

# India

FOR THE

No. 137. NEW SERIES.  
No. 231. OLD SERIES.

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, AUGUST 17, 1900.

REGISTERED AS A PRICE—3d. PER  
NEWSPAPER. {BY POST, 2d. PER

Notes and News	85	The Investors' Review Fund	91
Army Expenditure and Finance	86	Appeal by the Bishop of Hereford	91
A Fleet of Greece	88	"The Indian Famine and Finance"	92
Our London Letter	89	Indian Affairs in Parliament	92
Notes from Bombay	90	Special Report	92
The Famine in India	90	The "Indian Budget Debate"	93
6,140,000 on Relief	91	Opinions of the British Press	93
The Mansion House Fund	91	Advertisements	96

## NOTES AND NEWS.

AN extensive and important Resolution of the Government of India on the subject of the plague was published in the official *Gazette* of July 21. It furnishes the Simla correspondent of the *Standard* with abundant material for rhetorical narrative, and for pointing the moral after the event. On the outbreak at Bombay in the autumn of 1895, it became "apparent to all careful observers of Indian affairs that it (the plague) would need to be handled with the utmost care." How few of such "careful observers," then, must there have been in official circles! "Nearly every one of the sanitary precautions which Western science deemed absolutely necessary for the rooting out of the plague went directly against some Native prejudice or some religious custom." Well, it might have been—as indeed we thought it was, and is—a practical maxim of Government not to offend Native prejudice and not to violate religious custom. But the Government went on its Western way and imagined that force was a remedy. We do not know why the correspondent should put stress upon the murder of Mr. Rand, or attribute that melancholy occurrence to a delusion recalling the greased cartridge of 1857, unless it be to put in a side-stroke against "a seditious Press," which had nothing to do with the matter, and in fact did not exist. However, what happened? This:—

Urged on by sanitary experts and by the clamourings of commercial bodies, which feared to see the trade of the country boycotted by the world unless the precautions considered necessary by International Conferences were put in force bodily, the authorities even went further in their endeavours to stem the tide of pestilence than they had done in the first instance. Cordons were drawn round infected localities, all passenger traffic was practically stopped, houses were entered with or without the permission of the owners, roofs were pulled off, drains flushed, clothes removed and stamed, women examined, sick people dragged off to segregation hospitals on mere suspicion, and a vast amount of robbery and peculation of every sort carried out by vicious underlings in the name of plague precautions.

The list is not quite complete indeed, but it constitutes a grave indictment of the Government policy and of the executive measures.

For example, the writer, strangely enough, omits at least two matters that go to the very root of the whole foolish business: (1) the employment of British soldiers without adequate supervision, and (2) the personal idiosyncrasies of individual officers. We make no charge in particular against British soldiers employed on plague work, but we do say that they were wholly out of place in Native houses, however benevolent and judicious their intentions. And on the other point, it is to be remembered that General Gatacre at Bombay and Colonel Creagh at Poona were able, by their personal discretion, to maintain perfect quietness and to get the people to do voluntarily everything that was really necessary. But when executive officers that lacked sympathy with the Natives and simply dragoned them came upon the scene, what happened? Something like this:—

The enforcement of these unpopular measures, and more particularly the extortion of the subordinates entrusted with their carrying out, soon brought the people to a pitch of frenzy which had to be seen to be realised. There were serious riots in Bombay; troops were called out, English soldiers bludgeoned to death by broad daylight, white men beaten and assaulted, plague hospitals burned down, and the doctors and nurses compelled to flee for their lives. In the suppression of these riots a large number of lives were lost. . . . Similar scenes took place elsewhere in India. There were riots in Calcutta, English officers were dragged down and left for dead in the streets, English ladies disgracefully assaulted, police quarters were

besieged by surging bloodthirsty crowds, all traffic put an end to, all business stopped.

Some little allowance made for colour, we should like to ask the writer whether, if like things had been done in London, Liverpool, Glasgow, etc., like results would not have followed. It is not in human nature to endure so unceremonious a subversal of traditional beliefs and customs. And why does the writer make no mention of the British soldiers on the job? The action of General Gatacre and Colonel Creagh, in contrast with the action of predecessors and successors of theirs, demonstrates conclusively that the essential mischief was lack of sympathy and ordinary humane feeling.

We have now the text of the Resolution before us, and we propose to return to the subject. But meantime we will quote the *Standard* correspondent's summary of the alterations introduced by the Resolution, which is based on the Report of the Plague Commissioners. He says:—

Many of the measures which have hitherto been adopted are thrown overboard. Others only remain in a very modified state. . . . The Government of India has practically abandoned all the measures which were distasteful to the people, and the carrying out of which brought about riots and the shedding of blood. Everyone in an infected locality is now free to come or go as he pleases. There is no compulsory attendance at hospitals, no examination of corpses, no system of paid informers. The searching of houses and the compulsory notification of sickness are practically abandoned. The requirements which remain are not such as to arouse any great degree of resentment among the people, and it is hoped that, with the co-operation of the unofficial classes and the leaders of the Native community, the necessary measures may be carried out in such a way as to put an end to the distressing scenes and the bitter feelings to which the combating of the plague has invariably given rise.

Not "invariably" by any means, as we have pointed out. But here is a clean sweep of all the elaborate policy of the Government, after four years of continuous insistence on rules that were foredoomed to failure! It is little satisfaction to us to recall how we warned and protested. Nor, we should imagine, is it much satisfaction to the brothers Nattu to find that now—after four years—the Government at last finds itself compelled to invoke "the co-operation of the unofficial classes and the leaders of the Native community." The whole four years' administration of the plague has been strangely perverse, and now that a reversal of policy is imperative, "Lord Curzon may be congratulated on the course which he has adopted."

It is not a little curious to find the correspondent ascribing all the trouble to "political agitators" and "the seditious Press," for, if his diagnosis be correct, it would appear that these obnoxious elements of society have overpowered the Government, and that "Lord Curzon may be congratulated" on his capitulating to them at discretion. That would be an odd situation surely. The correspondent writes:—

The political agitator was hard at work, the seditious Press boiled over with activity. Both played the plague and its attendant measures for all they were worth against the Government.

And the Government has submitted! Such is the posterous argument. Why not frankly acknowledge that the whole process was a complete blunder from start to finish? The correspondent points to the finally determining consideration:—

In the spring of this year serious riots took place at Cawnpore, resulting in more bloodshed. It is known now that they were instigated by men of light and leading—men who are now undergoing their trial. There can be little doubt that it is this last incident at Cawnpore which determined the authorities in India to take the line which they have now formally adopted in the Government resolution under consideration.

Are we then to draw the inference that the Government is to be moved to sympathetic action only by a series of riots? In our issue of May 18 (*INDIA*, vol. xiii, p. 237) we discussed the Cawnpore riots, and we pointed out four matters that deserved special attention, namely:—

(1) The union of Moslems and Hindus throughout the business;

- (2) the curious self-control exhibited by a mob which yet was guilty of such terrible violence;
- (3) the stronger feeling against plague regulations, though far milder than in many other parts, as well as the hatred of the police; and
- (4) the universal congratulations showered on the Lieutenant-Governor for concessions which under other circumstances many would have been inclined to treat as signs of degrading weakness.

The first two points show clearly the earnestness and justice of the popular feeling, and the last indicates that Sir Antony MacDonnell is a capable administrator, and that it is really he that ought to be congratulated for putting in train this Government resolution.

The *Standard* closes a leading article on the subject with this sentence:—

We have suffered as a governing nation in India from our anxiety to do what was best for the people, and not what they liked.

But, of course, the sentence should run: "our anxiety to do what we conceived to be best for the people, and not what they liked." That is to say, we approach the task of the government of a great Empire with ideas and feelings very diverse from those of the inhabitants, and we think we are doing well to carry into action our own notions and not theirs—all for their good. This is benevolent work undoubtedly, but it is not statesmanship. The thing is to enable the people to develop on their own lines, assimilating from us what they care to assimilate. The "best" in this matter of government is the most efficacious in a practical way. It may be that our ideas are better than the Indian ideas, according to some absolute standard; but where is the good of such ideas of ours if they alienate the people? Ideas of a very inferior character, according to an absolute standard, would be far more efficacious if they did not alienate the people. Is the Government not acting for the best now when it decides to conciliate the co-operation of the people, even if some of our most highly considered notions must be put aside? Was it not acting for the very worst when it tried to put down the plague by measures that issued in riot and murder, however well approved such measures might be in England? However, let us be thankful that the Government has at last learned a lesson, though the recognition of the value of popular co-operation would have come more gracefully four years ago.

The special correspondent of the *Standard* (August 14) at Simla, writing on July 26, confirms—or at any rate repeats—the grave reports of the famine that have come over on official or private authority. The case of Gujerat still stands out the worst. "In many parts of the division," says the correspondent, "there has been no rain at all, and in most others not nearly enough to enable agricultural operations to be commenced." This is a most serious position. The rayat cannot drive his plough through the hard sun-baked ground, and even if he could his autumn crop would fail for lack of moisture. The fodder famine continues, and "many of the cattle imported from Central India to repair the terrible wastage caused by the drought are dying." One would have supposed that by this time the railway authorities would be able to bring over enough fodder from Central India, as well as cattle. A great industrial calamity in Ahmedabad is also said to be impending. The correspondent reports:—

To add to the trials of the unfortunate Gujeratis, the mill industry of Ahmedabad has now reached a critical phase and there is the possibility of a general stoppage of the machinery. Should this occur, some 30,000 hands will be thrown out of work, and about five times that number will at once become dependent on Government for their daily food.

The prospect of 150,000 additional mouths on Government relief, with all the social disorganisation and misery that this implies, should stimulate the Government to vigorous anticipation of such a calamity.

On the cholera, travelling in the wake of the famine and making special excursions from various points, the correspondent sounds the like note. Thus:—

The deaths which have taken place from cholera during the present summer throughout India would, if they could only be totalled, prove astonishing even to those with some experience of the ravages of this terrible scourge in Oriental countries.

Of course, the deaths never will be totalled. Even if they were all reckoned in a famine or public health Blue-book, a very small proportion of them would appear under the head of cholera: they would be largely distributed under

less formidable names, such as enteric (or gastric) fever, heart failure, natural causes. It is hopeless to make any confident estimate. The correspondent, however, says:—

Altogether there have been 12,000 odd cases in the Punjab up to the end of June, some 60 per cent. of which terminated fatally. The returns for July are not yet available, but the totals will probably be every bit as formidable. Elsewhere throughout India there is much the same story to tell.

The correspondent attempts to single out particular points in the story, and then concludes in these words:—

What the weekly number of deaths has been it is impossible to say, but, seeing that both in Bombay and in the Central Provinces the mortality was at the rate of about 4,000 a week, it will be well within the mark to say that for weeks past 10,000 victims have been claimed by cholera.

It is weeks since we pointed out that the estimate must be well within the facts. And here is but one of the issues of the famine.

The Government of Bombay has issued a Resolution on the question of revenue collection in answer to the recent memorial presented by the Bombay Presidency Association. The Government maintains that "there is no good reason for excusing from the fulfilment of their liabilities to the State people who hold land as an investment or who are known to have ample means besides what are needed for cultivation." Agreed; but the difficulty of just discrimination remains where it was, and it is a practical difficulty that no amount of clever logis-chopping can serve to solve. The wisest course still seems to be the plan suggested by the Association—to err on the safe side. Better let ten fraudulent landholders escape temporarily than oppress one really destitute landholder, in the frightful circumstances of the time. The Government is rather surprised at the Association's statement that "well-founded complaints are being made in the Native newspapers that the collection of the arrears of revenue are even now being carried on in certain afflicted tracts with nearly the same cast-iron rigidity which is so much deplored by all well-wishers of the rayat in normal seasons." The principles to be applied are re-stated. No doubt, theoretically, they are good principles, and well meant. "The complaints referred to by the Association," says the Government, "imply that these orders are deliberately disregarded, and in the opinion of his Excellency the Governor in Council they should not have been stated to be well-founded without ample evidence." Very well, let the Association now support its complaints with detailed evidence. As to the loss of cattle, too, the Government and the Association appear to rely on very different statistics. All this dubiety of fact ought to be cleared up on both sides.

The Hon. Mr. Monteath, Chief Secretary to the Bombay Government in the Famine Department, has addressed a letter to the *Times of India* announcing the determination of the Government not to take action on "anonymous letters to newspapers" concerning the collection of revenue in certain districts of Gujerat, and expressing the assurance that "any complaint made in the proper manner to the proper authority will be fully investigated." The *Times of India* regards the refusal as "too absolute," and the promise as "not a little delusive." Our contemporary most justly remarks as follows:—

If the Government resolve to pay heed to no complaint that is made to them through other than strictly conventional channels, then it is certain that of many things that happen in the Presidency to the detriment of the commonweal they will learn nothing. It is a strange conception of the character and capacity of an average village community which assumes that every person in it—or even any large proportion of its constituents—who suffers wrong at the hands of the subordinate officers of Government is able and willing to appeal to Caesar, and in the one way that Caesar has prescribed. Government are fully aware of the incapacity of the greater part of the people for protecting themselves, and do not need to be told that they will bear many things without raising a formal complaint. . . . They would be able to pass with greater strength through the ordeal that is now before them if they had not preface it by an announcement that seems intended to stave off criticism and to discourage all but the most formal representation of popular grievances.

This is "certainly not a time for shutting off any source of information;" and "even in India the superstition of exclusive official authenticity ought to be at an end by this time."

At a time when there is a general inclination on the part of the authorities to belittle the work of the Native States, the granting of two additional guns to the salute of the

Maharaja of Travancore is not without interest; for it is generally taken as a testimony on the part of the Government of India to the good government of that country. Travancore is happily out of the range of famine, but readers of INDIA are already familiar with the economy and enlightenment which characterise its administration.

The Irrigation Cess Bill has gone through the Madras Legislative Council, and by this time it may have received the sanction of the Secretary of State for India. The dissent of the representatives of the public within the Council, strong and convincing as it seemed to be, did not delay the measure or modify it. Even in Anglo-Indian circles independent criticism is still pointed and severe. Thus the *Indian Engineering*, with all the force of professional authority, remarks as follows:—

It is iniquitous to force a man to pay for water thrown on his land against his will—even if he avail himself of what advantage he may be able to gain from it; that is, presuming the man is a free agent in the matter and not a tenant whose rent the landlord is competent arbitrarily to enhance at any time; and even then such a charge for water so delivered could not righteously be made as charge for irrigation directly, but only as an increased rent demanded because the property is now thought worth more than it was before.

The writer gives the aggrieved rayats the highest credit for their temperate remonstrances; “and, when all circumstances are considered,” he adds, “it is surprising that they keep their tempers.” For instance, he says:—

When this matter was discussed before, it was contended that the water could not be properly charged for as being forced upon the rayat without his asking, and indeed its flow was simply consequent on the defective nature of the Irrigations works. The Government, replying, wrote: “Assumption on which the Board’s reasoning is based, viz. that the percolation is due to the defective character of the irrigation work, is unwarranted in the face of the collector’s assertion that the lands receive a constant supply, and are as well off as any wet lands in the district.”

A man who keeps his temper when a Government gives an illogical reply like this to his complaint is worthy of the highest praise. Because the leakage is plentiful, therefore it is not due to the defective condition of the irrigation works. . . . Nothing could damage any administration in the eyes of men more surely than such bad logic and such bias can.

“As this most imbecile of arguments,” says the writer, “was dated May, 1889, let us devoutly hope its author is now shelved comfortably out of mischief’s way.” But what are the chances that the Secretary of State will investigate the argument and recognise its imbecility?

The Press of India, Indian and Anglo-Indian alike, is amazed at the answer of Lord George Hamilton to Sir William Wedderburn that the law of sedition in India and England is identical. Some papers are inclined to think that Reuter is mistaken. The *Times of India*, which had so much to do with the passing of the new law, says:—

This is not accurate, and if it were accurate it would not necessarily be relevant, as it would carry with it the implication that a law which is suitable for England is necessarily suitable for India.

The longer Lord George Hamilton remains in office the more he loses the respect, not of the Indians only, but even of those Anglo-Indians who are the firmest adherents of the policy he represents.

Chail Bahari Lal criticises in the *Pioneer* the arguments by which that journal strives to show that a separation of Judicial and Executive powers, however desirable, is unnecessary, and in the present state of Indian finances, improper. He declares that he has never heard it said, even by the most ardent advocate of the separation of the two functions, that the reform is necessary, because there is a wholesale failure of justice under the present system, or that under the proposed system there will be no cases of injustice.

But under the present system magistrates are not only influenced by those human weaknesses and errors against which it is so difficult to guard; they are exposed in addition to prejudices which are a direct result of the confusion of two powers.

According to the Indian papers, two boys recently had a quarrel, but one of the boys was an Indian, the other the son of a European guard, so that the quarrel had a sequel. The European boy complained to his father, who beat the Indian with his stick so unmercifully that he had to be removed to hospital. The truth of this story is now being investigated in Benares, where the guard is on his trial.

A correspondent of the *Pioneer* who signs himself

“Shooter,” takes up the defence of the Indian peasants who get involved in affrays with British soldiers. He writes:—

Though there is no excuse for the cowardly attacks of crowds of Natives on solitary soldiers, or on parties of soldiers, I will ask any Englishman if the manner in which Europeans out shooting in this country tramp over young corn, or even through standing crops, with very little regard for the feelings of the owner of the land did not cause him considerable surprise when he first saw it.

This, according to “Shooter,” is of frequent occurrence, and is done without ever asking permission of the owner of the land, though it would not be tolerated in England, nor from Indians in India. He suggests, too, that the indignation caused by the shooting of peafowl may be due not only to the sacred character of the bird, but to a belief that the land on which they have been slain comes under an evil influence.

The overcrowding of the Bombay gaols, not unknown before, has been greatly intensified by the recent distress; for as the *Times of India* says:—

No doubt the circumstances of the year were exceptional, for famine means an increase of crime, though it is due to the patient and suffering people of the Bombay districts to recognise that the increase has been small in proportion to the calamity.

The same paper announces that the Government have in view a revision of sentences for offences attributable to famine as soon as conditions have improved and the distress has been relieved—a course at once prudent and merciful. It must not be forgotten, however, that even in normal years the gaols are overcrowded.

The *Tribune* complains that on the railway line between Bhatinda and Samasata goods waggons and cattle trucks are being used for third class passengers. As it says, in times of pilgrimage, the pilgrims do not complain because they know that the capacities of the line are then taxed to the uttermost, and the greater the discomforts of the journey, the greater the merit. But this kind of thing is intolerable in ordinary times when there is no special pressure.

A correspondent (“Singler”) of the *Pioneer* makes a simple suggestion for the prevention of theft of rifles, against which our men have to guard all along the frontier, and indeed elsewhere. The experience of the recent Afridi campaign might well give an impulse to the inventive faculty. “All that is wanted,” says the correspondent, “is a little kerosene oil and a few cheap lamps.” The thefts take place generally on the darkest nights; and a lamp at every twenty or thirty yards a little outside the line of sentries, throwing its light outwards, would render it practically impossible for a rifle thief or a ghazi to reach the camp without being discovered and dealt with. Possibly the suggestion is too simple for the official mind. Anyhow, it seems to be well worth serious consideration.

Colonel A. N. Lockwood, towards the close of the Session, placed before the Secretary of State for India a question to the following effect, which does not seem to have appeared on the Notice Paper:—

Has there been established at Kasanti, with the countenance and support of the Indian Government, what is described as an Anti-Rabies Institute; what is the estimated annual cost of this institution, including that of the medical officer, said to be lent by Government to it as manager or principal?

Is the Secretary of State aware that there have been provided, through private liberality, in all the large cities and cantonments of India the appliances needed for treatment, by means of the Buisson or vapour baths, of soldiers and others bitten by animals supposed to be infected with rabies; and that in several instances that treatment has been successful in the cure and prevention of hydrophobia?

Can medical and commanding officers be induced to arrange that in cases of soldiers supposed to be infected with rabies they should be treated by this safe and effective natural remedy instead of incurring the cost and risk of their being sent to Paris or Kasanti?

The Indian Secretary’s reply was to the effect that he was aware that such an institution had been established, in the first instance by private subscriptions, and that Government has agreed to contribute Rs. 9,500 per annum towards its upkeep, which sum, he added, was very much less than that incurred previously in sending soldiers and others to the Pasteur Institution at Paris. As to the alleged success of the vapour bath treatment enquiry had been made, and as the balance of opinion did not seem to confirm the efficacy of that method it is not expected that medical officers will be induced to adopt it.

## ARMY EXPENDITURE AND FAMINE.

FOR some months past there have appeared side by side in the English papers two sets of telegrams, the one telling of the progress of famine, the loss of cattle, the sufferings of the people, the millions on relief, the other of the embarkation of troops in India to fight in South Africa and China. It is possible that most readers saw no connexion save the chance one of locality between these two sets of telegrams. And yet the connexion is both real and deep, for if famine be the result, not of drought alone, but of drought falling on an impoverished people, then everything that has made or kept the Indians poor has contributed to the intensity of the distress, not least the heavy military expenditure, felt in the load of taxation, and now proved by the course of events to be unnecessary. It has for many years been the contention of the Anglo-Indian world that the country could not spare without risk a single British soldier. And now in the hour of danger when, if ever, external and internal foes would be active, the British garrison is depleted by close upon a seventh of its strength. According to an answer given by Lord George Hamilton in the House of Commons, the number of European troops withdrawn for foreign service is 8,600, the number remaining 61,000. Most of these 8,600 have been absent some nine months, and yet India stands secure. Thus does the action of a Unionist Government, impelled by the necessities of the situation, give the lie to the preconceived notions of Anglo-Indian officials. Of those that are taken away, both Indian and European, India is relieved of the immediate expense. Mr. Buchanan asked the Secretary of State,

What provision was being made to recoup the Indian Exchequer for the initial expenditure on transport and similar purposes connected with the despatch of the Indian contingent to China.

Lord George Hamilton made answer:—

An approximate estimate of the initial cost of the force that is being sent from India to China has been obtained from the Government of India and forwarded to the War Office. When a vote has been passed by the House application for the amount will be made to the War Office.

So far so good. India has already gained immensely by no longer having to bear this useless weight, but the relief is only temporary, and there remains a heavy reckoning for all the years during which the unjust burden has been borne.

The authorities who have thus saddled poverty-stricken India with the payment of soldiers now shown to be unnecessary for the purposes of that country, cannot pretend that the matter was not pressed on their notice. To begin with, the National Congress, whose advice is so generally despised by Indian officialdom, and so often proved wise by the event, passed in their fifteenth Session, held at Lucknow, the following firm but very moderate resolution:—

Resolved that whereas it is considered safe and prudent to withdraw large bodies of British troops for service outside the statutory limits of India, this Congress is of opinion that the time has come when the Indian taxpayer should be granted some relief out of the British Exchequer towards the cost of maintaining in India so large a force of European soldiers. This Congress sees no objection to the location of British troops in India as a reserve force for the whole of the British Empire, but is of opinion that the time has come for the transfer of the cost of 20,000 British troops from the Indian to the British Exchequer.

But in the years gone by another voice was heard proclaiming a similar view in much stronger language—a voice to which even the most obstinate Anglo-Indian cannot refuse some deference. Lord Salisbury has held higher posts than that of Secretary of State for India. He has now for the third time reached the highest object of an English politician's ambition; but nothing in his whole career has done him so much credit as his conduct of Indian affairs in the days of his youth. Speaking as Lord Cranborne in the House of Commons, and while still responsible for the Government of India, he used these ever memorable words:—

I do not like India to be looked upon as an English barrack in the Oriental sense from which we may draw any number of troops without paying for them. It is bad for England, because it is always bad for us not to have that check upon the temptation to engage in little wars which can only be controlled by the necessity of paying for them. If this garrison which we keep in India is, as all Indian authorities assure us, necessary for maintaining that country in security and peace, that garrison ought not to be rashly diminished. If, on the other hand, it is too large, and India can for any length of time conveniently spare these troops, then the Indian population ought not to be so unnecessarily taxed.

India for a considerable and a still undefined time has spared these troops, apparently without danger or inconvenience, and therefore it follows on the authority of the present Prime Minister of the United Kingdom that the garrison is too large, and that the Indian people in their dire poverty have been unnecessarily taxed.

Nor can the account be considered closed by the removal of some thousands of troops from Indian soil, and the transfer of their maintenance to the Treasury of the United Kingdom. A powerful party in India feel bitterly that the Government of which they have been such loyal and ardent supporters have brought them to open shame and ridicule, by believing all their prophecies and reversing the policy in which they had put their trust. This party, feeling that it is impossible to do anything at once in view of the unexpected turn of events first in Africa, in the autumn, and now in China, are concentrating their energies for a determined attempt to restore the Indian garrison to its old strength whenever the long deferred days of peace arrive. If that party succeed in their designs, then India after a short and temporary respite will once more be required to take up the burden of an armament proved to be unnecessary, and therefore iniquitous. But even if this design does not succeed, even if in the future India remains in such comparative ease as the withdrawal of 8,600 European troops allows, there will still be a heavy debt from England to India. For this army, so greatly in excess of India's needs, has been maintained for years at India's expense as an Imperial reserve. When Lord George Hamilton, answering Mr. Buchanan, said that the initial cost of the force now being sent from India to China would be paid by the United Kingdom, he did not mean the real initial cost, the cost of the men destined not for India but for Africa and the far East who had been maintained in health and efficiency during many years to be ready for service in an Imperial crisis. Nor did he include the cost of those other men who had fallen out of the ranks, and all that India has had to pay for the care of the sick and the disabled. Yet all that is a true part of the initial cost of the armies that have gone forth from India over the seas to fight the battles of the Empire.

In any adjustment that may hereafter take place between England and India, this expenditure on an Imperial reserve must be taken into account. And however fully the adjustment and the compensation may be made, it will always remain to the discredit of the British Empire that in this, the richest Empire the world has ever seen, the support of so great a reserve was left not merely to its poorest part, but to the poorest of all civilised nations. When this shameful fact is read by posterity in its place amid the records of famine, the connexion between the two things, which to many is now so obscure, will then become plain in all its ugliness; and the Empire on which the sun never sets will wish for some brief space of darkness in which to hide its open and apparent shame.

This brings us to the question whether, without waiting for a formal adjustment of accounts, something cannot be done to remedy this wrong at once. England is in India's debt for the maintenance of an Imperial reserve. Starving India is struggling to rise again from the greatest famine of the century. Has not India a claim, grounded not on benevolence, not on pity, but on the simplest dictates of justice, to an immediate repayment of some part of the cost which she has borne so patiently. Even Lord George Hamilton did not speak of the grant to India as being refused definitely and for ever. That grant the heart of the English people, touched by the appalling misery of India, has long ago accorded. How much more, then, should it be welcomed, when it is seen by the course of events to be an act of justice, necessary to relieve the conscience of England from the burden of a great wrong?

A HISTORY OF GREECE.<sup>1</sup>

IT would hardly be rash to predict for Professor Bury's new history that it is likely to be for the next generation of English readers the standard one-volume history of ancient Greece. Nor does this statement exhaust the importance of the book. It is probably the most valuable contribution, whether in one volume or in many, made

<sup>1</sup> "A History of Greece to the Death of Alexander the Great." By J. E. Bury, M.A., Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Dublin. (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited.)

within recent years by any English writer to the study of Greek history. This may be said with full acknowledgment of the learning and conscientious industry that Mr. Evelyn Abbott has bestowed on the three volumes in which he has brought his history down to the end of the Peloponnesian War. Professor Bury's clearly but closely printed volume of 900 pages is necessarily less detailed than Mr. Abbott's work, but it has also more approach to finality. Invaluable as Mr. Abbott's writings are to the historical student, they are rather material for history than history itself. Again, Professor Bury's work has great advantages for the English reader over the recently published translation of Holm. Though Holm runs to four volumes (three to the death of Alexander), the amount of detail in Professor Bury is not very materially less. For a reader with any feeling about style the question between the two works is decided at once. Professor Bury has a style which never irritates, occasionally charms, and most often has the great merit (in a historian) of not attracting any attention to itself. If Holm's work has any literary quality in the original German, it certainly does not survive in the translation.

The part of Professor Bury's history that will have most attraction for readers of India is probably his account of the first European conqueror of India, "the first and last Western conqueror of Afghanistan," and "the only European conqueror who marched straight from the West to the Indus and the Oxus." The pages that tell the actual story of conquest—the years when Alexander's camp was his court and capital, the political centre of his empire, "a vast city rolling along over mountain and river through Central Asia"—are among the most fascinating of a fascinating volume. After enjoying unrivalled prestige for many generations, and after being regarded throughout the Middle Ages as magician as well as warrior, Alexander the Great has suffered some eclipse of fame during the nineteenth century. Holm has endeavoured to give him back all or more than all the greatness he has lost by making him the Greek counterpart of Mommsen's conception of Julius Caesar, the conqueror by divine right of genius. To complete the likeness, Demosthenes, the orator who refused to acknowledge the divine mission of Caesar. Further, we are invited to see in Alexander a sort of historical anticipation of the present German Kaiser, for whose all-embracing interest nothing is too great or too small. Professor Bury, too, exalts Alexander, but less crudely and more convincingly than Holm. His view is very much the same sort of modification of Holm's that, in the case of Julius Caesar, Seely's or Pelham's is of Mommsen's—the view that, as Alexander advanced, his ideas expanded and he rose to a loftier conception of his new position and his relation to Asia.

He began to transcend the familiar distinction of Greek and barbarian, and to see that, for all the truth it contained, it was not the last word that could be said. He formed the notion of an empire, both European and Asiatic, in which the Asiatic should not be dominated by the European invaders, but Europeans and Asiatics alike should be ruled on an equality by a monarch, indifferent to the distinction of Greek and barbarian, and looked upon as their own king by Persians as well as by Macedonians.

Professor Bury's conclusion is that Alexander, had he lived, would have been more wonderful as statesman than he was as conqueror. His comparisons, who wrote memoirs about him, were not capable of appreciating his statesmanship, and they have unwittingly done him an injustice. His successors, too, were "hard-headed Macedonians, capable and practical rulers, but without the higher qualities of the founder's genius": what they did gives us little notion of what he might have done.

Upon our judgment of Alexander must depend our judgment of Demosthenes. Professor Bury regards Demosthenes as on the wrong as well as the losing side. But he indulges in none of the cheap sneers that disgrace Holm's work in imitation of the cheap sneers against Cicero that disgrace Mommsen's. Demosthenes deserves admiration for genuine patriotism as well as for splendid oratory, even if we feel with Professor Bury that oratory, detached from the practical qualities with which it had been combined in Pericles, was a curse to the Greek city-state.

Admirers of Alexander are generally content to leave his father Philip in the shade, with the epithet "barbarian," which Demosthenes hurled at him, still sticking to his

memory. Professor Bury thinks Philip one of the world's greatest rulers. He has suffered from the superior reputation of his son, from the attacks of orators whose business was to misrepresent him, and from the absence of any history of his conquest of Thrace. His choice of Aristotle to be his son's tutor, Professor Bury acutely says, proves that he was no barbarian, but a conscious promoter of Greek civilisation; and, finally, "the work of Alexander is the most authentic testimony to the work of Philip."

We have dwelt at such length on the later part of the volume that we must be content to notice very briefly some of the features of the earlier portion. The discoveries of the last twenty years have made the task of the historian of early Greece a very fascinating but a very difficult one. Instead of treading ground that has been trodden many times before, revising a conclusion here and there, he has practically to construct a new history out of material abundant indeed, but still involved in deep obscurity and seldom leading to certain inferences. It would be difficult to speak too highly of the skill with which Professor Bury has managed this part of his narrative. A word must be said in praise of the numerous illustrations from photographs, coins, and works of art, that illuminate the text. Passing on to historic Athens, we can hardly expect at this time of day to find anything that is both new and true said of Pericles. But Professor Bury holds the scales with an impartial hand. He sees the real greatness of Pericles far better than Mr. Abbott. But he does not condone the unscrupulousness which then, as now, was characteristic of an "imperial" policy.

One thing more must be mentioned. Not the least merit of this history is the humour, unaggressive and dignified, that lightens its serious pages. Two instances may suffice. The Herodotean oracle in which Apollo debates whether Lycurgus was god or man, and pronounces that he was a god, is quoted in a foot-note with the comment: "The decision of the god agrees with the result of modern criticism." To the latest criticism, it must be remembered, "Lycurgus" means "wolf-repeller," and he is identified with an Arcadian god whom the Spartans found in possession when they arrived in Lacedæmon. Again, we are told the excellent story of Alexander of Phœnix and the performance of the fearful play of the "Troades." At the conclusion the tyrant apologised to the actor for his dry eyes: they were not due, he explained, to any defect in the acting but to his feeling that one who had pitilessly killed so many real people ought not to weep over imaginary sorrows. To this story Professor Bury appends the apt marginal comment: "What's Hebeba to him?"

## OUR LONDON LETTER.

WESTMINSTER, Thursday.

TO some of us, London without Parliament is like an unlit lantern. When the light over the Clock Tower is extinguished our interest in the great city dies out along with it. Yet of the multitudes who pass across Westminster Bridge day by day, probably not one in a hundred notes that the signal which all through the Session proclaims the devotion of the Senate is no longer shining in its beacon tower above Big Ben. Passers-by, indeed, are more likely to observe that Big Ben himself is sadly out of order, and that the iron-tongued bell has suspended its accustomed monitions. After all, the number of people who are interested in the problems of the Parliamentary lobby is extremely small. If the date of the dissolution continues to be discussed, it is not the man in the street who keeps the topic alive but the man in the club. The country, like Lord Salisbury and Sir M. Hicks Beach, and Mr. Micaewser, is waiting for something to turn up, and meanwhile it goes about its business quite placidly, finding the newspapers perhaps a little more interesting for the absence of the Parliamentary debates, but not otherwise conscious of any great vacancy in the intellectual life of the nation. And this, when one thinks of it, is perhaps the most striking testimony yet offered to the monumental dullness of the dead Session.

Dullness is infectious. When the Chancellor of the Exchequer solemnly announced the other night that there would be an electoral contest in November—for the Bristol City Council—and that the dissolution of Parliament would take place between now and the next general election, columns of ex-

cellent prose were written to prove that the jesting Minister had foretold an election within the next six months. The fault was partly Sir M. Hicks-Beach's. He damaged the point of his little joke by saying that the election must take place between now and the seventh Session of Parliament. What he meant was that the election must take place between now and the seventh year of Parliament. The existing Parliament, although only five years old, has already survived its seventh Session and is now looking forward dubiously to its eighth. Clubmen, whose interest in this subject appears to be inextinguishable, are never in the same mind about it for two days running. To-day the inclination is to throw cold water on the idea of an autumn dissolution. To-morrow men may be penning their election addresses.

Foreign affairs are, of course, the governing factor of the situation. If the Chinese inbroglio were once settled, all would be plain sailing. Those who have examined the recesses of Lord Salisbury's mind tell us that he would like to retire at the end of this Parliament but that he feels bound to stick to his post, so long at least as the outlook abroad retains its present threatening aspect. The theory is plausible and it suggests another. If Lord Salisbury is animated by this patriotic sentiment, it must clearly be to the interest of his probable successor to seek a prolongation of Parliament in the hope that before the Septennial Act comes into operation the storm-clouds may have so far cleared away as to permit the Prime Minister to court repose. Otherwise, Lord Salisbury, yielding to his own sense of duty and to the solicitations of the Queen and the more responsible men in the Conservative wing of his party, may consider himself obliged to retain office. Were that to happen it would be a severe blow to the most ambitious spirit in Europe. Mr. Chamberlain is too old a man to view the prospect of another seven years' apprenticeship with equanimity; yet no one knows better than he that Lord Salisbury's motto has ever been, *d'y suis, et j'y reste*. If vaulting ambition should overleap itself, which is not unlikely, Birmingham alone will weep.

Meanwhile the war in South Africa drags wearily on. The mercurial De Wet, it is true, continues to be surrounded at regularly recurring intervals, while President Kruger, as of yore, sits trembling on the verge of capitulation. But the indecision of the old man and the baffling elusiveness of the younger one are more than tantalising—they are positively exasperating. A few days before the rising of Parliament, Mr. Wyndham incautiously predicted that the war would be over within the current month. Since then we have read of the capture of a British garrison at Elands River, of the failure of Lord Methuen to arrest the flight of the brilliant 'will-o'-the-wisp De Wet, and of a succession of audacious assaults on the British line of communications. We are now in the eleventh month of the war and shall soon be celebrating the anniversary of its birth; and to this day we are still sending out shiploads of reinforcements.

To those facts as much as to the discovery of a hare-brained plot at Pretoria for the abduction of the British Commander-in-Chief is to be attributed the savage outburst of impatience which was witnessed the other day against the methods of civilised warfare. Lord Roberts himself did not escape criticism. The obstinacy of the Boers, he was told, was the direct outcome of his misplaced leniency. He must drop the character of Don Quixote and assume that of another Spanish celebrity—the Duke of Alva. Happily, Lord Roberts is far removed from the influence of the shrieking school of Imperialism. His contemptuous yet whimsical allusion to the plot "to carry me off," which he stigmatised as clumsily conceived, acted like a cold douche on the inflamed imaginations of his critics. Some of them are even beginning to suggest that the polioice of Quixotism might prove more remedial than the surgical operation of Cromwellism. Those who know the Boers best are convinced that the effect of the wholesale deportations, recently to St. Helena and now to Ceylon, must be to render a desperate enemy more irreconcilable.

That sturdy Anglo-Indian, Mr. J. M. Maclean, continues to wage war with official Conservatism in his constituency, the borough of Cardiff. Mr. Maclean has been disowned by his political godfathers on account of his heretical views on the war, which he has had the audacity to describe as both unnecessary and unjust. The Conservatives of Cardiff have retaliated by selecting a candidate of a more accommodating turn of mind, and now Mr. Maclean, in a letter in which he

traverses the whole policy of the Unionist Government, challenges his adversaries to abide by the verdict of a public meeting of electors. Some of the counts in Mr. Maclean's indictment betray an extremely old-fashioned point of view. For example, he appears to think that the electorate is interested in India. "Finally," he says, "I condemn in the strongest terms the selfishness of the English Treasury in refusing to give a grant of money to India. It used to be the boast of the Indian Government that whatever happened in time of famine, human life at least would be preserved; but this year Lord George Hamilton and Lord Curzon have looked helplessly on while two millions of human beings have died of starvation and disease." It is to be hoped, in the interests of outspoken debate, that the official Tory ring at Cardiff will accede to Mr. Maclean's request and permit him to expound his manifesto on the platform.

## NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

### FAMINE AND IRRIGATION.

[FROM AN INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

BOMBAY, July 27.

No rain yet! Gujarat is daily growing worse, and the number on relief works is weekly increasing. All reports say that the water in the wells has dried up. If there is to be another drought, it is a problem whence the people will obtain their daily supply of drinking water. The food may be there, but if the vital necessary of life grows scarcer and scarcer what is to be done? This is the problem which is staring both the people and the Government in the face. It may be that for a time the thirsty will draw upon the water of the nearest river and her tributaries. But even that supply must soon fail, and meanwhile one cannot say what may happen to the quality of the water. Where humanity congregates in large numbers there must follow pollution, and I need not stop to describe the fatal effects of polluted drinking water among a thirsty population. Hence one can imagine what miseries are in store for unhappy India in the coming months. The residuum of the cattle must die first. As a matter of fact, animals purchased some time ago are now being resold for a song, it being found impracticable to get sufficient provender and water for them.

Simla has been greatly alarmed at the situation; and the Viceroy, without a moment's delay, like the energetic and courageous administrator that he has proved himself to be, has buckled on his armour and resolved to repair to the scene of the greatest misery. He will leave the breezy heights of Simla on the 30th, and arrive a couple of days later at Ahmedabad, where he means to make a stay of ten days. The time will be employed in visiting all the worst places in the district, seeing things for himself and directing what may be necessary to be done. We are quite confident that whatever requires to be immediately taken in hand will be done to combat the grim monster that will stalk through Gujarat for another twelve long and weary months—months that will demand the greatest patience and endurance, and claim nobody knows what number of victims.

The most important remedial measure will be the finding of drinking water. It is felt here that for such a purpose the best relief works which could be immediately undertaken are the sinking of *cucha* wells wherever possible, and the deepening of tanks, reservoirs, and similar structures. The latter will be of a permanent character, and so far the cost will be reproductive. As to the former, the *cucha* wells, too, could by-and-by be turned into well-built ones. But time is of the essence of the matter. The sooner the Viceroy decides on such excellent works of primary necessity at this juncture the better for the unlucky people who, for the second time, are about to be sorely smitten with a severe drought. In this connexion it may be suggested that Lord Curzon might do well to indent on the services of some of those talented English and American engineers who have so successfully carried out large irrigations works in Egypt. Lord Cromer would, no doubt, do his best to assist India at this juncture. Messrs. Aird and Co., who are now damming the Nile and impounding the waters at Athara, if pressed into the service with a competent staff, could work wonders. This is just the time to invite the best engineering skill in connexion with irrigation.

It may be that in some places the water-bearing strata are

very deep and impracticable for work. But, given a competent staff of experts, a great deal of good permanent work could be accomplished, apart from temporary operations. The taxpayers' monies—practically those of the rajats—could not be utilised for a better and more reproductive purpose than this. Within five years the surface of the country might be changed. No spot should remain unexplored where water wells, reservoirs, tanks, or other devices could be constructed. Tracts liable to drought would thus be greatly secured against future shortage of rain. The authorities are now spending nearly four crores per annum on railways. If they would outlay that amount by half, and spend the rest on irrigation works of all kinds, suitable to different localities, the ten crores which might be spent in five years would be most usefully and beneficently laid out. That outlay would in future famines greatly diminish the expenditure on relief works. What is wanted is a bold and broad policy. It is to be hoped that Lord Curzon's statesmanship will be equal to the occasion. If any Viceroy can put the scheme in train, and lay a permanent and solid foundation for the future prosperity of the cultivator, it is he. Immunity from drought is the first essential requisite, and famine may become as rare in India as it has been in Europe.

### THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

6,149,000 ON RELIEF.

The Secretary of State for India has received the following telegram from the Viceroy, dated August 14:—

"The favourable conditions reported last week continue and rain is now falling generally throughout the country. Total number supported in all famine-stricken provinces still large owing to backwardness of crops, restricted demand for labour in the fields, and high prices.

"Numbers of persons in receipt of relief:—Bombay, 1,586,000; Punjab, 169,000; Central Provinces, 2,270,000; Berar, 472,000; Ajmere-Merwara, 95,000; Rajputana States, 324,000; Central India States, 105,000; Bombay Native States, 421,000; Baroda, 122,000; North-Western Provinces, 2,000; Punjab Native States, 42,000; Central Provinces Feudatory States, 51,000; Hyderabad, 460,000; Madras, 8,000; Bengal, 22,000. Total, 6,149,000. Bombay and Bengal returns of number on relief works incomplete."

The Secretary of State for India has received the following telegram from the Governor of Bombay, dated August 12, 1900:—

"Following are figures for week ending August 4:—Famine-stricken districts, 6,545 cases of cholera, of which there were fatal 4,264. Native States—cases of cholera, 5,414; deaths from cholera, 3,290. Total number of deaths among numbers on relief works and gratuitous relief, British districts, 7,041, or 4 2-5 per mille. Cultivation active and sowings growing forward generally in North Gujarat (and) Kathiawar, where plentiful rain has fallen. Crop prospects continue favourable in the remainder of the affected tracts. Numbers on relief works decreasing, numbers on gratuitous relief increasing."

### THE MANSION HOUSE FUND.

The Mansion House Fund for the relief of the Indian famine sufferers amounted on Wednesday night to £353,200.

### THE "INVESTORS' REVIEW" FUND.

We take the following from the current issue (August 11) of the *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 ..	£ 4778 7 1
J. M. .. .. .	10 0
Total to date ..	£ 4778 17 1

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

### APPEAL BY THE BISHOP OF HEREFORD.

The subjoined letter has been sent to every incumbent in the Hereford diocese:—

Dear Brother,—The accounts of the famine in India which continue to arrive are so heartrending that I am moved to suggest the appropriateness of a special appeal to our people at the time of their harvest thanksgiving. Although many of our parishes have already sent liberal contributions, I believe that they would still desire to give additional help and that all would welcome the opportunity of giving something at this season in aid of those suffering multitudes who are slowly dying of starvation, while we have bread enough and to spare, and I should be glad if we could make up a substantial diocesan fund from our harvest thank-offerings. I would not ask or suggest that your annual offertory should be taken away from the good cause to which you may be in the habit of giving it, as true charity requires that our ordinary good works should go on uninterrupted and undiminished by these special appeals to which we make a special response. My hope is that if you could announce to your parishioners beforehand either that some portion of the harvest thanksgiving offertories or some additional offering at this thanksgiving season would be sent to relieve the famine-stricken people of India, and if you were to explain in some detail the nature and extent of the suffering that is crying to us for relief the hearts of your parishioners, rich and poor alike, would be so touched by the contrast between their own happier lot and the sad and sore burden of those who are perishing and seeing their children perish from starvation and cholera that their offerings would be exceptionally generous. Thus while help would be given to our patient and starving fellow-subjects your good work at home would not suffer. All experience shows how ready and how generous is the response of our people to the cry of want or suffering when it reaches their hearts, and in the sad plight of India at this moment we have one of the most touching appeals that I remember. Should you be able to respond to my invitation I shall be glad to take charge of any contribution from your parish and add it to a harvest thanksgiving fund from the diocese of Hereford and forward it to the proper Indian authorities for distribution to the best advantage. Those authorities—in other words, civilian officials, doctors, missionaries, soldiers, and others, men and women—are fighting the good fight there and doing a brave and saving work, risking their lives in it every day. Such workers and their work are the real glory of our Empire, and their example may well stir us to give, as God has prospered us here in our highly favoured English life. As I write this letter I see it reported by the Viceroy that on July 28 the number of persons receiving relief was 6,266,000, and that during the week ending July 21, 11,413 deaths from cholera occurred in our own famine-stricken districts and the Native States. To grasp the practical meaning of such appalling figures as these or to gain any idea of the suffering they represent is for us in our circumstances almost impossible. It is as if here at home the entire population of Wales and Ireland, or let us say, eight times the whole population of Herefordshire, Shropshire, and Worcestershire had at this moment to be kept alive by Government relief; and the deathroll from cholera of the one week ending July 21 is equivalent to more than half of the inhabitants of the city of Hereford, or just about one-tenth of the population of the whole county. As we think of all those thousands meeting starvation, disease, death, entire families together, in their long-suffering patience, with hardly a cry or complaint, while we are joining in our harvest thanksgivings and saying with more or less of serious thought "What shall I render unto the Lord for all the benefits that He hath done unto me?" the contrast will surely move us to give generously out of the pity of a thankful heart. To the figure quoted above I may add the testimony of a personal friend of my own, who has lately returned from a visit of eleven weeks' duration to the famine-stricken districts. He writes to me as follows:—

"The parts of India which are threatened with a second year of famine were in a terrible condition when I visited them in May. The people of Gujarat, in the north of the Bombay Presidency, were dying in great numbers from starvation and famine diseases, and cholera was and still is carrying thousands of them off every week. The cholera deaths throughout the Bombay Presidency and its Native States are 50,000 a month. Their plough cattle were mostly dead, and hardly any of the milch cattle were left. Ploughing is doubly out of the question now that the monsoon has failed; but the want of milk will mean death for many of the children. The miles of the

people will have somehow to be kept alive for many months to come. They are so reduced that it will really be almost a case of nursing them through the crisis. The ordinary famine rations are not nourishing enough for people in such a state. There are nearly two and a-half millions of people in the British protectorate where things are worst. In Kathiawar, which is Native territory, I believe that matters are, if possible, even more serious. An Englishman who has large interests there, and who has been doing much to keep the people alive, wrote to me by the end of next month my funds will be exhausted. I feel very sad, and am filled with fear and anxiety for the lives of those who are striving to keep from disease and starvation. The majority are respectable poor, a class very hard to deal with, and yet absolutely dependent on a charity that does not reach them and cannot reach them through ordinary channels; and it is here where private efforts are wanted to supplement the best efforts of Government. The failure of a second monsoon would bring the most appalling consequences to Gujarat and Kathiawar, and turn them into barren deserts. Should even favourable rains fall at once we can now look for no amelioration of the people's prospects before November. Rain in the middle of August would avail nothing for monsoon crops or planting, though it might help the winter crops. There will be two and three-quarter millions of people to be looked after, in Kathiawar, and another three millions, I am afraid, in the smaller Native States of Gujarat. It is simply impossible to describe the heroic patience and courage of the people. They are heart-broken by the loss of everything; but so long as a fraction of an anna is to be earned by any sort of labour they will work on, exhausted as they are, sooner than come on relief. I never saw or imagined such fortitude as they are showing under such fearful conditions. If only Englishmen could see the way they are taking it there would be no need to appeal for help. Baroda and a great part of Rajputana are also faced by another famine year, and here too the condition of the people is piteous. In parts of Rajputana the cholera has carried off ten per cent. of them, and all over this huge area the cattle have died of starvation. Scarcely any are left, and there can be little ploughing done even if the rains come. And now it appears from Lord Curzon's latest telegram that in the South-Western Punjab the crops are in imminent danger from want of rain, whilst in the Central Provinces, Benar, and Hyderabad good crops can only be hoped for if the monsoon improves. In other words, a second year of famine is certain for the western tracts, and every day that passes without rain darkens the outlook for the northern and central parts of India."

This letter was written on July 30. Since then, owing to more abundant rains, the prospect for next year is apparently improved in some of the districts; but at the very best the condition of the people for many months must be such as may well move our pity beyond the power of words. Never were the words of the Roman poet more applicable, "*Sunt lacrymæ rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt*" ("There are tears for trouble, and human sorrows touch the heart").—Yours sincerely,  
J. HERFORD.

#### "THE INDIAN FAMINE AND FINANCE."

Under this heading the *Morning Post* publishes the following letter:—

Sir,—It used to be a joke with us Englishmen, I remember, in the days of the Second Empire that the prosperity budget annually produced was always dated two or three years ahead. It was a discreet postponement. We, however, are apparently never tired of using this same device in relation to Indian finance. But for some unforeseen occurrence, which will persist in taking place, there would have been a surplus last year, the year before, this year; but beyond any peradventure there will be a surplus next year, or the year after, or the year after that. Then, in the fineness of time and the Exchange, there will be a reduction of taxation. But—and so on, "withstanding," "we look at it in this way," etc., world without end! Now that sort of thing has been going on, to my certain knowledge, ever since the Queen took over the Government of India from the East India Company in 1858. Lord George Hamilton gave us another example of the postponed prosperity dodge in the House of Commons; and I have very little doubt that five or six years hence, meantime, some other glib figure-manipulator will be enlarging in the same place on the same financial phenomena in the same way. The result of all this optimism, however, has been a succession of deficits, a continuous stream of taxation, a series of famines quite unprecedented in all the long history of Hindustan, and a growth of the amount of the drain of produce from India without any commercial return until it has now attained the colossal total of £50,000,000 a year. In view of the frightful facts in reference to the present famine adduced even by the Secretary of State for India, is it not absolutely incumbent on us as a people to take account in earnest of what is going on in our great dependency? If I am right in my contentions—and nobody in your column or elsewhere has yet proved them to be incorrect—we ourselves are manufacturing poverty and famine in British India by the tremendous drain of wealth for home charges and the remittances on private accounts. Deficient rainfall induces scarcity; our exaction of tribute, with its inevitable accompaniments of over-assessment and over-taxation, converts that scarcity into famine. Until we recognise that our foreign rule, however good it may be in itself, and our

heavy drain of foreign tribute, however necessary it may be, constitute together far too heavy a burden on British India these awful famines will continue to extend and extend, as they have done for the past two and forty years, with ever-increasing rapidity. The unprecedented loss of cattle in this present famine—there are still six million two hundred thousand people on the relief works—cannot fail to place the impoverished people at a tremendous disadvantage in tilling their petty holdings and in endeavouring to make up for this ruinous year, seeing that without their ploughing cattle tillage is almost impossible for the bulk of the population. I trust, therefore, that even if the monsoon should have brought plenteous rain your readers will not imagine that the danger of an economic catastrophe in India is by any means averted. One word more. Anyone would think, to read Lord George Hamilton's speech or to hear what Anglo-Indians commonly say on the subject, that we were supplying the money and food necessary for the relief works, possibly even that all this fell from Heaven like the manna of the Israelites in response to our earnest supplications. As a matter of fact, however, every farthing of the money and every ounce of the food is contributed by the natives of India themselves. All we Englishmen do is to distribute it, charging very high rates indeed for our administration, as well as for the transport. Let us bear in mind throughout that economically we contribute nothing to India. All we do in this regard, apart from £300,000 of charity, is to drain away her wealth without return and lend her back her own abstracted capital at interest. Surely, if ever there were a case for an Imperial grant, or rather for the suspension of the ruinous Imperial drawings in this year of awful famine, the case of British India to-day is that case.—Yours, etc.,  
9, Queen Anne's Gate, July 28. H. M. HYNDMAN.

## Imperial Parliament.

Tuesday, August 7.

### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

#### THE FAMINE.

SIR MACHELREE BROWNAGGER asked the Secretary of State for India if he had any further information about the rainfall in the districts affected by the famine in India, and whether the prospects of the ensuing crops were improved:

And if he had received from Lord Curzon any reports regarding his inspection last week of the affected provinces in Western India.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The Government of India telegraph as follows: "Famine. Very decided improvement in last ten days through sudden opportune renewed advance of the monsoon. The rain which has fallen is ample for present agricultural requirements in Gujarat, also in the greater part of Rajputana and Central India. Sowings being actively prosecuted, so far as scarcity of plough bullocks permits. If present favourable conditions continue, considerable autumn crops will be secured and tension will relax." On August 6 the Governor of Bombay reported that "rainfall continues in affected area. Agricultural operations are progressing satisfactorily in Gujarat, Pench Mahals, and Kathiawar. Elsewhere agricultural prospects are encouraging. Numbers on relief works and gratuitous relief increased." I have not yet received from the Viceroy any special reports regarding what he has witnessed during the inspections he is now making in the famine districts.

#### THE GUARANTEED RAILWAYS.

MR. MACNELL asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in the transactions whereby the property and interests of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company were taken over and acquired by the Government of India, account was taken of the debt due to the State in respect of sums advanced from India's general revenues to make up the dividends guaranteed to the company or for other purposes:

And seeing that the aggregate total of these advances to the three remaining guaranteed companies (including the Great Indian Peninsula) still amounted to over Rs. 35,000,000, could he state what means, if any, were there by which the Indian revenues might recover the amount of those advances.

LORD G. HAMILTON: Under contract of November 20, 1870, between the Secretary of State for India in Council and the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company, the Company gave up its right to more than half the surplus profits in the event of advances of interest being entirely repaid, and in return the Government abandoned all claim to repayment of such advances in any other manner. Similar arrangements were made with the Bombay, Baroda, and Central India and Madras Railway Companies.

#### COOPER'S HILL ENGINEERS.

MR. KIMMER asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been called to a Despatch No. 15, P. W., dated 28-1-90, from the Government of India, dealing with matters to be brought before the Select Committee of the House of Commons, and specially affecting the claims of the Cooper's Hill Engineers:

And whether the evidence therein contained was laid before that Committee; and, if not, why it was withheld.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The question as to the selection of papers to

be laid before the Select Committee in 1890 was, I believe, very carefully considered by my predecessor in office, and all papers bearing on the subject under discussion, which it was thought could be published without prejudice to the interest of the public service, were produced. I am not prepared, at this distance of time, to re-open the question.

Mr. KIMBER: Can the noble lord say whether the despatch in question was included in the papers laid before the Committee?

Lord G. HAMILTON: I think it was not included.

#### INDIAN STUDENTS AT COOPER'S HILL.

Sir MANCHESTER BROWNSHAW asked the Secretary of State for India whether any alterations had been made recently in the regulations for the admission of students to the Royal Engineering College, Cooper's Hill; and, if so, would he state the particulars regarding the same, and also whether they tend to impose any restrictions on the entrance of students from India to the college, and on their passing through it to the several departments of public service for which they had been hitherto eligible.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The college was established to supply from this country officers for the Public Works Departments in India. Colleges were also set up in India to supply Native officers for the same departments, and at these colleges no Europeans were allowed to be trained. Recently there was a rush of Indian students to the Cooper's Hill College. Finding that in the past few years one Native student had on the average got into the Public Works Department through Cooper's Hill, I fixed for the future two appointments as the number to be annually competed for by them. Thus the main object is maintained for which the college was established, viz., the annual provision of European officers for these departments, whilst at the same time no restriction is imposed upon the limit of Indian students.

#### THE INDIAN TROOPS FOR CHINA.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked the Secretary of State for India what would be the composition of the force of the Third Indian Brigade now placed under orders for China, and would it consist of British or Native troops; would the expenses of this force also be borne by the Imperial Exchequer?

And, what steps would be forthwith taken to supply this further depletion of the defensive forces of India.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The composition of the Third Indian Brigade now under orders for China will be four Native infantry regiments. The expenses of this force will be borne by the Imperial Exchequer.

As the Reserve of the Native army was below the fixed establishment, I have authorised a temporary addition to it of 4,000 Native infantry.

#### PRESBYTERIAN SOLDIERS AT GARRISON STATIONS.

Mr. JAMES A. CAMERON asked the Secretary of State for India whether he could yet say what action the Government of India had resolved to take on the subject on which representations had been made by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, as to insufficient provision in India of special churches or the use of garrison churches for services for Presbyterian soldiers at garrison stations.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The intentions of the Government of India have been fully explained in the correspondence laid before Parliament, viz., to establish equality of treatment, so far as the provision and use of churches is concerned, between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland. As regards increased accommodation, it is proposed to build Presbyterian churches at Rawal Pindi, Sialkote and Cherat. Enquiries are being instituted on this point elsewhere.

#### CONSERVATION OF MONSOON FLOODS.

Mr. H. J. WILSON (on behalf of Mr. Souttar) asked the Secretary of State for India whether any proposals had been made or projects prepared for conservation by dams or reservoirs of the waters of the Nerbudda and Tapi rivers, the monsoon floods of which were now rushing to the sea through the Central Provinces and Gujerat, where the people and cattle had been perishing for want of water?

And, if no such plans had as yet been proposed, would the Indian Government consider whether it might even yet be practicable to store and utilise some portion of the volume of water which would otherwise be largely wasted.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I am not aware as to what plans of the kind mentioned may exist; but enquiry shall be made of the Indian Government on the subject. My own impression is that those rivers are not well adapted for such works.

#### PROPOSED PENSIONS FOR THE LAW AND FINANCE MEMBERS OF COUNCIL.

Mr. MACNILL asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would state when and whence the proposals originated to the effect that the Law and Finance Members of the Supreme Executive Council in India were each to have pensions of £750 after their five years of office terminate, and whether the present incumbents of those posts were to receive these new pensions?

And, by what authority had this permanent addition to Indian

expenditure been imposed, and would Parliament have an opportunity to consider the proposal for these new pensions.

Lord G. HAMILTON: No resolution to the effect suggested has been passed though the question of adding to the pecuniary attractions of these two appointments for persons not in the permanent employ of the Government has been under consideration.

Should it be deemed advisable to take the action indicated, the Secretary of State in Council will be guided by the requirements of the Statutes defining his powers in respect of Indian Expenditure.

Wednesday, August 8.

#### HOUSE OF LORDS.

##### THE QUEEN'S SPEECH ON THE FAMINE AND THE PLAGUE.

The Queen's Speech on the prorogation of Parliament, read by the Lord Chancellor, contained the following references to India:—

The British and other Legations at Peking have been unexpectedly attacked by an insurgent mob, and it is feared that many of their inmates have been murdered. How far Chinese authorities were accomplices in this atrocious crime, and whether the British Minister and his family have been among the victims, are matters that are still in some uncertainty. The utmost efforts will be made by myself and my Allies to visit with worthy punishment the authors of this unexampled crime. I have sent a considerable force of British and Indian troops to assist in protecting the interests of Europeans in that country, and have largely reinforced my squadron in those waters. . . .

In my Indian dominions the failure of the rains last autumn has caused intense and prolonged distress over a large part of the country. Strenuous and persistent endeavour has been made by my Governments to relieve suffering and prevent starvation. The self-denying efforts of my officers, and of the many private persons who have joined in the relief operations, deserve the highest commendation.

Though the fall of rain this season has been abnormally late, it is hoped that its volume may be sufficient to rapidly curtail the present area of distress, and restore to the people their previous means of livelihood.

The epidemic of plague continues, but the extent and virulence of the disease have decreased, and there has been a marked diminution in the mortality.

#### THE "INDIAN BUDGET DEBATE."

##### SOME OPINIONS OF THE BRITISH PRESS.

##### STRONG ADVOCACY OF A NATIONAL GRANT.

##### THE "TIMES."

There never was a time when it was more imperative to make it clear that England's duty to India, any more than India's duty to England, is not to be measured out by arithmetical and economical rules. . . . It certainly seems to us that the case for a grant in aid to India under existing conditions is very strong. It is not possible, happily, to affirm that India has been reduced to critical straits, much less to the verge of bankruptcy, by the distress with which the Government is now resolutely grappling. But the strain has been undoubtedly severe, and it is on this ground that the Secretary of State and the Viceroy made, some time ago, a forcible appeal to the liberality of the people of the United Kingdom. It is to be regretted that the demands made upon public generosity in connexion with the war in South Africa have inevitably restricted the amount of the contributions in relief of the Indian famine. The Mansion House Fund has not yet reached £340,000. . . . Why should not Parliament vote a sum, not in aid of the finances of India, but for the same purposes as those for which Lord George Hamilton has asked the public to contribute to the Mansion House Fund? The need which was felt when the Secretary of State made his appeal to the Lord Mayor more than half a year ago is more urgent now than it was then. Setting aside all questions of Indian finance and taxation, why should not, as Sir Henry Fowler said in the recent debate, "a payment be made by Great Britain to her great dependency to help her in this great emergency?" . . . We may have to make a call, at no distant day, upon the fidelity and devotion of our Indian fellow-subjects, from the prince to the peasant, and we have every reason to believe that the answer will not be disappointing. But when we welcome generous and uncalculating loyalty, it is unwise to put forward the Imperial Government in the character of Mr. Graggrind. (July 28.)

##### THE "STANDARD."

A response, not in itself meagre, has been made to the appeal issued for private subscriptions for this voluntary fund; but, relatively to the need, it has not reached the desired amount. Even if the Mansion House were in a position to send several millions to be dispensed by the local charitable Committees, the question would still remain whether the Nation as a nation ought not to come to the rescue of India. The issue was raised in a precise form by Mr. Souttar's Amendment last night, and we must own to much regret that the attitude of Ministers was discouraging, and that, on a Division, the proposal was rejected by one hundred and twelve to sixty-five. It was left to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to offer a detailed defence of the ungracious course adopted. But Lord George

Hamilton was, of course, unable to dissociate himself from the policy of the Cabinet. Yet the considerations advanced by the two Statesmen will not be found generally convincing. . . . It is not the relative condition of the finances of the two countries that is the criterion; but the relative wealth and prosperity of the respective populations. In spite of our deficits, we are waxing, as a community, rich, whereas the average native of India, notwithstanding the neat appearance of the Calcutta account books, is exceptionally poor. What would be to us a small loss would mean to the vast multitude the disappearance of his margin of subsistence. Apart from the practical agency of its claim to succour, India would welcome and value a grant from Imperial funds as a mark of national sympathy. By a coincidence, the employment of Indian troops in China, which thus become chargeable to us, and the arrangement in accordance with the recommendation of the Welby Commission—whereby a sum of about a-quarter of a million is to be annually paid by the Imperial to the Calcutta Exchequer, combine to relieve the strain. But it is not assistance of the sort that carries with it the evidence of goodwill. (July 27.)

#### THE "DAILY NEWS."

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach said in the debate that it was his duty to protect the British taxpayer, and that he could see no reason for helping India at the present time. The deficit in Indian finances was, he said, five millions. The finances of the United Kingdom last year showed a deficit of fourteen millions sterling. It is thirty-six millions this year. Where, then, is the money to come from? Sir Michael did not, of course, ask the question with any hope of getting an answer. It was his method of indicating that there were no available funds. Lord George Hamilton does not discharge the functions imposed upon a Secretary of State. Instead of standing up and braving the Chancellor of the Exchequer, he argues against the demand of India as if he were not the only representative of the Indian people. Voting money to India in ordinary circumstances would, no doubt, be a mistake. It would lead to extravagance, demoralisation and waste. But the present circumstances are peculiar and considering what Sir Michael has allowed in the shape of doles to the landowning class, his present rigidity is not impressive. He had a majority in the lobby, but public opinion will not support him, even though Mr. Balfour came to his assistance. (July 27.)

#### THE "MANCHESTER GUARDIAN."

On grounds of sound finance it would be impossible to quarrel with the line adopted by Lord George Hamilton and the Chancellor of the Exchequer with regard to the proposal for a grant from the Imperial Exchequer. No doubt it is right enough in normal times that India should have to make her own way and cut her coat according to her cloth. But there are two qualifications to be borne in mind in the present case. In the first place, we are dealing with a great emergency, and the maxims and platitudes which are suitable to everyday conditions are no guide to the course to be adopted in dealing with a catastrophe like the one of which the modern world has never seen. Sir Michael is always ready to give the grant proposed by Mr. Souttar should demoralise the financial policy of the Indian Government and lead them to look to us for fresh subventions. We should have thought that the dangers of an appeal to private liberality were of much the same kind, seeing that every penny contributed by the public relieves the Government of an obligation. But, after all, the Government of India is carried on by Englishmen, and there is the Indian Council and the India Office to keep them straight. For the rest, the people of India are starving, and the resources of the Government, even with the loan of £3,000,000 to carry on with till October, are nearly exhausted. And the other point is scarcely less important. Justice is better than charity, and we should all be glad if India were able to dispense with a free grant and trim her sails for the storm. But then we do not happen to have exercised justice in our relations with India. We have made her carry her own burdens and ours as well. We have looked to the broken and poverty-stricken peasantry of India for the support of the Imperial establishment, and it is unfair when the crash comes to meet her with the cool assurance that a strict observance in the matter of balancing accounts the way of salvation lies. When we have balanced our own accounts with India it will be time enough for us to talk. We are glad to see that Sir Henry Fowler drove home this point in the debate last night. (July 27.)

#### THE "DAILY CHRONICLE."

Lord George Hamilton will not unloose his purse-strings until India comes and ruses on her knees to him for aid, instead of using the Viceroy's silence as an opportunity for spontaneous generosity. Sir Henry Fowler, with a wider grasp of the situation, held that an Imperial grant is necessary in order that the rich people in this country who are not charitable may be made to contribute to the burden of Empire against the rich people in India, who are not charitable from generosity the barest justice required that we should contribute to India's revenues more than we do at present. It has just been decided to pay India a quarter of a million for the Imperial uses to which we put her army. Reckoning on a proportionate basis of revenue to military expenditure for the whole Empire, India is overcharged for military purposes to the extent of six millions a year. That is a debt which is everlastingly mounting. Now Mr. Souttar proposes to give India a debt which is everlastingly mounting. Now Mr. Souttar proposes to refuse India the aid she requires in the hour of her need, we shall be shirking our share of "the white man's burden" and proving ourselves unworthy of the responsibilities of Empire. (July 27.)

#### THE "DAILY GRAPHIC."

There is nothing in the Indian Secretary's speech to suggest that her Majesty's Government are even yet prepared to give adequate assistance to the greatest dependency of the Crown. The sum of £3,000,000 is to be borrowed by India on the security of Indian revenues. If that proves insufficient, her Majesty's Government will then consider what they can do to help India. This is not the spirit in which the princes and the peoples of India have treated this

country. When the war in South Africa began people in India did not wait to see how soon Great Britain would exhaust her borrowing powers. They eagerly subscribed money to bring succour to wounded British soldiers, by whose side they would gladly have fought if they had been permitted to do so. The Indian Government has also played its part. It was the soldiers borrowed from the Indian establishment who saved Natal from being completely overrun by the Boers, and other soldiers borrowed from India are, in the same way, the first on the scene to defend the interests of the Empire in China. All this splendid help we have received from India with lip gratitude; but when it is proposed that the nation should make a national gift to India to help her in her sore distress, the responsible Minister informs the world that "India's borrowing powers are not yet exhausted." (July 27.)

#### THE "MORNING LEADER."

If the speeches of Lord George Hamilton and Sir Michael Hicks-Beach were emphatic, they were absurdly inconclusive. They amounted in fact to an elaborate missing of the point. Briefly, the argument was that, as the Government of India has not asked for money, and is not in want of money, it would be a dangerous precedent for Parliament to vote a grant. This, we say, is a missing of the point because, as we have pointed out over and over again, nobody proposes a grant to the Government of India. What it is wanted is a grant to supplement the private charity which has subscribed for the present famine only about one-third of what it subscribed for the far less severe famine of three years ago. The Famine Code in India draws a sharp line between the relief operations of the Government (that is, the taxpayers) and the relief operations of private benevolence. Lord George Hamilton insists frequently enough on this distinction. But he could not or would not see that it was for the second and not for the first kind of work that a national grant was requested yesterday. (July 27.)

#### THE "OBSERVER."

We trust that the refusal of the Government to make any contribution from the Imperial Exchequer to the Indian Famine Funds will not be maintained. This is no time for financial pedantry. The Indian Government has already spent thirteen millions sterling in an unsuccessful struggle with the calamity that has overtaken multitudes of the Indian people. Indian finances show a deficit of £800,000, which is to be covered by a loan. But our responsibility to India will not be adequately discharged by an Imperial guarantee for that loan. Mr. Balfour says that help for the starving Natives is a matter for private charity. Private charity has subscribed only £340,000 to the Mansion House Relief Fund, which is a poor contribution towards the sustenance of six million lives. Why should not the House of Commons vote a national grant in aid? Lord George Hamilton has admitted that some such course would have to be taken if the Indian Government were to say frankly that it was unable to cope with the evil. Why not do so as an act of grace what may have to be done on the spur of necessity? (July 28.)

#### "COMMERCE."

In our hour of need the princes and the people of India have come forward nobly to our aid, both with men and with money. Certainly the Government refused to accept the offer of 10,000 men, which the Viceroy offered for service in South Africa, but that does not detract from the spontaneous response to the "call to arms" of the people of India. At this time, in the crisis in China, it is to native Indian soldiers that we make appeal, and it is upon them that we rely. Mr. Souttar proposed a free grant of five millions, and why should not the nation grant this—not to help Indian finances, but to supplement the relief funds? We are so proud of our imperialism that we are spending millions without stint to increase our Empire in South Africa, but for our Indian Empire the Government refuses any State aid whatever. Would it not be wiser and more in the spirit of patriotism to curb the expenditure in South Africa; be open-hearted and open-handed in our treatment of our Indian fellow subjects and so bind them closer to us by ties of gratitude? (August 1.)

#### THE "YORKSHIRE POST."

We regret that the Government do not at present see their way to offer direct pecuniary assistance to India in her desperate need. Lord George Hamilton stated in the House of Commons last evening that he will at once offer a loan of £3,000,000 in behalf of India, and that if lenders are not forthcoming he will draw to assist the Imperial Government—whether to lend the sum or to give it he does not say. Doubtless a loan would be of service, but it would lack the grace of a gift to the six millions who are saved from starvation only by public relief. It is not a question of whether this country actually owes financial aid to India. That is a matter that might be discussed if space would allow; we draw no direct tribute from India, but probably India pays more than she can properly afford to pay for the excellent services rendered to her. Probably also she pays for the maintenance of troops required not for her defence but for the foreign Powers so much as to preserve our authority over her populations. But we place the matter on other grounds, and chief among them the desirability of showing India that the Imperial Government is not merely a ruler, but also stands in maternal relationship, ready to consider and meet the need of those who suffer through no fault of their own. (July 27.)

#### THE "BRADFORD OBSERVER."

The sum total of the debate, it is to be feared, is on the one side to emphasise the magnitude of the evil from which India has suffered, and must for an indefinite period continue to suffer; while, on the other side, it appears to indicate on the part of the Government a shifty desire to shrink as far as possible the response to claims which are accorded to none of those now pressing on us. The Lord George Hamilton's picture of the famine as one of unparalleled dimensions and severity, carrying death and ruin to more than sixty millions of people, it is not necessary to add afresh the tragic and harrowing

details which are unapparently only familiar to most of us. The Ministerial presentation of the crying need for help may be accepted as sufficient, if not complete; but this only makes the dislocation of the remedial section of his speech the more painfully apparent. (July 27.)

"BIRMINGHAM DAILY POST."

It is interesting to note that India has saved considerably by the removal of the British contingent of the army to South Africa; but Lord G. Hamilton frankly admits that it may become necessary to apply to the Imperial Exchequer for aid, but whether as a free grant or as a loan he was not prepared to say. That he had not yet asked for an Imperial grant he defended on grounds of policy in the interests of India, though on this point he found himself in opposition to Sir H. Fowler, who argued that a grant to India, not as a matter of duty, but as an expression of sympathy, would have been a wise thing to do as a matter of State policy. An amendment proposing a grant of £5,000,000 was discussed at some length. In any case, there should be no delay in transferring to the Indian account the £250,000 which the Commission on Indian finance has reported as being due from the Imperial funds. (July 27.)

THE "WESTERN DAILY MERCURY."

The House of Commons is permitted to debate the Indian Budget, but it has no power to alter it, as it has become law months before its provisions are expounded by the Indian Secretary. The opportunity is offered, however, for making suggestions and moving amendments, though our Indian Secretary usually the most immobile of statesmen, and regard even the most gentle criticism as the impudence of outsiders. There are private members in the House who have lived in India, studied Indian questions, held office in India, and visited it frequently since they retired from official work. Their views are generous, sound, and based on broad knowledge; whereas the Indian Secretary may have never been to India at all. Yet the latter always treats the former as if they were ignorant, incapable of judging, and altogether to be crushed aside. His legislation is never absent. It occurs every time the Indian Budget comes on. It occurred last night. Lord George Hamilton has a manner in the House that combines haughtiness with the narrowest self-sufficiency and the most crabbed temper. He has the official habit of regarding it as a liberal education to be permitted to read the circulars and memoranda of the Indian Government at first hand. To differ from such an authority is like quarrelling with something lofty and supermundane. This attitude is unfavourable to the reception of advice. (July 27.)

THE "NOTTINGHAM DAILY EXPRESS."

How long is the Government to persist in its refusal to make an Imperial famine grant to India? Lord George Hamilton has told us that if India herself is unable to cope with the famine such a step will be taken, but to wait until we are driven to it by necessity will rot the dot of half its grace. The sums subscribed by private charity go only a small way towards relieving the widespread distress, and it is the duty of the Imperial Government to help India in her hour of need. The Government pleads that it would violate the code of financial orthodoxy to make such a grant. Ministers had no such scruples when they gave dollops of financial sections of their own supporters. Millions have been thrown away on class legislation of this sort, but when it is India who wants a dollop the Government discover all at once that such a thing is highly incorrect. In this display of "unctuous rectitude" they outdo Mr. Pecksniff himself. (July 30.)

THE "NOTTINGHAM GUARDIAN."

The Indian Government has grappled with the famine in a remarkably successful manner, and in comparison with the magnitude of the disaster, the loss of life will be slight. But it must now devote its energies to preventive measures. The people would be able to protect themselves if they were not so poor as to be dependent upon every single year's harvest for a living. They have nothing in reserve, and, therefore, when the crops fail they are almost at once reduced to starvation. We do not at present see how the lot of the people is to be so improved as to render them independent of any single year's supply, but it is perfectly clear that the work of famine prevention is one that now rests most heavily upon the Indian Government. (July 27.)

"REYNOLDS'S WEEKLY NEWS-PAPER."

It is a mockery to talk about a Budget at all in connection with a land where the wretched population is dying by the thousand of disease or starvation. It was proposed that this country should make a free grant of five millions to help in saving some of the doomed wretches alive, but of course the Government opposed any such proposal. We can spare about one hundred millions in order to exterminate the Boers in the interests of the German-Jew capitalists, but we cannot vote one halfpenny to satisfy the hunger of the starving Hindus. They want bread and we give them missionaries! Mr. Chamberlain's war is so costly that we can do nothing for the victims of Lord George Hamilton's famine. We can spend any amount on Kynoch's ammunition for killing a brave race fighting for freedom, but cannot spare a xene for food for a hunger-stricken continent desolated by disease. Surely such a monstrous and iniquitous hypocrisy will not much longer be allowed to affront the face of Heaven. (July 29.)

"MANCHESTER EVENING NEWS."

Sir M. Hicks-Beach, in an ungenerous spirit, opposed the amendment. He produced figures which were doubtless pertinent if not yet exhausted. It might be a sentimental, but it would not be sensible thing to provide a large dollop at the cost of the nation. Let the House wait until the Indian Government declared that its purse was empty and its credit exhausted. Mr. Maclean—and with him

other members—protested against such a parsimonious course. No comparison was possible between the wealth of Britain and the poverty of the Hindu peasant. Had not all in the South African war accepted gifts? Had not the Government taken "reliefs" for English and Irish landlords out of the National Exchequer? Not to accept the amendment would be a policy unworthy of this great people. The amendment was vigorously supported—less vigorously resisted. Eventually on a division it was rejected, 65 voting for and 112 against it. Nevertheless has service been rendered by its supporters to the cause of suffering India; and we venture to add, scarcely less service to the honour and charity of this country which, when its conscience is touched and its heart captured, pours forth its beneficence without stint. (July 27.)

"MANCHESTER EVENING CHRONICLE."

The people, of all classes and all parties, are therefore agreeable that the Imperial Government should make such a grant as that proposed. They admire "the uncomplaining patience and silent dignity"—to quote a phrase from Mr. Emmott's speech—of the Indian people, and would not only like to see the Indian Government entrusted with a substantial sum of relief funds, but would also like to see a serious effort made toward the settlement of the land assessments on the lines reported by Mr. Phayre-Smith. Money alone is good, but accompanied by reforms and reforms it is better. The Government has thus, in our opinion, misused gaining rights, the will of the people, in this matter. The South African war has cost us many millions; the turmoil in China is likely to be very expensive too, and therefore caution is desirable, but when millions are poured out as they have been of late five more would be like a drop in the ocean, and they would have meant so much to suffering India. There is more than a possibility that in being penny wise to-day we shall be pound foolish to-morrow. Instead of us saved with a little effort. Later something heroic will have to be done to accomplish what might have been done now with comparative ease. (July 29.)

THE "NEW AGE."

The speeches of Sir M. Hicks-Beach and Mr. Balfour represent the meanest conception of Imperial duty that ever entered into the heart of statesman. The thing is beyond us, and the Government is alleged are not the real grumblers. The one object of the India Office is to give the British taxpayers no direct handle for inquiring into Indian finance and administration. We venture to repeat that it will be next to a miracle if the refusal of a grant of five millions now do not eventually cost us ten times as much. And apart from the mere money aspect of the matter, think of the incredible meanness of the whole wretched business! (August 2.)

The DAILY EXPRESS (July 27) said: Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, by way of rubbing in Lord George Hamilton's refusal to help them, says nothing is to be done unless the outlook becomes much worse! What in the world does he want, or does he expect? And what will the Native Press say about this amazing declaration? The Chancellor of the Exchequer, with South Africa and China on his hands—or shall we say on the brain?—is bound to be careful, and to guard against raids on the Treasury. But his declaration, and the tone of his declaration, really seem to show that he has utterly failed to understand the gravity of the situation in India.

THE SUNDAY TIMES (July 29) said:—We say would it not be far more patriotic, far more in accordance with the spirit of Imperialism, to spend a few millions in relieving a starving people, and thus make the world rather than expend tens of millions in South Africa in sowing discord and hate—the effects of which will not be stamped out for generations?

THE BALTIMORE (August 4) said:—Millions upon millions are still going out of our national Exchequer to wage war, but peaceful, famishing India kneels imploringly at our State door in vain.

THE SUNDAY TIMES (July 29) said:—In any case, India may rest assured that, though assistance be not hastily proffered, her strength will not be allowed, so far as England can ever prevent it, to be strained beyond endurance.

THE ABERDEEN FREE PRESS (July 27) said:—It is all very well to talk, like Sir Henry Fowler, of the good feeling between the two countries being strengthened by a grant to India in respect of the famine. This might be the effect if the thing were to happen but once, but it cannot be doubted that one grant would lead to another being given or expected when the next famine happened, and the effect would in the end be either that, if the grant were refused, there would be disappointment and dissatisfaction on the part of India, or that, if it were conceded, the British taxpayer would begin to ask himself why in addition to his own proper burden he should be made to bear the burdens of India as well. It would thus be that the long run the course suggested by the impulses of charity would lead to effects the very opposite of those desired; that, instead of drawing closer the bonds between the two peoples, by making the one pay for the misfortunes of the other it would lead to estrangement and division.

THE GLASGOW HERALD (July 27) said:—We are doing our best to maintain a reputation for charity andness, and, besides, the Chancellor of the Exchequer assures us that the employment we are giving to the Indian troops in South Africa and China will relieve the Indian Exchequer during the present financial year of a charge of not less than three millions. In short, the proposal to vote five millions to the Eastern Empire has not a leg to stand upon, and Sir Michael Hicks-Beach must be thanked for resisting it sternly.

THE SHEFFIELD DAILY TELEGRAPH (July 27) said:—The trouble is on a scale too huge for anything but State effort. Contributions, the result of appeals to the sympathy and commiseration of the public, have done much to alleviate the sufferings of the victims and to preserve life, but at the best the help from this source must be woefully inadequate, and its insufficiency has been all too marked in the present instance, when circumstances have prevented the concentration of the public mind on the famine area.

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 GARTH, 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 RUDD PHEAL  
(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 GRANHAMS, SHELFORD, CAMBRIDGE.

W. A. DOUGLAS RUDGE, B.A., late Scholar and  
Prizeman 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. References kindly permitted by Romesh C. Dutt, Esq., C.I.E., and Dadabhai Naoroji, Esq., in London. In India to B. G. 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 Famire 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 BALSAM.**  
A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND  
COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.  
For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma,  
Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

DR. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1899.

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



is what its name implies **FEVER DESTROYER,**

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

I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER. North Raglan Barracks, Liverpool. G. S. WOOD, Capt. 2nd North Staff. Regt. "Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 1 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there more than made in it. G. L. NARSINGA ROW.

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

Guidance Municipal Councils 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 "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., Rs. 1/8 Bn., 2/12 Bn., and 11 Bn. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors.

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

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 unchartered 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, Hayo's Reports, Hyde's Reports, Marshall's Reports, Coryton's Reports, Agra 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, Burma Select Judgments, Punjab Records, Central Provinces Reports, and Oudh Select cases, together with important cases from 1802 to 1862 decided by the Sudder Foudzarees Adawlut and Nizamut 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 otherwise judicially noticed in these reports.

Price Rs. 17.

Apply to THE COMPILER, 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 subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the MANAGER of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.

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

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