

India

FOR THE

No. 90. NEW SERIES.
No. 184. OLD SERIES.

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1899.

[REGISTERED AS A (PRICE.....2d.
NEWSPAPER.) By Post, 2½d.]

Notes and News	141	The Rangoon Outrage: Trial of the	143
India and "Party Questions"	144	Accused	143
The Calcutta Municipal Bill	145	British Indians in Natal	149
The People of India: Their many	146	The Indian Gold Standard	149
morits by many who have known	146	"Bluff and Bluster"	150
them, by Alfred Webb	146	The Right of Interpellation	150
Notes from Bombay	148	Judicial and Executive Functions	151
British Soldiers and Indians: New	148	The Bengal Provincial Service	151
Army Order	148	Advertisements	152

NOTES AND NEWS.

DREYFUS was released on Wednesday in spite of the verdict of the Court-Martial at Rennes. The Natus still remain State prisoners, not yet brought to trial nor informed of the charge made against them. What have the British Press and public to say to this outrage? Is our righteous indignation to be reserved for the offences of our neighbours? If so, there is, to put it gently, some risk of an appearance of hypocrisy.

The death of Lord Watson, one of the Lords of Appeal in Ordinary, means a loss to the nation and to the Empire which it would not be easy to overstate. The able writer of the obituary notice which appeared in the *Times* did not go beyond the mark when he said:—

Lord Chancellors come and go, and the men, if they be great lawyers, who are not subject to political fluctuations, naturally acquire a commanding, if unseen, influence in the tribunals of which they are members. Such men have been Lord Kingsdown, Lord Wensleydale, Lord Bramwell—but probably none of them have so largely affected the jurisprudence of the British Empire as Lord Watson. In this regard he may fitly be compared with Lord Mansfield, and it may be doubted whether in the Victorian era any one has contributed in an equal degree to the sum total of British and Imperial jurisprudence. But with all his learning and intellectual power few indeed have preserved the same simplicity of character and carriage, or been so free from all trace of vanity or arrogance. His sole desire was to get at the truth, and the quaint expression which he so often used, "it humbly appears to me," seemed in his mouth to be an indication of character and not a mere conventionalism.

The loss of Lord Watson will be felt with peculiar keenness in India because of his invaluable services in Indian appeals before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. He was not, indeed, infallible. But he always went straight for justice, regardless of the susceptibilities of High Courts or any other Courts. His name therefore always carried great weight in India, and his decisions created a feeling of confidence in the minds of the Indian people. When he attended the sittings of the Judicial Committee he was easily *primus inter pares*. It was a pity that he was not of the number who heard Mr. Tilak's appeal.

The *Times of India*, as will be seen from the article which we reproduce elsewhere, does not deny that there is ground for the dissatisfaction of Indians with the official mode of answering questions in the Legislative Councils. "It must be acknowledged," it says, "that the operations of the process of interpellation do not always tend to the illumination of enquiring minds." That, we suppose, is a polysyllabic way of saying that the answers are usually scrappy and evasive. Again, "there is too much reason for looking upon an official answer as the means of concealing rather than of exhibiting what is in the mind of the ruling authorities." It is no excuse to say that questions are put to "corner" the Government. Of course they are. But the way to avoid questions that "corner" is to refrain from a policy which suggests such questions. The *Times of India* seems to argue that it is fair to treat questions in the Indian Legislative Councils in a more casual way than questions in Parliament, because "in the House of Commons a member who is dissatisfied with the answer that a Minister gives to his question has other means of gaining his end." Perhaps

that is how it strikes Anglo-Indians. But the legitimate conclusion is obviously the reverse.

Things do move after all. We are glad to see that the criticisms which have appeared in our columns and elsewhere have at length induced the authorities in India to take action with reference to the frequent and unpunished assaults committed by European soldiers upon Indians. We print elsewhere the new army order which requires that prompt information of such occurrences shall be sent by telegram to the Adjutant-General, to the Secretary to the Government of India in the Military Department, to the Deputy Adjutant-General of the command, and to the General Officer commanding the district. Further action is prescribed to secure that the army headquarters may learn without delay of any case of a serious nature. All this is very much to the good. Its direct effect, we take it, will be to prevent such scandalous delay as that which has occurred in the Rangoon case. But its indirect effects should be even more important. For the issue of the new order announces to every officer and to every soldier in India that assaults upon Indians are at length to be noticed seriously by high authorities and that it is no longer safe to count upon impunity.

Another shooting outrage by British soldiers is reported from Sialkot. Two soldiers were out shooting, and near a village about a mile from the cantonment approached a *dara*, where a poor woman and her husband lived. Seeing a bird sitting close by the woman, one of the men aimed and fired, shooting the woman in the face and injuring her so severely that her life is despaired of. We do not understand that any evil intention is alleged against the soldier, but the story seems to imply gross negligence not readily distinguishable from intention. Would that soldier have fired so carelessly if the person sitting near the bird had been a European, and not a defenceless Native woman? The case may, of course, be taken before the magistrate. But how is that likely to help the poor woman? Or what are the chances that the case will act as a deterrent upon this or another soldier on future occasions? These shooting outrages are becoming a source of continual and intolerable irritation. Indian life, however, is cheap, and nobody cares. But English life—ah! that is a very different thing.

At the last meeting of the Bombay Legislative Council Lord Sandhurst, in the course of his concluding speech, made the following reference to Professor Gokhale:—

Two years ago, it will be remembered, it was my duty to comment somewhat severely upon the report which had been spread by Professor Gokhale, owing, no doubt, to his having been misinformed. I pointed out then that, at any rate, he should have been more careful about his information before propagating such damaging statements. Anxious as I was, however, to refute these statements on that occasion, no less anxious am I to avow that there is no more hard-working, generous, and sympathetic worker amongst the plague volunteers than Professor Gokhale.

The *Mahratta* regards this appreciative acknowledgment as "some reparation," and as "an indirect apology" for the humiliation Lord Sandhurst's Government forced upon Professor Gokhale. It may, or may not, be so. At any rate, English journalists who were so ready to denounce Professor Gokhale may be expected to take notice of Lord Sandhurst's words now. We may add that Professor Gokhale was in fact as "careful about his information" two years ago as even Lord Sandhurst himself could have been. The unfortunate element in the case lay elsewhere, as Lord Sandhurst ought to know.

The *Pioneer* handles very cautiously, but fairly, the thorny question of the separation of judicial and executive functions. Our contemporary cannot adopt without reservations the assumption that such separation is as applicable

in India as in England, but concedes that "it must be admitted that it has a very large and weighty backing, and that not only amongst judicial officers, but also amongst officers who have held the highest administrative posts." The *Pioneer*, however, will not hear of it that the union of functions works "any substantial injustice":—

An answer is to hand in the fact that application for transfer of the case to another district can always be made, that important cases have to be committed to sessions, and that in all except the most trivial cases there is an unlimited—some think an unduly extensive—right of appeal. In practice, then, there are excellent safeguards to the present system.

Yet it has been shown abundantly that in spite of all these "excellent safeguards," which involve additional cost and trouble to persons ill able to afford them, injustice, and "substantial injustice," has been worked in fact. The cases adduced by Mr. Manomoh Ghose can leave no doubt on that point, and Mr. A. Nundy has confirmed this from his own experience. Nor can the weighty opinion of men of the highest judicial experience—such as those that signed the recent Memorial to the Secretary of State—be for a moment ignored.

The present system, according to the *Pioneer*, has also "many advantages." Well, these ought, of course, to receive due consideration. The chief advantage mentioned by our contemporary is "the knowledge of the people and of the country in his jurisdiction which is gained by the officer who moves about the district on tour." It is not very obvious, however, why such knowledge should be inaccessible to a man unless he combines both functions. Why should the judicial officer pure and simple not "move about" with his eyes and ears open? "Again," says the *Pioneer*, "the judicial training is an excellent corrective to the intemperate zeal of the administrative officer." Yes, sometimes; but what if it is not? Surely it is better to be clear of the "intemperate zeal" altogether than to be exposed to the risks of its correction. Of course nobody that presses for this reform desires that the administrative authorities should be weakened in any way or in any degree; on the other hand, it is believed that the reform will advantageously relieve the District Magistrate of his present "press of duties which it is (as the *Pioneer* says) quite impossible for any human being adequately to perform." And it has been shown, more fully and clearly than the *Pioneer* recognises, that there need be no difficulty of any consequence on the score of increased expenditure.

There is every reason to be gratified that the *Pioneer* shows such an open mind on the subject, although, as Mr. A. Nundy has pointed out, it bases its judgment on a wrong principle. The substance of its conclusions are as follows:—

If the separation of functions can be effected without any great expenditure of money, and if district officers are afforded any material relief in the process, we should be inclined to believe that the balance might be found to turn in favour of separation. . . . For our own part, any decision would seem fairly satisfactory which does not weaken the powers of the district magistrate to keep the peace, and which does not involve any considerable expenditure for an object that rests in the main on rarified sentiment in a country like India and with an administration like the Indian. In any case, is it too much to hope that the district magistrate, the head of the police, may be relieved of trying cases as a court of first instance? . . . It may be necessary to reserve special powers to the district magistrate as a judicial officer, but we cannot think such powers should be exercised except in special cases or to meet a special emergency, such as an epidemic of violent crime.

This is good as far as it goes. Last week the *Pioneer* returned to the subject, and asked, "Would separation in a moderate degree be an improvement and strengthening of the administration?" The expected answer was evidently affirmative.

The *Champion* has done excellent service in calling pointed attention to the arbitrary action of Indian officialdom, and the striking conflict between the Bombay Government and the Secretary of State, on the subject of the non-authorisation of the proposed private Law College by the former authority. Sir William Wedderburn (June 8) drew from Lord George Hamilton the admission "that the control of legal education in Calcutta was wholly in private hands, the Government Presidency College having no law department, and the four private colleges teaching up to the full course of the University Law degree."

Naturally, in these circumstances, Sir William proceeded to ask Lord George

Whether he would state upon what ground the Bombay Government had now decided to pursue a different policy, and considered it not advisable that the control of higher legal education in Bombay should be wholly or partially in private hands.

In reply, Lord George Hamilton quoted from a letter from the Bombay Government of September 1, 1898:—

In the opinion of this Government it is inadvisable to allow the control of higher legal education to pass to private institutions, for the administration of the law is undoubtedly a part of the general administration of the country, and in spite of the fundamental dissociation of law from politics there is a distinct danger of the perversion of legal instruction to political uses.

The arbitrary distinction between Calcutta and Bombay was thus based upon a speculative ground of seditious possibilities.

Sir William then went on to refer to the profit made by the Government Law School in Bombay from fees, which were said to be about to be raised, and asked Lord George Hamilton,

Whether he was aware that the Bombay Government refused to sanction the affiliation of the proposed private College of Law on the ground that they desired to improve the Government School by means of these enhanced fees, and were therefore unwilling that students should be diverted to another institution.

This was pressing the point home, seeing that Lord George had made no reference to fees in his previous answer. His reply was:—

The question of the fees had nothing to do with the refusal of the Bombay Government to sanction the affiliation of the private institution to the Bombay University.

Sir William was apparently thwarted for the moment. But the whirligig of time brings in its revenges. The *Champion* now sets forth in a parallel column with the foregoing two answers of Lord George Hamilton the following passage from the Bombay Government Resolution of February, 1899, refusing authorisation:—

The proposals of the Committee regarding the strengthening of the staff of the Government Law School are based on the assumption that the institution must be self-supporting. A corollary of this assumption, without which the whole scheme falls to the ground, is that the present number of students must be maintained, and it is in fact also found necessary to raise the scale of fees. It would therefore be quite inconsistent with an approval of the Committee's proposals for Government to sanction the establishment of a second and rival institution which would avowedly admit law students at a lower rate of fees.

If we ourselves had been responsible for that last answer of Lord George Hamilton's, we should not have been surprised if somebody had charged us with circulating a "gross falsehood."

It is gratefully refreshing to us to learn that Indian merit has in two cases just been officially recognized in quite a handsome fashion. We learn that the Secretary of State for India has awarded a special scholarship of £200 tenable for one year to Mr. R. P. Paranjpye, the Indian Senior Wrangler. This is a sort of act that has the effect of blotting out a multitude of sins—an act not to be forgotten in balancing Lord George Hamilton's merits and demerits. Apart from the personal considerations, the policy of it is most excellent. Again, the Government of India has awarded a pension of Rs. 600 a year to Pandit Kesari Mohun Ganguli, the translator of the "Mahābhārata." "Government may be sure," says the *Mahratta*, "that liberality shown like this will never be wasted upon the susceptible Indian minds."

Mr. Hem Chandra Banerjea, we regret to learn, has fallen into "sore distress." He is the greatest living poet of Bengal, and has thrilled his countrymen with his elevated and patriotic muse. Like so many men of genius and of large heart, he has neglected the ways of money-making and now suffers for his lack of worldly prudence. But, as *Power* and *Guardian* says in a noble appeal on behalf of the poet, "a Hem Chandra Banerjea is not born every day," and "it would be a shame and a disgrace if the greatest living poet of Bengal should die of starvation." Or, we may add, live in starvation. It is the privilege of men of comfortable means to succour a helpless brother of eminent spiritual merit in his distress. It is a duty that will be regarded as an honour.

The discussion of the Provincial Budget in the Bombay Legislative Council was anything but exhilarating, in spite of the jaunty air assumed by the Hon. Mr. Nugent.

It was hardly to be expected that Mr. Nugent would like Sir James Westland's criticism in para. 55 of the Financial Statement of the Government of India, which, Mr. Nugent complained, would lead imperfectly informed persons to suppose that the Bombay Government had been spending recklessly on all manner of luxuries in years of declining revenue and calamity. Anyhow they have been very hard up, and have been saved from bankruptcy by the "liberality" of the Government of India. Mr. Nugent lays the blame on the exacting demands of the famine and the plague. Of course various public works of more or less pressing importance have suffered, and Mr. Mehta pointed out that dacoity was on the increase in the districts of the province. In spite of the irksome operation of the provincial contract system, Mr. Nugent would not listen to Mr. Mehta's counsel to give it up and revert to the former state of affairs. Mr. Fasubhoy Visram regretted the retrenchment under the head of education, but Mr. Nugent rather took credit for the rate of expenditure, seeing that "one of the main arguments used against us by the Government of India, notably in the time of Sir James Westland, was that we were spending too much money on education."

The line of the Government of India throughout has been that the outlay on education was to a great extent a luxury with much of which we ought to dispense, only spending what other provinces spent—that when you find you have not got enough money to provide additional police, additional collectors, and additional public works, cut down education.

A very interesting and instructive glimpse.

There was also a noteworthy appendix to the chief subject of discussion. The Bill to amend the Khoti Act was down for second reading. But the Select Committee, though it had got six months to report, had not accomplished its work, and Mr. Nugent asked the Council to give it six months more. This was agreed to. Why had the Committee not reported? Mr. Nugent explained:—

The reply is, that the subject is exceedingly difficult and one of great complexity, and the Select Committee as well as the Government have been endeavouring to obtain information on various points, but mainly on the important point that it would be easy to carry out the suggestion made by the Hon. Mr. Khare that the payments of the rent to the Khotis should be a certain fixed multiple of the assessment.

But why should the Government and the Committee be only now industrious in collecting information? Why, this question has been urgent for many years, and it has been on the anvil for at least a couple of years. When tardy justice is to be done to Indians apparently prolonged deliberation and enquiry are unavoidable; but when Indians are to be repressed—by a new Sedition law, by wrecking a Calcutta municipality, by revolutionising the tariff at dictation from elsewhere—then there is no need for enquiry, and deliberation is out precious short.

Elsewhere we print the substance of a paper on Indian currency read by Mr. Hermann Schmidt before the British Association. He said:—

The constant depreciation of silver had a twofold effect on the economical and financial condition of India. It provided an undoubted and powerful stimulus to her productive energies, which made the years of the falling rupee periods of steady and continuous improvement in the Indian figures of exports and imports, shipping, railways, canals, export, post and telegraph. But there was the other side to this pleasing picture. Whilst the "India of the Indians" had prospered, the foreign merchants were exasperated by the constantly fluctuating exchange with the gold standard countries, the Anglo-Indian community were suffering heavily by the smaller amount of sterling which rupee salaries realised, and, above all, the Indian Government lost most severely by the low exchange.

If it be true that we are in India for India's good, and that, as Lord Mayo said, we have no business to be there on any other terms, Mr. Schmidt draws a very heavy indictment against the Indian Government, though he does not seem to see it.

Mr. Schmidt draws a "pleasing picture," if not a just one, of the prosperity of the "India of the Indians"—the only India that we have any moral right to consider on a comparison of conflicting interests. Yet, in the teeth of this prosperity, we have changed its basis in deference to the other considerations he enumerated. The grievance of the foreign merchants is wholly imaginary; not one had the least difficulty in adjusting his daily transactions to the rupee. The Anglo-Indian community suffered, not heavily, but not at all, in respect of necessary expenditure in India; indeed they were gamers, like the Indians

themselves. The official part of them did not suffer in so far as they sent money home; for though Mr. Schmidt overlooks it, a compensation has been provided by a benevolent Government—benevolent at other people's expense. In fact many of them went out with the rupee several pence below the compensation exchange, and have all the advantage and no risks. The Indian Government suffered most, but surely the Indian Government is in the last resort the Indian taxpayer; and, as we are pretty sick of repeating, the obvious course is to reduce the Home Charges firmly and gradually and take the advantage of the prosperity of the country on a sound basis, instead of shifting it on to a purely artificial basis.

Discussing the question of the betterment of the police, the *Pioneer* says that in this department of the Indian administration "we find a highly elaborate system with an admittedly corrupt and incompetent personnel, so far, at least, as the lower ranks are concerned." With full deduction for abuse, "the working of the police is the weakest side of our administration." Everybody will agree in this judgment, unless, indeed, one were to place the highest guides of policy in the position of this bad eminence. Unfortunately, "it does not seem within the limits of official ingenuity to devise any far-reaching cure of the admitted evils." What seems wanted is a better stamp of men, in the higher rank at least. This means better pay and better prospects. The difficulty is to find the wherewithal to pay; it is so much more brilliant to squander the money on warlike enterprises. The *Pioneer* would like to tap the propertied and professional classes for a supply of sub-inspectors. We are not sure that even "constant social relations" between the District Superintendent and men of these classes would work the result, but in any case how are such relations to be established and maintained in the existing trend of feeling? The suggestion that an attraction might be found in treatment of the policeman "as a gentleman," with the further hope that he "will perhaps behave as such," will seem very odd to Englishmen at home, and not particularly hopeful. So it is quite right that the policeman should not be unjustly subjected to indignities, even at the hands of smart magistrates and judges. But can the Ethiopian change his skin? Still, we hope the *Pioneer* will continue to urge the attempt in that sensible direction.

Possibly the *Pioneer's* suggestion of a solution of the Berar question is not set forth without some hint of what is in the mind of Lord Curzon's Government. "The debt due by the Nizam having long since been wiped out," it says, "there remains only the cost of the contingent, for the payment of which the Government of India need to require security." We must repeat that the alleged debt was no debt at all; the immense account was never due; and it is on official record, after the most stringent official investigation, that only a very small fraction of it was due, if indeed anything at all. The alleged "debt" is simply a monstrous fraud, and the payment of it is a gross case of "stand and deliver!" The cost of the contingent always was, and is, preposterous; and in any case it is more for the purposes of the Government of India than for the necessities, or even the pride, of the Nizam that it has been kept up. However, this is what the *Pioneer* says:—

We are prepared to assume that in order to keep this force up to modern requirements the amount now spent (say forty-four lakhs) is absolutely necessary. We would even go further and allow forty-five lakhs. This being done why should not the precedent of 1890 be followed, and after retaining so much of the Province as is sufficient to pay this sum plus cost of administration why should not the remaining districts be handed back to the Nizam?

Very well; but mark this. The *Pioneer* says that on such an arrangement

the new treaty would provide that one part of Berar should go back to Hyderabad, while the Nizam would hand over the remaining districts required for the maintenance of the contingent bodily to the Government of India to be incorporated either with the Bombay Presidency or the Central Provinces, leaving the Government of India to keep the contingent in its present cantonments or to employ the regiments elsewhere.

Does the *Pioneer* recommend another barefaced robbery on a smaller scale? The only interest the Nizam has in the contingent is in so far as it protects his dominions. To "employ the regiments elsewhere" and to take a slice of territory for their maintenance is to deprive the Nizam at one stroke both of the protection of the contingent and of the territory for its support. What does it all mean?

INDIA AND "PARTY QUESTIONS."

PERHAPS no remark in the recent debate on the Indian Budget excited more applause in the House of Commons and in English newspapers than Sir Henry Fowler's renewed protest against the treatment of Indian questions as "party questions." One has heard this protest so often, and from so many quarters, that it seems worth while to enquire once more what precisely it amounts to and what assumptions it involves. One could easily imagine a political philosopher, whose business it is, far removed from the din and strife of parties, to see life steadily and see it whole, making such a protest not indeed about Indian questions but about all questions concerning the welfare of the State and its citizens. But the protest is not quite the same when it singles out a particular group of questions and comes from a man who has been for many years a more or less conspicuous member of a political party. Sir Henry Fowler has been Liberal member for Wolverhampton for the past nineteen years and in successive Liberal administrations has held the offices of Under-Secretary for the Home Department, Secretary to the Treasury, President of the Local Government Board, and Secretary of State for India. Until recent years at any rate one has always heard him spoken of as a "good party man," and, unless rumour is more than usually misleading, there are still many Nonconformists who regard him as one of the bright and shining lights of Liberalism. When a man holding this position protests with vigour, on all possible occasions, that Indian questions are not party questions and must not be treated as such, one is tempted to make some enquiries. What, one asks, are party questions, properly so called? How, exactly, are party questions to be treated? And what is the feature in the treatment of them which makes it desirable to set Indian questions apart in another category? The cynic might perhaps answer that treating a question as a party question means ignoring its intrinsic merits and employing it merely as a pawn in the game between the "ins" and the "outs"; that when questions are so treated members of Parliament speak and vote upon them not as they really think, but as the Whips dictate, and in the way which they conceive to be most helpful to the purposes of their party, whether it be a question of keeping their friends in office or getting their opponents out of office. Therefore, the argument would run, it is much better that Indian questions should be kept out of this arena; let parties wage their petty warfare over the House of Lords, or registration, or local veto, or any other domestic peg upon which they can claim that "Codlin's the friend, not Short," but let us at least save the interests of the "brightest jewel in the Imperial diadem" from controversy at once so perilous and so contemptible.

That, or something like that, might be the reply of a cynic. Before we look into it, it is important to note its assumption—which Sir Henry Fowler, also, and his friends in the Press are evidently prepared to make—that at present Indian question are not treated as party questions in the House of Commons. One is to suppose that Indian questions, unlike the comparatively trivial matters which more intimately and obviously concern the population of the United Kingdom, are at present discussed on their intrinsic merits alone and that when a motion relating to India is taken to a division no considerations of party loyalty are allowed to influence the votes of members. The assumption is amiable enough. There is only one objection to it, but that is a serious one. It is at variance with notorious facts. It is not merely untrue but the reverse of the truth, as anybody can see who examines Parliamentary debates and divisions on Indian questions. Take, for example, the recent debate (June 15) on the Indian Sugar Duty Act, in which Sir Henry Fowler himself took a prominent and creditable part. The Government would not permit a debate upon the matter at all until a request for a day was made from the Front Opposition Bench and it thus became possible to represent the issue as one of confidence or no confidence. When Mr. Maclean, a member of the Government's party, rose to second Sir Henry

Fowler's motion he said that "he had been told that this was a motion of censure, and that it was wrong for any one on the Government benches to second a vote of censure on the Government. But the motion had only taken the form of a vote of censure because the Government had resolutely persisted in denying honourable members any opportunity of raising a debate on the question on its merits during the last three months." Precisely. And when the division came the vote, as we pointed out at the time, was as strictly a party vote as the Government could make it. "The motion was officially described as a vote of censure, the supporters of the Government were entreated to abandon amendments and vote on the issue of confidence, and the party Whips were tellers in the division." An examination of the division-list showed how obedient the Ministerialists were to the party lash. Only three Unionists voted with Sir Henry Fowler, and the supporters of the motion were drawn not less exclusively from the Opposition. In these circumstances, we say, Indian questions are made party questions in the worst sense of the term. Take any other important debate on an Indian question since the administration of India passed from the East India Company to the Crown and a similar result is seen. There is no need to multiply examples especially as on one memorable occasion the Secretary of State for India was candid enough or imprudent enough to admit the truth. It was at the time when the Tories were exulting over the "forward" policy and the retention of Chitral, and in the debate on Sir William Wedderburn's amendment regretting the retention of Chitral (House of Commons, February 17, 1896) Lord George Hamilton said:—

Before sitting down he congratulated his friends behind him that the first time they had to give a party vote last year they were actuated by true political instincts when, by an overwhelming majority, they assented to this forward movement. He believed there had been no forward movement in recent years made by any Government which had been more beneficial to all concerned, and which would [more] tend to put an end to those periodical disturbances and outbreaks of fanaticism and terrorism which had characterised that part of her Majesty's dominions.

"The first time they had to give a party vote last year"—yes, and the vote was taken upon an amendment to the motion to go into Committee on the East India Revenue Accounts.

So far, then, as party machinery in the House of Commons is concerned, Indian questions are habitually treated as party questions by the Government. Nor is it easy to see how, under our present Parliamentary system, the practice can be avoided. For the Secretary of State for India is a Cabinet Minister, his colleagues are therefore jointly responsible with him for his official acts, and if the House of Commons censures him it brings the life of the Government to an end. It follows that all the resources of the Government are employed in his defence. If the Secretary for India were a private member the case would be very different. But what would then become of the theory of Parliamentary responsibility? When, therefore, the House of Commons is assured by Ministers or ex-Ministers that Indian questions are not party questions and should not be treated as such, what is meant is merely that the Opposition must not oppose. The common and ironical result is that the official machinery of both parties is employed to suppress and to vote down independent criticism of errors in Indian administration—a result not unsatisfactory perhaps to the individuals who are or hope to be Secretary for India, but distinctly less satisfactory to impartial judges. The latter do not, indeed, desire to see Indian questions treated as party questions in the cynical sense which we have indicated above. But neither is it open to Sir Henry Fowler so to interpret the phrase. We take it that when he is actually treating any question as a party question he is applying to it the principles of the Liberal party. That is what we claim for India. Depend upon it, the Tory party in the lump has no hesitation about treating Indian questions as party questions—that is to say, about applying to them the principles, and regarding them through the spectacles, of Toryism. It is high time that the party of progress had the courage of its convictions in this matter, and refused any longer to be misled by plausible official catch-words. To Liberals who are worth their salt the thing that matters is whether Liberal principles are being—and, if not, how best they may be—carried out. The persistent negation of them in India, with the Liberal leaders standing by, is a humiliation and a challenge.

THE CALCUTTA MUNICIPAL BILL.

LAST week we drew attention to the able and conclusive Notes of Dissent tabled by Mr. Surendranath Banerjea and Mr. Apcar against the Report of the second Select Committee on the Calcutta Municipal Bill. We dealt mainly with the astounding and misleading allegation that the talk of the Commissioners precluded adequate work, and showed that it is completely at variance with officially admitted facts. We pointed out also that the reduction of the number of elected commissioners from 50 to 25 is no remedy for the alleged fault even if it existed, and that it is not supported, but quite the reverse, by a comparison with the largest municipalities of Great Britain—a comparison, strangely enough, invited by the Government of India. On any serious consideration of the question the Bill ought to be in the waste-paper basket. The fundamental grounds of its origin and purpose are entirely out away.

The Government of Bengal, however, are impervious to the claims of reason, and one can only follow them step by step in detail, so that the public may eventually learn how perverse they are showing themselves. Their letter of June 17 to the Government of India set forth five principal grounds for the introduction of this mischievous Bill:—

(1.) The complete failure of the elective system to secure adequate representation even of the different interests existing in the Native City.—This must mean that the Mahometans are not adequately represented. It is not apparent, however, that the Mahometans had lodged any complaint on any such ground. The reason seems to be purely *ex post facto*, and merely argumentative. There is no evidence that the Hindus have unduly overborne the Mahometans; on the contrary, they have been treated with marked consideration and in a conspicuously friendly spirit. But, even if they were aggrieved, how does the proposed system meet the grievance? Mr. Apcar explains pointedly how the new Bill will work out in practice, and how little the Mahometan population will have to be thankful to their *soi-disant* champions:—

This reduction in the number of Ward Commissioners will entirely destroy the representation of minorities which was built up with such solicitude on a previous occasion in this Legislature. *It will be exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, for a Mahometan to be returned for any ward.* Mahometan Commissioners are returned now in a friendly spirit, in conjunction with Hindus, with the support of Hindu votes. Sometimes they are returned without a contest, with a Hindu colleague. The elections will in future be fought out purely on class lines, and I venture to warn the Government that there will be a risk of racial feeling being excited in municipal election contests, particularly if the Mahometans find themselves unsuccessful in elections throughout the town.

This is what comes of hot-headed legislation without preliminary enquiry according to precedent. But for that matter neither Hindus nor Mahometans need care for election at all, for they will be in a hopeless minority, both races together. "It is the Hindu and Mahometan rate-payers who pay the bulk of the taxes," says Mr. Banerjea, "but their representatives will have little or no influence in determining how the proceeds of the taxes are to be spent." Why should they bother about representation when representation is reduced to a ridiculous farce?

(2.) The practical exclusion of European men of business from all share in the municipal government of Calcutta.—Yet, in fact, the European wards enjoyed a proportionately larger measure of representation, which was admittedly designed, as Mr. Banerjea points out, "to be a check against the possibility of an undue preponderance of the Hindus on the Corporation, and to provide a strong minority of Europeans on that body." Mr. Banerjea contends fairly enough that this privilege should now be withdrawn; for now that the proportion of elected to nominated Commissioners is to be reduced from 2:1 to 1:1, "to continue the concession would be to weaken still further the Indian element, which under the Bill would necessarily be in a minority." Besides, why should the Europeans be coddled and thrust forward on the Corporation when they have not taken advantage of their opportunities and privileges hitherto? They have excluded themselves, so far as they have been excluded. The mere fact that it is proposed to pay them for attendance is enough to dispose of their intrinsic claims. This part of the Bill is purely artificial, and therefore utterly worthless, if not worse than worthless. And, after all, as Mr. Apcar

says, "the European Ward Commissioners will be reduced to a minimum!"

(3.) The growth of party spirit and the appearance among the elected Commissioners of a class of professional and in some cases corrupt politicians.—It is quite evident, on Messrs. Banerjea and Apcar's showing, that this Bill will arouse party spirit in unexampled degree and in its bitterest forms. How "professional" politicians are to be excluded from popularly elected assemblies, by this Bill or otherwise, does not appear; but in any case the answer is that it is out of the question to look behind the fact of election. Why, is not every member of the Government of Bengal a professional politician? How is a standard to be set up, and where is the machinery to adjudicate upon it? The allegation is mere nonsense. The charge of "corruption" ought to have been made definitively, or not at all. Who are the men, and what have they done? Unless the Government prosecute the parties, the charge must be dismissed with contempt. Meantime, it has brought about the resignation of more than half the elected Commissioners. It is an intolerable insult.

(4.) The abuse of the Committee system, which paralysed the Executive officers and demoralised the subordinate staff.—On Mr. Apcar's statement of the working of the Corporation this charge is unintelligible. We await the specific explanations of the Government.

(5.) The consequent breakdown of the conservancy and water supply of the town and every department of municipal administration.—The question of conservancy and water supply is much contested, and the final sweeping allegation is a preposterous exaggeration. It is futile to discuss such general propositions without the details on which they are based.

Leaving in hopeless wreck the "grounds" put forward by the Government of Bengal in their Letter to the Government of India, let us now turn to the Government of India's Letter to the Government of Bengal. We have already seen how seriously the Bill prejudices their desire to have the municipal administration "businesslike, efficient, and free from scandal and reproach," and their express wish that there shall be "no contravention of the broad principles of Local Self-Government already conceded." The Government of India suggested only "the outlines" of the revision of the existing system, and they indicated that "in a more close adaptation of the Bombay model might be found the solution for which they are seeking." The Bombay model itself would be gravely retrograde in Calcutta; but Messrs. Banerjea and Sen, while declaring themselves "no advocates of the Bombay system," said in their joint Note of Dissent that, if it were to be given a trial in Calcutta, they were "certainly of opinion that it will not do to borrow from it here and there, but that the system should be introduced into Calcutta in its entirety." But the Bill, as it has passed the Select Committee, makes no real adaptation of the Bombay system. The Government of India specified only two reservations: the reduction of the Commissioners to 50 (instead of the Bombay 72), and a provision for the proportionate representation of the constituent elements of the Corporation in the portion of the General Committee (two-thirds) to be elected by that body. The natural inference is that the rest of the Bombay system might be taken bodily; but that view has not commended itself to the Bengal Government. Messrs. Banerjea and Apcar both demonstrate the most fundamental differences, all tending to the subordination of Indian opinion and the practical suppression of Local Self-Government.

Thus: the Bombay Corporation consists of seventy-two members, as follows:—

- 36 elected at ward elections.
- 16 elected by the justices.
- 2 elected by the Fellows of the University.
- 2 elected by the Bombay Chamber of Commerce.
- 16 appointed by the Bombay Government.

Of 572 justices 335 are Indians. Of 342 Fellows of the University 208 are Indians. Thus 54 out of the 72 members are returned by Indians or their representatives. On the whole, "out of 72 members 60 are Indians, and there are only three Europeans who are members of the Standing Committee." Contrast Calcutta. Under the revised Bill the Calcutta Corporation will consist of the following members:—

- 25 elected at ward elections.
- 15 appointed by Government.
- 10 nominated by the European trading and mercantile interests.

(four by the Chamber of Commerce, four by the Trades' Association, two by the Port Trust).

Mr. Banerjee justly comments as follows:—

Now it is very obvious that the ten members nominated by the special constituencies will all be Europeans, and the bulk of the fifteen members nominated by the Government will also be Europeans in the sense in which that word is used by the Government, and then there are the European wards which in all probability will return Europeans. Further, among the elected Commissioners there may be a few officials, as there are at present. It is safe to assume that the "Europeans" will, generally speaking, vote on the official side. The representatives of the ratepayers in the Corporation and in the General Committee will thus be in a minority, and not, as in the Bombay Corporation, in a majority. How, then, let me ask, is the Bombay model faithfully reproduced? What becomes of local self-government in Calcutta?

Not content with this *reductio ad absurdum* both Mr. Banerjee and Mr. Apear follow out the proposals into details as to the constitution and powers of the three co-ordinate authorities, the result of which is to emphasise the disastrous difference. "The difference between the Bombay and Calcutta systems," says the former member, "is based on the ground that the population of Calcutta is more diversified than that of Bombay." The fact, as he points out, is just the other way:—

The population of Calcutta consists of the three great divisions of Hindus, Mahometans, and Europeans. The population of Bombay is less homogeneous, and there is a greater conflict of interests there than here. In addition to the Hindus, Mahometans, and Europeans, the population comprises the Parsees, Portuguese, and Jews, who form influential sections of the community in Bombay.

These Notes of Dissent conclusively demolish the Bill on every point of argument. The unhappy thing is that argument may be powerless in the face of an overwhelming force of authority bent on a project for keeping down the public activity of Indians in the administration of their own local affairs. The Bill is but a branch of the new-fangled policy of repression. The Government can have their way if they so choose. But a wise statesman keeps his eye upon the end of his projects, and the inevitable end to this monstrous policy is but too plain. Meantime, "What becomes of local self-government in Calcutta?"

THE PEOPLE OF INDIA: THEIR MANY MERITS BY MANY WHO HAVE KNOWN THEM.

Collected and Edited with an Introduction by ALFRED WEBB
(President Tenth Indian National Congress).

II.

SIR GEORGE C. M. BIRDWOOD, K.C.I.E. Late Bombay Medical Staff; Special Assistant in the Revenue, Statistics and Commerce Department, India Office; Royal Commissioner, Colonial and Indian Exhibition, 1886.

'The idolatry of the Hindus is a sore point with most Englishmen, and Europeans generally. I will not allow myself to here enlarge on this topic, nor is it necessary, as the following anecdote will suffice to indicate my own conclusions on the subject, impressed on me, as they have been by many similar experiences of my life in Bombay. The late Hon. Jugonnathjee Sunkersett was a bigoted Hindu, of the most uncompromising temper; but, owing to some service I was able to render him in 1857, I enjoyed his entire confidence, and there is no man in whom I have ever taken a deeper personal interest, or for whom I could possibly have a more affectionate or steadfast regard. We were so intimate, that he would freely admit me to his presence while engaged in private worship with his domestic Brahman; only I sat down on such occasions just beyond the threshold of the door leading from his bedroom—in his Girgaum house—into the room in which he worshipped the ancestors of his family, and the greater deities of the official Brahmanic Pantheon; and seated there opposite me, stripped to his skin, with the images of his gods before him, and the attendant Brahman, and all the utensils of idolatrous worship, he would explain every detail of it to me as it proceeded. Now, the great longing of his heart was that, before he should see death he might be blessed with the birth of a son to his only son Venyekrow Jugonnathjee, familiarly called Rowjee. Years had followed years, but only girls had been born to Rowjee, and the birth of a man child began to appear hopeless. Jugonnathjee Sunkersett himself had visited every shrine in Western India praying for a grandson, and had even extended his pilgrimages to Benares, and I believe to Muttra and Hardwar, for the purpose; and he never saw me without introducing the subject into our conversation. Such was the state of matters when, being on a visit to the hill station of Matheran, and anxious to ascertain the truth of the oragistic rites that were said to be enacted by the outcast jungle tribes—chiefly cow-herds and cutch [extract of *Acacia catechu*]

collectors—of the locality, before the uncouth altar to "Pishnath [i.e., Pasha-Natha, "Pasture Lord"] "Deo," in the dark evergreen grove of iron-wood trees at "Danger Point," on the west side of the hill, just above, and to the left of "The Waterfall," I concealed myself behind a rent in the stone wall enclosing the grove. A number of poor, scared creatures had gathered there, and were about to kill a scared-looking cock, when suddenly, who should come trotting into the gloom of the grove, from the opposite side to where I was, but the Hon. Jugonnathjee Sunkersett, followed by a mounted orderly, for he was a member of the Legislative Council of Bombay, and two running poons. I thought at first that he was there from curiosity, and was about to go forward to greet him; but immediately the poons placed themselves at the head of his horse, and he dismounted, and stepped up before the degraded shrine. He was a man, as I have said, of splendid presence, of the Scytho-Aryan type, and there he stood, in the light of a sloping ray of the declining sun, that stole in between the dark trunks of the iron-wood trees, long-robed, and high turbaned, and girdled round the loins, a living presentment for the moment of the "magnificent son of Akbar"; but in another instant he was wringing his hands in an agony of prayer, with the burning tears streaming down his handsome, massive, and now deeply seared face; his wan, beseeching eyes looking straight up toward the heavens. Feeling that I was a spectator of what I certainly ought not to witness, I stealthily withdrew from the spot, strolling on leisurely toward the bazaar. I had not gone on my way more than a quarter of an hour, when, just before reaching the Clarendon Hotel, I became aware of galloping horses approaching me from behind, and presently heard my name being joyfully shouted after me, and almost before I could turn round, the honourable Jugonnathjee Sunkersett and his escort were upon me, his face lighted up in the golden gloaming with the most proudly radiant look of gladness. "Oh, Setjee," I said, responsively to his mood, "you have received good hope of a grandson." "Indeed, yes," he replied, "it is just what I wanted to tell you, Birdwood." "But," I interpolated, "what solid ground have you for your assurance?" His answer was, "Solid ground for assurance? Why God himself has told me!" I was astounded by the reply, and could say nothing for awhile—remembering what I had secretly seen—for my emotion, and left him to talk on like a happy child, until by devious paths—as by much as possible, still pressing eastward—we at last arrived at "Alexander (now called Alexandra) Point." This point is a little beyond a mile east from "Danger Point," and commands the whole of the picturesque vale of the Chouk river, trending away south-westward between the main mass of Matheran and its north-eastern spur, called, from its flinty surface, Garbat. The twilight had now passed, in the valley below us, into a purple tint, rising higher and higher to the great grove ["Ram Bagh"] of wide spreading mangoes and towering *Jambola*, lordliest foliage of the woodlands of Western India, and other fine forest trees, hanging upon the east-side of the hill, half-way down the thread-like track of the old zig-zag ghāt road to Chouk. The warm purple mist welled up to this level, but above it the umbrageous top of Matheran was flushed over with the clear reflection from the refulgent orange light yet lingering in the west, turning all its enchanted leafage to a rich mystic green, of gem-like illumination. In the advancing night, thus momentarily irradiated with the still unfolded brightness of departing day, the whole mountain and valley seemed filled as with the visible glory of overshadowing deity; and Sunkersett at once became silent before the profoundly solemnising, wondrous scene. Silently he watched the primitive hill-men returning by the precipitous Chouk ghāt road to their scattered huts in the rapidly darkening depths of the valley below, each one, as he advanced to the head of the dangerous ascent, bending lowly down, and reverently, towards the sun's far sunken flame:—

"Through Ages hymned by Hindu devotee."

The tumult of his soul was hushed; and at the last, from its depth, as we turned to retrace our steps homeward, he thoughtfully, but in his frequent oracular manner, observed: "Yes, just as our five fingers go back to one and the same arm, so all religions go back to one and the same God." Thus closed what was to prove an ever memorable day with him; for, remarkable to relate, with the completion of nine months from that date, a grandson, the deferred hope of all the years of his prime, was born to Jugonnathjee Sunkersett. And then, the great hope of his life having been fulfilled, straightway a change came over him. He was a man of strenuous energy, and the most masterful natural capacity, and undisguised ambition and pride. He was not only the leader of the Hindus of Bombay, but after the death of the first Sir Jamsetjee Jejeebhoy, of the whole Native community. But now he laid aside all worldliness, and unobtrusively, and determinedly, submitted himself to the great desire for death that seemed to have taken complete possession of him; saying, on my once venturing to remonstrate with him for thus yielding himself up to die, and, in so saying using almost the very words of the Greek writer: "It is not difficult, Birdwood, but easy; for the road is not crooked, but straight, and not up, and then down, but all downward; and an unfeeling man may walk it blind-

fold." No! he had seen the salvation of God, as sought by him; and now all he wanted was to depart in peace. Soon afterwards he died; and then a very great burning was made for him. I thought it would have given me a cruel shock. But it was attended with none of the horrors, the awful reverberatory furnace, and the repulsive factory-like chimney, and all the soulless mechanism of cremation in Europe. Except that milk was used instead of wine, the ritual was essentially that described by Homer in the burial of Patroclus; and so far from being pained, when it was all over, I looked up into the clear and brilliant heavens above, I was soothed by the reflection that no taint of earthly corruption would ever be associated with the memory of my friend, for all that had been mortal of him was now part of the sunshine around and about me; a consideration naturally suggesting the inspiring hope that if human self-consciousness was indeed immortal, the freed spirit of Jugonathjee Sunkersett was already with the "Father of Lights," "the Ancient of Days." It is impossible not to be deeply interested in such men, and when you know them, for what they really are, not to have the sincerest friendship and admiration for them. As for their idolatry, my whole mind was changed toward it after that answer given by Jugonathjee Sunkersett near the Clarendon Hotel:—"Solid ground for my assurance? Why, God himself has told me!"—and this out of the mouth of a man I had just seen apparently praying to a hideous heap of foully-ruddled and stinking stones! Henceforward I knew that there were not many gods of human worship, but one God only, who was polyonymous ["*εἰς ὅν πολλοὺς ὀνόματι ἔστι*"]; being named according to the variety of the outward condition of things, which are always changing and everywhere different.—*Representative Men of India*, Sir George Birdwood, W. H. Allen, 1889.

GENERAL JOHN BRIGGS. Served in India, retiring, in 1835; Resident at Nagpur.

'I have long since come to the conclusion of the Abbé Raynal in his *History of India*, that "Mankind under similar circumstances in all parts of the globe will act alike." I find among my acquaintances who have long resided in India, that after travelling over Europe they have reason to think more highly of the natives of India every day.—*Admission of Educated Natives into the Indian Civil Service*, Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., Commercial Press, Bombay, 1893.

MAJOR-GENERAL SIR O. T. BURNE, K.C.S.I. (1879). *Some-time Military Secretary to the Commander-in-Chief in India*.

'Speaking generally, the typical Hindu is quiet, industrious, and tolerant in religious matters unless provoked to excitement. It has been truly said by a distinguished military writer that the natives of India, both as friends and foes, have proved themselves gallant soldiers, not unworthy of being matched with Europeans.—*Clyde and Strathairne* (Rulers of India Series), Major-General Sir O. T. Burne, K.C.S.I., Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1891.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL, K.C.S.I. Served in India, 1842 to 1875; Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, 1871-1874.

'Practically I should say that the religion of the Hindus is the simplest monotheism. This may more particularly apply to Northern India, where the Mahometans have destroyed the temples, and more impregnated the country with their ideas; but in all dealings with all classes of Natives, in conversation, and appeals to a higher power, I have never found any active or practical belief in particular gods or idols; and under different names, Hindus, Mahometans, and Christians all look to and appeal to one and the same God, invisible and all-powerful. But as the Hindus claim no recent revelation, moral religion is less active as a guide of their lives than with Christians or Mahometans, and most of their faith is natural religion. They have an undoubted apprehension of a future state of rewards and punishments, but in no distinct form, and their reliance is on good work. They have the feeling of charity to mankind which, perhaps, results from that "moral sense" which is a part of our nature, and the chief of their good works are practical benevolences to mankind. A Hindu who wishes to lay up for himself a store of good deeds founds institutions for feeding the poor, or builds wells and serais, or plants trees to protect travellers from the sun'. . . . [Discussing the question of honesty.] 'The fact I take it to be that, while there are many more professional thieves in India, there is a much larger proportion of occasional thefts by servants, etc., in England. It is wonderful how seldom servants and others, not thieves by profession, pilfer in India.' 'Child-murder, as it involves concealment of the fact, would not be shown by the reports; and the murder of female infants, at one time common among certain tribes in certain parts of the country, is sometimes represented to be very general in our Provinces. But I must say that I doubt the fact. I do not think that it is likely to occur in present prosperous circumstances among large clans, in which there is plenty of room for intermarriages without infringing the rule which prohibits the marriage of blood relations. In fact, except among isolated families claiming peculiar rank, girls are very valuable, and if

child murder did take place to a large extent, many instances must come to light. If ten such cases be ascertained by the magistrate, we may well believe that ninety are concealed; but if none are found out, I should believe in neither ninety nor nine. I have had to do with a considerable Rajpoot population, and have seen nothing of the kind. I am therefore slow to believe speculative people who go into a village, pencil in hand, and because they fancy that they see more boys than girls, calculate and propound that exactly one-half of the female infants of the ordinary agricultural Rajpoots are annually murdered.—*Modern India*, George Campbell, Bengal C.S. Murray, 1852.

SIR G. B. CLERK, G.C.S.I. Served in, or for India, 1818 to 1876; Nominated Governor of Bombay, 1860. Evidence before Select Committee, Commons, 1853.

'Looking at the long experience you have had of Natives, what is your opinion of the standard of morality among the best of the native population, those with whom you have come in contact, and in whom you have placed confidence among the higher classes?'—'I should say that the morality among the higher classes of the Hindus was of a high standard, and among the middling and lower classes remarkably so; there is less of immorality and less of extreme poverty than you would see in many countries in Europe. In all their domestic relations, and their charity to their neighbours, they are superior to what you will find in many countries; it is not so much so perhaps with the Mahometans, but still I should say that there is no striking degree of immorality among them.' 'Is it your opinion that confidence might be placed in the natives for the performance of the duties of many higher offices than they are now employed in in those districts?'—'Certainly, if allowed salaries sufficient to place them on a respectable footing.' 'You mean that if their allowances were such as to maintain them in the relative station in which they ought to be, as compared with Europeans, confidence might be placed in their honest and straightforward conduct?'—'Certainly, for official business of most kinds.' 'Are the decisions of the judges between the lowest class and the Zillah judge looked on as equal to the decisions of the Zillah judge?'—'I have had but little opportunity of comparing them, but I should say that they are. The decisions of all the native judges are considered, I believe, to have fully answered the expectations formed of their capacities for administering justice.' 'Have you ever taken pains to enquire into the questions which have been raised upon appeal from the decisions of the native judges, and the result of those appeals?'—'I have read their decisions.' 'Have you formed a judgment upon the subject yourself, as to whether the decisions of the Zillah judges are superior to those of the Native judges?'—'I should not say that they are superior. The decision of the Native judge is as good as that of the European judge.'—*Same source as views of General Briggs*.

HENRY J. S. COTTON, C.S.I. Indian Service 1867 to 1899; Member Bengal Legislative Council, 1892; Chief Commissioner, Assam, 1896; Author of various works on India. (Writing in 1885.)

'The superiority of the Natives of the country in administering law and justice to their own people is indeed a fact that cannot be seriously disputed. The intellectual attainments and high moral virtues of Dwarkanath Mitter sufficiently vindicate the competence of Natives to exercise the most responsible functions. He sat for many years upon the bench of the High Court of Judicature in Bengal. Other Native gentlemen might also be mentioned, who before and after him have occupied the same post and acquitted themselves with credit. At the same time the judicial appointments in the lower grades of the service are already filled by Natives, and there is abundant testimony to show that they discharge their duties with integrity and ability.—*INDIA*, September 8, 1899.

VICTOR COUSIN (1792-1867). Founder of Systematic Eclecticism in Philosophy.

'On the other hand, when we read with attention the poetical and philosophical movements of the East, above all those of India, which are beginning to spread in Europe, we discover there so many truths, and truths so profound, and which make such a contrast with the meanness of the results at which the European genius has sometimes stopped, that we are constrained to bend the knee before that of the East, and to see in this cradle of the human race the native land of the highest philosophy.—*Thoughts on the Past and Future of India*, Manasikharām Sūryarām.

A. T. CRAWFORD. Indian Civilian, writing in 1892:—

'I am one of those who, with all my Indian experience before me, have had special opportunities in later years of studying police cases of every kind in England, and of hearing what barristers and solicitors say of the civil cases in which they are concerned. The daily journals teem, too, with cases in which false swearing on one side or the other is palpable, and judges inveigh, in vain, from the bench against the prevalence of perjury. Has there ever been a worse case in India than what is known as the "Hurlbert" case, to say nothing of several more recent instances of perjury in connexion with

will suits? Has there ever been more wholesale perjury than in the Tichborne, commonly known as the "Claimant's" case? or the Piggott part of the *Times*' Commission, which combined forgery with false swearing? I have been thrown in contact with the English agricultural—the farmer and the labourer—classes, and find them quite as much, if not more, addicted to lying than my old friend Bhow Pater or Baboo Kumbi in India. The fact is that "service men" go out to India young, without any experience of their own countrymen, and at first, from the very nature of their duties, seeing only the seamy side of Native character, they become impressed with the belief that those around them have no regard for veracity, a belief so strong that a subsequent better knowledge can hardly eradicate it. Professional men and those connected with mercantile pursuits, on the other hand, similarly ignorant of their own land, and also going out in their youth, live in large cities or stations, know nothing or next to nothing of the languages, and have little communication with non-English speaking Natives, and that little is through the interpretation of their clerks. Few, very few, if any of us, get to know anything of the masses of Natives, their habits, their modes of thought, their inner lives. Betwixt us and them "there is a great gulf fixed," and we are apt in our self-conceit and ignorance to judge rashly and harshly, and usually fail to perceive that the poor people around us have very many good qualities that should command our respect. Somehow or other it has become a settled belief that Natives are habitually liars, and in the courts of law indulge the propensity with the utmost freedom. We do not know how often the Native does not rightly understand his questioner—how very easily he is confused, and made to say (or misinterpreted to say) what he does not really mean. The imperturbable Briton, though of the strictest veracity, can often be shown up to public scorn when in the witness box, to contradict himself and appear bent upon prevarication; he is being examined by his own countryman, in his own language—the Native witness is often in the hands of an examiner who imperfectly understands him, and has to take his evidence at second-hand. Why should we always jump to the conclusion that the Native witness is bent on perjurying himself? Why not make as much allowance for the Native as for the Englishman? We come to be more charitable when we get older and have left the East for good: we find, when it is too late, from what we see of our countrymen and women, that we must often have judged very harshly and uncharitably in India. It is not a pleasant retrospect.—*Supplied in MS. by Mr. Talcherkar from 'Reminiscences of a Mofussil Policeman,' by A. T. Crawford.*

(To be continued.)

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

[FROM AN INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

BOMBAY, September 2.

Almost all the Indian papers have now commented on the Budget debate in Parliament, and especially on the atrabularious attack by Lord G. Hamilton on Sir William Wedderburn and INDIA. That there was no foundation in fact for Lord G. Hamilton's malicious explosion goes without saying. As for Sir William Wedderburn all India has spoken with no uncertain voice. India is indignant at the foul attack. I propose to forward to you on an early day a collection of opinions on the subject by the Indian Press that would be worth distributing among members of Parliament, who will then have an opportunity of learning fully in what high estimation and regard Sir William Wedderburn is held. There is not an Englishman at the present moment who is more beloved by my countrymen than he, and it is in contemplation at the capital towns to hold very shortly public meetings expressive of the undiminished confidence in that thorough English gentleman who has such deep and abiding sympathy for the people of this country.

At the last meeting of the Bombay Legislative Council the Hon. Mr. Mehta had half-a-dozen interpellations on the Sirdars Natu and an equal number on the recent questions and answers in the House of Commons touching the precious Law College. Needless to say both interpellations were framed on what the *Times* of India calls the "Socratic method." They were meant to corner the Government, and cornered the Government was. It was a most difficult operation to give straightforward replies, so the Government had to wriggle out as best it could—not an edifying spectacle. The Sirdars Natu are still denied ordinary justice, which is not a little scandalous, and reflects not a little on the fair reputation of the British Government for judicial impartiality. "Benevolent despotism" is worse than despotism pure and simple. Here is an instance of it. Lord Sandhurst missed a golden opportunity of doing what was just and generous; and I say that his replies have enhanced his unpopularity. However, on cognate matters he has made some

reparation—I mean in the case of Professor G. K. Gokhale. The very excellent civic work which that distinguished Professor of Fergusson College is doing has had its effect on the Head of the State who about two years ago, in the same Council chamber, attacked him with a severity of tone which was universally regarded as unjustifiable. But, as Governments are never in the habit of admitting errors, it is something to elicit from Lord Sandhurst a voluntary expression of opinion as to the good work done in plague matters in Poona by Professor Gokhale. More valuable still is the work that Professor Gokhale has been discharging in the Poona Municipality as Chairman of the Finance Committee. I attach the highest value to that work; and gifted as Professor Gokhale is with a remarkably clear head and a lucidity of expression—often of great eloquence and earnestness—I fancy the Government in the future will yet have to reckon with him more than in the past. He is already the natural leader of the moderate but advanced party in the Capital of the Deccan, and is most likely to gain a seat in the general election for the Legislative Council a few months hence. His remarkable abilities, especially in finance would be a great acquisition to that body. The Bombay public, if he is elected, will have two most able men to fight the battle of provincial finance. The Hon. Mr. Mehta has been rendering yeoman's service in this direction for the past few weeks both here and in the Imperial Legislative Council. In our Local Council the other day he fought strenuously for greater financial freedom for all the Provinces. It is a pity that the published report of his speech on the occasion is far from full. Mr. Mehta demonstrated by quotations from the official authorities how far the Imperial Government has departed from the wholesome and beneficent principle of provincial contracts laid down by the Government of Lord Ripon in 1881. Since that year, owing to the active military policy of the Imperial Government, there has been a fresh retrogression in provincial finance. The healthy principle that only one-third of the increased revenues of a province should be taken by the Imperial Government has been gravely departed from, thanks to the mischievous policy of external aggression and breathless railway construction. The non-productive central authority now sweeps away into its bottomless treasury almost the greater portion of the enhanced quinquennial revenue, regardless of increased burdens, especially for plague and famine, entailed on the subordinate administrations, while starving the productive entities. Not until the provincial finances are genuinely decentralised can the provincials hope to build large surpluses or spend on many administrative needs. The octopus of the Military Department eats up everything. The first step in reform must be to deal with that harpy, though the Central Government needs to be given a certain larger percentage of provincial revenues. This is the only way of curbing its wasteful expenditure.

BRITISH SOLDIERS AND INDIANS.

A NEW ARMY ORDER.

WISE CONCESSION TO PROTESTS.

The following order in reconstruction of the existing paragraph on the subject in Army Regulations has (says the *Pioneer*) a significance which it is not difficult to locate:—

"Whenever serious breaches of discipline, acts of violence, outrages and affrays, or disputes take place in any of which Natives and soldiers are concerned, or when any unusual events occur, the officer commanding on the spot will report the incident by telegram direct to the Adjutant-General, repeating the telegram to the Secretary to the Government of India in the Military Department, the Deputy Adjutant-General of the command, and the General Officer commanding the district. A detailed report of such occurrences will be submitted through the prescribed channel by post for transmission to the Headquarters of the Command, further reports following as facts of the case become more fully elucidated. Lieutenant-Generals commanding the forces will forward these reports to army headquarters in all cases, which they may consider of a serious nature."

The *Pioneer* adds that the Lieutenant-General Commanding in Bengal has issued special instructions in Command Orders that all assaults committed by British soldiers on Natives are to be reported to the General Officer of the district, who will decide whether any further mention is to be made of the matter. When a case of the kind appears to the regimental Commanding Officer to be sufficiently serious to be reported under the existing regulations it is to be reported in the way already prescribed.

Commenting on the new Army Order the *Times* of India (September 2) writes:—"An Army Order which was promulgated a few days

ago has not yet attracted the attention its importance deserves. The Order directs that whenever serious breaches of discipline, outrages, affrays, or disputes take place in which British or Native soldiers are concerned, or 'when any unusual events occur,' the Officer Commanding on the spot is to report the incident by telegram direct to the Adjutant-General, Simla, repeating the telegram to the Secretary to Government, Military Department, the Deputy Adjutant-General of the Command, and the General Officer Commanding the District. The same procedure is to be followed whenever an officer or soldier is killed or wounded by a fanatic or other person, or meets with sudden or violent death, or grave injury under very exceptional circumstances. It may be assumed that this Order is the direct outcome of a notorious case now under trial. Serious delay is believed to have occurred upon that occasion in notifying the central authorities regarding the incident, and the Government of India were evidently for some time unaware of what had happened. The new Order should render such delays impossible in future, and it may be hoped that the scandal of an extremely belated intervention will not be repeated."

[The notorious case referred to by the *Times of India* and the *Pioneer* is, of course, the Rangoon outrage.]

THE RANGOON OUTRAGE.

TRIAL OF THE ACCUSED.

[FROM THE "TIMES OF INDIA."]

Before the Recorder and a special jury of nine persons the trial of the six soldiers of the West Kent Regiment on the charge of outraging a Burmese woman commenced at Rangoon on August 28. The Court was crowded with both the civil and military element of the station.

After some discussion between counsel whether accused should be tried jointly in one trial or whether they should be tried separately, the Court decided that the case should proceed by separate trials, and Private Thorpe was picked out to stand his trial first.

The charge was read out to the prisoners, who pleaded not guilty, and claimed to be tried.

The Government Advocate then opened the case for the Crown. The story for the prosecution was then unravelled, but needs no recapitulation, as it has already been somewhat fully reported in the proceedings of the Lower Court. Referring to the action of the officers, counsel thought that it was excusable that the officers of the regiment considered the story was an exaggerated one, for no Englishman would be willing to believe that it was possible that a number of men could have behaved in such an inhuman manner towards this woman, and least of all the officers of the regiment to which the men belonged. Counsel said he would not disclose to the jury the statements of the accused because the defending counsel objected on the ground of their inadmissibility. Counsel maintained that considering Mah Goon's respectability and physical condition it was impossible that she could have solicited the accused, and he discredited the story of the alleged prostitution. He explained that it was probably a case of misidentification as regarded Sullivan. Counsel was not going to put him forward as a witness to be relied on, because, although he was not implicated by the other accused, yet he did not come forward till some time afterwards to give evidence. In conclusion, counsel characterised the fact that twenty or thirty men were witnesses of this occurrence as being disgraceful to members of society, and even more so in the case of Englishmen who behaved in the way that they did to this old woman. It was almost incredible, but it was nevertheless true. It was shocking to believe that twenty or thirty men, European British soldiers, could have been on that spot and seen what was going on, and that not one of them raised a hand, or ran a single risk, or even raised a voice in the defence of the poor woman.

The evidence was then led, and the case adjourned.

Private Martin, the seventh accused in the Rangoon outrage case, who was struck down with enteric fever, is now convalescent, but it is feared that he will not be able to stand his trial for some little time in consequence of his mind being a bit uninged.

The charge against Private Thorpe is still proceeding.

ACQUITTAL OF JOHNSON.

A Reuter's telegram from Rangoon dated Tuesday last (September 19) stated that the trial of Private William Johnson, the second of the six men of the West Kent Regiment who were committed to the sessions on the charge of outraging a Burmese woman, has resulted in the acquittal of the accused.

A THIRD ACQUITTAL.

An Exchange Telegraph Company's telegram from Allahabad, dated Wednesday last, said:—"The third soldier tried for outraging a woman at Rangoon in April has been acquitted. It is most impos-

able that anyone will be punished for this inhuman outrage by about a dozen soldiers in the presence of many others."

The *Morning Leader* wrote yesterday (Thursday):—"A telegram from Allahabad reports the acquittal of the third of the soldiers accused of the appalling outrage at Rangoon of which our Bombay correspondent promptly informed the public at home last April. Seven soldiers are charged, and they are being tried—and acquitted—one by one. Yesterday's message adds that 'it is most improbable that anyone will be punished for this inhuman outrage by about a dozen soldiers in the presence of many others.' The remark recalls the speech of the prosecuting counsel, which is reported in the Indian journals to hand by the last mail. The case illustrates both the law's delays and the difficulty in India of obtaining a verdict against a European charged with assault upon a Native. We are glad to see, however, that a new army order has just been issued in India requiring prompt information of all such attacks by soldiers to be sent to the highest authorities. The connection between this order and the Rangoon case is, as the *Pioneer* and the *Times of India* remark, quite obvious."

BRITISH INDIANS IN NATAL.

THE DEALERS' LICENCES ACT.

The *Manchester Guardian* (September 18) wrote: We gather from INDIA that Mr. Chamberlain has been in communication with the Natal Government with respect to the treatment of its Outlanders, and that in consequence the licensing boards have been advised "to exercise caution in refusing Indian licences, so as not to interfere with vested interests." This is encouraging so far as it goes; but there is everything to be said for the remedy which the Indians in Natal want, namely right of appeal from the decisions of the local boards to a Supreme Court. The Dealers' Licence Act of 1897, under which so many complaints have arisen, is an unjust piece of legislation. The people of Natal have a right to say that certain standards shall be kept up in the management and conduct of their shops and enforce these standards, if necessary, against the Indian traders. They have no right to protect themselves against perfectly fair competition irrespective of the standards which are deemed necessary in the public interest, still less have they the right to use the Act of 1897, arbitrarily to remove existing competition and to ruin in one hour the trade which an Indian immigrant has taken years to build up, simply and solely because he is an Indian. The Act gives far too much power to the local authorities, who may—in some cases undoubtedly have—been influenced by purely personal interests in the administration of the Act, and the Indian trader is entitled as a mere matter of elementary justice to protection against its more flagrant abuses. Natal is said to sympathise with the Outlanders in the Transvaal. But within its own borders it has Outlanders, in these British subjects from India, who, encouraged in the first instance to immigrate to Natal, not only remain destitute of political rights, but are liable by a stroke of the pen to be deprived of their livelihood without compensation for goodwill and without right of appeal.

THE INDIAN GOLD STANDARD.

At last it is accomplished. A week ago yesterday the Legislative Council of the Governor-General of India met in Simla, and agreed to the issue of a proclamation announcing to the world that from this time henceforward to the end of the world, or of the British dominion in India, the sovereign is to be, not the legal tender but legal "standard," of that dependency. Mr. Clinton Dawkins told the Council that it was a "measure of transcendent importance to place the currency of India on a gold basis and endow India with a stable exchange." And no doubt it is. He and Lord Curzon were in such a hurry to get this "standard" set up as the new god for all India to worship, that they could not wait for the decree from England authorising the establishment of a mint to coin golden sovereigns in India, nor yet for the dies and other tools necessary to the business. No, the standard must be declared operative forthwith, and now everybody is going to be happy henceforth and for ever. In virtue of this decree all the world can take its gold to Calcutta, and receive in exchange for each sovereign's weight fifteen silver rupees. These silver rupees are only worth about 10d., as Mr. David Yule pointed out in his recent address to the Bank of Calcutta, but at this exchange they will be treated as worth sixteen pence. No wonder that Mr. Dawkins took the precaution to say that, although they were quite willing to sell rupees at this price in exchange for gold, the Viceroy's Government had no intention whatever of buying them. "There would be no obligation," he said, "to give gold for rupees, because that would entail the acquisition by borrowing of an immense and indefinite sum." Just so; and how is a one-sided currency of this kind going to be worked as a standard of value, we should like to know? If the Government of India cannot sell gold for rupees at its fixed ratio, how is it going to meet its gold obligations in this country—obligations that amount, direct and indirect, to about twenty millions sterling a year? That question is left out of sight.

Lord Curzon must have been even funnier in his remarks than his financial member of Council, if we may judge by the telegraphic summaries sent to the papers. He declared that he was not afraid of the danger of losing the gold now on its way to the Indian reserves. No less than £2,600,000 had already arrived, and imports were

increasing steadily, which is very nice news indeed, although ten times £2,600,000 will not go far when India falls into her next period of financial leanness. But his lordship seems to dream of a flowing out of the sovereign from India as well as a flowing in, and there we are not able to rise to the height of his intellectual vision. How can gold flow out if the Government of India refuses to sell it for rupees at fifteen to the sovereign? Where are the people of India going to get it when they want it to export, and what is the Government of India going to do to keep the stream up if it has no gold reserve? Borrow in London, no doubt. Without borrowing we cannot see in this device the potent guarantee for the expansion of mercantile relations with every part of the empire that his lordship fondles in the inmost study of his imagination. Nor do we see the "fixed value in the exchange," which is the *ignis fatuus* that all these currency fakirs of the official class have chased after these many years. It cannot be brought into being by solely depending on the operations of trade. If India should be recklessly exhorted in order to keep up such an excess of exports as will enable her to pay for all her imports, plus the Government drain and the private drain of capital, of money, mercantile and official, aggregating at least £30,000,000 a year, then the exchange must be maintained until India collapsed under the strain, but in no other way outside steady dependence upon fresh loans in London. The permanent state of the exchange must always be adverse to India, always tending downwards, because of the load we have laid upon the country, and no amount of ingenious concocting of schemes and issuing of decrees can get round that established fact. A stringency of loanable capital may still occur in India, Mr. Dawkins thinks, but never a currency. We really do not understand what he means. Apparently he thinks that notwithstanding this "gold standard" grandeur now imparted to the Imperial Government it will be possible to maintain and expand or contract the silver rupee currency just as trade requires it. "The Treasury will always have such a surplus that it can buy any amount of gold and send any amount of silver rupees at a false valuation into circulation among the people and the banks." We suppose this gentleman is sane, for he has a great reputation, but we should not have thought it possible until we saw these statements for any man in adequate possession of his senses to make them. However, we can wait developments with a certain amusement because, if they do nothing else, these great currency governors out in India and at home do give occasion for a good deal of mirth. It would be unalloyed enjoyment to us all, this spectacle of Bedlam, but for the danger of disaster that lies ahead in no punishment that is mean while being inflicted upon the Indian people. They, however, do not count in a currency experiment, which is intended to add to the glory of the empire and to cause capital in the form of gold to rush into India in an overwhelming flood, as well as to do many other things that Baron Munchausen might have thought of had he lived nowadays. Indeed, after reading this wonderful display of owl-wisdom we cannot be sure he is dead.—*The Investors' Review.*

the making of gold and gold coins legal tender—and all other measures necessary for the final settlement and effective establishment of a gold standard in India were, however, left in abeyance. The hopes of the supporters of the present Indian monetary policy were based upon the argument that a stable exchange would lead to an influx of capital. This was true, but with the important addition *ceteris paribus*—i.e., provided the inducement to capital to flow to the country remained the same. The whole difficulty lay, however, in the fact that the introduction of the "exchange standard" into India had diminished the remunerability of investment in India, and there was thus no more reason to anticipate an increase in the flow of capital to India than happened to Italy, Austria, and Russia after their "fixed" their exchanges. Nor was this difficult of explanation. The raising of the value of the money of the country was no royal road to wealth. If the Government sold for *s. 14d.* what cost *10d.* only, the difference was a heavy tax on the producing forces of the nation, a certain means of discouraging importation of foreign capital. Profitable conditions of production, on the other hand, would attract capital in spite of the exchanges. Witness Mexico. This country had resolutely stuck to silver, and its statesmen attributed to this fact the great prosperity now being witnessed, which had enabled her Government to successfully convert her foreign debt into a lower rate of interest. For better or for worse, India had chosen the opposite way to Mexico. There was nothing for her to do but to go forward and try to bring the difficult task undertaken to a successful issue. If in spite of all efforts failure was the final result she would have the consolation that she had been beaten by economic laws against which the powers of Government availed not.

"BLUFF AND BLUSTER."

The *Lahore Tribune* sees in Lord George Hamilton's attack on Sir William Wedderburn "another illustration of the change which is coming over the spirit of British statesmanship." "Bluff and bluster," it says, "is taking the place of calm reasoning and impartial judgment." There is but too much ground for the observation. Both Sir William Wedderburn and the Editor of *INDIA* may well be gratified by the comments of the Indian Press upon the recent outburst of the Secretary of State for India. The expression of respect and admiration, and even affection, for Sir William, is warm and emphatic, not to say touching. The Anglo-Indian *Englishman* of Calcutta does not affect to be surprised for it says Lord George Hamilton "denies to his opponents the possession of a single scrap of loyalty, or patriotism, or even common-sense." It is not a flattering picture, especially when one recognises that it is drawn by a friendly hand. The *Champion* of Bombay, a vigorous and independent journal, sees in Lord George Hamilton's denunciations only "the outcome of baffled impotence and rage." "If anything," it says, "these repeated attacks on Sir William Wedderburn, and through him on the Congress, show the incapacity of making any serious defence in reference to the allegations made concerning the administration here"—that is, in India. Again: "Such attacks, it is needless to say, defeat their own object. Lord George Hamilton and those who are behind him are egregiously mistaken if they think that the epithets that have been hurled at Sir William Wedderburn will even by a hair's breadth turn away that gentle and most noble-minded Englishman from his purpose of trying to right the many grievous wrongs of India." Where "gross falsehoods" are to be found, the *Champion* says is notorious, with a boldly obvious innuendo. The only specimen of "gross falsehood" referred to by Lord George Hamilton—which India has so effectually demolished—does not appear to have been wired to India, so that as yet the papers have been left to their imagination to discover the will be none the wiser for the official report of the debate, for, strangely enough, it has been omitted there also, apparently by Lord George's own hand. The *Englishman* which expressly admits that "the paper India certainly is not more violent and inaccurate in its language than any other party organ at home," says "its especially mischievous nature is to be found rather in the fact that it is addressed to Natives of India who have not the same restraint, or the reasons for restraint, as the people of England." Yet, as the *Hindu* points out, no sort of harm had hitherto come of that. "Can Sir William Wedderburn and his co-agitators not see," asks the *Englishman*, "that India is not the country in which to try political experiments?" It would be very difficult to devise any more fatuous argument. The *Hindu* makes prompt answer: "The question might with equal reason have been asked about the British Government in India. For what have they been doing in India these many decades but 'trying political experiments'?" A steady, accurate, fair, and moderate criticism of Indian affairs does seem to us to be a very extraordinary ground of complaint. But we are very sure that no "bluff and bluster" from Lord George Hamilton or anybody else will for a moment stay the pen or the tongue of any British citizen jealous for the honour and the welfare of his country, and of its great Dependency.—*The New Age.*

THE RIGHT OF INTERPELLATION.

A good deal of dissatisfaction is being expressed in the Native Press at the fashion in which the questions put to Government in the Legislative Council are answered. It must be acknowledged that the operations of the process of interpellation do not always tend to the illumination of enquiring minds. Nor, on the other hand, have any of the Indian Governments so far taken large advantage of it as affording them an opportunity for expounding and defending their acts. Long before the right of interpellation was conceded it was pointed out by an

Before the British Association (Economic Science and Statistics section) at Dover on Tuesday last, Mr. Hermann Schmid read a paper on "Indian Currency after the Report of the Commission." He said that on the 8th of the present month Mr. Clinton Dawkins, the financial member of the Viceroy's Council, introduced the new Indian Currency Bill in the Legislative Council at Simla, which it was hoped would finally settle the vexed question of the standard of India by placing the trades and finances of that great dependency on a gold basis, fixing the rupee at *s. 14d.* The proposals now enacted had not come as a surprise, but were only the final step in a series of measures long deliberated upon, carefully prepared, and gradually accepted. A complete victory for the gold standard party had thus been won. The constant depreciation of silver had a twofold effect on the economic and financial condition of India. It provided an undoubted and powerful stimulus to her productive energies, which made the years of the "falling rupee" periods of steady and continuous improvement in the Indian figures of exports and imports, shipping, railways, canals, excise, post, and telegraph. But there was the other side to this pleasing picture. Whilst the "India of the Indians" had prospered the foreign merchants were exasperated by the constantly fluctuating exchange with the gold standard countries, the Anglo-Indian community were suffering heavily by the smaller amount of sterling which rupee salaries realised, and, above all, the Indian Government lost most severely by the low exchange, having to remit from £15,000,000 to £18,000,000 sterling a year from India to England for different "home charges," to a great extent representing interest on debt contracted in gold. For a long time the Anglo-Indian officials were strongly of the opinion that the benefits derived by the country at large from a "cheap rupee" outweighed the embarrassment of individuals and the difficulties of the Government. But the evidence taken before Lord Herschell's Committee showed that the weight of authority was in favour of India's adherence to the silver standard and of the preservation of the automatic rupee, which was able to stand the test of all honest money—the ordeal of fire. But the committee were more impressed with the difficulties of the Government finances than with all the other arguments, and in their report of May 31, 1893, they stated that, "while conscious of the gravity of the suggestion," they could not, "in view of the serious evils with which the Government of India may at any time be confronted if matters are left where they are," advise to overrule the proposals for the closing of the mints and the adoption of a gold standard. This negatively expressed recommendation was acted upon by the Government in their famous Act, No. 8, the Indian Coinage and Paper Currency Act, 1893. The object of this Act was to "alter the Indian monetary standard from silver to gold." But the Act proceeded with great caution. It closed the Indian mints to the free coinage of silver, and provided as a provisional arrangement for the issue of rupees at these mints in exchange for gold at the rate of *s. 14d.* per rupee, i.e., 7-53,344 grains troy of fine gold for one rupee. The settlement of a permanent rate of exchange between gold and the silver rupee—i.e.,

eminent Anglo-Indian journalist, in the course of a correspondence with Sir Henry Maine, that it would obviate the necessity for an official newspaper, the establishment of which was then under confidential discussion. Thus far no Government has seen its way to make use of it for that purpose, and there is too much reason for looking upon an official answer as the means of concealing rather than of exhibiting what is in the mind of the ruling authorities. The institution, however, is in its infancy, it is capable of development, and we cannot yet foresee what shape will ultimately be given to it. Those who find occasion for complaint in the manner in which Government take their part in the dialogue may be asked if they are not themselves contributing to their own disappointment. If there were a less manifest desire on the part of some of the framers of questions to "corner" the Government there would perhaps be a less manifest determination on the part of the official members to avoid being cornered. The Socratic method is an invaluable device in dialectics, but we are not sure that it is quite as much in place in Council. We should not insist upon too close a copying of British Parliamentary methods in the procedure of our Legislative Councils, for in the House of Commons a member who is dissatisfied with the answer that a Minister gives to his question has other means of gaining his end. He may, if he gets the required number of members to support him, move the adjournment of the House in order to call attention to his grievance, and there are various expedients for bringing on a discussion which may very effectively make amends for the disappointments of question time. Therefore it would scarcely be fair to appeal too rigidly to Parliamentary analogies. At the same time it may be well to remember that such a question paper as that which was laid on the table at Poona last week would have undergone merciless editing at the hands of the Speaker. The question the answers to which have been complained of are for the most part essentially argumentative questions, and argumentative questions are invariably held by the Speaker to be out of order. They invite argumentative answers, and argument and interpellation are two entirely different processes. We can well understand that it may be mortifying to honourable additional members of Council to see so flagrant a disproportion between the fulness of their enquiries and the sententious barrenness of the replies that they elicit. But we must not be surprised if they continue to be subjected to this disappointment so long as they continue to conduct their inquiries upon the present lines. They would probably be told more if they asked less—at all events if they were more careful to observe the difference between asking and arguing.—*The Times of India.*

JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS.

A very strong argument in support of the separation of the judicial and executive functions of Government officers has been afforded by a criminal case which had lately engaged the attention of the first-class magistrate and Huzur deputy collector of Satara. In this case one Janu Patil of the village named Limb in the Satara Taluka was tried along with several others for a number of offences, minor and major, relating mostly to theft of certain property alleged to be committed at the time when the plague was raging in Limb, and many of the house-owners therein had evacuated it and left their properties more or less ineffectively safe-guarded in their village. We do not think it necessary to enter into all the interesting details about the case given by our contemporary the *Prekshak* of Satara; we shall choose only such as have a bearing upon the case from the point of view we have taken up. The earliest arrests in this case were made on February 17 last, and the Huzur deputy collector gave his final judgment in the case on the 15th of this month. It will be thus seen that the principal accused, Janu Patil, was in custody as an under-trial prisoner for six months. But of these six months the hearings before the Huzur deputy collector occupied four months. These hearings numbered no less than 105; and some 86 witnesses in all were examined in the case. The fees of the public prosecutor alone are said to have amounted to Rs. 2,625, and the process fees to about Rs. 200 at the least. The expenses of Government, therefore, in this case, may be said to have amounted to Rs. 3,000. As for the accused his costs are estimated at Rs. 10,000. The net result of all these proceedings was that the principal accused, Janu Patil, was convicted and sentenced to twenty-four hours' rigorous imprisonment and a fine of twenty rupees. It is not for us to say how far such a large expenditure on the part of Government was or was not necessary for bringing the accused to justice, also whether real justice was or was not done even at this enormous cost. We may, however, say that six months of informal but real imprisonment and a technical sentence of twenty-four hours' imprisonment at the end of it afford a rather suspiciously sharp contrast. We must confess we know nothing of the merits of the case from the point of view of the accused; but we are bound to observe that six months of under-trial prisoners must have been little short of judicial persecution to him. But the principal point we want to notice in this case is the extraordinary length of the trial, which on a most charitable view may be said to be due to the heavy pressure

of non-judicial business on the hands of the Huzur deputy-collector. The examination of 86 witnesses in 105 sittings cannot be said to be an ideal of despatch in judicial work. But apparently the magistrate had done everything in his power to finish the case soon, and even gone out of his way to hold his Court in the mornings. Most of the blame therefore may be said to fall on the head of the system in which the judicial and the executive functions are incongruously blended together. We do not think that many instances more glaring than the one afforded by the Satara case can be found of the mischief and injury that is being done to the public by the pernicious system against which not only Indian public opinion but also the sense of such eminent judicial authorities as many Chief Justices of Indian High Courts has so forcibly protested.—*The Mahattrata.*

THE BENGAL PROVINCIAL SERVICE.

[FROM A CORRESPONDENT.]

The *Anvita Bazar Patrika* of August 13 contains a very edifying article with reference to the executive branch of the Bengal Provincial Service. This branch consists of a higher grade of magistracy, including deputy-magistrates, with salaries ranging from about £200 to £600 per annum, and a lower grade in which the emolument is from about £50 to £150. In the former class there are 266 permanent posts and in the latter 105, all of which have of course long since been filled up. To supply any vacancy, however, caused by the death or retirement or disablement in any way of an officer, there is the provision of a temporary staff which keeps up the efficiency of the service, and from which officers are transferred to the permanent list as soon as the vacancies they have been filling up become permanent. The rate of confirmation, however, is not very high with the deputy-magistrates, being 11 in 1896, 9 in 1897, and 7 in 1898; while with the sub-deputy magistrates the corresponding numbers were 4, 5 and 4.

Now, a temporary appointment, besides having the inevitable drawback of being terminated at the end of an uncertain time, carries in the case we are considering this great disadvantage that during the period it is held the officer holding it is disentitled to any of the benefits of the Leave Rules of the Service, "having," according to the *Patrika*, "little or no leave at all," and suffering in addition the more serious loss of not being permitted to calculate the whole of such period as a contribution to his superannuation. It would be common justice, therefore, one would think, to approximate the employment of these temporary officers as closely as possible to the number of confirmations every year. But the Service has for some time, been getting so shamefully undermanned that the 266 Deputy Magistrates were supplemented by 125, or in other words the Temporary establishment was 47 per cent. of the Permanent; and 105 Sub-Deputy Magistrates were assisted by no fewer than 84 officers, or 80 per cent. of the whole strength.

These "Temporary" outcasts, whom official Anglo-Indian red tape had kept outside of the "Permanent" fold, stood in a quag, so to speak, "in which each second stood heir to the first"; and the case of the man whose chances stood first is thus described by the *Patrika*—

"Among sub-deputy collectors" (these double-barrelled guns have to discharge both judicial and executive duties be it remembered, hence they are sometimes called magistrates, sometimes collectors). "Among sub-deputy collectors Babu Fatik Chunder Das (now a sub, *pro tem*, deputy magistrate) who was appointed in July, 1889, or ten years ago, has not yet been confirmed in any capacity. He is fifty-one years old and within four years of his retirement. This case of Babu Fatik Chunder promised to be the most unique and unprecedented in the annals of any service inasmuch as it would have probably established a record of an officer retiring from the service of Government, without having been confirmed in the service in which he had spent more than half a lifetime."

When things came to this pass, one hears that a scheme for the re-organization of the executive branch of the Bengal Provincial Service has met with the approval of the Secretary of State for India. Six weeks' time was too much to grant for a re-consideration of the Calcutta Municipal Bill. One wonders how long it took this Augean stable to be ordered to be cleansed.

PRINCE RAJNITSINHJI'S TEAM.—At noon on Saturday Prince Rajnitsinhji and his team of cricketers left Euston for Liverpool, and eventually sailed for New York on board the Cunard liner "Etirua." The combination is exceptionally strong in all departments of the game, as may be gleaned from the following names:—K. S. Ranjitsinhji (captain) and George Barnard (Sussex); C. Robson and C. B. Llewellyn (Hampshire); G. L. Jessop and C. L. Townsend (Gloucestershire); S. M. J. Woods (Somerset); W. P. Robertson (Cambridge); B. J. T. Bosanquet (Oxford); A. E. Stoddart (Middlesex); A. C. McLaren (Lancashire); and A. Priestly (M.C.C.). Victor Barton, the well-known Hampshire professional, accompanies the side as attendant. The tour as at present arranged is only a short one, as the team expect to be back by October 25. The fixtures arranged are eighteen colts at Philadelphia, and two matches against All Philadelphia and one each against Baltimore and New York.

SINGER'S SEWING MACHINES.

FOR CASH OR HIRE.

Machines Exchanged and Repaired.

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

100 Offices in India, Burma, and Ceylon.

Instructions Free. Price Lists Free on application.

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

MAHA-BHARATA,

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

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

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

May be had in India through any Indian bookseller.

OPINIONS.

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

"Mr. Romesh Chandra Dutt is the first scholar who brings to his task a life-long study of the original, with a perfect command of our own language. He puts into vigorous verse the episodes which are still recited in thousands of quiet hamlets, and hundreds of crowded schools."—*The Times.*

"An interesting Epilogue by the translator further explains the history and scope of the work, and furnishes an instance of the marvelous command of English required by educated Bengali gentlemen. The wisdom of the East is worthily presented in attractive blinding and printing."—*The Saturday Review.*

"If the Epic could not attract European readers by its intrinsic merits—its noble moral conceptions, its encyclopedic picture of Indian civilization in the remote past, its pathos, its delineation of character—still its extraordinary popularity and influence, as described in the translator's elegant 'Epilogue,' should alone make us curious to learn something of the story of the Kurus and the God-like sons of Pandu."—*The Manchester Guardian.*

LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY.

DADABHAI NAOROJI, Esq., PRESIDENT.

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

Apply, Dr. MULLICK,

SORO SQUARE, NATIONAL HOSPITAL, LONDON, W.

"INDIA," JAN.-JUNE, 1899.

VOL. XI.

NOW READY.

Bound in Cloth (post free)
7/6 each net cash.

The following volumes of "INDIA," bound in cloth, can also be obtained:—

Vols. V. (1894), VI. (1895), VII. (1896), VIII. (1897).

Price 8/6 each, post free.

Vols. IX. (Jan.-June, 1898), X. (July-Dec., 1898). Price 7/6 each, post free.

Remittances should accompany order.

Apply to the Manager, "INDIA,"

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

NEW SERIES OF PROFESSOR MAX MÜLLER'S
RECOLLECTIONS.

AULD LANG SYNE.

SECOND SERIES,

My Indian Friends.

BY

THE RIGHT HON. PROFESSOR MAX MÜLLER.

8vo, 10/6.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LONDON.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

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

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

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

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



is what its name implies **FEVER DESTROYER**,
and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER. North Raglan Barracks, Devonport. G. S. SRINIVASA, Chairman.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc. Cuddalore Municipal Council's Office.—"I have much pleasure 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 annas, Rs. 1/8, Rs. 2/12, Rs. 4, and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 dose sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

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



NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

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

THE MANAGER,

84 & 85, Palace Chambers,

Westminster, S.W.

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

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

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

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