every beggar who comes to his door."

This explains the fact that we have not felt the need of a Poor Law in this country. We have our poor always with us, and in much larger numbers than can be found in Western countries; but they cause no trouble to the State, because the people have been always accustomed to do here what the State does in other countries.

The Indian Joint Family has long been an object of attack on the part of Englishmen, and especially Englishwomen, who want to "reform" Indian habits, whether the Indians will or no. It is somewhat unfair for English public men to claim as a sign of Indian prosperity under English rule the effects of the victory which their countrymen are so ready to flout.

The *Advocate of India* has been studying the latest Railway Administration Report, and is not at all enamoured of railway expansion. Of course, there is something in the well-worn claim of "moral" blessings conferred by means of railways. But how is it with the figures, on a purely financial basis? Last year there were 45 lines, directly owned and managed by the State, whose capital outlay, up to December 31 last, was 110-18 crores; and there were 10 State lines leased to companies, the capital outlay on these being 52-83 crores. Now what have these lines, costing in the aggregate 163 crores to start with, gained for the taxpayer? The answer is—"absolutely nothing." Nay, less than nothing; for "the aggregate losses" on them since the date of their construction "now reach the colossal figure of 45-98 crores," and the gains to balance these losses amount to but 7-53 crores (gathered from the Rajputana-Malwa and the Eastern Bengal and five small lines); so that the missing crores number 38-45. Among the losing lines "that white elephant of the North-Western Railway" stands prominent. "Its capital is 49-69 crores, and it has obligingly managed to lose 24-26 crores for the taxpayer since the date of its construction." It is thus responsible for more loss than all the other losing lines lumped together. But then, it is always said, consider how magnificent an "insurance" it is against external

aggression. The *Advocate of India*, however, recalls the remark of Sir Theodore Hope, that military and strategic railways are just as much instruments for facilitating the rapid march of a victorious external enemy as for repelling external aggression. But we are wont to keep our eye on only one side of the possibilities.

The *Hindu* quotes from the *Kolar Gold Fields News* a report of the case of John Beers, a European, who was charged with wounding fifteen Indians by shooting into a crowd assembled for the festival of the *Mohurrum*. Tried by a European magistrate, his defence that he was shooting "in fun" was so far accepted that he was only fined thirty rupees, or two rupees for each person injured. The *Hindu* points out one anomaly, viz., that while the district is within the jurisdiction of Mysore, the only court to which an appeal will lie is the High Court of Madras.

The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* believes that the recent measures introduced by Lord Curzon for the prevention of shooting accidents are of even more importance to the soldiers than the villagers. They can hardly fail in the end to allay the ill-feeling that has hitherto existed and so to restore to the British soldiery one of the few healthy pastimes open to them in India.

The following remark of Mr. Justice Prinsep, made in the course of a judgment on a petty case, and reported by the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, deserves to be held in remembrance:—

Every Judicial Officer in the country should by all means try to avoid creating prejudice in the minds of the people against the administration of justice.

The *Hindu* believes that the present Resident in Travancore is anxious that more Europeans should be employed there and it asks:—

Why a model Native Prince like his Highness the Maharaja of Travancore, whose administration of that Province has evoked the genuine eulogy of successive Governors of Madras and successive Viceroy, cannot be left in undisturbed possession of patronage of this kind?

A former British Resident is reported to have said, "Natives lack moral force of character and your Highness should employ more Europeans." Yet in spite of the advice being neglected, Travancore has been well governed and prosperous. Now there are evident signs of an attempt to increase the number of Europeans employed in the higher posts of administration. As the *Hindu* says, there is no objection to the Resident giving advice, but there should be no suspicion of insistence.

One of the advantages which the Government of a Native State has over that of British India is that reforming laws are viewed by its subjects with less suspicion. This is well shown by the Mysore law for the prevention of Infant Marriages. The *Hindu* says:—

The Mysore Government has been both cautious and watchful in the matter of administering the law, and people, we believe, have become fully reconciled to it. In British India the enactment of a like law would have been most strenuously and bitterly opposed, while in Mysore the new law was accepted without much opposition. This striking difference is due, we think, to the fact in one case that the law would be harshly administered, and in the other to the confidence that it could be worked with moderation and sympathy.

In the four years 1895-1899 there were 123 convictions under the law—sixty persons were sentenced to fines of Rs.10 and under, forty-five to fines of more than Rs.10, and eighteen to imprisonment.

A recent lecture by Mr. Nair, itself somewhat extravagant in its condemnation of caste, gave the Bishop of Bombay, who was present, an opportunity for a good suggestion. Remarking that difference of language had something to do with keeping English and Indians apart as well as the caste system, and that most Englishmen, if they knew the vernaculars at all, only knew just enough to express themselves in the imperative mood, the Bishop went on to propose that instead of compelling the Indians to learn English, the Government should compel Englishmen coming out to India to learn at least one of the languages of the country. Unfortunately, there are many vernaculars, and the Government in making the Indians learn English have provided them with an instrument by which they could express their grievances with one voice.

A NATIONAL FAMINE GRANT.

SIR WILLIAM WEDDEBURN, who was the first to moot the subject of a National grant for the charitable purposes of famine relief in India (April 3), has placed on the Order Paper of the House of Commons the following Notice of Motion:—

That, looking to the special needs of the famine-stricken people in India on the approach of the monsoon, this House recognises that funds are urgently required to feed, clothe, and house the cultivators in their villages until their crops are ripe; to provide them with plough cattle, seed, and other requisites of cultivation; and to restore them to their normal economic condition; that these requirements cannot be adequately met from Indian revenues raised from the suffering Indian people, and within the necessarily restricted field of ordinary relief operations; that the funds subscribed by charity are altogether insufficient for these purposes; and this House is therefore of opinion that an Imperial free grant of not less than five millions sterling should be provided to assist in meeting this unprecedented calamity.

We announced this important fact in our last two issues, and we understand that an opportunity of moving will be found in the course of the "debate" on the Indian Budget. Mr. Robinson Souttar, who has obtained first place in the ballot, has adopted the motion.

Let us once more look around the situation on which the proposed motion is based. "Here is one half of the whole area of the Indian Empire, containing one third of the whole population, prostrated helplessly, and beyond all historical parallel, by famine and plague, and the frightful diseases and distresses that follow in their train. The monsoon, which arrived tardily, has considerably disappointed expectation. It was due a month ago, and still the rainfall is far from being sufficient in many wide stretches of territory. In Gujerat, Kathiawar, Baroda, and Rajputana West, the Viceroy's telegram of this week informs us, "cultivation is at a standstill for want of rain, and fodder is almost unprocurable." In North Gujerat, the Governor of Bombay reports, the "rainfall is, as yet, inconsiderable, and causes serious anxiety." Instead of showing a rapid and material diminution, the numbers in receipt of relief are higher now than they have ever been in any week of the famine: they are officially given at 6,281,000. The deaths on relief works and on gratuitous relief, in the British districts alone, are given as 6,435; and there can be no reasonable doubt that the vast majority are directly or indirectly attributable to the famine. Cholera has established a weekly toll of some 12,000 lives a week, the larger half in British districts; and this dreadful mortality must also be traced to the prevalence and severity of the famine. As for the cattle, we have already seen that they have been swept away in millions—in some districts, one and all; in Rajputana, 90 per cent., so long ago as April; in Gujerat and elsewhere in the Bombay Presidency, 75 per cent., so long ago as May. "There had never," says Mr. Vaughan Nash, "been anything like such devastation." Can it be possible that such a terrible picture of distress needs to be elaborated in detail in order to satisfy the British public of the unparalleled calamity that has fallen upon our fellow-subjects in India?

Now that the monsoon has appeared, every cultivator will be anxious to be at the plough. Except in Gujerat, Kathiawar, Baroda, and Rajputana West, the Viceroy reports "autumn sowings are being actively prosecuted and germinating well." The statement is general, and one would like to know how the sowings have been prosecuted on the lands of the six million and a-quarter persons that are yet on relief, and whether such sowings are germinating well. It seems impossible to doubt that there will be a formidable diminution of the acreage under crops in the famine districts this year. It is not only that there are admittedly such a large number still on relief, and a vastly larger number, of whom we never hear a syllable, dragging out a painful life on the very verge of relief conditions; but there is the further consideration that the sowings cannot be adequate in the absence of some three-fourths of the cattle. How can it be possible that an average crop can be raised when the cultivators are physically enfeebled, or even not present on their land, and three out of every four of the plough cattle are dead, and the surviving beasts are only with the utmost difficulty kept in bare life? Really when we are reassured about the active prosecution of autumn sowings and the satisfactory germination of the crops we ought to have some feasible explanation of the extent of the beneficent process, and of

the means whereby it has been effected. Even in the Central Provinces, where the famine administration has proved a conspicuous success, "a Native gentleman of influence, who is held in the highest respect by Indians and Englishmen"—the Secretary to the Central Provinces Branch of the Famine Charitable Fund—was reported by Mr. Vaughan Nash (Bilaspur, May 31) as having written this statement (INDIA, vol. xiv, p. 1, July 6, 1900):—

There is absolutely no money left with the majority of the cultivators to buy seed, buy or hire bullocks to plough their fields, and to pay the other expenses of cultivation, and to feed themselves and their families between the sowing and the earliest harvest. . . . For the cultivators are in most tracts simply bankrupts, without cattle, without money, and without credit.

We must accept this as a substantially correct account of the rayats in the Central Provinces, and it would require more faith than we can muster to believe that the rayats in any of the other afflicted districts are in any better position. There seems, then, in spite of the hopeful suggestion of the Viceroy's telegram, to be no room to question that the basis of the Indian Parliamentary Committee's motion is absolutely solid.

The object is "to restore the people to their normal economic condition." That object, as we have already insisted, cannot be accomplished too promptly or too liberally. The Secretary of State may carry the House with him in one of his optimistic flourishes, but there will still be awaiting him the unspeakable nemesis of a breakdown of the land revenue, and almost certainly a recurrence of famine on a yet larger scale, which will indeed "stagger humanity." If these too probable results of niggardly treatment now are well before the minds of members of the House, they will take care to scrutinise with independent severity the representations of Lord George Hamilton. There is no question here of the capacity or efficiency of the Government officers, or even of the good intentions of the Government itself. Not a single critic has a word to say against the one or the other. The one simple question is—How to restore the people to their normal economic condition? There is no room for a division of party opinion; it is a truly Imperial question, if ever there was or could be an Imperial question. Clearly, the only solution is—money. Not that even money—not even the whole Imperial Exchequer—can at once furnish the people with the normal strength of cattle. But all that money can do ought to be done, and must be done. It is still "a famine of money." The efforts of charity, which after all have been tolerably successful in the face of India Office discouragement, can go but a very short way in supplement of the efforts of the Government of India within the sphere to which it has strangely limited itself. They are, as the motion expresses it, "altogether insufficient" for the purposes in view; and it is quite patent that even the appeal of the Viceroy has exhausted its force. The liberality of the Indian Government towards the rehabilitation of the rayat has, as yet declared, been restricted to less than a million and a quarter of tens of rupees—a little over £800,000. To the amazement even of the *Times* of India, Lord George Hamilton professes to rely upon the ordinary borrowing powers of the Indian Government in England, and to intend to exhaust these before accepting "assistance" from the Imperial Exchequer. It is but little wonder that our Anglo-Indian contemporary is driven to suppose that the Minister's statement does not cover "the whole field of ministerial intention." To relieve the present terrible stress of the naked, famishing, rupeeless, creditless cultivator, it does seem an abhorrent expedient to load him with yet more debt—abhorrent to anyone not saturated with the commonplaces of officialism. Surely it is the very nadir of Imperialism.

There remains, therefore, but one prompt and effective method of saving India—and the British Empire in India—from a future disaster of measureless consequence. That method is that the House provide, as the motion indicates, "an Imperial free grant of not less than five millions sterling to assist in meeting this unprecedented calamity." Left to itself, uncontrolled by the party whip, the House would no doubt vote such a grant without hesitation; and certainly the vote would meet with cordial approval throughout the country. In spite of the large demands for the deplorable war in South Africa, it will scarcely be argued that Britain is unable to afford such a contribution. Was it not the *Times* that said the South African war had not touched, and was not likely to touch, more than the fringe of the vast wealth of the country?

And, as Sir Henry Fowler pointed out (April 3), a nation which could pour into the national Exchequer, unexpected by its guardian, and without any increase of taxation, the difference between 116 millions and 120 millions sterling is a nation that can afford to be generous. The House will surely recognize the mere duty that lies upon it and upon the British public. Sir Henry Fowler himself put it to the House (April 3) "that as a nation we owe a duty to India as a great branch of our Empire"; and since then that duty has been ominously emphasised by the course of events. Besides, "as India has so promptly and generously responded to the appeals made to her at this crisis on behalf of the Empire," Sir Henry thought, and no doubt still thinks, "the Empire should do something, not in return but in acknowledgment and in reciprocation of the feeling of sympathy which India has so marvellously displayed." The grace of the expression of our sympathy has been somewhat dimmed by delay; but it is not yet too late. "The moral advantage of such an act," said Sir Henry Fowler, "would far outweigh the amount voted: There are fortifications much stronger than either arms or artillery." Yet cogent as are all these considerations, the weightiest argument of all, if the Government could but look beyond their dread of enquiry and see it in its true proportions, is the very practical question of self-preservation. For, if the rayats are not re-established effectively so as to maintain the revenue till the necessary re-adjustments be made, the question will have gone irrevocably beyond the temporary buttressing of the rayats' position, and touched vitally upon the very permanence of the British Indian Empire.

MR. NAOROJI'S VICTORY.

THE debate which took place in the House of Lords on Friday, July 20, is very important, not only because of Lord Northbrook's pronouncement in favour of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, and of the repayment of what has been unjustly demanded in the past, but also because of the promise of the Government to contribute over a quarter of a million yearly to redressing the balance which has so long been inclined against India; and because of the weighty words of Lord Salisbury on the burdens involved in empire. The debate, therefore, is one that demands our attention, especially seeing that the more powerful and popular assembly has not yet found an opportunity to discuss these matters. Mr. Naoroji's victory has begun.

Lord Northbrook began by recounting how the Government of India had been protesting for twenty-five years against the apportionment of the military charges; and how a small Commission over which he presided had, after sitting for ten years, unanimously decided that India should only pay in accordance with the number of effective British troops serving in that country. He then called attention to the dispatch of Lord Lansdowne, signed also by Lord Roberts, in which it was said:—

Millions of money had been spent on increasing the army of India, on armaments and fortifications to provide for the security of India, not against domestic enemies, or to prevent the incursions of the warlike peoples of adjoining countries, but to maintain the supremacy of British power in the East. The scope of all these great and costly measures reaches far beyond Indian limits, and the policy which dictates them is an Imperial policy. We claim, therefore, that in the maintenance of the British forces in this country a just and even liberal view should be taken of the charges which should legitimately be made against Indian revenues.

As Lord Northbrook pointed out, the Treasury had this despatch of Lord Lansdowne's before them in 1890. They might, therefore, have very well introduced a new apportionment in 1893. As it is, with the Report of the new Commission only lately issued, nothing can well be done before 1901 at the earliest, so that India has had to pay a sum of near £300,000 per annum for eight years which the Commission thought she ought not to have paid, and which she would not have paid if the Treasury had given effect to the views of Lord Lansdowne. Under these circumstances, it seems only right that India should receive not only justice in the future, but recompense for the past, and Lord Northbrook boldly claimed that a sum of £2,400,000 should be paid to India, or rather that £2,400,000 of the Indian debt should be taken over by this country.

In his reply, Lord Onslow, while he ignored this sugges-

tion of repayment, declared that the Government intended in the future to pay a quarter of a million, or more, of the charges which now fall on India. He concluded by saying:—

Her Majesty's Government desire to treat India, not only equitably, but liberally; and if time were given them they hoped to give effect to other recommendations of the Royal Commission.

The recommendations of the Commission were neither drastic nor revolutionary. As Lord Welby said, in the course of the debate, "It was composed largely of officials who were conscious of one another's infirmities." But there were some arrangements so flagrantly inequitable that even a Commission so disinclined to unnecessary interference could not refrain from suggesting changes, and these changes, involving a yearly saving to India of at least £250,000, have now been accepted by the British Government. Small as the sum may be, and inadequate as may be the justice now to be rendered to India, it will be received with thanksgiving, if only as a sign that the ears of her rulers are not closed for ever.

If, however, some satisfaction could be found even in the limited promises of Lord Onslow, a very different feeling is aroused in perusing the words of Lord Kimberley. The leader of the Opposition in the House of Lords, after endorsing all that Lord Onslow had said in favour of delay, went on to remark:—

It was said that the object of the expenditure of millions of money on the army of India was to maintain the supremacy of the British power in the East, and that this policy which dictated the whole treatment of India by this country was an Imperial policy. But India was part of the Empire, and consequently she must bear her share of the Imperial burden.

India, according to Lord Kimberley, has not been unjustly treated in the past. As to the recommendation of arbitration as a means of deciding the apportionment of charges, he will have none of it. And if the British army in India is a reserve for England, so is the English army a reserve for India. This last point was seen and met in the Report of the Commissioners, who showed how many more times England had drawn on India in the hour of adversity than India on England. But even Lord Kimberley wound up by urging "a liberal and generous view" of the question of apportionment:—

He thought we ought not to be too stiff in dealing with financial questions which arose between us and India. The soundest policy of this country was to treat our fellow-subjects in India in a wise and generous spirit.

The most important speech, however, was made by the Marquis of Salisbury. The *Times*, in its report of the debate, declares, indeed, that his remarks were almost inaudible in the gallery, but enough was heard to afford considerable matter for reflection to all Imperialists. Early in his speech he remarked:—

It was very desirable that the treatment of India should be generous and liberal, because, as one reason, the mass of the people of that country were much more struggling and suffering than the mass of the people here.

But a moment later, he boldly faced the contrast between our treatment of India and the Colonies:—

There was another fallacy in arguing Indian questions which had been pushed too much forward, and that was that we were bound to bear a certain number of expenses on behalf of India, because, as a matter of fact, we had borne similar expenses on behalf of many of our colonies. He could not see the cogency of that argument at all. We had undoubtedly been exceedingly generous in our dealings with the colonies during the past fifty years, but he did not think that by that we incurred the obligation to apply precisely the same rule to every other case that came up for judgment, or that we were bound to discharge this or that claim on the part of India, because we had discharged a similar claim on the part of our colonies.

But surely the very reason which the Prime Minister had just urged for liberal and generous treatment for India—the poverty of her people—is also a strong reason for her receiving at least as generous treatment as has been meted out to the Colonies. Why is one child of the Empire to be made to pay out of her poverty what is forgiven to another child in her wealth? If we have been "exceedingly generous" to rich Australia, does not every consideration of justice require that we should be at least equally generous to poor India? The *Pall Mall Gazette*, commenting on the debate, puts another face on the matter. We have not made the Colonies contribute to Imperial defence, not because we were generous, but because we had no option; and having covered before the strength of Canada and Australia, we may take advantage of the weakness of India. But if the *Pall Mall Gazette* is right, what hypocrisy is this talk of generosity to the

Colonies which Lord Salisbury indulges in. It would seem that our Empire is established on a basis of making the weak pay, and letting the strong go scot-free.

But Lord Salisbury went on very pertinently to ask whether the burdens of Empire in the East were not growing too heavy for these little islands, and to protest against the United Kingdom being asked to bear the exclusive burden of Empire. It is a pertinent argument, but one that concerns Australia and Canada much more than India. To relieve England at the expense of India, in every way so much poorer, would be too base, and the help obtained would be too trivial. Every friend of India must insist that none of the burdens of Empire shall fall upon her poverty, till the great self-governing Colonies have paid their share to the uttermost farthing.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

WESTMINSTER, Thursday.

NOT even faultless as a syllogism, the argument so carefully constructed by the Chinese Government to prove that the European Ministers are still alive has naturally failed to carry conviction. Confucius, we are told, has said that an Envoy must not be slain. The Chinese officials are Confucians. Therefore the Envoys are alive. The reasoning is a trifle elliptical. There are missing links in the chain, and common sense supplies the reason of their absence. When Mr. Brodrick, addressing the House of Commons the other night, repeated the emphatic assurances of the Governor of Shantung as to the safety of the Legations, the recital was received in silence—the silence of reluctant incredulity. The attitude of Parliament is simply a reflection, though an involuntary one, of the sceptical demeanour of the Foreign Office. Until a message signed and dated by Sir Claude Macdonald or other British official, or a telegram in the Downing Street cipher, has been received by Lord Salisbury no credence is to be given to the pious protestations of the mandarins. A letter from Sir Claude was communicated to the Foreign Office on Tuesday night, but as its date was July 4—two days earlier than the date of the alleged massacre—the document unfortunately threw no fresh light on the situation. All that it did was to show that despite the “ceaseless solicitude” which the Chinese authorities claim to have exercised on behalf of the Ministers, more than a hundred men of the foreign garrison had then been killed and wounded, while the survivors were in momentary peril of destruction.

India's generosity to England knows no bounds. When Lord George Hamilton rose in the House of Commons on Monday night to reply to a question relating to hospital accommodation for our troops in China, members were unable to conceal their perplexity. What had the Secretary for India to do with the military situation at Taku? If they had reflected for a moment they must have admitted that even on general grounds Lord George Hamilton's interposition was excusable. Indeed, it was more than that—it was peculiarly appropriate. British interests in China are supported almost exclusively on Indian bayonets. The connexion between the two Oriental Empires is now so intimate, thanks to the military makeshifts of the British Government, that what is the affair of one is the business of the other. Lord George Hamilton described the hospital arrangements at Wei-hai-wei and Taku just as if he were dealing with the arrangements for another Chitral campaign. Whatever it may have seemed to others, the situation presented no novelty to him. Formerly, it might have been a paradox, but now the times did give it proof.

But the element of paradox was not exhausted in this aspect of the situation. The real reason of Lord George Hamilton's rising was to announce a gift from the Maharaja Sindhia of Gwalior—a princely gift, a munificent gift, as the noble lord kept repeating, a gift of an hospital ship at a cost of twenty lakhs. Members fairly gasped, but not so much at the magnitude of the sum as at the source whence it came. Was the Indian famine a myth? Or was this the subtle Eastern method of shaming England into an emulous liberality? Some of the Irish members expressed their bewilderment in inarticulate noises. They laughed uneasily, quite unable, as it seemed, to decide whether to jeer at the gratitude of the Imperial recipient of India's bounty or to applaud the generous philanthropy of the giver. On the other hand, Lord George Hamilton's acknowledgments were couched

in the superlative degree, and members generally were so far infected by his emotion as to give it the support of their enthusiastic applause. After all, looking at the incident from the narrowest point of view, the Maharaja was dedicating his money to the service of his own countrymen, for as it is the Indian troops that are fighting our battles in China the wounded soldiers on whom his Highness's bounty is to fall will necessarily be Indian too.

With all deference to Mr. Balfour, one may perhaps venture to hope that the hospital arrangements in China may be better managed than they have been in South Africa. If uttered in the House of Commons this mild and amiable sentiment would be condemned by the First Lord of the Treasury as a piece of rancorous heresy. When Mr. Burdett-Coutts, referring to the subject on Tuesday night, so far forgot himself as to suggest that unless expressly guaranteed the protection of the Crown witnesses in humble and dependent positions might hesitate to risk their livelihood by giving evidence against powerful officials, Mr. Balfour could scarcely find words in which to express his scorn of the insinuation. It was an unmerited insult, he hotly declared. Curiously enough, the right hon. gentleman seemed to be quite oblivious to the fact that his own attitude supplied as strong a justification as could be imagined of the soundness of Mr. Burdett-Coutts's argument. Although neither humble nor dependent, the member for Westminster has unquestionably been made to suffer for his outspokenness on the side of truth, one of the most embittered of his detractors being Mr. Balfour himself. If a wealthy member of Parliament is treated as a pariah merely because of his temerity in bringing inconvenient truths to light, what is likely to be the fate of Tommy Atkins who dares to follow suit? Mr. Swift MacNeill supplied the appropriate comment when in his rude and blunt, but terribly truthful way, he exclaimed that the Commission was a farce.

“Clemency to rebels, justice to loyalists”—so runs the alluring motto which Mr. Chamberlain has chosen for his policy in South Africa. The Colonial Secretary speaks of this simple programme as comprising two policies. “How are they to be harmonised?” he asks. The answer reveals a characteristic interpretation of human nature. In effect it comes to this: “Let the loyal community enjoy the reward of its well-doing by basking in the sunshine of other people's misery.” The suggestion may offer little prospect either of moral warmth or of substantial satisfaction to persons whose ethical standard differs from that of Highbury, but it has the great advantage of cheapness. Moreover, it promises to ensure a majority of loyalist votes if not of loyalist voices in Cape Colony; for the method by which Mr. Chamberlain would apply his principle would be to deprive some ten thousand suspected persons of the franchise. “Disfranchisement for life,” he observes complacently, “does not seem to her Majesty's Government to be a very serious punishment for rebellion.” As long as he lives Mr. Chamberlain will seldom allow us to forget that he was once a provincial wirepuller.

A further vote of £11,500,000 on account of “the war in South Africa and affairs in China” is about to be granted by the House of Commons. More than £10,000,000 of this amount is due to the South African campaign, so that already the repression of the Boer Republics has cost the British taxpayer over £70,000,000. In announcing the coming introduction of the supplementary estimate Mr. Balfour indicated that the vote would be large enough to cover the remaining cost of the war. He has since admitted that he had expected to hear of the termination of the campaign before the end of the present Parliamentary Session, so that in view of the continued activity and repeated successes of the enemy, it may now be assumed that this estimate will be followed by yet another, and that the next will likewise have its sequel. And day by day the toll of lives keeps pace with the financial drain, while laurels won under brighter stars fade on the brows of those whom the nation had accounted invincible.

Despite the disappointing progress of the war, both parties in Parliament are looking forward to a dissolution in October. Ministerialists want a general election before things go from bad to worse, while Liberals, encouraged by the multiplicity of their opponents' blunders, are now almost equally willing to engage in an early struggle. But the last word has yet to be spoken, and as it rests with Lord Salisbury it will be uttered in no impetuous mood.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

[FROM AN INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

BOMBAY, July 6.

A veil of impenetrable darkness seems to hang over India at present. The much looked-for rain does not come, and there are few favourable signs of it. Even the official meteorologist gives no assurance of the near probability of an abundant fall. It is beginning to be realised that the few inches of rain which have fallen in some parts of the country are not really indicative of the true monsoon. Almost the whole of the peninsula is still without the necessary rain. People's minds are filled with apprehension as to a possible second season of severe drought. All is not lost yet, but each day that the rain is delayed aggravates the dismal situation.

As if the situation were not sufficiently alarming, there comes daily, almost hourly, news of the great rebellion in China and of bloodshed and anarchy. The events that are now being enacted there are as tragic as they are ghastly in their details. Fires, rapine, massacres—these seem to be the order of the day. To India all this means further depression of trade. The cotton industry is in as bad a plight as could be imagined. Nine-tenths of the yarn produced in Indian factories finds its way to China. A prolonged Chinese war would mean the virtual extinction of India's export trade with that country. The civil war in South Africa had no anxieties of this kind for India. As yet the tragic drama is unfolding itself. We are in the midst of the scenes of the first act. When the *finale* may be reached, and what it may reveal, none can presage. Verily, for India there could not be a more dismal situation than the present. All seems dark—a temporary eclipse without any hope of day.

If one assumes that the worst happens, then what will be the financial and economic condition of this unhappy country? How is the Government of India to cope with a second year of famine? How long does the Viceroy, able and courageous as he is, expect to carry on famine relief operations with the aid of private charity? How long will he continue to depend on foreign alms and indigent doles? Is there to be no courageous and bold departure in coping with famine? Are you still to run in the old groove? Are you still to starve all public works, clog the wheels of current administration, in order that you may fulfil the financial dogma of paying for famine expenditure from revenue? What prevents the Imperial Government from defraying all ordinary and extraordinary expenditure on famine from loans? Is India to go abegging for charity every time that a famine occurs? What, then, becomes of the so-called financial "indebtedness" of the country? If you can borrow millions at a time, for purposes the most doubtful, why should you refrain from borrowing for a purpose the most benevolent, and one which the country itself demands? Of what use are appeals after appeals to Lord Mayors and other dispensers of civic alms in other countries? When will the Imperial Government cease to send the hat round?

Meanwhile the public and the press here have been strenuously urging on the Bombay Government the imperative urgency of giving large remissions of revenue to the much-suffering rayats in Gujerat and in the Deccan. The Presidency Association have submitted a well-reasoned Memorial on the subject. Another deputation of the Deccan Sabha, who waited on Lord Northcote on the 2nd instant with an address of welcome, also referred to the matter. His Excellency, like the open-minded administrator that he is, embraced the opportunity to make a full statement of the policy of his Government with regard to the future of the famine-afflicted rayat. So far he took the public into his confidence, which was an act worthy of his position. So much public criticism has lately been directed to this topic that Lord Northcote might have been considered wanting in his duty had he failed to make any declaration of policy till all interest in the matter had exhausted itself. So far we have had nothing but praise for his Excellency. The same praise cannot be given to his utterances. As to the penal maximum wage, it is better now to draw a veil over it. It is well known, though not yet publicly declared, that that harsh and unjustifiable system has had to be abandoned under stress of public opinion. But for Lord Northcote to persist in saying that his Government was not actuated to resort to it by any sense of economy is inexplicable. What, then, was the object of the notorious Circular of Mr. Holderness? I pass over his

lordship's exposition regarding relief works for the rayats nearer home. He is obliged to recognise the inadequacy of superior officials to supervise the relief operations entrusted to the village patels and others—a class by no means impeccable. But why is the superior staff inadequate? And why cannot it be increased? If an adequate staff could carry out the system of relief operations nearer the homes of the famished, why should there be hesitation to employ such a staff? Here again economy comes in the way. Can the Government deny that it is this cheese-paring policy alone which prevents the engagement of an adequate staff of superior men? Yet all the State railways (excluding the East Indian) have managed to lose for the taxpayer fully one crore of rupees during 1899. The State can bear with equanimity this loss, of which the general public have no knowledge, though the official *Gazette* gives it to us in black and white. (Those interested in the financial operations of State railways should refer to the table appended to the *Gazette of India* of June 30 last.) The State can quietly bear this loss, and yet it has not the heart to employ an adequate staff whereby greater good nearer home might be rendered to the famished? How will the British public characterise this policy? The additional staff, if employed, would not cost so much as the crore and more which the Government of India has been annually losing in managing its State railways. The net loss, according to the table just referred to, has been thirty-eight crores in thirty years.

Lastly, the answer which Lord Northcote has been led into giving regarding the popular demand for liberal remission of land revenue arrears, is, I regret to say, very disappointing, if not wholly unsatisfactory, and full of the sophistry of the Bombay Revenue Department. A grudging promise of a qualified character is made so far as the Deccan rayat is concerned. But no promise is held out as regards Gujerat. We are preached a homily on the grave administrative sin of encouraging the well-to-do who are now, it is alleged, attempting to defraud the revenue. Even if we admit for argument's sake that there are a class of fraudulent men in Gujerat who want to escape their just dues, what is their number? And can that number bear any comparison to the majority of many thousands who have no larger holdings than seven acres or thereabout, who stand in great need of liberal remissions, but whom the underlings of the Revenue Department even now vex and annoy and try to oppress by collecting dues in a way that scandalises the Administration? I am not speaking without book. The representative of the *Manchester Guardian* has already referred to the fact from his own personal observation, and two correspondents of the *Times of India*, which continues to hammer away most admirably at this pressing problem of the hour, give specific instances of the way in which revenue is collected. One of them "Gujarati" gives such startling instances as to bring blood to the cheeks of honest folk. It is matter of the greatest regret that in face of such known facts as that almost the whole of the agricultural cattle in Gujerat have perished, the Bombay Government should yet be so relentless as to refuse remissions to the rayats of that locality.

I cannot close this letter without referring to the learned, elaborate, and exhaustive lecture delivered the other day before the Bombay branch of the Royal Asiatic Society by the Hon. Mr. Justice Ranade, on the polity of the Government of the Mahrattas or Peshwas during the hundred years ending with 1816. The versatile talents of Mr. Ranade are well known. Whatever subject he handles, he stamps with his own individuality.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

6,281,000 ON RELIEF.

The Secretary of State for India has received the following telegram from the Viceroy:—

"Monsoon continued favourable in week, except in Gujerat, Kathiawar, Baroda, and Rajputana (West), where cultivation at a standstill for want of rain and fodder almost unprocureable. Elsewhere autumn sowings being actively prosecuted and germinating well.

"Number on relief works and gratuitous relief rising in Gujerat, where relief of all kinds has been greatly expanded and establishment strengthened in view of the

prolonged drought and low condition of the people; cholera still prevails badly there and famine campaign indefinitely protracted. Kitchen relief general in Central Provinces to carry poorest classes on till crops ripen.

"Numbers of persons in receipt of relief:—Bombay, 1,559,000; Punjab, 184,000; Central Provinces, 2,029,000; Berar, 537,000; Ajmere-Merwara, 141,000; Rajputana States, 476,000; Central India States, 135,000; Bombay Native States, 480,000; Baroda, 101,000; North-Western Provinces, 4,000; Punjab Native States, 42,000; Central Provinces Feudatory States, 61,000; Hyderabad, 500,000; Madras, 15,000; Bengal, 17,000. Total, 6,281,000."

The following telegram has been received from the Governor of Bombay:—

"Following are figures for week ended July 14:—Famine-stricken districts.—9,876 cases of cholera, of which there were fatal 6,322. Native States: Cases of cholera 9,740; deaths from cholera, 6,617. Total number of deaths among number on relief works and gratuitous relief, British districts, 6,435, or four and one-tenth per mille.

"Rainfall as yet quite inconsiderable and causes serious anxiety in North Gujarat, where the numbers demanding relief have continued to increase. Cattle mortality increasing, and unless rain falls within a short time and in sufficient quantities to admit of the ordinary cultivation being carried on the consequences cannot fail to be very serious. Rainfall has been generally sufficient for agricultural purposes in the remainder of the affected tracts."

The following was issued from the India Office on Saturday:—

The Secretary of State for India has received the following telegram from the Viceroy on the subject of the famine, dated July 20:—

"Your telegram of July 13. In Bombay crops reported to be above average; promising in Carnatic, Eastern Decan, Kongkan, and elsewhere south of Nerbudda. North of Nerbudda, in Gujarat, Kathiawar, Baroda, rainfall to date insufficient for sowings, except in few places. Food crops sowing is not possible after August 1, cotton sowing is not possible after August 15. In Central Provinces there has been excellent rain lately, sowing being actively prosecuted; if monsoon continues favourable in cultivated area will fall short only in Nagpur and Chattisgarh. Prospects encouraging. Crops are promising in Berar. Sufficient rain has fallen in Hyderabad, but want of cattle felt. In Rajputana rainfall has been generally sufficient for agricultural purposes, save in Jaicalmor, South-west Marmar, Sirohi, Bikaner. The Rajputana cropping will fall short, owing to heavy mortality among cattle. In Central India present agricultural prospects generally satisfactory. In Punjab sufficient rain has fallen for sowings, but more rain is needed everywhere. In Mysore some anxiety in places, but no distress is yet reported. In Madras sowings normal. Bengal and Burma prospects good. North-Western Provinces and Oudh have now received rain sufficient for sowings, and no anxiety is felt at present."

The Secretary of State for India has received (July 25) the following telegram from the Governor of Bombay:—

"Rainfall has been generally sufficient for agricultural purposes in Surat and Southern Gujarat States. Some rain has fallen in parts of Broach, where cotton sowings being actively prosecuted, but more rain is urgently required in Kaira, Ahmedabad, Panch Mahals. Rain not sufficient for agricultural purposes, excepting in a few places. Two and a-half inches of rain have fallen since yesterday, Godhra, Panch Mahals; one in several parts Ahmedabad; over half-inch in parts Khaira; rain sufficient in parts Baroda, adjoining Surat; no rain anywhere in Okhamandal Division, Baroda; rainfall to date insuffi-

cient in the remainder of Baroda, where extensive failure of crops inevitable unless good rain falls in a few days. No rain worth mentioning has fallen in any of the districts of Kathiawar, excepting small area south-east, where also more rain is urgently wanted. Cultivation at a standstill for want of rain in almost the whole province. No signs of rain. Season is far advanced for sowing jowar, staple cereal, but bajri can be still mostly substituted for jowar; still time for cotton. Cattle dying from starvation; scarcity of water increasing day by day. Good falls of rain during the past week where most needed in affected area, Bombay, Decan, and Khandesh. In those tracts agricultural prospects have greatly improved. Statistics of mortality in June show death-rate has decreased in Gujarat nearly one-half as compared with May."

(THROUGH REUTER'S AGENCY.)

SIMLA, July 25.

Mr. Lawrence (Private Secretary), Major the Hon. E. Baring (Military Secretary), and Lieut.-Colonel Penn (R.A.M.C.) will accompany Lord Curzon on his visit to the famine-stricken districts.

Lord Northcote, Governor of Bombay, will confer with the Viceroy, at Ahmedabad, on the conclusion of the tour, which will probably last about ten days. His Excellency may possibly return by way of Rajputana.

Opinions are divided regarding Lord Curzon's decision to visit the famine districts. The strain of the journey, the heat, and the cholera are arguments against it, but a feeling of sympathy and a desire to see matters personally, and to encourage the overworked and wearied officers are arguments in its favour.

Lord Curzon will probably make a tour through Southern India in the autumn.

THE MANSION HOUSE FUND.

The Mansion House Fund for the relief of the Indian famine sufferers amounted on Wednesday night to £336,200.

THE "INVESTORS' REVIEW" FUND.

We take the following from the current issue (July 21) of the *Investors' Review*:—

84, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.
July 13, 1900.

DEAR SIR,—In continuation of my former letter, I beg to state that the Bombay Committee report that, rain having fallen, they are now engaged in arranging for the distribution of the *Investors' Review* Fund on the lines already indicated. In the meantime they have disbursed the following sums:—

Pandarpur Orphanage	Rs. 100
Ahmedabad Orphanage	100
Weavers at Ahmednagar	100
Cultivators at Akalkot, to buy ploughs, seed, etc.	100
Superintendent of native charity at Poona ..	100
Smaller sums	100
Total	Rs. 600

It will be observed that help is being given in various directions, where local knowledge shows the need to be greatest. Owing to the wide discretion allowed by your instructions, the Committee are able, as occasion arises, to supplement the relief given by official agency and by other charitable organisations.—Yours truly,

W. WEDDERBURN.

A. J. Wilson, Esq., *Investors' Review*.

Subjoined is the list and amount of subscriptions received for our little fund up to date. May we again repeat that it is a fund, every farthing of which will be put to good uses, especially in helping the starved cultivators to replace their lost cattle, and that the more help we can give in this direction the sooner will the distressed provinces and Native States—for they cannot be forgotten in the present misery—recover some of their ancient prosperity? Cheques and postal orders should be drawn to A. J. Wilson, crossed Union Bank of London, Famine Fund Account.

LIST OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Amount acknowledged last week	£715 0 6
Rennie Wilkinson, Esq., of Addington, Thrapston ..	5 0 0
Messrs. Taylor, Calvert and Co., Belfast	3 3 0

Total to date £723 3 6

Remittances should be made to Mr. A. J. Wilson, *Investors' Review* office, Norfolk House, Norfolk Street, Strand, W.C.

MR. NAOROJI AT PLUMSTEAD.

[FROM OUR OWN REPORTER.]

On Saturday, July 21, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji addressed the delegates of the Metropolitan Radical Federation, at a meeting held at the Plumstead Radical Club under the Presidency of Mr. James Jeffrey, L.C.C. There was a fairly large attendance.

Mr. NAOROJI, who was heartily cheered, took the following resolution as the text of his speech:—

"RESOLVED:—

"Considering that Britain has appropriated thousands of millions of India's wealth for building up and maintaining her British Indian Empire, and for directly drawing vast wealth to herself; that she is continuing to drain about £30,000,000 of India's wealth every year unceasingly in a variety of ways; and that she has thereby reduced the bulk of the Indian population to extreme poverty, destitution and degradation; it is therefore her bounden duty in common justice and humanity to pay from her own exchequer the costs of all famines and diseases caused by such impoverishment.

"That, therefore, for the present famine and diseases the British Exchequer should pay the whole cost of both saving life and restoring the stricken people to their normal industrial condition and wants, instead of further oppressing and crushing the Indian people themselves to find these costs directly or by loan under the deceptive pretext or disguise of what is called 'the resources of the Government of India,' which simply means squeezing the wretched people themselves.

"That it is most humiliating and discreditable to the British name that other countries should be appealed to or should have to come to Britain's help for relief of Britain's own subjects, and after and by her un-British rule of about 150 years.

"And that for the further prevention of famines and plagues, and to restore prosperity to the Indian people, as well as for benefiting vastly the masses of the British people also, measures must be adopted to put an end to the exorbitant and impoverishing bleeding, by dealing with justice for all expenditures for British interests, and by honourably carrying out the true and declared policy and solemn pledges of the British people, Parliament and Sovereign, by the Act 1833 and her Majesty's Proclamations of 1858, 1877, and 1887."

Dealing with the first part of the resolution, he said it was a pure matter of fact that Great Britain, during the whole period of her connexion with India, had never spent a single farthing of British money on the Eastern Empire. All the great wars which had been engaged in had been paid for by the Indians themselves, and it was India, or rather its Natives, who had given this noble heritage to the British Empire. Indians had also shed their blood in order to maintain and extend that empire. Up to the time of the Indian Mutiny the British Army there never exceeded 40,000 men, while its average strength was from 15,000 to 20,000 men. But the Indian Army of 200,000 was placed at the service of the Empire: it was maintained by India, and it shed its blood for India. Surely those facts required no comment. But that was not all. From the time when Great Britain first obtained territory in India down to the present day it had drawn millions upon millions sterling from that empire. Great Britain had appropriated this Indian wealth, thereby reducing the population to extreme poverty. At the beginning of the century only about 3 millions a year was drawn from India, but now the amount taken away was officially admitted to be about 30 millions sterling annually. This was an open sore, and no country could withstand being bled unceasingly in this manner. (Hear, hear.) As he had said the result had been to reduce the bulk of the Indian population to extreme poverty, destitution, and degradation, and to use the terms of his resolution, it was "Great Britain's bounden duty in common justice and humanity, to pay from her own Exchequer the costs of all famines and diseases caused by such impoverishment." There could only be one ending to this continual bleeding of India. Famine was following upon famine; each visitation was becoming more disastrous, and the present was the most disastrous of the whole century. For from thirty to forty years he had been as one crying in the wilderness against this terrible treatment. He had realised, and he had endeavoured to make the people realise, that a country thus drained must in the end die. Great Britain owed a debt to these poor, wretched, dying people. (Hear, hear.) The British people, through their policy, were the cause of the misery which now prevailed, and the least they could do surely was to try and help the natives of India in their time of terrible distress. The great idea of the Indian Government appeared to be not to let the English taxpayer have any trouble or annoyance in connection with India. The rulers of that Empire seemed to think that the people realise that a taxpayer was called upon to contribute a farthing for the maintenance of India, he would demand to know the reason why India had been treated in the manner she had been. They were well aware, too, that no good reason could be shown for such treatment. Let him give one illustration of the un wisdom of maintaining a running sore. Thirty years ago France and Germany had a deadly struggle. France was beaten and had to pay dearly for it. A heavy burden was imposed upon her, a severe wound was inflicted. But in process of time it healed. France repaid her debt, the wound was closed, and she became as prosperous as ever. Why was not an endeavour made to treat India in the same way? Why, having once drawn from her enormous sums of money, was not the account closed and the natives of India allowed to reap the benefit of the wealth which their country produced? No. The policy was to keep the wound running day after day and month after month, and they might rely upon it that

until the bleeding was stopped India would have no chance of prosperity. It surely was the duty of the British Exchequer, seeing that their policy was responsible for the present famine and disease, to pay the whole cost of saving life and of restoring the stricken people to their normal industrial condition instead of further oppressing and crushing the Indian people themselves by compelling them to find these costs directly or by loan under the deceptive pretext or disguise of what is called "the resources of the Government of India," which simply meant squeezing the wretched people themselves. The term "resources of the Government of India" was a most deceptive one. They had often been told that India had not exhausted her borrowing powers. But what were the facts? The Government of India consisted of Europeans. The Indians had not the slightest voice in the expenditure of a single farthing. They had only to pay, and, before any portion of the taxation exacted from them could be used for the benefit of India, 200,000,000 of rupees were annually devoted to the payment of salaries and pensions of Europeans who constituted the Government of India. The population of England paid 50s. per head, per annum in the form of taxation. The people of India did not even pay 5s. per head; yet, strange to say, they were crushed by a heavier burden of taxation than were the English. The incidence and heaviness of taxation did not depend upon the amount; it depended upon the capacity to bear it; and the fact was that, while English taxation represented from 6 per cent. to 8 per cent. of the taxpayers' income, the taxation in India represented 1s. to 15s. per cent. They all knew how hard it was for a man earning £1 per week to give 1s. out of it. It was far more easy for a man with an income of £1,000 a year to give away £100; and hence it was that the people of India, in their wretchedness and impoverishment, felt so heavily the taxation imposed upon them. Was it not most humiliating and discreditable to the British name that other countries should be appealed to to come to Britain's help for the relief of Britain's own subjects after they had been under British rule for a period of 150 years? British rule was supposed to confer great blessings upon the Indian race. But what had been the results of it? Millions of the people were dying of famine and disease, and scores of millions from year's end to year's end, never knew what it was to have a full meal! As he had been well said it was a shame that our own fellow-subjects should starve while the British Empire was the greatest and richest in the world. In treating India as they were doing they were killing the bird that laid the golden eggs. They were deriving great benefits from India, but those benefits carried with them losses to the Indian people. If they would only treat India honestly, if they would let the English people and the Indian people judge India they would be able to gain ten times as much benefit from India, and those benefits would then carry with them the blessings of the Indian people. More than that, how was the wealth now withdrawn from India distributed? It went into the pockets of the capitalists and the higher classes. It did not benefit the working men of Great Britain. He had no desire to appeal to their selfishness, but he was bound to point out the economic fact that the doing of evil reflected upon all who had a share in it. Now, in England the production represented something like 240 per head per annum. They exported goods to the whole world and the amount of exports was placed at three hundred millions sterling per annum. Upon those exports rested the question of their employment. Their own colonies had slammed the door of protection in their face, European countries had also adopted protective tariffs; so too, had the United States of America, and yet, notwithstanding this fact, Great Britain annually exported produce to the value of three hundred millions sterling. India was the only place where they had perfect freedom of trade, entirely under their own control. But what proportion of the British exports went into that country? Only about three or four million sterling. Why was it that such a small amount was exported to India? Simply because the process of bleeding had been carried on to such an extent that the people had literally no money left with which to buy British produce. Now if, instead of treating the natives of India in this cruel and barbarous fashion, they were to deal with them honestly, what would be the result? Let them remember that the Indians were not a race of savages. Two thousand years ago they were the most civilised nation in the world. And what sort of people were the natives of England when at that period they were discovered by Caesar? (A laugh.) Now the Indians knew how to enjoy the good things of this world, and if they were only allowed to benefit by what they produced they would be able to buy the manufactures of Great Britain. The Government were willing to massacre savages in South Africa in order to find markets for British goods, whereas if they would only develop the resources of India, which with her 300,000,000 of population, they would find ample outlet for their goods, they would soon cease to be any unemployed in India. Thus if they would only adopt an honest policy to India they would benefit ten times to the extent they now did. Nemesis always followed upon unrighteousness, and, as Lord Salisbury once said, "Injustice will bring the nightshade of the earth to ruin." He did not see why England should be an exception to that rule. British rule had given the people security of life and property, but of what value to them if the people meant to starve, or starvation or disease, or of what value to them if the people meant to be murdered for the benefit of Great Britain? The fact was that Indian natives were mere helots. They were worse than American slaves, for the latter were at least taken care of by their masters, whose property they were. All the Indian people asked was that this country should faithfully carry out the terms of the Queen's Proclamation of 1858 which promised that "Our subjects of whatever race or color be freely and impartially admitted to offices in our service the duties of which they may be qualified to discharge." Hitherto the policy of Great Britain had been in distinct contravention of Parliamentary pledges and of the Queen's Proclamation. The romance was that British rule was a blessing to India; the reality was that it was destroying India, and they might depend upon it that the destruction of India must ultimately be followed by the destruction of Great Britain. Let

them alter their policy before it was too late. He very much feared that the present famine would be followed by another famine next year, because the land had become so dry. Things were going from worse to worse, and it behoved the people of Great Britain to arouse themselves, and in the interests of humanity and common justice to adopt such a policy in India as would enable the people to develop the enormous wealth of that country and to enjoy the fruits of their own country. (Loud cheers.)

The resolution was then put to the meeting and unanimously approved, and the chairman was authorised to sign and forward to the Prime Minister a petition embodying its provisions.

Imperial Parliament.

Thursday, July 19.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

Imperial Institute (Indian Section).—Copy presented,—of Annual Report of the Imperial Institute (Indian Section) for the year 1899-1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LOYALTY AND PENAL LEGISLATION.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether, looking to the loyalty and patience manifested by the Indian people while suffering from grievous calamities, and looking to the benefit to Imperial interests from such manifestation at the present time, he would consider whether, by withdrawing recent penal legislation, this loyalty might be recognised, and the Indian people assured of the confidence and appreciation of her Majesty's Government.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The loyalty, courage, and resignation manifested by the Indian people in the face of most grievous calamities are most fully appreciated by her Majesty's Government and by the people of this country, and on more than one occasion both the Viceroy in India and I as Secretary of State in England have given unstinted expression of our admiration of their demeanour and conduct. I do not know what the hon. member means by the withdrawal of recent penal legislation, for during my tenure of office no such legislation has been sanctioned.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN: Does not the noble lord understand that I refer to the law with regard to the press and sedition, which now appear not to be necessary.

Lord G. HAMILTON: If the hon. baronet will be good enough to examine that law, I think he will find it exactly the same as that which obtains in this country.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Remember the case of the Nattu brothers.

THE COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked the Secretary of State for India how long had the office of the Commander-in-Chief in India been vacant, and when was an appointment to be made.

Lord G. HAMILTON: Sir W. Lockhart died suddenly on March 18, and since then General Sir Power Palmer has discharged, as acting Commander-in-Chief, the functions of the office. A permanent appointment will be made before long.

REMISSIONS OF LAND REVENUE.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was aware that in the famine of 1896-97 the Government of the North-West Provinces remitted land revenue to the extent of Rs. 6,000,000, while the Government of Bombay remitted Rs. 15,000.

And, whether, looking to the remarks of the Famine Commissioners of 1898, who approved the liberal remissions in the North-West Provinces as mitigating distress, while taking exception to the course followed in Bombay, he would urge upon the Bombay Government a more liberal policy than that followed by them in 1896-97.

Lord G. HAMILTON: In the North-West Provinces, where the population of the affected districts may be taken to have been 19½ millions, the Government during the famine of 1897-98 remitted revenue to the extent of 6,000,000 rupees; in Bombay, on a population of eight millions, about 800,000 rupees were either remitted or suspended, and 5,003,000 rupees were loaned out to occupiers. The Commissioners point out in their report that the land revenue assessment of the Bombay Deccan is admittedly light; and on the whole I am not prepared to accept without reservation the hon. member's version of their opinion as to the measures taken in the North-West Provinces and in Bombay respectively. So far as the famine is concerned, I have every reason to believe that the Bombay Government are acting in a judicious and liberal spirit towards the cultivators under their jurisdiction. In Gujerat alone the Bombay Government report that they had up to July deliberately left uncollected two-thirds of the land revenue in the affected districts.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN: The noble lord will understand I am referring to remissions and not suspensions?

Lord G. HAMILTON: Quite so.

FAMINE LOANS TO NATIVE STATES.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he was now in a position to specify the amounts advanced by the Government of India to the several Native States by way of famine loans:

Whether, when making each loan, the Government of India ascertained that the State was exercising economy in its general administration, with a view both to the relief of the famine-stricken and the repayment of the loan:

And, whether the Bhamnagar State in Kathiawar applied for a famine loan of 30 lakhs, what was the reason why Bhamnagar, recently prosperous, was now in financial straits, and had the Government of India satisfied itself that this State had reduced all unnecessary expenditure both in India and in England.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The total amount of loans to Native States for relief purposes sanctioned up to the end of May either from Government funds or on Government guarantee was £1,217,000. A list of these loans will be found at the end of the papers presented to Parliament regarding famine relief in Native States, which papers will, I hope, be distributed before the end of next week. The Government of India has repeatedly inculcated strict economy on Native States suffering from famine and applying for financial assistance. Applications for loans to such States and their conduct of relief measures are subjected to such scrutiny and supervision as are possible without undesirable interference. Bhamnagar is undoubtedly a prosperous State; but its Government has recently invested £507,000 in its railways, and had a working cash balance of only £20,000 at the beginning of the year. Owing to the famine its income has shrunk and its expenditure has increased considerably. The net deficit to be met was estimated in March last at £147,000; and so the State applied for and received a large loan from Government. The ways and means of the State, its intended expenditure, and the possible economies to be made were considered by the Government of India before the loan was granted.

THE RAINFALL.

Sir MANCHESTER BHOWNAGORE asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he had official information to the effect of the telegraphic news received since yesterday of satisfactory rainfalls having taken place in the areas affected by the famine; if so, could he give the total of the rainfall since the monsoon set in up to date in the several affected districts, and state if it was regarded as decidedly improving the prospects of the ensuing crops in those parts.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I am glad to say that I have received a report of good rainfalls in most parts of the famine area. The telegram giving this intelligence was dated Simla, July 14, and has been published in the newspapers. But I am afraid I cannot at present give precise figures of the rainfall up to date in the several affected districts.

MORTALITY AMONG CATTLE.

Mr. C. P. SCOTT asked the Secretary of State for India if he could state what, approximately, were the percentages of deaths among the cattle in the famine districts, and what funds were available for the supply of fodder and seed grain to the cultivators in these districts:

And what steps were being taken to secure a supply of fodder for the surviving cattle, and what proportion of the cattle recently supplied to make good previous losses had died from want of fodder.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have no precise figures about the mortality among cattle. We shall learn some months hence what approximately the losses have been in British districts when the yearly returns are made up of the number of cattle alive. No similar returns are made for Native States. The funds at present allotted for the supply of seed grain and cattle to cultivators in British districts are 123 lakhs for advances to cultivators. The charitable funds have also distributed for the same purpose a considerable sum to the poorer cultivators. Strenuous efforts were made in parts of the Bombay Presidency to collect and distribute fodder earlier in the season. Now that rain has come and grass is growing, I do not anticipate that further endeavours in that direction will be required. I am not able to say what proportion of the recently supplied cattle have perished from lack of fodder or from lack of water.

THE FAMINE MEDICAL SERVICE.

Mr. C. P. SCOTT asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the outbreak of cholera in the famine districts of India, any, and, if so, what addition had been made to the famine medical service:

And whether he could state the number of deaths from cholera in the famine districts.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I am not able to state the number of additional medical officers and medical subordinates sent to the famine districts in consequence of the outbreak of cholera. I was informed that as regards the worst cholera tract in the middle of June the local authorities there had received as much extra medical help as they thought necessary. The returns which have reached me show that during the month of June the telegrams stated that 22,193 cholera deaths were reported from British famine districts, and there were

19,122 from Native States similarly afflicted. During the three weeks ended on July 7 the reported cholera deaths averaged 5,562 a week for British famine districts and 6,185 a week for Native States affected by famine.

THE TROOPS SENT TO CHINA.

Mr. MacNEILL asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the expenses of the 22,000 troops withdrawn from the Indian establishment to serve in China would fall on the Imperial or on the Indian Exchequer:

And, whether provision would be made, having regard to the fact that no fewer than 90,000,000 persons in India were affected by the famine now devastating that dependency of the Crown, that the maintenance of the regiments, native or otherwise, now serving out of India be not charged directly or indirectly on the Indian Revenue.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have on several occasions stated that the cost of the Indian troops sent to China will be paid out of the Imperial Exchequer. The number so sent is not 22,000 but less than half that number.

THE YIELD OF NEW TAXES.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would grant a Return showing the amount yielded by new taxation imposed in India in or since the year 1886, and stating in each case the purpose for which such taxation was at the time said to be imposed.

Lord G. HAMILTON: There is no objection to the Motion for the Return which the hon. baronet desires.

Friday, July 20.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

IMPORTANT DEBATE.

AT LEAST £250,000 A YEAR TO BE REFUNDED TO INDIA.

The EARL OF NORTHBROOK called attention to the report of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, asked her Majesty's Government whether they proposed to accept the recommendations of the Commission, and moved for copies of any correspondence between the Secretary of State for India in Council and the Treasury on the subject. He said that the Royal Commission were instructed to inquire into the administration and management of the military and civil expenditure of India, and also into the apportionment of charge between the Governments of the United Kingdom and of India. He, however, proposed to confine his remarks to the second head of the order of reference—namely, the apportionment of charge between the two Governments, and of that apportionment almost entirely to the charge on account of her Majesty's forces serving in India. The history of the question was a rather sad one. For twenty-five years successive Governors-General of India and successive Secretaries of State for India had protested against what they considered to be the excessive charge which had been put upon the revenues of India on account of her Majesty's forces serving in that country. Twenty years ago he was asked by Mr. Stanhope, then Secretary of State for India, to preside over a small Commission to inquire into the subject. After sitting ten years the Commission determined unanimously what the charge to be paid by India should be per effective head of her Majesty's troops serving in India. They then approached the question of a permanent settlement of the matter and requested that they should be supplied with a statement of the opinions of the Governors of India on the subject. A despatch containing those opinions was received, but it was not communicated to his Commission for twelve months after its receipt in this country, and then it was sent accompanied by two letters—one from the Secretary of State for War and the other from the Treasury—stating that the writers were by no means inclined to accept the opinions of the Governors of India upon the subject. So far as his Commission was concerned the matter dropped. Nothing was done until 1895, when Sir Henry Fowler, then Secretary of State for India, appointed a Commission, to the report of which he now drew attention. That Commission issued a majority and a minority report. The minority consisted of Sir W. Wedderburn, Mr. W. S. Caine, and Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji; the majority, of Lord Welby, Chairman, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Jackson, Sir E. Hamilton, Sir R. Knox, Sir J. Peile, Sir A. Sooble, Mr. Ryder, Mr. Buchanan, and Mr. Mowbray. He was perfectly satisfied with the impartiality and ability of those who served, but at any rate the English Government could not say that there was any bias in favour of India. The main features of the report were, first, a plan for settling any questions which might arise as to the charge for troops, English or Indian, lent by either Government to the other. The second was a plan for settling other questions by arbitration—for everyone agreed that both sides should

be heard. He hoped that some plan based upon these recommendations of the Commission would be adopted at once by the Government in order that unfortunate disputes might never occur again. The necessity for such a step was still further established by the present condition of things in South Africa and China. The equitable pleas in regard to this matter mainly depended on Lord Lansdowne's despatch of March 26, 1890, which stated that Indian foreign policy was really determined by Imperial rather than by Indian considerations, and that the Indian army served for Imperial as well as for Indian purposes. What better authority could there be than that of Lord Lansdowne in this despatch, which was signed also by Lord Roberts? He said, "Millions of money had been spent on increasing the army of India, on armaments and fortifications, to provide for the security of India, not against domestic enemies or to prevent the incursions of the warlike people of adjoining countries, but to maintain the supremacy of British power in the East. The scope of all these great and costly measures reaches far beyond Indian limits, and the policy which dictates them is an Imperial policy. We claim therefore, that in the maintenance of the British forces in this country a just and even liberal view should be taken of the charges which should legitimately be made against Indian revenues." The Commission suggested that the two main recommendations should be considered when the capitation rate was revised; but they recommended an immediate and substantial relief of about £300,000 a year. For his part he was quite ready to accept arbitration, with the reservation that India should receive proper consideration for the great delay in the settlement of her claims. The Treasury had Lord Lansdowne's report before them in 1890, and the question might have been settled in 1893. Now it could not be settled before 1901. In his opinion India was entitled to consideration in that respect, and he did not think it was too much to ask that eight years' arrears of this £300,000 should be given to India. It was a mere trifle. Those eight years of arrears amounted to £2,400,000, and if £2,400,000 of the Indian debt was taken over by this country it would only add a charge of £66,000 a year to the British Exchequer. He hoped her Majesty's Government would be able to give an assurance that equitable treatment would be given to India in this matter. If the treatment he had suggested was carried out by the Government he felt sure that it would be exceedingly well received in India, (Hear, hear.)

Lord WELBY said that the recommendations of the Commission were entitled to the utmost consideration, but they must hold a just balance between the claims of the Indian taxpayer and the claims of the British taxpayer. In regard to the recommendations which the noble earl had mentioned the Commissioners were unanimous. From 1861 to 1884 the taxes of India were largely increased, but at the end of that period they had fallen to the level of the taxes before the Mutiny broke out. That was the result of remarkable economy both in regard to civil and military administration. He thought the history of financial administration in India between 1861 and 1884 was very remarkable, and was paralleled in very few countries in the world. From 1884 to 1896, owing to the fall in exchange and the demands for military expenditure, the taxation which had been remitted was reimposed. It should, however, be mentioned that but for the fall in exchange the natural growth of the Indian revenue was so satisfactory that after the increased demands for military expenditure had been met there would have been left a considerable surplus applicable to the reduction of the debt. The Commission was struck by the satisfactory natural growth of revenue, showing, on the whole, a healthy state of things in the Empire, but it appeared to them that the increase was not more than might naturally be expected in the case of a growing Empire. The Commission did not come to its enquiry with any foregone conclusion. It was composed largely of officials who were conscious of one another's infirmities. The report of the Commission deserved weight because it was unbiased and unprejudiced. During the forty years that India had been under the rule of her Majesty, her financial administration had been entrusted to faithful stewards. The system under which the finances of India were administered was sound, and one in which Parliament might fairly have confidence. The large growth of the non-effective service struck the Commission, and they considered the Indian Government ought to subject the regulations relating to that service to careful enquiry. The audit system of India would not be satisfactory until the independence of the Comptroller, and Auditor-General was completely established. Although the recommendations of the Commission fell short in many respects of the desires of the Indian Government their adoption would go far to remove just grounds of complaint.

The EARL OF ORSLOW said that the noble earl who brought forward the motion before the House had very wide experience of the administration of Indian affairs. The evidence given by the noble earl before the Commission has led to, perhaps, the most valuable part of the report which their lordships were now considering. Lord Welby expressed the hope that the Government would accept the report as the decision of a competent and judicial tribunal. So far, at any rate, as that part of it was concerned which dealt with the history of

the finances and administration of India, he had no complaints whatever to make, and he certainly was prepared to accept entirely the opinions which they had arrived at. The Commission took evidence for upwards of two years, and they were something like three years in considering what should be their report. In these circumstances it could hardly be considered unreasonable if her Majesty's Government had not in the three months which had elapsed since the publication of the report been able to consider it in all its bearings. It had seemed to them that the most important point in the report was the question of the apportionment of charges between the Indian Government and the home Government, and it was to that question that the Government had in the first place devoted their attention. Her Majesty's Government had not yet carefully considered the suggestions made for the settlement of the question of the payments for Indian troops when they were employed beyond the frontiers of India, or for the establishment of an arbitration tribunal to consider the differences between the Government of India and the Imperial Government; and between the India Office, the War Office, the Treasury, and the other departments of State with which the India Office was brought into communication. These matters were receiving careful consideration. In this country they thoroughly understood what was the meaning of a dispute between two Government Departments. Each Department was naturally doing the best for its views and interests, but it did not commend itself in that light to the people of India, who were led away by the impression that the Imperial Government was trying to take an advantage and deal illiberally with them. That, he agreed, was something they ought to do all they could to diminish, if not to put an end to altogether. He for one would have been more glad if the Commission could have seen its way to make some suggestions which would enable them to get rid altogether of the subjects of differences which were constantly arising between the Departments at home, but he could not help thinking that when they were able to give full consideration to the report they might see some way in which they might avoid these disputes in the future. Her Majesty's Government were quite willing to extend the principle of arbitration. They agreed with the noble earl in his desire to refer as far as possible all the questions of dispute that might arise between the Imperial Government and the Government of India to arbitration. (Hear, hear.) The noble chairman of the Commission had expressed his own opinion that it was desirable that the practice of audit in India should be assimilated to the practice in this country, but as that recommendation had not the authority which would have attached to a conclusion of the majority of the Commission, he could not hold out any hope that her Majesty's Government would be able to give it their favourable consideration. He might point out, however, that in India the audit was carried out continuously, that the officials of the Comptroller and the Auditor-General were in every department, that they checked and disallowed at once all items which, in their opinion, ought not to be charged, and that the charge came home for the sanction of the Secretary of State in the course of a very short time. In addition to that, there was a practice in India of carrying on a test audit, which, on the admission of the chairman of the Commission, was of very great value, and which did not obtain in this country. He was content to rely on the report of the majority of the Commission that they considered the audit in India to be well organised and efficient. He could assure the noble earl and the noble lord who presided over the Commission that her Majesty's Government intended to accept the recommendations of the noble lord as regarded the amount which, in their opinion ought to be contributed by the Imperial Government towards the revenues of India. That amount was, he thought, £293,000. But he might point out that the Commission made an error which somewhat vitiated those figures and reduced the total sum to £257,000. He was not prepared to pledge himself to the particular items and heads under which this contribution should be made, but he could say that her Majesty's Government were willing to accept the recommendations of the Commission and to give at least £250,000 and probably more towards the relief of the revenues of India. Her Majesty's Government desire to treat India, not only equitably, but liberally; and if time were given them they hoped to give effect to other recommendations of the Royal Commission. (Hear, hear.)

The Earl of KIMBERLEY thought it was not unreasonable that as the Royal Commission had taken five years to produce its report, the Government should be allowed reasonable time to consider how they would act in regard to it. He had never taken the view that India was unfairly treated by this country. It was said that the object of the expenditure of millions of money on the army of India was to maintain the supremacy of the British power in the East, and that the policy which dictated the whole treatment of India by this country was an Imperial policy. But India was part of the Empire, and consequently she must bear her share of the Imperial burden. He assumed that on the whole our presence in India was advantageous to the Indian people, and assuming that, he could not see that India, on account of her connexion with us, was really exposed to any danger that she would not be exposed to if she were entirely inde-

pendent. On the contrary, he was of opinion that her position would be one of far less security if she had no connexion with this country. Was there not a Power beyond the frontier of India, and would that Power be no longer a danger to the country if we were to cease to hold India? He did not assume there were any extraordinary designs on the part of that Power with regard to India, but it was impossible to suppose that if India were left to protect herself she would not be exposed to any danger from that great Power just beyond her frontier. Therefore, he did not admit the argument that the Indian army was maintained entirely for Imperial purposes. He certainly did not look with favour upon the appointment of a permanent arbitration tribunal presided over by a judge to determine disputes between the Indian Government and the home Government. He had the greatest respect for the judges in the performance of the duties appertaining to them; but as a rule judges were no more qualified to determine political questions than he was to discharge the duties of Lord Chancellor. It was absolutely necessary that an arbitrator in such matters should have some political training. But the argument did not exclude a reference to arbitration in certain cases of dispute. What he insisted upon was this, that in dealing with Indian affairs the Parliament of this country, led by the Government of this country, must be supreme. In his opinion, any attempt to pass by the Government of this country and the Parliament of this country would fail. Another point on which there was some misconception was in regard to the amount paid by India for the service of her Majesty's army in India. It was being constantly said that the Indian army was the reserve of this country. But was not the army of this country the reserve of India? If the Indian Government had to maintain an additional number of troops equal to that reserve it would mean a very large additional expenditure indeed. The whole of the Imperial army was available for service in India, if India were in danger; and it was only right that in return this country should regard the Indian army as a reserve. But when it came to the question what India should pay for this service, he was always inclined to say that we should take a liberal and generous view of the matter. He thought we ought not to be too stiff in dealing with financial questions which arose between us and India. The soundest policy of this country was to treat our fellow-subjects in India in a wise and generous spirit.

The Marquis of SALISBURY said that on the whole he concurred with the remarks of Lord Kimberley. He was glad that the India Office, under the guidance of the Commission, had been able to make pecuniary arrangements which appeared to be satisfactory to those who had charge of the administration in India, but he entirely concurred with the noble earl in repudiating the idea that India had any reason to complain of the treatment she had received. It was very desirable that the treatment of India should be generous and liberal, because, as one reason, the mass of the people of that country were much more struggling and suffering than the mass of the people here. Apart from the question of liberality and generosity, the matter must be looked upon as one of adjustment of the burden between the taxpayers of the two countries. People talked as if the expense was Imperial, and therefore that we ought to undertake it without considering whether it fell more upon us than it did upon the Indian exchequer. That seemed to him an unsound doctrine. The common burdens of empire ought to be borne as far as possible according to equal and equitable rule. There was another fallacy in arguing Indian questions which had been pushed too much forward, and that was that we were bound to bear a certain number of expenses on behalf of India because, as a matter of fact, we had borne similar expenses on behalf of many of our colonies. He could not see the cogency of that argument at all. We had undoubtedly been exceedingly generous in our dealings with the colonies during the past fifty years, but he did not think that by that we incurred the obligation to apply precisely the same rule to every other case that came up for judgment, or that we were bound to discharge this or that claim on the part of India because we had discharged a similar claim on the part of our colonies. There was no special call for expenditure which came upon us because we occupied an Imperial position. It was quite true that it depended upon this country to make the expenditure for the defence of both India and the colonies; but it was equally true that we did not incur the expenditure for India as a matter of favour to India, or, rather, India did not incur the claim of allegiance as a matter of favour and consideration to us. What was now happening in the East brought home to us very much how heavy the burden of defending our position in the East might come to be. We might have in future to ask whether others besides this little island were not concerned in the maintenance of that great fabric of Chinese trade in which we participated. He urged upon those who had to deal with this question to recollect that we were not dealing with a bottomless purse, and that, although we were bound not to put upon others any obligations they could not properly bear, we might find that we could not without injustice to others accept the exclusive burden of Empire.

The motion for a return of copies of any correspondence between the India Office and the Treasury was then agreed to.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITIONS.

East India (Contagious Diseases).—Petitions for alteration of Law; From Hoshangabad; Ferozepore; Calcutta; Bundi; Shimoga; Neemuch; Sandoway; Ludhiana (two); Nagpur; Hsipaw; Bhais-dehi; Aijal; Jalna (two); Ahmedabad; Batala; Girgoon; Dargal; Santipur; Bikanpur; Belgaua; and Muttra. To lie upon the Table.

INDIAN TROOPS OUT OF INDIA.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would state what number of the 22,000 troops at present drawn from the India establishment for foreign service were British troops, and what would be the number of British troops in India subject to these deductions.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The number of British troops at present withdrawn from the Indian establishment for foreign service is about 8,600. The actual number of British troops in India, allowing for these deductions, is about 61,000.

THE FAMINE MEDICAL SERVICE.

Mr. SCOTT asked the Secretary of State for India whether the services of more than one medical man had been available at most of the large famine camps, containing from 20,000 to 30,000 people, at any time during the famine or since the outbreak of cholera.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have not received details as to the individual distribution of medical officers and medical subordinates at the different relief camps and relief houses. The Famine Codes contain full instructions for strengthening the medical staff in famine districts, for provision of hospital accommodation or relief works, for posting a medical officer or a subordinate qualified for independent charge to each hospital, and for the duties of such medical officers. The instructions as to engaging additional medical officers and subordinates from outside the regular service when need arises are full and clear.

DEATHS FROM CHOLERA.

Mr. SCOTT asked the Secretary of State for India if he could state the total number of deaths from cholera in the famine districts, including the Native States, since the beginning of the famine.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have not yet received full statistics of cholera deaths in British districts and Native States since the beginning of the famine. When cholera became severely epidemic I asked for weekly telegrams regarding the ravages, and in my answer yesterday I quoted the totals of figures given in those telegrams, which are published with the famine telegrams in the newspapers.

Monday, July 23.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

FAMINE AND IRRIGATION.

Lord KINSMAN asked the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he would give a list of the irrigation and other works for the prevention of famine undertaken since the last famine of 1897 and the cost thereof; also of the large works approved as being necessary previous to 1897, which had not been undertaken owing to want of surplus revenue, notwithstanding the fact that they were expected to be remunerative, and that money could be borrowed at a lower rate than these works were expected to yield.

The EARL OF ORSKNEY explained that there were three kinds of irrigation works carried out by the Government of India. There were, first, the major works, which were paid for out of borrowed money and were expected to be remunerative. There were, in the second place, minor works, which were constructed out of capital, but out of revenue, and there were the protective works, which were paid for out of the Famine Fund and were also remunerative. A return of all these works could be prepared if the noble lord thought it necessary, but it would involve a considerable amount of labour. He was not aware that there was any ground for the suggestion that the expenditure on irrigation works had been cut down. On the contrary, it had been steadily increasing in recent years. The Viceroy had been giving very great attention to this question, and he hoped to lay down a permanent scheme of, and a continuous policy in reference to, irrigation works. The noble lord need have no apprehension that the money required to carry out these works would fall short in years to come, because the major works were extremely remunerative and, therefore, capital could be advantageously borrowed for this purpose. It was the intention of the Government of India to carry these works out as rapidly as a rate was consistent with their nature, and they believed that in a comparatively short time all the land in India that was capable of irrigation would be dealt with.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

ADVANCES TO AGRICULTURISTS.

East India (Famine).—Copy presented,—of Advances and Gifts to Agriculturists for Seed, Cattle, and Subsistence at the End of the Famine [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CABLE TELEGRAPHS.

Sir E. SAMPSON asked the Secretary of the Treasury whether he would state to the House the composition of the departmental committee on the system of cable telegraphs of the Empire, the scope, and the terms of its reference.

Mr. HANBURY: The terms of reference are: To enquire into the

present system of telegraphic communication between different parts of the Empire and to consider in what respects it requires to be supplemented. To investigate the relations between private cable companies and the Imperial and colonial Governments (including the Government of India), the amount of control at present exercised by those Governments, and the policy which should be pursued by them in future, especially when new concessions are sought. To examine, not, how any reduction should be effected." The committee will consist of Lord Balfour of Burleigh, as chairman, representing the Board of Trade, the Postmaster-General, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Under-Secretaries for India and the Colonies, and two members from the Intelligence branches of the Admiralty and the War Office.

NUMBERS ON RELIEF.
DEATHS FROM CHOLERA.

Mr. SCOTT asked the Secretary of State for India whether he could state the total number of persons on relief in the famine districts, and the number who were still being relieved in famine camps.

And, whether he would obtain the statistics of deaths from cholera, which were available in India, for the information of the House before the debate takes place on the Indian Budget.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The famine telegram dated July 14, and published in the daily Press, stated that 6,148,000 were in receipt of relief. It added that "village relief and advances were replacing relief work." I cannot at present say how many of this total were relieved at their villages and how many were on relief works. I can obtain the total figures for cholera deaths in British districts and in Native States, so far as they are available in India, but they may not be sent in time for the debate on Thursday next.

MORTALITY AMONG CATTLE.

Mr. SCOTT asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in many of the famine districts, from 75 to 90 per cent. of the cattle had died; what proportion of the cultivators in the districts affected would need advances for seed and cattle; and what proportion of these could be assisted out of the 123 lakhs allotted for the purpose, and the charitable funds.

And, whether he had information to show that there were enough cattle available in India to supply immediate needs; and, if not, whether any steps were being taken to make good the deficiency from elsewhere.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have no trustworthy information about the mortality among cattle; nor can I give particulars as to the proportion of cultivators that will be relieved from advances made by Government and from the charitable fund respectively. If the funds already allotted for this purpose prove insufficient, more money will be granted. No cattle have been brought into India from outside to meet the present need; but cattle are being moved into the famine districts from more prosperous parts of India.

Mr. SCOTT asked the Secretary of State for India what steps, if any, were being taken to assist the Governments of the Native States to obtain the necessary funds for making advances to cultivators for the purchase of plough cattle and seed grain.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The loans to Native States for famine purposes and the grants to those States from the charitable fund are intended to cover the necessary advances and gifts to cultivators in those tracts. In my answer to the hon. member for Banffshire on Thursday I stated the amount of those loans. Up to the end of May, 20½ lakhs (£177,000) had also been allotted by the Central Committee of the charitable fund for expenditure in Native States.

THE PURCHASE OF RAILWAYS.

Mr. GORDON asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in calculating the rate of interest under the contract powers for paying off (by annuities) the shareholders of the East India Railway Company in 1880, the Eastern Bengal Railway Company in 1884, and the Scinde Railway Company in 1885, the agreed results (viz., £4 6s., £3 17s., and £3 16s. 6d.) were the outcome of the same method of interpretation as explained before a Committee of the House of Commons in 1879 by Sir Louis Mallet, Mr. Dauvers, and Viscount Cranbrook.

Lord G. HAMILTON: As I have before said, the purchase of the Eastern Indian Railway stands on quite a different footing from those of the Eastern Bengal and Scinde Railway Companies, and was based on the average rate of interest received by investors. I have no knowledge of how the Governor and Deputy-Governor of the Bank of England calculated the rate of interest for the annuities of the other two purchases.

Mr. GORDON asked whether the same method was followed on the three occasions.

Lord G. HAMILTON said he should imagine not, it having been distinctly laid down that sanction was only given to the exceptional purchase in 1879 on the understanding that it was not to form a precedent.

Mr. GORDON asked the Secretary of State for India whether the rates of interest agreed to by the Indian Government on the termination of the contracts of the East Indian, Eastern Bengal, and Scinde Railway Companies during the past two years (viz., £4 6s., £3 17s., and £3 16s. 6d. per cent.), represented the average rate of interest received by persons who invested in the three India sterling stocks during the two-year-period relating to each of those three contracts.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The East Indian railway was bought under a special arrangement outside the contract which the Select Committee of 1879 (of which I was chairman) agreed to, on the understanding that the rate fixed was not to form a precedent for determining the terms of subsequent purchases under the Acts of Parliament. The other two railways were bought under the contract, and the rate of interest was determined by the Governor and the Deputy-Governor

of the Bank as prescribed by the Act of Parliament. I have no knowledge of the view they took of the evidence given before the Select Committee of 1879.

Mr. GORDON asked whether the noble lord would make enquiry.

Lord G. HAMILTON said that by Act of Parliament the Governor and Deputy-Governor were given the power of deciding what the rate was. He thought it would be most improper for the Secretary of State to interfere.

Mr. GORDON asked the Secretary of State for India whether it was the intention of the Indian Government to pay due respect to the precedents established during the past twenty years in their policy regarding the determination of any future railway contracts; and, if not, whether he would give due notice of this intention, and an explanation of his policy in the matter.

Lord G. HAMILTON: It is the intention of the Secretary of State in Council to act on all occasions of this kind in strict conformity with the terms prescribed in the contracts with the various Indian railway companies.

HOSPITAL SHIPS FOR CHINA.

Mr. HENDERWICK asked the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs what had been done to provide for the proper care of the British wounded at Tien-tsin and whether there was any hospital accommodation at Wei-hai-wei.

Lord G. HAMILTON, in the course of his reply, said: 'The Government of India have already provided a hospital ship and are prepared to supplement this accommodation by converting three transports into hospital ships. The American hospital ship "Maine" has also been placed at the disposal of her Majesty's Government, and I am glad to take this opportunity of expressing our gratitude for this great act of generosity to the Atlantic Transport Company, which has furnished the ship, and to the American ladies who have provided the funds for equipping and maintaining it. I have also to inform the House that I have received from the Maharaja of Sindia of Gwalior the offer of a fully-equipped hospital ship for China, upon which he is willing to spend twenty lakhs. This princely offer is made on behalf of himself, his mother, and his wife, to testify their loyalty to her Majesty the Queen-Empress. Her Majesty's Government have expressed their acceptance of this most munificent offer and their deep appreciation of the motives which actuated his Highness to make it. (Cheers.)

Tuesday, July 24.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE RANGOON OUTRAGE.

Sir LEWIS M'LYEN asked the Secretary of State for India whether Brigadier-General Rolland was removed from his command as Brigadier on the ground of alleged spidy and inaction in what is known as the Royal West Kent Regiment case; and, if so, whether the Secretary of State could name any specific act or omission on the part of Brigadier-General Rolland justifying this charge;

And whether he could state anything in the matter which Brigadier-General Rolland could have done, or ought to have done, and which he failed to do.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The ground upon which Colonel Rolland was removed from his command in connexion with the gross outrage committed at Rangoon in April, 1899, was that, being in immediate command at Rangoon and primarily responsible for discipline at the station, he showed an apathy and inaction which conducted to a miscarriage of justice. His case was most carefully considered by the Commander-in-Chief in India, by the Government of India, and by myself in Council; and in allowing Colonel Rolland to remain in the Service I adopted the most lenient course that was open to me under the circumstances.

FIELD BATTERIES.

Sir CHARLES DILKE asked the Secretary of State for India whether no such decision, tending to the reduction of guns in heavy field batteries in India, had been taken as was suggested in the Blue-book containing the financial statement and debate in the Viceroy's Council, recently laid before Parliament.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The question of the conversion of four heavy field batteries of four guns each into two howitzer batteries of six guns each is inseparably connected with other larger questions of artillery organisation which are under consideration in communication with the War Office, and it has not yet been decided.

FAMINE RELIEF.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether, with a view to stimulate liberality in subscriptions to the Indian Famine Fund, he would, by a detailed statement, make clear to the public what branches of relief were undertaken by the Indian Government and what branches were dependent upon private charity;

And, whether he could give a rough estimate of the total expenditure required from the Government of India and from private charity respectively in order to deal satisfactorily with the present calamity.

Lord G. HAMILTON: If the hon. baronet will read any of the statements which I have sent to the Lord Mayor or the various published letters I have written to the different organisations who have and are collecting funds for the Indian Charitable Famine Fund, he will there find clearly stated the branches of relief work undertaken by the Government and the special spheres of work reserved for charity. As regards the second question, the hon. baronet will perhaps allow me to reserve till Thursday the general detailed statement I shall be ready to make upon the Famine Expenditure.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN: May I ask if the noble lord is not aware that the relief functions of the Government have been considerably extended beyond the original statement, and that the public are a little in doubt as to what the exact position of the work is as between charity and Government work?

Lord G. HAMILTON: It would be better if the hon. gentleman would wait until Thursday, when the question will be fully discussed.

NOTICES OF MOTION.

The following Notices of Motion appear on the Order Paper of the House of Commons:—

On going into Committee on East India Revenue Accounts:

Mr. ROBINSON SOUTAR.—To move, That, looking to the special needs of the famine-stricken people in India on the approach of the monsoon, this House recognises that funds are urgently required to feed, clothe, and house the cultivators in their villages until their crops are ripe; to provide them with plough, cattle, seed, and other requisites of cultivation; and to restore them to their normal economic condition; that these requirements cannot be adequately met from Indian revenues raised from the suffering Indian people, and within the necessarily restricted field of ordinary relief operations; that the funds subscribed by charity are altogether insufficient for these purposes; and this House is therefore of opinion that an Imperial free grant of not less than five millions sterling should be provided to assist in meeting this unprecedented calamity.

Sir W. Wedderburn and Mr. Caldwell have given notice of motion in identical terms with the above.

Mr. BUCHANAN.—To move, That, in view of the important military aid rendered by India to the Empire in Africa, China, and elsewhere outside the boundaries of India, this House is of opinion that the apportionment of shares between the Home and Indian Exchequers should be revised and the contribution paid by India substantially reduced.

Sir MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGREE.—Distress in India.—To move, That the spread of famine and scarcity over extensive areas and affecting millions of inhabitants in India, although recurring at irregular intervals, may be regarded as a certain calamity to which that country is periodically exposed; that the disastrous consequences of such visitation are rendered unobscureable by the fact that an unusually large proportion of its population is allowed to remain dependent for its livelihood upon agricultural labour exclusively, whereas nearly all other industrial pursuits for which the nature of the resources of the country offer wide scope are neglected; that one of the most effective methods by which the rigour of the famines could be modified is the buying power of the people now succumbing to them increased, would be to enable large classes of the agricultural population to pursue other industries; and that, therefore, it is the opinion of this House that the Government of India should adopt measures for the elementary, industrial, and technical instruction of the poorer communities, so as to fit them for more profitable manual labour in other directions besides agriculture.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS.—To call attention to the Distress in India, and to move,—That, in view of the frequent and widespread famines which have occurred in India in recent years, it is desirable, in the opinion of this House, to afford some permanent relief and protection to the people in the future firstly, by a more rapid extension of irrigation canals, storage tanks, and wells; secondly, by reducing the land tax in those provinces or districts where it is excessive; and thirdly, by relieving India of a portion of the cost of the Indian army, which should equitably be borne by the Imperial Exchequer.

Mr. MACLEAN.—To move, That this House deeply deplores the appalling loss of life in India due to the inability of the Government of India, for want of sufficient means and staff, to control the famine in that country; and this House records its conviction that, to insure the Indian peasantry against future famines, a complete revision of the land revenue systems of India is essential.

Colonel MILWARD.—To move, That having regard to the widespread distress in India, and to the comparatively poor result of the appeal for subscriptions in aid in Great Britain, it is desirable to supplement the Government of India by a free grant from the National Exchequer of one million sterling, and that this sum be placed at the unfettered discretion of the Viceroy.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS.

Notice has been given of the following questions:—

Mr. PHILIP STANHOPE.—To ask the Secretary of State for India, if he can state the estimated annual cost to be incurred by the proposed addition of ninety-two European officers to Punjab and Bengal Native regiments; and whether these officers will be always selected from the Indian Staff Corps, or from officers of British regiments serving their term in India, in some cases, appointed by patronage or by the Commander-in-Chief; and whether selections for these additional officers could be made from experienced Native Commissioned officers already borne on the strength of these Punjab and Bengal regiments. [Thursday, July 26.]

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS.—To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will state what arrangements have been made, or will be made, for the sick and wounded among the British troops in China. [Thursday, July 26.]

Mr. GORDON.—To ask the Secretary of State for India, whether the methods of calculating the rates of interest (which were settled by the Bank of England), regarding the termination in 1884 and 1886 of the Eastern Bengal and Sindh Railway contracts, have never been checked and investigated by the India Office.

And, if no knowledge of this financial transaction is on record at the India Office, whether he will now seek to secure this information for official purposes, and also for publication. [Thursday, July 26.]

Sir MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGREE.—To ask the Secretary of State for India, if he will give in separate figures the value of manufactured articles and raw materials respectively which are comprised in the general headings export of manufactured goods and exports of merchandise, in the table relating to Trade at a Glance of his Explanatory Memorandum for 1900-1901. [Thursday, July 26.]

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

OFFICERS IN INDIA.

PRESIDENT (elected 1899):

ROMESH CHUNDER DUTT, C.I.E.

GENERAL SECRETARY:

A. O. HUME, C.B., ROTHNEY CASTLE, SIMLA; and THE CHALET,
UPPER NORWOOD, S.E.

JOINT GENERAL SECRETARY (in India):

D. E. WACHA, 84, HORNBY ROAD, BOMBAY.

ASSTT.-SEC.: ALFRED NUNDEY, Barr.-at-Law, GORAKHPUR.

STANDING COUNSEL:

Bengal, W. C. BONNERJEE;

Bombay, PHEROZSEAH MEHTA;

Madras, RAI BAHADUR ANANDU CHARLU.

BRITISH COMMITTEE.

SIR W. WREDEBURN, Bart.,

M.P., Chairman.

G. B. CLARK, M.P.

A. O. HUME, C.B.

B. B. JOSHI.

J. SEYMOUR KEAY.

SARAT MULLICK.

DADABAI NAOROJI.

J. M. PARIKH.

C. P. PILLAI.

J. HERBERT ROBERTS, M.P.

C. E. SCHWANN, M.P.

ROBINSON SOUTZAK, M.P.

NILEKANI B. WAGLE.

ALFRED WEBB.

W. MARTIN WOOD.

OFFICES: 84 AND 86, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER,
LONDON, S.W.

TELEGRAPHIC ADDRESS: "INCAS, LONDON."

NAME OF CHIEF.	JURISDICTION.	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SECRETARIES.
1. Calcutta ...	Presidency, Burdwan and Chittagong Divisions (except Murshidabad District) Assam & Orissa	Dupendra Nath Dose, Esq., and J. Ghosal, Esq. (Pritikwis Chandra Roy, Assist. Sec.), 62 Bow Bazar Street, Calcutta.
2. Dacca ...	Dacca District ...	Babu Sarat Chandra Bose, Pleader, Rajar Deyry, Dacca.
3. Maimansingh ...	Maimansingh District ...	Babu Anand Bandhu Guha, Sec., Maimansingh Association, Maimansingh.
4. Faridpur ...	Faridpur District ...	Babu Ambika Churn Mozumdar, Pleader, Faridpur.
5. Barisal ...	Barisal District ...	Babu Awasni Kumar Dutt, Pleader, Barisal.
6. Rangpur ...	Rangpur District ...	Babu Satis Chandra Chatterbury, B.L., Pleader, Rangpur.
7. Dinajpur ...	Dinajpur District ...	Babu Lalit Chandra Sen, B.A., D.L.S., Dinajpur.
8. Patna ...	Patna District ...	Babu Herendra Narain Roy, B.L., Patna.
9. Bogra ...	Bogra District ...	Babu Peary Sunker Das Gupta, L.M.S., Medical Practitioner, Bogra.
10. Jalpaiguri ...	Jalpaiguri District ...	Babu Unagati Roy, Jalpaiguri.
11. Rampur-Beaulah ...	Rajshahi District ...	Dr. Chandra Nath Choudhry, Rampur-Beaulah.
12. Behar ...	Murshidabad District ...	Babu Balkut Nath Sen, Ererampur, Dist. Murshidabad.
13. Bhagalpur ...	Bhagalpur Division (except Purneah District) ...	Babu Siva Ranjan Sahai and Surya Prasad, Bhagalpur.
14. Purneah ...	Purneah District ...	Babu Jorendra Nath Mukerji, Pleader, Purneah.
15. Chutia-Nagpur ...	Chutia-Nagpur Division ...	Rai Jodu Nath Mukerji, Pleader, Hazaribagh.
16. Behar ...	Patna Division (excluding the Muzaffarpur and Gaya Districts) ...	Babu Banwari Lal, Patna City.
17. Muzaffarpur ...	Muzaffarpur District ...	Babu Proo Nath Mukherji, B.L., Vakil, Muzaffarpur.
18. Gaya ...	Gaya District ...	Babua Nand Kishore Lal and Upendra Chandra Mitta, Gaya.
19. N.-W. Provinces ...	North-Western Provinces ...	Secretary, Standing Committee, Johnstonganj, Allahabad.
Sub-divisions of the N.W.P. for the purpose of distributing "INDIA."		
Name of Sub-division.		
Gorakhpur ...	Gorakhpur Division ...	A. Nundy, Esq., Gorakhpur.
Banarès ...	Banarès Division (except Mirzapur District) ...	Pandit Channu Lal, Banarès City.
Mirzapur ...	Mirzapur District ...	Babu Sri Ram, Mirzapur.
Cawnpur ...	Cawnpur District ...	Pandit Parul Nath, Cawnpur.
Bareilly ...	Bareilly District ...	The Secretary, Congress Committee, Bareilly.
Moradabad ...	Moradabad District ...	N. C. Dose, Esq., Moradabad.
Saharanpur ...	Saharanpur District ...	Babu Anand Swarup, B.A., LL.B., Vakil, Saharanpur.
Moorat ...	Moorat District ...	Babu Prasad Singh, Moorat.
Aligarh ...	Aligarh District ...	Babu M. Abdur Rahim, Esq., Aligarh.
Agra ...	Agra Division ...	Pandit Tulsi Ram, Agra, Bareilly.
Allahabad ...	All places in the N.W.P. not above enumerated	Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Sec. for the N.-W. P. Circle, Allahabad.
20. Oudh ...	Oudh ...	Munshi Ganga Prasad Varma, Office of the Advocate, Lucknow.
21. Punjab ...	The Punjab ...	Lala Jaishi Ram, Secretary, Congress Committee, Lahore; Babu Chetan Anand, Multan; Bhagat Ram, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, Jalandhar City; Lala Muri Dhar, Pleader, Amamba City; Babu Kedar Nath, Pleader, Delhi; and Pandit Parul Nath, Pleader, Peshawar.
22. Bombay ...	Bombay Island, Colaba, Thana & Ratnagiri Dist.	D. E. Wacha, Esq., Presidency Association, Bombay.
23. Sind ...	Sind ...	Tahilram Khemchand, Esq., Pleader, Karachi; Himatsing G. Advani, Esq., Shikarpur and Hinaud Khemchand, Esq., Hyderabad.
24. Ahmedabad ...	Ahmedabad, Kaira and Panch Mahals Dis- tricts, Cutch and Kathiawar, Rajkot	Rao Sahib Kesavalal Motilal, Gopalrao Ramchandra Dholkar, Esq., B.A., LL.B., and Maganlal Gheblabhar Mehta, Esq., B.A., LL.B., Pleaders, Ahmedabad.
25. Surat ...	Surat and Broach Districts, with Baroda	Haredevram Nanubhai Haridas, Esq., and Bhagubai Dayabhai, Esq., Surat.
26. Sholapur ...	Sholapur District ...	Vishram T. Tele, Esq., Sholapur.
27. Bijapur ...	Bijapur District ...	Srinivasa Krishna Bakshi, Esq., B.A., LL.B., Pleader, Bijapur.
28. Dharwar ...	Dharwar District ...	Narayan Gurnath Kargand, LL.B., Pleader, Bijapur.
29. Satara ...	Satara District ...	Raghunath Pandurang Karandikar, Esq., High Court Pleader, Satara.
30. Ahmadnagar ...	Ahmadnagar District ...	Mohanlal Hirsal and Kashinath Vinayak Bhawe, Pleaders, Ahmadnagar.
31. Poona ...	Poona, Nasik, & Khandesh Districts	Lakshman Raghunath Gokhale, Esq., Pleader, Poona.
32. Ichalkaranji ...	Southern Mahratta Country ...	Schubhi Ramchandra Apke, Ichalkaranji, near Kolhapur, S.M. Country.
33. Beas ...	Beas ...	R. N. Mudholkar, Esq., and B. H. Karandikar, Esq., Pleaders, High Court, Amraoti.
34. Nagpur ...	Central Provinces ...	The Secretary, Congress Committee, Nagpur.
35. Madras ...	Madras, Chingleput, N. and S. Arcot, Nellore and Native States	M. r. y. V. R. y. Nambiar, High Court Vakil, Madras; M. r. y. S. H. Belgrami, Barrister- at-Law, Madras, Secs., Mahajana Sabha.
36. Madras ...	Madras and Tanjavur ...	M. r. y. G. Srinivasa Row Garu, Pleader, Madras; M. r. y. K. R. Gurusami Iyer, District M. r. y. S. Ramaswanda Iyer Aoi, High Court Vakil, Tanjavur; M. r. y. K. Vasudeva Iyengar, Mirasdar, Chingannur; M. r. y. N. V. Yandandha Iyer, M. r. y. A. Kumbakara M. r. y. P. Ratana Sahapathy Pillai, Pleader, Negapatam.
37. Tanjore ...	Tanjore and Trichinopoly ...	M. r. y. Srinivasa Row Garu, B.A., Pleader, Bellary; M. r. y. Dhons Subba Row Garu, Pleader, Bellary; M. r. y. P. Kesava Pillai, Pleader, Cooty.
38. Bellary ...	Bellary, Anantapur, Cuddapah, and Karmul ...	Hon. C. Sankara Nair, Poonamali Road, Egmore, Madras; M. r. y. K. C. Manavikraman Raja, Secretary, Korai Mahajana Sabha, Cuddapah; M. r. y. T. Viraraghava Iyer, Pal- ghat; M. r. y. P. C. Narayana Kurup, High Court Vakil, Tellicherry; Rao Bahadur N. Shiva Row, Pleader, Mangalore.
39. Malabar ...	Malabar and Kanara ...	Hon. C. Vijayaraghava Chariar, B.A., Pleader, Salem.
40. Salem ...	Salem ...	M. r. y. C. M. Padmanabha Chariar, B.A., B.L., Coimbatore.
41. Coimbatore ...	Coimbatore and Nilgiris ...	M. r. y. V. Ramasam, High Court Vakil, Visagapatam; M. r. y. C. Ramachariar, High Court Vakil, Manipal; M. r. y. D. Subramaniam, Pleader, Coimbatore.
42. Ganjam ...	Ganjam, Visagapatam, Godavari, and Krishna	

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

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

• **NOW READY.**
CONGRESS GREEN BOOK.—No. III.

The Proposed Separation OF Judicial and Executive Duties in India. MEMORIAL

FROM

- RT. HON. LORD HOBHOUSE, K.C.S.I.
(late Legal Member of the Viceroy's Council, Member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council).
RT. HON. SIR RICHARD CARTIL, Q.C.
(late Chief Justice of Bengal).
RT. HON. SIR RICHARD COUCH
(late Chief Justice of Bengal, Member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council).
SIR CHARLES SARGENT
(late Chief Justice of Bombay).
SIR WILLIAM MARKBY, K.C.I.E.
(late Judge of the High Court, Calcutta).
SIR JOHN BUDD PHEAR
(late Judge of the High Court, Calcutta, and Chief Justice of Ceylon).
SIR JOHN SCOTT, K.C.M.G.
(late Judge of the High Court, Bombay).
SIR W. WEDDERBURN, BART., M.P.
(late Judge of the High Court, Bombay).
SIR ROLAND K. WILSON, BART.
(late Reader in Indian Law at the University of Cambridge).
MR. HERBERT J. REYNOLDS, C.S.I.
(late Member of the Bengal Legislative Council).

TOGETHER WITH TWO APPENDICES.

LONDON: PUBLISHED BY THE BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE
INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.
Price One Shilling, postage 2d. extra.

In India: Copies may be had from D. E. WACHA, Esq., Presidency
Association, Bombay, by V. P. Post, Fourteen Annas.

THE GRANHAM'S, SHELFORD, CAMBRIDGE.

W A. DOUGLAS RUDGE, B.A., late Scholar and
Friseman of St. John's College, Cambridge, is prepared
to take entire charge of a limited number of young
Indian gentlemen and to educate them for the University or
Public Schools. Special attention paid to Science subjects.
Healthy country home four miles from Cambridge. Refer-
ences kindly permitted by Romesh C. Dutt, Esq., C.I.E., and
Dadabhai Naoroji, Esq., in London. In India to B. C. Ghose,
Esq., M.A., Lecturer, City College, Calcutta, who will furnish
further particulars.

To Political Associations, Literary
Societies, Ethical Societies,
Etc., etc.

LECTURES and ADDRESSES ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

The British Committee of the Indian National
Congress (84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster,
S.W.), is now making arrangements for lectures and
addresses on Indian questions.

Associations or individuals that desire the services
of thoroughly competent speakers on Indian questions
are requested to communicate as early as may be with
the Secretary to the British Committee at the above
address. The services of a recent visitor to the Famine
districts are available.

For a limited number of lectures lantern slides
can be provided.

No charge will be made for the services of speakers
with whom engagements are made through the British
Committee.

Address, **THE SECRETARY,**

**BRITISH COMMITTEE of the
INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,**
84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALM.

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, Indige-
stion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found
gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1899.

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



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.
I know G. S. WOOD, CAPT. 32nd North Staffs. Regt.
"Jvara-Hari" is an effaceless on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there
more than magic in it. G. L. NARSINGA ROW.

For **INDIGESTION, DIARRHOEA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.**

Cuddalore Municipal Council's Office.—"I am much pleased in stating that your 'Omum-Carpoor' was found very
useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage.
Prices of all 'JVARA-HARI' and 'OMUM-CARPOOR' 8 annas, Rs. 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and
12 Ea. per bottle. 12 Ea.—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.

JUST OUT. THE HIGHLY SPOKEN OF.

COMPREHENSIVE CRIMINAL DIGEST, 1862-1899.

By **CHUNILAL HARILAL VAKIL, B.A., LL.B.,**

Subordinate Judge, Dhoolka; First Class Magistrate, Ahmedabad.

This Digest contains all the criminal cases decided by the four
High Courts and the uncharted High Courts in the Punjab, Oudh,
Central Provinces, and Burma, reported in the four series of the
Indian Law Reports, Bengal Law Reports, Madras H. C. Reports,
Bombay H. C. Reports, N.W.P. High Court Reports, Calcutta Law
Reports, Indian Jurist, Weekly Reporter, Day's Reports, Hyde's
Reports, Marshall's Reports, Coryton's Reports, Agre H. C. Reports,
Moore's Indian Appeals, Criminal Rulings of the Bombay High
Court, Calcutta Weekly Notes, Bombay Law Reporter, Joy Govind
Shome's Reports, Bourke's Reports, Duma Select Judgments,
Punjab Records, Central Provinces Reports, and Oudh Select cases,
together with important cases from 1802 to 1862 decided by the
Sudder Fouzdaree Adawlut and Mizamat Adawlut. It
contains rulings from more than 300 volumes, while the greatest
existing digest contains rulings from about 150 volumes only. It
contains a complete index of all cases followed, overruled, or other-
wise judicially noticed in these reports.

Price Rs. 17.

Apply to **THE COMPLEX, DHOLKA.**

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

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

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