

India

FOR THE

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1901.

[REGISTERED AS A FOREIGNER'S
NEWSPAPER. (BY POST, 24d.)

Notes and News	49	The late Mr. Justice Ranade:	
The "Scissors" of the India Office	52	Reaction by the London Indian	Society
British Indians in British Colonies	53	The Queen-Empress and the King- Emperor: Concidence and Con- gratulation by the London Indian	Society
Our London Letter	54	Mr. S. H. Swinay at Newton Hall	58
Notes from Bombay	53	Indian Affairs in Parliament	59
The Famine in India	53	Special Report	59
233,000 on Relief	55	Public Meetings on Indian Ques- tions	59
Letters to the Editors	55	Advertisements	60
Land Assessments and Middlemen	55		
The Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure: Important Corre- spondence between the Treasury and the India Office	57		

* * * An Index with Title-page to Volume XIV. of INDIA (July to December, 1900) is now ready. A copy will be forwarded gratis and post free to any Subscriber on application to the Manager.

NOTES AND NEWS.

AFTER an interval of twenty days comes another telegram (Jan. 24) from the Viceroy on the subject of the famine. An exceptionally liberal rainfall has produced rosy prospects in Upper India, Rajputana, the Central Provinces, and Central India. But it is very different with Gujerat, and the Bombay Deccan and Karnataka. In these extensive regions the short monsoon leaves "crop prospects bad and serious distress expected between now and August." It is admitted that "relief measures will be required, and expenditure estimated at one crore during next financial year, besides large loss of revenue." The numbers on relief continue at nearly a quarter of a million (233,000), the large majority (196,000) belonging to Bombay. The official expectation is that the numbers "will increase rapidly when harvest is completed." Here, then, is a striking confirmation, unfortunately, of the speculations we felt compelled to make on the recent absence of Viceregal telegrams. It is only too probable that the famine has come to stay. Is it not high time for the authorities to take measures that will effectually extirpate it? What can be the possible reason for hesitating to strike at the roots of this frightful upas tree?

The list of questions to be asked by the Famine Commissioners shows clearly enough that the Government looks no further ahead than to some amendment of the already "perfect" Famine Code. They are to enquire into the outlook at the commencement of the rains of 1899—the character of the two years' harvests immediately preceding, the extent of the cultivated area, the percentage of population dependent on agriculture, and the rainfall. They are to examine the preparations to meet famine, the systems of relief, the details of the opening and management of large public works and small village works, the operations of special relief and gratuitous relief, and a number of general matters—such as the sanitary arrangements, the sale of grain, the mortality, and non-official agencies of relief. But in all the 112 general questions, with their many sub-divisions, there is no indication of any intention to probe the essential question to the bottom—or at all. The warnings of the recrudescence of famine, however, may at length lead the Government to see that, while it is right and necessary that the administration of the past (if we may say "the past") famine should be fully investigated, it is urgent that the real cause or causes of famine should be explored and definitively dealt with. The peril is menacing and instant.

The *Standard* writes the usual official style of article on the new Famine Commission. It points out that "the causes of drought, and the inability of the people to bear up against any serious failure of crops, are not directly within the terms of reference," nor yet "propylactic measures." It does not express the least surprise, for "in a general way enough is already known for practical guidance." If this be so, then really it would seem to be high time that this "practical guidance" led to some

results of a tangible character. Then our contemporary solemnly trots out that venerable and outworn stager, the over-population theory.—

If these topics, serious as they are, be excluded from the purview of the Commissioners, it will be no surprise that the reference is silent as to that terrible and dominant factor in the problem which presses on the mind of every Indian Administrator—the rapid increase of population. Our régime is, in fact, endangered by its very success in suspending or obliterating the old checks of death, pestilence, and interecine wars.

So hard is it to overtake and extinguish a misrepresentation once it gets a start. For the *Standard* Mr. Hume and Sir James Caird would appear to have written in vain. The increase of population is not rapid; the densest population is found in districts that know not famine; and the most moderate improvements in agriculture would produce abundance of food in all parts of the country. Yet the leading semi-official journal in England submits to its readers as solemn fact an absurd official excuse that has been exposed to ridicule for the greater part of a generation.

The *Investors' Review* wishes that "every intelligent citizen" would read Mr. Chandavakar's Presidential Address. Our contemporary proceeds:—

It is accessible to people in this country in the pages of INDIA, that rarely conducted and most useful little organ of Indian Native opinion published weekly in this country under the aegis of the Indian National Congress. Mr. Chandavakar deals with the problems of the day affecting Indian life with an intelligence, moderation, and charity of view politicians in this country might well envy, and the Congress over which he presides, as he fairly says, has emerged from the period of contempt and abuse to be recognised as a genuine and authoritative exponent of Native views. The burden of his story is still India's poverty—a poverty that must be remedied soon if the whole fair fabric of our dominion there is not to crumble in the dust. Our intentions are good enough, as Mr. Chandavakar admits, and he has much that is cordial to say in his acknowledgement of Lord Curzon's high-minded and intelligent endeavour to master the problems with which he finds himself confronted; but our very strength of character is our bane, inasmuch as no systematic attempt is made to get at the bottom of India's chronic misery. We are excellent when roused to work, but a habit of indolence pervades our Indian service; it drifts when wise and sustained direction is urgently needed to save India and keep our dominion there from foundering.

The writer goes on to explain from statistics "how desperate the position of the people is."

The Lucknow *Advocate* points out that, while it is the fashion among Anglo-Indians to sneer at the Congress, the Government has promoted many Congressmen to the highest post yet attained by Indians in British India—a High Court Judgeship. Among these are: in Madras, Mr. Justice Subramania Iyer; in Calcutta, Mr. Justice Gurusdas Banerji; in the Punjab, Mr. Justice Protub Chandra Chatterji; and in Bombay, the late Mr. Justice Telang, the late Mr. Justice Ranade, Mr. Justice Budrudin Tyabji, and now Mr. Chandavakar, to whose promotion a certain dramatic interest attaches, since he is President of the Congress. As it can hardly be supposed that the Government goes out of its way to favour unduly supporters of the Congress, this is itself a good proof of the hold which that institution has on the intellectual leaders of India.

It is a commonplace that the attempts of governments to suppress freedom of speech have only the effect of endearing their victims to the people; but however often repeated, this is a truth that governments are slow to learn. In the reception accorded to Mr. Tilak at Lahore, this truth received a new illustration. There were no doubt many present who differed from him on one point or another, but it was rightly felt by all that his courage and his suffering deserved the recognition of all India. As the *Tribune* points out, it is one of the advantages of the Congress that it brings together the leading men from

different parts of India. In doing so, it gives them an opportunity which might otherwise be lacking of showing their appreciation of great sufferings and great services.

We are glad to be able to announce that the Lewisham Liberal and Radical Club has elected Mr. Romesh Dutt, C.I.E., as a delegate to the General Meeting of the National Liberal Federation to be held at Rugby this month, and that the Resolution they have adopted—to be moved by Mr. Dutt at the meeting—is as follows:—

That this Meeting deplores the succession of severe famines which have caused the deaths of millions of people in India in recent years, and considers it necessary to prevent the recurrence of such severe calamities by moderating the Land Tax, extending irrigation works, and relieving as far as possible the annual burdensome drain on the financial resources of India which impoverishes the people of that country.

We deal at some length elsewhere with what seems to us the most important feature of the correspondence between the India Office and the Treasury on the subject of the Report of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure—namely, the determination of the India Office to avoid the proposed grant in aid of its own charges. Here let us notice the amazing readiness of the India Office to let the Treasury off lightly in the matter of India's claims. Lord George Hamilton, in his letter to the Treasury of July 17, having set out various proposed grants amounting to £261,287 a year, says:—

If these suggestions are accepted by the Lords Commissioners, the total amount of relief to be received by India will be £261,287 a year, and Lord George Hamilton is prepared to accept that sum as satisfying the equitable claims of India under existing circumstances in respect of the subjects referred to the Royal Commission.

The italics are ours. By what title, and on what grounds, it may well be asked, is the trustee for India ready to make an offer so ruinous for his helpless client?

For a clear statement of one part of "the equitable claims of India" in this matter, we need only refer to Lord Northbrook's speech in the House of Lords on July 20 last, in the debate which led to the publication of the present correspondence. At the conclusion of his speech Lord Northbrook said:—

The Commission suggested that the two main recommendations should be considered when the capitation rate was revised; but they recommended an immediate and substantial relief of about £300,000 a year. For his part he was quite ready to accept arbitration, with the reservation that India should receive proper consideration for the great delay in the settlement of her claims. The Treasury had Lord Lansdowne's report before them in 1890, and the question might have been settled in 1893. Now it could not be settled before 1901. In his opinion India was entitled to consideration in that respect, and he did not think it was too much to ask that eight years' arrears of this £300,000 should be given to India. It was a mere trifle. Those eight years of arrears amounted to £2,400,000, and if £2,400,000 of the Indian debt was taken over by this country it would only add a charge of £68,000 a year to the British Exchequer. He hoped her Majesty's Government would be able to give an assurance that equitable treatment would be given to India in this matter. If the treatment he had suggested was carried out by the Government he felt sure that it would be exceedingly well received in India.

Now whatever might be the view of the Treasury, or of the Cabinet as a whole, the duty of the Secretary of State for India was perfectly clear. He was bound to demand, on behalf of India, "proper consideration for the great delay in the settlement of her claims," and at the very least he ought to have stood out firmly for the eight years' arrears mentioned by Lord Northbrook. Yet this correspondence exhibits him, not only as making no fight on the question at all, but actually as going out of his way to meet the Treasury with a gratuitous waiver of a large part of "the equitable claims of India." What sort of stewardship is this? How can the unrepresented taxpayers of India hope to get their due if their salaried advocate is thus complaisant in dealing with his powerful colleagues in the Government?

Such remissness even on behalf of a wealthy client would be inexcusable. But what is to be said of it where the client is indigent and famine-stricken India? For our part, we see no reason why the India Office should not have claimed much more than eight years' arrears. As we have often pointed out, here was an excellent way of answering the objections of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to a national grant for famine relief. Lord George Hamilton was in a position to dispense with charity. The charges which the Royal Commission has certified to be unfair to India are not things of yesterday. Assuming the amount in question to be a quarter of a

million a year, Lord George Hamilton might have settled the account on payment (say) of twenty years' arrears, without interest. There would have been a round five million sterling for the relief of famine. How much suffering would that have prevented? How many lives would it have saved? We hope that Lord Northbrook, Lord Welby, Sir Henry Fowler and many others in both Houses of Parliament, will have something to say to this unbusinesslike "deal" between the India Office and the Treasury while the Indian peasant—now threatened by a recrudescence of famine—stands hungry by.

Before we leave the subject it may be worth while to point out that, if the India Office is careless of the interests of the Indian taxpayers in this connexion, the Indian National Congress is not. On referring to the newspaper reports of the Congress held at Lahore a month ago, we find that the eleventh Resolution, which was unanimously adopted, was in these terms:—

That this Congress, while expressing its grateful acknowledgments for the annual contribution of £250,000 promised to be made from the British to the Indian Exchequer in accordance with the recommendations of the majority of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, respectfully desires to point out that for doing adequate justice even in regard to the claims admitted by that Commission it is necessary that India should receive the arrears payable on this account for the past many years, and prays that the British Parliament will be pleased to make this grant.

Critics of the Congress, who are ignorant of its proceedings, are sometimes heard to say that it is not practical. Here, at any rate, is a proposal practical enough, and marked by a vigilance which is wanting in the official custodians of India's interests. Once again the India Office has failed signally in the effort to demonstrate that the most zealous protector of a man's interests is not himself.

Nor is it only in regard to the arrears that the India Office shows unpardonable carelessness. The Treasury, on July 26 last, concluded its acknowledgment of the letter from the India Office as follows:—

Meantime it would be convenient to their Lordships to be informed, as soon as possible, whether they are correct in assuming that Lord George Hamilton proposes that the new financial arrangements should come into force on April 1, 1901.

Now, in point of fact, Lord George Hamilton, to do him justice, had proposed nothing of the sort. How could the Treasury be "correct in assuming" that the refund for a whole year was to be thrown away? The Report of the Royal Commission was dated April 6, 1900. It found that India had for a long time been unfairly burdened with certain charges. Why should India wait till April 1, 1901, for the unfair charges to cease? That they might have been made to cease straightway is evident, among other grounds, precisely from the form in which the Treasury puts its query. Yet Lord George Hamilton immediately complied with the suggestion of the Treasury. A week later the Treasury received a letter expressing his "concourse." So lightly is a quarter of a million foregone!

To agree with the Calcutta correspondent of the *Times* is a pleasure as piquant as it is rare. He is doing good service just now in combating the attempt of the War Office to throw upon the Indian revenues the charge for bounties to time-expired British soldiers who are detained in India because the demands of the South African war have caused a suspension of drafts from England, and who may to some extent be urged to re-engage for a further term with the colours. In a telegram dated January 27, the correspondent says:—

The newspapers continue to contain numerous letters from time-expired British soldiers anxious to know if reliefs will be carried out or bounties given. A number of men have been seen over nine years' service with the colours. The delay of the War Office in announcing a definite decision causes much surprise. Its effort to make India pay bounties and re-engage the men will certainly fail, as public opinion in England would not countenance the placing of this expenditure on the Indian revenues when the position rendering re-engagement necessary arises entirely from the prolongation of the war in South Africa.

Precisely. And how refreshing to find the Calcutta correspondent of the *Times* condescending to recognise such a thing as "public opinion in England." *E pur si muove!* We hope the India Office has declined to budge an inch.

Blue Books and Parliamentary Returns do not usually contain anything humorous—at least, such is their reputation; but there is at least one amusing point in the paper on the restrictions upon British Indian subjects in British

Colonies, noticed on another page of this issue. The same questions were addressed to the Canadian as to the other Colonial Governments, but there are few if any Natives of India in the Dominion. The term "Indian" has there a different connotation. The Canadian Government, therefore, sent a return, not of the laws affecting those who had come from India, but of legislation dealing with the North American Indians, the Red-skins who furnished the heroes of Fenimore Cooper's novels. It is not surprising to hear that this unexpected answer to the questions propounded "has been printed separately as a Colonial Report." "British Indian" has different meanings at Ottawa and at Calcutta.

Dr. Silvanus P. Thompson of the Technical College, Finsbury, writing to the *Times* (January 23), thinks it incredible that Lord George Hamilton will not grant the enquiry asked for in regard to the recent dismissal of teachers at Coopers Hill. He says:—

It is alleged that the new President of the College is but acting on the recommendations of the Board of Visitors. But I, for one, absolutely refuse to believe that Sir John Wolfe-Barry, or Sir W. H. Preece, or the President of the Institution of Civil Engineers—to say nothing of the other distinguished persons who constitute the Board—have recommended any such action as this. To reward a body of teachers who have not only been singularly successful in their teaching, but who hold high distinctions in science, by summarily dismissing the half of them from their chairs is an action absolutely alien to commonsense as well as to ordinary justice.

On the face of the situation, that is so. Clearly, however, there may be something to say on the other side. And to discover whether that something exists, and, if so, what it is, is just why an enquiry is necessary.

In the Gujarat Revenue Enquiry, the Court continued to meet at Olpat on January 3-4, and 7-9. The most exciting incident was connected with the evidence of Makan Lala, police and revenue Patel of the Bhadol village. He denied that he had written a letter containing certain allegations which had been produced by Mr Parekh. That gentleman declared his intention of bringing forward evidence to show that the letter was genuine. In the case of the Takama village, the officials have adopted as their line of defence the plea that the produce was being clandestinely removed and disposed of by the defaulting cultivators, who were in many cases able to pay their assessments and in some instances mortgaged their lands or incurred debts for other purposes.

Mauritius, originally colonised by the French, was taken possession of by the English in 1810. The descendants of the original settlers have remained French in their sympathies, their language, and their manners; but the island is now fast becoming Indian. The population is now 380,000, of whom 263,000 are Indians, whether immigrant or born in the Colony. Moreover, they are gradually dispossessing the Creoles of the ownership of the soil. The Indian immigrants do not as a rule return to India. After serving the covenanted time on the coffee or sugar plantations they settle in the country, save money and buy land. In the four years, 1896-99, they purchased land to the value of 71 lakhs of rupees. Sir Graham Bower, the Acting Governor, shows that this means, not merely the substitution of Indians for Creoles, but "the elimination of the middle-class proprietor of moderate means. He is being gradually squeezed out by the Limited Liability Company on one side and the Indian peasant proprietor on the other."

The *Madras Mail* agrees with Sir Graham Bower in deploring the threatened disappearance of French civilisation from the island; but it is evidently due to economic causes which cannot be stayed. Sir Graham says:—

If the present movement continues, Mauritius must in a few generations become a purely Indian island, governed and administered by a few English officials, some factory managers, and a military garrison.

This passing of the land from the Creoles to the Indians is possible only because of the saving habits of the latter; and yet famines in India are ascribed to the thriftlessness of the people, men of the same race. To what absurdities will not those descend who are bent on ignoring the real causes of famine!

The case of the Kotwal of Lucknow, who has recently been deprived of his Rai Bahadurship, has given rise to many differences of opinion. Some time ago, Mr.

Labouchere's organ, *Truth*, strongly blamed Sir Antony MacDonnell, but the *Tribune*, while giving all credit to the veteran radical's good wishes for India, thinks on this point he has been misled. Our Lahore contemporary warmly supports the action of Sir Antony. It says:—

The result of the case has satisfied all India, and strengthened the claims already established by Sir Antony MacDonnell as a vigorous and just ruler such as the country stands very much in need of.

Even the very strong step taken by Sir Antony in sending a telegram discrediting the evidence of Mr. Sherer, one of the Kotwal's witnesses, is approved by the *Tribune*, which declares that it was

in the opinion of every honest man in India a most exemplary action on the part of Sir Antony MacDonnell, for which he will be ever remembered in this country as being no less a straightforward and truth-loving man than a just and impartial Governor.

Whatever we may think of the case in question there are few countries where such praise would be freely given to an alien Governor. And yet we are told that educated Indians are mere critics, intent only on finding faults and blind to the good works of English officials.

With regard to our note last week (p. 38), quoting from and commenting on a demi-official letter from Simla to the *Standard* on the relative claims of railways and irrigation, one of our candid friends thus remarks: "When at last even the lesser gods on Olympus have been induced to confess that India needs water more than iron, and that to produce food-crops in the country by water-supply, not iron roads wherewith to carry export crops out of India, it was very disappointing to see your Note raising difficulties as to how and where the fertilising floods should be stored and distributed. Such idle excuses have been the stale stock of the Simla and other superficial obstructionists for the last twenty years. As it is, one result of these fumbling 'considerations' has been the spending of tens of millions on costly railways while putting away a few lakhs on water-storage as if just to keep the Irrigation Department going and keep at bay the few earnest, clear-sighted men—following that stalwart engineer Sir Arthur Cotton—who have long since grasped the saving truth that the only, but the effective, remedy against the tyrant Drought lies in WATER-STORAGE and re-forestation, the latter being only another form of the former." Our correspondent adds: "Happily the procrastinating plea in your note of the 25th inst. was met the week before by your quotation (p. 26) from the energetic 'R. E.'—writing in the *Saturday Review*—when he said that irrigation canals are 'calculated to increase indefinitely the produce which . . . railways alone are incompetent to carry'—and which, let me add, cannot cease to grow."

Our esteemed correspondent takes us to task tenderly, yet faithfully; and we are glad that there really does not seem to be any necessity for entering the lists with so well-equipped and experienced an adversary. We were perfectly well aware of the arts and shifts of the enemy, and had not the remotest intention of playing into his hands. In speaking of the need for "consideration," we had in mind the process of selection of things to do and the getting of the machinery in order for the doing of it. Even if projects are lying ready in pigeon-holes, they cannot, we apprehend, be put in operation without some little consideration. Should not our whole attitude on such matters protect us against the supposition that we could possibly endorse any "consideration" of the protracted and shelving character at which our correspondent does well to be angry?

Remittances on India for 70 lakhs were on Wednesday offered for tender by the India Council, and applications amounting to 71 lakhs were received at prices ranging from 1s. 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. to 1s. 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. The following were the amounts allotted—viz., in bills, Rs. 45,50,000 on Calcutta at an average of 1s. 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ d., Rs. 10,70,000 on Bombay at an average of 1s. 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ d., and Rs. 5,30,000 on Madras at an average of 1s. 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.; and in transfers, Rs. 1,50,000 on Bombay and Rs. 8,00,000 on Madras at an average of 1s. 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. Tenders for bills at 1s. 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. and for transfers at 1s. 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. will receive in full. Later the Council sold bills for Rs. 22,456 on Madras at 1s. 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. Last week remittances for Rs. 66,85,000 were sold for £445,892, making the total disposed of from April 1 to Tuesday night Rs. 13,57,27,456, producing £9,041,302. Next week 70 lakhs will again be offered.

THE "SLIMNESS" OF THE INDIA OFFICE.

WE print in full elsewhere the interesting correspondence which has passed between the Secretary of State for India in Council and the British Treasury "on the subject of the Report of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure." Such is the official description of the White-paper. But it may well prove somewhat misleading, as the subject of the correspondence is not the Report as a whole but merely the recommendations of the Majority Report regarding "the apportionment of charge between the Governments of the United Kingdom and of India for purposes in which both are interested." Indeed, it is not strictly accurate to say even that these recommendations are discussed in the correspondence. For to those who are acquainted with the Report of Lord Welby and his colleagues the remarkable feature of this correspondence is its suppression of the subject-matter of the first and, in many respects, the most important of all the recommendations. The list of annual grants which the Commission said should in fairness be made by the Imperial Government to the Indian taxpayers begins (Report, para. 364) as follows:—

In aid of the charge for the India Office £50,000

But this little detail is shunned like the plague in the correspondence. In the opening letter, in which the India Office professes to "draw the attention" of the Treasury to the "proposals of the Royal Commission," there is not a syllable to suggest that any such proposal as this was made. Instead, Lord George Hamilton takes the total amount of the annual charges proposed to be transferred from the revenues of India to those of the United Kingdom, and on his own motion redistributes the items under new heads; so that what is really offered to the Treasury is not the proposals of the Royal Commission but the proposals of the India Office, and the leading characteristic of these latter proposals is that the India Office is silent about a grant in aid of its own charges. What is the meaning of this manoeuvre? What have the members of the Royal Commission to say to it? What must Parliament and the public—especially the Indian public—think of it? The India Office, it will be seen, while it professes to be drawing attention to the proposals of the Royal Commission, takes pains to avoid even the mention of the proposal which most nearly concerns itself. Nay, in order to execute the manoeuvre it is prepared not only to overlook what the Royal Commission recommended but actually to recommend what the Royal Commission refused. There must be some strong reason for such remarkable behaviour on the part of intelligent men, and Parliament and the public will ask what the reason is.

The annual grants proposed by the Royal Commission were these:—

	£
In aid of the India Office	50,000
Half the Military Charges for Aden	108,000
Increased Contribution to the Charge of the Persian Mission	5,000
Half the Cost of the Transport of Troops to and from India	130,000
	£293,000

In compiling this table, however, the Commission made one of its too numerous mistakes. Half the military charges for Aden is not £108,000 but 108,000 tens of rupees—a difference of £36,000. This correction being made, the total amount of the proposed grants is reduced to £257,000. The India Office, in its letter to the Treasury, proposed a new set of grants as follows:—

	£
Political charges [i.e. charges for diplomatic establishments abroad]	21,287
Telegraph subsidy	10,000
Transport, moiety	130,000
Share of Aden expenses	100,000
	£261,287

The reason given for this re-arrangement is that "it appears to Lord George Hamilton that this opportunity might with advantage be taken to put an end to certain minor payments that are now made by India, and thus to simplify the accounts between the two Governments." So

important, it would appear, is the simplification of accounts that the India Office is ready to attain it, as we have said, by omitting part of the recommendations of the Commission and making recommendations (such as that regarding the subsidy on account of the Zanzibar-Mauritius cable) which the Commission expressly refused. Into the details of the discussion which followed between the Treasury, the War Office, the Foreign Office, and the India Office, we need not at the moment enter. The net result was that the proposals of the India Office were substantially accepted by the other departments, certain modifications being made in the suggested changes regarding the diplomatic and consular establishments in China, Persia and Turkey. The final catalogue of grants agreed upon by the Treasury and the India Office is:—

	£
Transport of troops	130,000
Aden	100,000
Zanzibar-Mauritius Cable	10,000
China establishments	12,500
Persian mission, etc.	5,000
	£257,500

Comparing this catalogue with the actual recommendations of the Commission, one sees at once what the India Office has achieved. It has escaped all the unpleasant consequences which bureaucrats might fear from placing upon the British Estimates any charge on account of the India Office. And this convenient transaction is called taking an opportunity "to simplify the accounts." One is reminded of earlier transactions of a like kind. When, four years ago, public meetings in the United Kingdom were passing resolutions in favour of a British contribution towards the cost of an Imperial war beyond the North-West frontier of India, the *Pioneer* enlarged upon the perils of encouraging the British working-man to think that, as he was paying part of the expenses of the "Indian concern," he should have some hand in controlling it. The grant was averted. Again, last year, when politicians and journals of all parties in this country were advocating a national contribution to the famine relief funds, the suggestion was vigorously and successfully resisted by the officials. Colonel Milward, a trusted Tory, let the cat out of the bag when he gravely proposed a mode of making the grant which might avoid any risk of financial interference with the heaven-born rulers of India. And now, when a Royal Commission, consisting largely of officials, recommends a grant in aid of the charge for the India Office, that disinterested establishment, like the prudent Levite, passes by on the other side. It passes by "to simplify the accounts."

The result, we submit, is among other things slightly grotesque. The India Office, in its alacrity to simplify accounts, has somehow got into a dilemma. For if the recommendation of the Commission with regard to the India Office was based upon good grounds, why is it not carried out? And if the recommendation was not based upon good grounds, why is not the proposed grant under that head deducted from the total amount of relief? The India Office says in effect to the Commissioners:—"We think your recommendation that the British taxpayer should pay part of our salaries was nonsense—such egregious nonsense, in fact, that we decline to discuss it. But, for reasons which we prefer not to explain, we think it would be unpleasant to reduce the total amount of relief which you suggest. So we will do, instead, some of the things which you considered and dismissed; and this operation we will entitle 'giving effect to the recommendations of the Royal Commission.'" We earnestly hope that Lord George Hamilton will be offered an early opportunity of impressing Parliament with the reasonableness of this position; and, while he is explaining why the India Office bashfully avoids any appearance upon the Estimates, perhaps he might also tell us why the Famine Commission is not to enquire into the economic causes of famine. Meantime it may be well to refresh our memories with the reasons offered by the Royal Commission for their proposal which has been dismissed with so little ceremony. Here is the passage from the Report (paras. 233 and 234):—

The charge of the India Office is at present borne entirely by India.

It may, however, be urged that in a special sense both the United Kingdom and India are interested in that organisation, which exists in the capital of the Empire, and there brings together in a kind of co-ordination the Government of India and of the United Kingdom, and

we have considered the question whether the charge of this organisation is not a proper subject of apportionment.

Light is thrown on this subject by a study of the treatment of similar questions in relation to Colonies, whether Crown or self-governing.

Historical circumstances explain the origin of the difference, but in relation to the Colonies the ultimate solution arrived at is—The United Kingdom pays the whole cost of the Committee of its own Government which represents it in relation to the Colonies.

The Colony pays the whole cost of agencies established here for the transaction of its business.

Upon this principle, the cost of the India Office would be thus apportioned: its Parliamentary representatives, with an adequate staff, would be paid by the United Kingdom, and the rest of the establishment would be paid by India.

There is, however, a difference between the two cases. The East India Company paid the whole charge of its establishment in England, including that of the Board of Control. The Crown, in taking over the government of India, took it over on existing conditions, and the present arrangement is sanctioned by tradition and long practice. Tradition and long practice have established another arrangement in the Colonies. A contribution has never been asked from them, and the great self-governing Colonies throw so little work on the Colonial Office that their share of the charge that that Office would be infinitesimal. Although therefore, in theory they might fairly be asked to contribute, it would not be worth while to raise the question with them for so small a result. The cases, therefore, are not on examination as parallel as they appear at first sight. It is, however, a fact that the Colonies do not contribute to the charge of the Colonial Office, and in order that there may be no ground for allegation that India is treated less favourably than other parts of her Majesty's Empire, we recommend that Parliament should be asked to make a contribution towards the charge of the India Office. This contribution may be made the subject either of a charge on the Consolidated Fund or of an annual vote in aid of the home charges of the establishment of the Secretary of State. A choice between the two methods of procedure involves a question of policy. These home charges amounted, in the years 1897-8, to £240,000. The larger part, however, of this sum represented costs of ordinary Indian administration. The vote for the Colonial Office, including non-effective allowances, amounts to about £60,000 a year; and a Government would be, we think, a fair contribution towards the cost of the India Office.

We have on former occasions indicated the weakness of the reasoning offered, in the middle part of this passage, against the analogy with the Colonies—the facility, for example, of assuming that arrangements made by a trading company must permanently govern the relations of England and India, the courage of the statement that the great self-governing Colonies (like Cape Colony and Natal) throw little work on the Colonial Office, and the oddness of ignoring the rather material consideration that the Colonies, precisely because they are self-governing, would be asked in vain for a payment of the kind. The welcome fact remains, however, that the Commissioners saw the weakness of their own reasoning, and decided in favour of a British contribution towards the cost of the India Office. The determining reason they give for their decision is one of supreme importance—"in order that there may be no ground for allegation that India is treated less favourably than other parts of her Majesty's Empire." This reason, it would seem, does not count for much with the India Office, which seeks rather to "simplify the accounts between the two Governments." It will be merely monstrous if the final decision upon a matter of such enormous importance is allowed to rest with persons so directly concerned and so incurably prejudiced.

BRITISH INDIANS IN BRITISH COLONIES.

TO those who are accustomed to vaunt the unity of the British Empire and the advantages of British citizenship, it may be a shock to learn that in several parts of the Empire it is almost a crime to belong to another part thereof; or it may cause surprise to hear the long list of Colonies in which British Indians are subject to disabilities and restrictions. A Return, for which Sir William Wedderburn moved so long ago as May 11, 1899, has now been issued, and from this it appears that in many of the colonies in which British Indians are found there are laws restricting their immigration, hampering their trade, or excluding them from a share in the political life of the community. The subject—if we neglect a few Asiatic cases—falls naturally into three parts: Australasia, the West Indies, and South Africa. In Europe there are no disabilities, and in Canada there are no Indians (in the sense of Natives of India)—at least this is inferred from the fact that the Canadian Government, in answer to the

request for information, furnished an account of the laws relating to the noble Redskins, an account which, of course, finds no place in the present Report. We will consider the three parts of the Report *seriatim*.

Turning first to Australasia, we find no disabilities in New Zealand, Tasmania, and South Australia; but it is to be noticed that in each of these the Indian population is very small, being at the last enumeration only 47 in the first case, 385 in the second, and about 500 in the third. In Victoria, too, we are told that when the Report was made the Indian was under no disabilities, but a Bill was before the Legislative Assembly to place certain restrictions on the immigration of undesirable persons—those likely to become chargeable on the community, those suffering from malignant diseases, idiots, and persons unable to write out an application for admission in a European language. The last clause was evidently intended to exclude Indians. Nor was it made more palatable by the penalty attached to its infringement, which might amount to six months' imprisonment with hard labour. Acts directed against the Indian were actually in force in New South Wales, Queensland, and Western Australia. It is stated that in New South Wales they can exercise all the rights of British citizenship, subject to the provisions of the Immigration Restriction Act, and as they are more numerous there than in any other colony of Australia, amounting to nearly 2,000 in 1891, it is important to see what are the specific provisions of that Act. The Act thus defines the prohibited immigrant who lands under a threat of six months' hard labour:—

Any person who when asked to do so by an officer appointed under this Act shall fail to write out in his own handwriting in some European language and sign an application to the Colonial Secretary. . . .

Then follow various clauses for getting rid of those who have evaded the Act, and for mulcting the owners and masters of any vessel which brings prohibited immigrants into the Colony.

The disabilities in Queensland are not very important, the two chief being that Indians can vote only if they possess land, and cannot be employed in the construction of railways subsidised by the State. But in Western Australia the legislation is much more severe. In the Imported Labour Registry Act, we are told that

"labourer" means any male person apparently a Native of India, China, or Africa, or of the Islands of the Indian or Pacific Oceans, or of the Malayan Archipelago, and brought into the Colony as a labourer or servant, or for any other similar employment.

The Act has for its apparent objects to limit the number of such labourers imported, and to ensure that they shall be brought in under contract and sent back by their masters when the contract expires. In Fiji, where there are as many as 12,397 British Indians—while there are only 301 in Western Australia—the restrictions relate only to the consumption of intoxicating liquors and migration to other parts of Australasia. In New Guinea the term "Native" is held to apply to all who are not of European descent, and therefore includes British Indians, who cannot as a consequence be supplied with fire-arms, intoxicants, or opium.

In the West Indies a rather different state of things prevails. Most of the Indians have come as coolies under indentures. The obligations into which the coolies have entered are rigidly enforced, but when the time for which they were indentured has expired they are free. In Jamaica there are 14,661 Indians, of whom only 2,100 are under indenture. After being ten years on the island they are entitled to a free passage home, but they can remain if they prefer to do so. In British Guiana the Indian population amounts to 118,000, only 13,000 being still under indenture. There are regulations both for the control and the protection of indentured coolies, who are in certain cases entitled to leave of absence from their plantations. Those who have completed their term of service must obtain a certificate of exemption.

Every police constable may, without warrant, stop any immigrant whom he may have cause to suspect of being absent from his plantation without leave, and may require him to show his certificate of exemption from labour or a pass signed by his employer.

If he fails to show one or other of these he may be detained in custody. In Trinidad, where there are over 83,000 Indians, they are under special laws only while indentured. In the other islands there seem to be no disabilities save such as apply to all indentured labourers.

It will be seen, then, that several of the Australian

Colonies are free from reproach, and that there is nothing serious to complain of in the West Indies where the industrious Indian coolie is evidently very welcome. But these sections occupy only 27 pages out of 68, or less than half the book. Of the remainder, 33 pages are taken up with the restrictions imposed in South Africa, where "equal rights for all white men" is a maxim so dear to the "Imperial" heart. The Native Protectorate of Basutoland, indeed, where there are 500 Indians, imposes no disabilities; and we are told that none are imposed in the Cape of Good Hope on Indians, as such, by the Legislature. But this apparent equality seems to be somewhat endangered by the conferment of powers on municipalities whereby these can impose restrictions. Only two towns, however, have received these powers, Kimberley and East London. In both the Indians are confined to particular locations. In Kimberley they cannot trade without a licence. In East London they cannot be outside the location between 8 p.m. and 5 a.m. without a pass, and they may not walk in certain streets unless they hold a certificate of good character from the resident magistrate of the town. In East London, however, Asiatics owning land to the value of £75 are exempt from restrictions. The number of Indians in these towns does not appear, but in 1899 there were under 3,500 in the whole Colony. In Rhodesia, too, the restrictions on Indians are very slight, at least, so far as they appear on paper; but we have some remembrance of the use of general regulations, such as licences to trade, as a means of discrimination against Indians.

But it is in Natal, which occupies in itself nearly half the book, *i.e.*, nearly as much as the whole of the rest of the Empire put together, that we experience the full force of anti-Indian legislation. In Basutoland, where the Natives predominate, there are no laws against Indians. In the Cape Colony, where the Dutch are in the majority, there is little to complain of, save in Kimberley and East London, towns essentially English. But in Natal, a colony that especially boasts of its "Imperial" patriotism, the Indian experiences the worst treatment. The Acts which apply to Indians, and differentiate their position from that of Europeans, are very numerous. Save in a few exceptional instances, Indians are excluded from the franchise and from juries, and they must be provided with a pass or they may be arrested on suspicion of being deserting servants. In many towns a hell is rung at nine o'clock and any coloured person, a description held to include Indians, found abroad is required to give an account of himself. All immigrants must write out and sign in European characters a prescribed form of application. Licences to trade can be refused to all who are unable to keep their books in the English language. Breaches of contract in the cases of covenanted servants fall under the criminal law, and at the expiration of his term the covenanted Indian servant must return to India whether he will or no. Some of these laws include Indians under the polite heading of "uncivilised races."

This is a long list, but it gives a very inadequate view of what the Indians in Natal have had to suffer. Not only have many of these laws been enforced in a way that the framers seem scarcely to have contemplated—witness the wholesale refusal of trading licences to Indians in some towns—but there are many grievances, such as the exclusion of Indians from all higher education, which find no expressions in the laws. There are some 65,000 Indians in the Colony; they outnumber the population of European descent. Some of these have been born in the Colony and have never been in India. Some are men of wealth and education. Yet they find themselves exposed to the action of laws which not only draw an invidious distinction between themselves and their European neighbours but interfere with their business, their pleasures, and their liberty in a thousand irritating and insulting ways. Subsequent events in the Colony have thrown an unexpected light on this legislation and furnished one of the most dramatic contrasts known in history. When in the grip of the invader, Natal was rescued by troops supported and kept in efficiency by the taxpayers of India; and Indian stretcher-bearers saved the lives of the wounded at the risk of their own. This is the race whose very presence on the soil has been accounted a public misfortune (except in so far as it does the work that keeps the Colony prosperous), and which has been subject to such harsh and insulting laws.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

WESTMINSTER, Thursday.

LONDON has been the stage of so many pageants during the past week that the people have scarcely had time to mourn. The proclamation of the King, the assembling of Parliament, the comings and goings of foreign potentates, all the bustle and excitement of a sudden transition of epochs—one might continue the enumeration indefinitely. Suffice it to say that only now are the distractions of the week giving place to a period of reflection; only now are people beginning to realise that the last chapter of the Victorian era has been written, and not till now has the popular mind been brought calmly to regard the realities of the transformation. It has been a week of emotions and demonstrations, and of these the greatest is still to come. But sentiment is no longer unbridled. People are turning their eyes to the future. "*La Reine est morte; vive le Roi*," is the motto of the hour, and when the nation has paid a final tribute on Saturday to the illustrious memory of Victoria it will cross the threshold of the new era in a spirit of eager anticipation.

Her Majesty's desire for a military funeral is to be respected; but many of her subjects wish that their late Queen had chosen a ceremonial more in harmony with the tenour of her life and the general character of her reign. "On earth peace, goodwill to men"—that was the motto of her Jubilee year, and the governing principle of her rule. England has had many warlike monarchs, but by a strange caprice it has been reserved for the gentlest of our Queens to be carried to the grave in the panoply of a soldier. There is something incongruous in the association of the good Queen Victoria with gun-carriages and khaki. If her Majesty were indeed to be numbered among the victims of the war those obsequies might be appropriate. But unless they were intended to bear a symbolical meaning the last rites might more fittingly have been devised to commemorate the Queen's devotion to the cause of peace.

King Edward clearly intends to rule as a constitutional monarch. He has shown himself almost singularly reluctant to assume the regal and Imperial dignity. His first message after the death of the Queen was signed according to his former style as Prince of Wales, and on the day subsequent to his accession he continued to be described by that title in the Court Circular. Moreover, in his speech to the Privy Council, his Majesty solemnly consecrated himself to the "loyal service of the nation"—a vow which must have made Charles I. turn in his grave. In the first documents issued in the name of the new King it was observed that only the regal symbol appeared as an appendix to the signature, thus—"Edward R." Did this mean that the Imperial dignity was to be dropped? That could hardly be, for, as it happened, Edward VII had been proclaimed not only as King of England but as Emperor of India—the first of English monarchs to receive the latter title on accession. Perhaps the King for the moment had overlooked the brightest jewel in his crown. At all events, in subsequent documents the omission was rectified, and now the proclamations, in accordance with the later Victorian precedent, are duly signed "Edward R. and I."

A curious incident, which seems to have escaped attention, marked the proceedings of the House of Commons at the opening of its first Session last week. The Speaker announced that Parliament had assembled to enable Members to take the oath of allegiance to Edward VII; but in the oath to which Members actually subscribed no mention was made of the King's numerical distinction. Members simply vowed fealty to King Edward. It is said that the vigilant Mr. Caldwell was responsible for the modification. He had given the authorities private warning that Members from Scotland would refuse to describe the King as Edward VII, inasmuch as Scotland had never hitherto acknowledged the sovereignty of an English Edward. Mr. Caldwell had his way, and Bannockburn again proved not to have been fought in vain.

From the tone of the newspaper comments on the Parliamentary speeches of last Friday, one might imagine that *De mortuis nil nisi bonum* had come to mean "Of those that speak of the dead utter nothing but praise." Because Mr. Balfour happened to be less halting in his delivery than usual his panegyric on the Queen was acclaimed as a miracle of eloquence. The greater part of it was a string of common-places, sometimes gracefully phrased, but at no point really

sympathetic. Far more touching were the less studied sentences of Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, whose allusion to the Queen Alexandra evoked sustained applause. But the man who was best fitted to be the orator of the occasion sat silent. The theme was a great one, and perhaps only a Gladstone could have done it justice. Nevertheless, Sir William Harcourt, as the sole remaining repository of the traditions of the great school of Parliamentary oratory, ought to have had his say.

Of the speeches in the House of Lords, members of the Royal Family would probably say: "The least said is the soonest mended." The Prime Minister, by a veritable inspiration of maladroitness, contrived to suggest that in the Queen were incarnated the qualities of the *bourgeoisie*—not in itself a bad thing, but scarcely the kind of compliment that a monarch would appreciate. At the same time Lord Salisbury represented her Majesty almost as a benevolent despot, the emphasis with which he dwelt on the power exercised by the sovereign probably inducing Lord Kimberley to relate the significant little anecdote in which the Queen on the other hand was shown to have submitted to the advice of her Ministers even against her better judgment. If the speeches were disappointing, the demeanour of the two Houses was equally unimpressive. Before the reading of the King's message, members were still taking the oath—a ceremony which is usually accompanied by a good deal of jostling and conversation and subdued merriment. Parliament was seen to better advantage on the day when it solemnly commemorated Mr. Gladstone's death.

It is still doubtful whether the coming Session is to be opened by the King in person, and in all probability the point will not be decided till after the Royal funeral. Fifteen or sixteen years have passed since Parliament was last opened by the monarch, so that if there is to be a revival of the custom it will excite extraordinary interest. Should the King refrain from opening the Session he may visit the House of Lords later in the year for the prorogation. He has shown a disposition since the Queen's death to seclude himself personally as much as possible, while at the same time encouraging the fullest ceremonial in State affairs. His absence at the present juncture from a purely ornamental function would certainly give rise to no reproach.

Lobby gossip during the short Session was chiefly concerned with the possible effect of the change in the monarchy on the political situation. The direct effect is likely to be slight indeed. Lord Salisbury appears to be enjoying remarkably good health at present. He has been relieved by Lord Lansdowne of the most onerous part of his duties, and is credited with a confidence in his colleagues which serves to render the office of supervision a sinecure. If Lord Salisbury remains at his post the present Government and Parliament should last for some years. The Prime Minister may not be one of the new King's intimates, but he is on excellent terms with his Majesty. Moreover, if he stuck to his post to please the Queen in her declining years, he will doubtless conceive it to be his duty to remain and guide the Queen's successor through his novitiate. Monarchs have no party preferences, but it is generally understood that the King's favourite among statesmen is Lord Rosebery.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

THE OPENING OF THE FAMINE COMMISSION.

LORD LANSDOWNE'S STATUE.

[FROM AN INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

BOMBAY, January 12.

The new Famine Commission, under the presidency of Sir Antony MacDonnell, commenced its sittings on the 10th inst. Officials recently engaged in famine work in the Central Provinces are being examined. It is to be presumed that the Commission will continue to sit for some time yet at Nagpur, seeing that the Central Provinces attracted a great deal of attention even during the last famine, though the distress was not so acute as in Gujerat. A brief summary of the first day's proceedings appeared in the local dailies, from which I learn, with no little surprise, that Mr. Chitnavis asserted before the Commission that the famine had nothing to do with land revenue assessments. I shall suspend my judgment on this statement till there is a detailed account of the evidence of

this witness, who, I need not say, was for a couple of years member of the Viceroyal Legislative Council. Can it be that it was in view of airing this opinion that Mr. Chitnavis declined the Presidency of the Congress? We live and learn. Meanwhile all eyes will no doubt be turned from day to day on the proceedings of this Commission. Whether Sir Antony MacDonnell will enquire into matters beyond the very limited scope of reference and walk round it remains to be seen. But so far as the Central Provinces are concerned the enquiry is in safe hands. Perhaps no man has known the condition of the rays better than Sir Antony. The greater part of his civilian career was spent there, and there he rose to be Chief Commissioner; so that there is every hope that he will not be carried away by the latter-day sophistries and plausibilities of some of the officials. Again, his exceptional broadmindedness, which is in pleasing contrast with the narrow vision of the majority of the members of the distinguished service, leads us to hope that he will be able to take a wide survey of the condition of the agriculturists in the Bombay Presidency. And as he will be coming fresh to the subject, with none of the biases and prejudices of a Nugent or a Monteath, it is expected that the enquiry will suffer nothing at his experienced and statesmanlike hand.

Another incident of the week is the apotheosis of Lord Lansdowne by his friends and admirers. These had voted him a statue. The non-official subscribers, it was given out at the time in the Calcutta papers, were few and far between; though, it was alleged, pressure had been brought from certain high quarters. Be that as it may, it was notorious that by far the largest amount of subscriptions came from the Native Princes and Chiefs. With their generous support Lord Lansdowne's panegyrists were able to raise a statue in his honour, though an open challenge was thrown to them to demonstrate the justification of the step. The statue recently arrived in the metropolis and the unveiling ceremony took place last week. Lord Curzon, of course, was invited to perform that exhilarating rite. He was asked to bless the givers and bless the subject of the bronze effigy. To have declined the duty might have looked ungracious. But Lord Curzon is a master in the art of rhetoric. So this time his harangue on the subject of the statue was nothing but one long chorus of eulogy of a sort. He naively avoided saying aught about the administrative capacity or ability of Lord Lansdowne. He began sprinkling abundance of rose water by declaring that Lord Lansdowne was too too near our own times. It was but yesterday that he reigned at Calcutta. And when the greatest Proconsul of India, no other than Lord Dalhousie, enjoined in his will that no biography of him should be written till half a century after his death, it would be unbecoming in a young Viceroy and budding British statesman of the future to say aught on the Vicereignty of one who was only removed from his own exalted position by seven years. But Viceroyal amenities demanded that some swan-like song should be sung on the occasion. So he talked of Lord Lansdowne's amiability and courtesy, about which there are no two opinions. Lord Elgin was uncouth and provokingly bluff, like the bluffest Scotsman. But with the blood of the bluest of the French in his veins, Lord Lansdowne was undoubtedly the personification of complaisance, in which envy itself might find no flaw. So far good. What next should Lord Curzon say? Well, Lord Lansdowne was instrumental in giving the finishing touch to some problems which his predecessors had initiated and advanced. No doubt it was during his Vicereignty that the expanded Legislative Councils came to be first put into motion. And it may be fairly put to his credit that he did his best to give effect to Lord Cross's Bill in a spirit of liberalism—such liberalism as was expected from the party to which he then belonged—the party of that great Liberal David, Mr. Gladstone, the like of whom England and India will not see for a century to come. But Indians must join issue with Lord Curzon when he enigmatically Lord Lansdowne for his foreign policy and his currency policy. The former was all nanby-pamby, and even then Lord Roberts had the greatest ascendancy over him. As to the currency nostrum, it is superfluous at this time of the day, when every independent financial paper in England has condemned it as a huge failure, after full seven years' experience, and when even as we write the stupendous folly of that hasty and iniquitous measure is being vividly brought to our notice in a most practical form, to talk of it as a beneficent piece of legislation! Either Lord Curzon was ill-informed when he praised that

measure, or he strangely allowed himself to utter an eulogical fallacy of the first order. This, then, completes the sum and substance of his eulogy of some of the acts of a past Viceroy—acts which have earned the statue. But, of course, statues are nowadays as common as the different orders and decorations the Government of India showers on its servants or other *personae gratie*. Whatever value mankind once attached to these marble counterfeits is lost. Some people regret that Lord Ripon, among later Viceroys, should be the only one to whose merits no statue has been raised. This is no real evil, nor need Indians lament the omission. For Lord Ripon lives in the heart of each unit of her Majesty's Indian subjects and needs no marble or bronze to keep his name alive in our memory. So I may now drop a curtain over this hollow ceremonial and say: "Peace be to Lord Lansdowne's hallow."

But India can never forget the unhallowed compensation allowance, or the closure of the Mints, which by one stroke deprived the mass of the poorest population of well nigh half of its miserable saving in silver ornaments. At the same time the Congress has to be grateful to Lord Lansdowne for having distinctly placed on record the opinion of his Government that it represents the honest convictions of the advanced Liberal party in India and is a perfectly legitimate and constitutional organisation.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

233,000 ON RELIEF.

The Secretary of State for India has received the following telegram from the Viceroy on the subject of the Famine, dated January 21:—

"Winter rainfall unusually good in Upper India, Rajputana, Central Provinces, Central India, and agricultural prospects very favourable. But in Gujerat, Deccan, and Karnataka districts of Bombay, through early cessation of monsoon in September and absence of rain, crop prospects bad and serious distress expected between now and August. Relief measures will be required, and expenditure estimated at one crore during next financial year, besides large loss of revenue. Number on relief works not increasing rapidly at present, but will when harvest completed. Affected area also includes Baroda and part of Hyderabad. Prices continue high in affected tracts, but should drop when Upper India harvest is secured.

"Number of persons in receipt of relief: Bombay, 193,000; Bombay Native States, 19,000; Baroda, 13,000; Hyderabad, 3,000; Madras, 2,000. Total, 233,000."

LETTER TO THE EDITOR.

LAND ASSESSMENTS AND MIDDLEMEN.

TO THE EDITOR OF "INDIA."

SIR,—Many a sun has sunk in the Western wave since last I ventured to intervene in the controversy raised by Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt, C.I.P., regarding excessive Indian land revenue assessments. If my memory serves me aright, he spoke me fair in response, but failed to grasp the drift of my implied criticisms. This was only to be expected in one reared amidst and intimately associated with the exotic *un-Indian* land system of Bengal since the so-called Permanent Settlement of a century ago. Since that easy-going answer of Mr. Dutt's, I gather from occasional scanning of your columns, also from other sources, that he has gone sounding on his patriotic and perilous way, repeating himself with increased emphasis and growing zeal. That his crusade proceeds on patriotic motives might go without saying, for Mr. Romesh Chunder's sincerity is apparent in every paragraph: while the sacrifice of his time, energy, and unrequited expenditure (as printing and publishing for public objects never pays) affords an example that might well be followed, more generally, by certain of our Indian friends after their retirement from Government service. As to my term "perilous," this is to be taken only in so far as it seems to me that in certain respects Mr. Dutt's zeal is misdirected, and tends to confuse the real and fundamental issues in this problem of internal Indian administration. To put this point very briefly, these efforts, though ostensibly on behalf of the cultivators, will go, in effect, to support the claims, largely factitious, of those intermediaries between the State and the rayats who are ever striving to appropriate as large a share as possible of the surplus produce of the soil (when there is any surplus), which, under the true Indian land system, is the appanage of the actual cultivators on the one hand, and, on the other, of the State as trustee for the whole community.

2. As to Mr. Romesh Chunder's broad contention that the land has been over-assessed during the last twenty years or so

—always excepting Bengal, privileged at the cost of the rest of the India—I am inclined to accept that general conclusion, with this qualification, namely, that it is not so much the amount of the assessments as it is the rigidity in the terms and times of the collection of land revenue, and the inexcusable processes for its realisation. Of this we are having painful illustration in the harsh proceedings in Gujerat, as demonstrated in the somewhat cramped official enquiries now being carried out in that province. But Mr. Dutt's method of trying to show in detail that the assessments are excessive, being too technical and perplexing to the general reader, comes short of convincing. Far more conclusive in this respect are the large facts concisely stated in par. 44-46 of the real, that is, the "Minority," Report of the Royal Commission. There it is shown that, whereas in the ten years ending with 1895-96 the area actually cropped (Bengal and new Burma excluded) increased by $4\frac{1}{2}$ million acres, or $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., the (gross) land revenue collected over the same area increased by Rs. 2,800,000, or 15 per cent. Further, taking the twenty years ending with 1895-96, the higher assessments brought the revenue an addition of Rs. 3,800,000, or an increased yield or pressure on agricultural land since 1875-6 equal to 21.5 per cent. So we are all agreed that there has been in the period an excessive "growth" in the central Government's realised demand on the produce of land over all India—except Bengal, where the increase is stated at only 3.1 per cent. And it is probable we should find that in districts where later settlements have come into force, the assessments were at a higher figure; though, as we know too well, pitiless (because neglected) Nature has baffled the collectors in spite of their inflexible rules and, as in Gujerat, ruthless confiscation of the rayats' wretched chattels.

3. But here, as pertaining to another branch of my argument, let me make one widely qualifying remark, namely, that even the large growth of land revenue in the twenty years might, if India were in a normal self-contained economic condition, be accounted for without admitting the reproach of undue fiscal exaction. For since 1875 the extension of railways, also road-making and consequent cheaper transport of agricultural produce, lessening of freight charges by the Suez Canal route, and the increase of population (not so impoverished in the former portion of the period) will go far towards explaining, if not excusing, that large percentage of increase in the State's share of the produce—again always supposing that the actual cultivators were able to hold their harvests as an independent self-supporting class. As to the chief, if not dominating, cause of the rayat *not* being a thriving producer and free agent, let me postpone exposition of this anomaly to some subsequent portion of these notes.

4. Now let us look at a subsidiary factor in the impecunious condition of the cultivator which also, curious though this may seem at first sight, affords some explanation of the undue increase in the gross land revenue of India in the period under notice. This may be traced in the misplaced deference shown by settlement officers in many Provinces, to the intermediaries, the middlemen of sorts, who, partly by successive usurpations and more by the power that inevitably accrues even to small capitalists in the midst of an impecunious peasantry, are enabled to absorb so large a share of agricultural produce. Thus we have to consider, besides the rigidity of collections and the inexcusable pressure of cash payments from the rayats, the question in a question of the distribution of the gross land revenue, its unequal incidence in favour of the classes between the cultivator and the *Sirkar*. Some numerically small proportion of those intermediate classes may, by usage and prescription, have come to be regarded as "pillars of the State;" but by far the larger portion are ester-pillars of the community, persons who "gather where they have not strawed," men who live by the labour of others through factitious claims, inherent, as it would seem, in the modern landed organisation of India, and in return for which they render no productive service to the country at large.

5. Mr. Dutt's forcibly put arguments are studded all through with pleadings that tell mainly on behalf of these interceptors of large portions of the net produce of the land revenue—zemindars, talukdars, malguzars—subfeudation of all sorts; are not only *unskars* proper, but of persons of the trading and professional classes who have cash to lend so far as they can thereby secure some slice in the net produce of the soil and the rayats' labour. So far, then, as Mr. Romesh Chunder's efforts tend in favour of these intermediaries—it may be unconsciously on his part—to that extent I feel constrained to regard his energy and eloquence as expended in a "perilous," because misplaced direction as concerns the Indian community as a whole.

6. For evidence to the above effect I must ask you to spare me further space at another time. Also for explanation of the apparent paradox—"the rayats ought to be able to pay these assessments, but cannot"—too concisely stated in the concluding passage of my letter in your issue of January 27, 1899, to which it may be still worth while asking the attention of the more careful amongst your readers. Again allow me to subscribe myself—Yours truly,
"SENEX."

January 30.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

APPORTIONMENT OF CHARGES BETWEEN INDIA AND ENGLAND.

IMPORTANT CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE TREASURY AND THE INDIA OFFICE.

An important white paper has just been issued containing the correspondence which has passed between the Secretary of State for India in Council and the Treasury on the subject of the Report of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure. Below will be found the correspondence in full. We comment upon the matter in a leading article elsewhere:—

No. 1.
India Office to Treasury.

F. 3418. July 17, 1900.
I am directed by the Secretary of State for India in Council to draw the attention of the Lords Commissioners of her Majesty's Treasury to the proposals of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, regarding the apportionment of charge between the Governments of the United Kingdom and of India for purposes in which both are interested.

According to paragraph 394 of the Report of the Commission, the total amount of the annual charges to be transferred from the revenues of India to those of the United Kingdom would be approximately £293,000; but this includes a sum of £108,000 sterling as one half of the military charges for Aden, which should have been stated as 108,000 tens of rupees, so that a reduction of £36,000 must be made. The total amount of the relief which India would receive if all the recommendations of the Commission were adopted, would therefore be, not £293,000, but £257,000 a year.

I am desired to express Lord George Hamilton's confident hope that the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury will favour the unanimous opinion of the Commission, in so far as it is in favour of relieving the revenues of India to that extent. As regards the heads under which the relief should be given, I am directed to make the following suggestions.

It appears to Lord George Hamilton that this opportunity might with advantage be taken to put an end to certain minor payments that are now made by India, and thus to simplify the accounts between the two Governments. At present the Secretary of State in Council pays £7,000 a year on account of the Mission to the Court of Persia, £12,500 a year for her Majesty's Establishments in China, and £1,787 as contributions towards the expenses of the Jeddah, Momein, and Bureah Consulates, making a total of £21,287 for political charges. He also pays a subsidy of £10,000 a year to the Eastern Telegraph Company on account of the Zanzibar-Mauritius cable.

I am to suggest that for the future all these contributions might be foregone by the Imperial Government.

His Lordship assumes that £130,000 will be allowed as half the cost of the transport of troops to and from India, and will be defrayed by the Imperial Government, in accordance with the proposals of the Commission.

With respect to the Military Charges for Aden, Lord George Hamilton desires me to suggest that the sum to be granted from Imperial revenues might equitably be fixed at £100,000 a year, being slightly in excess of the share which the Commissioners considered that the Imperial Government should bear, but on the other hand somewhat less than the sum (£108,000) by which they apparently intended that India should benefit under this head.

If these suggestions are accepted by the Lords Commissioners, the total amount of relief to be received by India will be £261,287 a year, and Lord George Hamilton is prepared to accept that sum as satisfying the equitable claims of India under existing circumstances in respect of the subjects referred to the Royal Commission.—I have, etc., (Signed) A. GODLEY.

No. 2.
Treasury to India Office.

No. 12,560. July 26, 1900.
I am directed by the Lords Commissioners of her Majesty's Treasury to acknowledge the receipt of your letter (F. 3418) of the 17th instant, on the subject of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on the Administration of the Expenditure of India with regard to the financial relations between her Majesty's Government and the Government of India.

As the proposals of the Secretary of State for India in Council affect not only the Treasury but also the Foreign Office and War Office, it is necessary that my Lords should consult these Departments; and this has been done by their Lordships, who, on receipt of replies, will communicate their decision to you forthwith.

Meantime, it would be convenient to the Lordships to be informed, as soon as possible, whether they are correct in assuming that Lord George Hamilton proposes that the new financial arrangements should come into force on April 1, 1901.—I am, etc., (Signed) E. W. HAMILTON.

No. 3.
India Office to Treasury.

F. 3730. August 2, 1900.
In reply to your letter of July 26, No. 12,560, I am directed by

Political charges	£21,287
Treasury subsidy	10,000
Transport, moiety	130,000
Share of Aden expenses	100,000
Total	£261,287

the Secretary of State for India in Council to inform you that he concurs in the view that the financial arrangements which may take place as the result of the consideration of the recommendations of the Report of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure shall come into force on April 1, 1901, and that the payments during the current year should be settled as in 1899-1900.—I am, etc., (Signed) A. GODLEY.

No. 4.
Treasury to India Office.

No. 13,585. August 10, 1900.
I am directed by the Lords Commissioners of her Majesty's Treasury to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 2nd instant (F. 3730), stating that the Secretary of State for India in Council concurs in the view that the financial arrangements which may be made as the result of the consideration of the recommendations in the Report of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure should come into force on April 1, 1901, and that the payments during the current year should be settled as in 1899-1900.—I am, etc., (Signed) FRANCIS MOWATT.

No. 5.
Treasury to India Office.

September 11, 1900.
The Lords Commissioners of her Majesty's Treasury have carefully considered, in communication with the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and the Secretary of State for War, your letter of July 17, 1900, relative to the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure in favour of the transfer of certain annual charges from the revenues of India to those of the United Kingdom; and I from the revenues of India to those of the United Kingdom; and I am directed to request that you will submit to the Secretary of State for India in Council the following reply.

After the necessary correction of the figure given by the Royal Commission for half the military charges for Aden, their recommendations are that the following grants be made by the Imperial Government to India:—

In aid of the charge for the India Office	£50,000
Half the military charges for Aden	72,000
Increased contribution to the charge of the Persian Mission	5,000
Half the cost of the transport of troops to and from India	130,000
Total	£257,000

The modification of these proposals suggested in your letter under reply consists in the substitution, for the direct contribution in aid of the charge for the India Office, and for the £5,000 increase of contribution to the Persian Mission, of the following:—

Additional grant in respect of the military charges for Aden (making the total £100,000) £23,000

The balance by the Imperial Government of certain minor payments now made annually by India:—

1. Subsidy to the Eastern Telegraph Company on account of the Zanzibar-Mauritius Cable	£10,000
2. Persian Mission	7,000
3. Establishments in China	12,500
4. Consulates at Jeddah, Momein and Basra	1,787
Total	£21,287

This sum, together with £72,000 representing half the military charges for Aden and £130,000 representing half the cost of transport of troops, makes up a total of £261,287, as compared with the £257,000 recommended by the Royal Commission, beyond which my Lords are not prepared to increase materially the contribution from Imperial Funds.

With reference to the above proposals, the Secretary of State for War informs my Lords that he is prepared to make an annual contribution from Army funds towards the cost of the transport of troops and towards the military charges for Aden, of £230,000, to commence as from April 1, 1901. His Lordship, however, points out that the Royal Commission recommended that the capitulation rate, which forms the basis of the contribution paid by India for Home Effective Charges, should be revised in five or six years, and he proposes therefore that the contribution of £230,000 should remain in force for a similar period. My Lords concur in this proposal.

There remains to be considered the suggestion that the Imperial Government should forego the payments now made by India to the extent of £21,287 per annum, as set out above.

My Lords fully share the opinion of the Secretary of State in Council that it is desirable to take the opportunity of putting an end to these payments, so far as circumstances justify, with a view to simplifying to that extent the accounts between the two Governments; and, for their part, they readily agree to give up the Indian contribution of £10,000 per annum towards the subsidy for the Zanzibar-Mauritius cable.

As regards the other payments by India which are now appropriated in aid of the Diplomatic and Consular vote, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs has expressed his views in a letter dated the 11th ultimo, of which I am to enclose a copy.

It will be seen that the Marquess of Salisbury is prepared to forego the following sums:—

For establishments in China	£12,500
For the Persian Mission (the sum recommended by the Royal Commission)	5,000
Total	£17,500

£2,000 per annum would thus continue to be payable by India in respect of the Persian Mission. The Foreign Office letter points out that £1,787 does not correctly

represent the existing contributions from Jeddah, Momein and Basra Consulates, which should be £2,684 per annum, and suggests that India should continue to pay a lump sum of £6,000 (to include the remaining £2,000 in respect of the Persian Mission, and the present contributions (a) for the Consulates of Jeddah, Momein and Basra, and (b) for the Consulates at Kerman and Chiongmai). My Lords concur in this suggestion, which would have the result of making the total concession to India about £500 more than the £257,000 per annum recommended by the Royal Commission.

My Lords trust that the Secretary of State in Council will be able to accept the above proposals as satisfying the equitable claims of India, under existing circumstances, in respect of the subjects referred to the Royal Commission.—I am, etc.,

(Signed) E. W. HAMILTON.

Enclosure in No. 5.
Foreign Office to Treasury.

August 11, 1900.

The Marquess of Salisbury has given careful consideration to your letter of the 26th ultimo, and to the proposals of the Secretary of State for India with regard to the withdrawal of certain contributions hitherto made from Indian funds towards Her Majesty's Diplomatic and Consular Establishments in China, Persia and Turkey.

I am directed by his Lordship to state that, in view of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, he is prepared to accept the arrangement as modified by the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury, viz., that the contribution of £12,500 towards the establishments in China should no longer appear as an appropriation-in-aid of the Diplomatic and Consular vote, and that the £7,000 now furnished by India towards Imperial expenditure in Persia should be reduced by £5,000.

With regard to the payments for the maintenance of her Majesty's Consulates at Jeddah, Momein and Basra, I am to observe that the sum of £1,787 does not correctly represent the amounts supplied by India for that purpose. The figures appear to have been taken from the Appropriation Account for 1898-99, which, amongst other things, only included a half-year's contribution in the case of Basra.

The items now stand as follows:—

For Jeddah	£790
„ Momein	474 (maximum)
„ Basra	1,400
	£2,664
I am also to point out that contributions have hitherto been received from India towards the expenses of two other consulates, viz.:—	
For Kerman	£400 (maximum)
„ Chiongmai	1,000
	£1,400

Lord Salisbury entirely concurs in Lord George Hamilton's view that it is very desirable to put an end to the minor payments which are now made by India, and thus to simplify the accounts between the two Governments, and he gathers from the expressions contained in your letter that the Lords of the Treasury are of the same opinion.

The periodical revision of these assessments gives rise to some inconvenience, and to much lengthy correspondence. If the Secretary of State is asked to forego so large a sum as £17,500 for the benefit of the Indian Exchequer, there seems to be no sufficient reason for disputing the exact figures at which the full share to be borne by India on account of each individual consulate should from time to time be fixed. Moreover, these special payments are apt to attract attention, and to give rise to adverse comment and criticism, relating as they do to places affected by so many diverse political considerations, and situated so far apart on the Red Sea and the Shatt-el-Arab and in remote provinces of Persia, China, and Siam.

It appears to his Lordship that the desired simplification of accounts can best be effected by merging the smaller payments in one general contribution, which, however much reduced, might still be regarded as a share of the Imperial expenditure in China, Persia, and Siam.

I am therefore to suggest, for their Lordships' consideration, that the Government of India should for the future contribute £6,000 per annum to the Diplomatic and Consular Vote, this sum being arrived at approximately as follows:—

Remnant of general contribution for Persia	£2,000
Existing contributions for Jeddah	£790
„ „ „ Momein	474
„ „ „ Basra	1,400
	2,664
„ „ „ Kerman	400
„ „ „ Chiongmai	1,000
	1,400
	£6,064

The total amount at present paid from Indian revenues is £23,564, and the saving to India by reducing this sum to £6,000 is £17,564, as compared with £17,500, the figure mentioned in your letter.

I am, etc.,
(Signed) T. H. SANDERSON.

No. 6.
India Office to Treasury.

October 11, 1900.

F. 4728.
In acknowledging the receipt of your letter of September 11, No. 14,137, respecting the apportionment of the Indian Home Charges, I am directed to express the concurrence of the Secretary of State in Council in the proposal that the contribution by the Government of India towards the expenses of the Persian Mission and the Minor Consulates shall be fixed at £6,000 a year, or less by about £5,000 than the amount for which they are at present liable.

With this modification of the suggestions made in Sir Arthur Godley's letter, dated the 17th of July, the relief to Indian revenues

in the apportionment of the Home Charges will be approximately as follows:—

Transport of troops	£130,000
Aden	100,000
Zanzibar-Mauritius cable	10,000
China Establishments	12,500
Persian Mission, etc.	5,000
	£257,500

This arrangement will take effect on the 1st of April, 1901, up to which date the payments by India will remain unaltered.

The contribution of £230,000 a year for the first two entries in the list will be subject to revision, if and when any alteration is made in the capitation rate for the Army Effective Charges.

I am, etc.,
(Signed) HORACE WALPOLE.

No. 7.
Treasury to India Office.

No. 16699.

October 13, 1900.

I am directed by the Lords Commissioners of her Majesty's Treasury to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 11th inst., from which they are glad to learn that the Secretary of State for India in Council accepts the proposals made in the letter from this Department of the 11th ultimo, relative to the transfer of certain annual charges from the revenues of India to those of the United Kingdom.

I am, etc.,
(Signed) FRANCIS MOWATT.

THE LATE MR. JUSTICE RANADE.

RESOLUTION BY THE LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY.

On Saturday, January 26, the London Indian Society passed unanimously the following resolution:—

That the London Indian Society has heard with great regret of the sudden death of the Hon. Mr. Justice Mahadev Govind Ranade, C. J. E., and deeply deploras the irreparable loss sustained by India; and it expresses its sincerest sympathy with the family of the late Mr. Justice Ranade.

Dr. S. K. MULLICK, in moving the resolution, lamented the death of Mr. Ranade as a double loss to India at the present time of transition—a loss to the Government and a loss to the popular cause. Mr. Ranade was pre-eminently a man of independent mind, but at the same time a man of prudent judgment. He was thus able to reconcile his duty as a Government official with large popular sympathies and ready support of the popular movement. Dr. Mullick referred at some length to Mr. Ranade's labours as a jurist, as a political economist, and as a social reformer. As a writer, Mr. Ranade had brought into the proper light many of the glorious traditions of his race. But it was as a man that Mr. Ranade was most deeply mourned. To the younger generation his life was a brilliant example of the services that every true-born son owes to his Motherland.

Mr. J. M. PAREKH, barrister-at-law, seconded the resolution. He confirmed Dr. Mullick's eulogy of Mr. Justice Ranade, regretting that the late judge had not been permitted to use his leisure on retirement in taking a direct share in the National movement. The country would miss his sound practical advice and his inspiring example; and it would be all but impossible to fill the gap occasioned by his loss.

Mr. GADGEL and Mr. WAGLE spoke in high terms of the personal qualities of Mr. Ranade, of his love for India, of his social reforms, and of his many acts of kindness. The resolution was passed unanimously, all the members standing.

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, in communicating the resolution to Mrs. Ranade, writes:—

"I cannot say how fully I join in this expression of sympathy with you and your family.

"The death of my highly esteemed friend, Mr. Ranade, is indeed a great loss to India, and the loss is the more deplorable as we were so very hopeful that his brilliant talents and great knowledge would now be more completely available for the good of India after his retirement from Government service."

THE QUEEN-EMPRESS AND THE KING-EMPEROR.

CONDOLENCE AND CONGRATULATION BY THE LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY.

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, as President of the London Indian Society, despatched the following telegraphic messages and received the following replies:—

[TELEGRAM.]

Private Telegram to her Majesty the Queen, Osborne.
London Indian Society present their deepest solicitude for her Majesty's recovery.—Naoroji (President), 72, Anierley Park, London, S.E.
21st January, 1901.

[REPLY.]

The Prince of Wales desires the Private Secretary to thank

Mr. Naoroji for the kind message conveyed in his telegram from the London Indian Society.
22nd January, 1901.

[TELEGRAM.]

Private Secretary, the King and Emperor of India, Osborne.
London Indian Society express their profound grief and condolence at the death of their most beloved Queen and Empress of India.—D. Naoroji (President), 72, Anerley Park, London, S.E.
23rd January, 1901.

[REPLY.]

O.H.M.S., Osborne.

D. Naoroji, 72, Anerley Park, London.

The King desires me to thank you and the London Indian Society for your kind expression of sympathy.—Egquery.
24th January, 1901.

[TELEGRAM.]

His Majesty the King and Emperor of India, Osborne.
London Indian Society present their loyal congratulations to His Majesty the King and Emperor of India.—D. Naoroji (President), 72, Anerley Road, London, S.E.
24th January, 1901.

[REPLY.]

Buckingham Palace.

The Private Secretary is commanded to convey the thanks of the King for the kind expressions of loyalty and sympathy contained in the message which you have forwarded to his Majesty.
30th January, 1901.

MR. S. H. SWINNY AT NEWTON HALL.

On Sunday, January 20, Mr. Swinny, who is now delivering a course of lectures on "The British Empire" at Newton Hall—the meeting place of the London Positivist Society—took as his subject "India." He said that there were two special difficulties in coming to a right conclusion on Indian questions. One of these was the theory of the expert, the man on the spot, which had the effect of making many people pay no attention to any views but those of Anglo-Indian officials—not an entirely unprejudiced class. The other was the habit of judging the institutions of India by Western standards, and thinking that what was suitable to Europe must be suitable to Asia. A long line of Positivists had taken up the cause of India: Dr. Congreve, who protested against the conduct of the British after the Mutiny; James Giddies, who was one of the first to draw attention to the impoverishment of the country; Professor Beesly, Mr. Cotton, the author of "New India," and several Indian adherents, among whom were the first Mr. Justice Mitter and Jogendra Chander Ghosh. They were usually reckoned as critics of the existing order, but none of them were inclined to pass over the incidental advantages of English rule in India. The good points were four: first, the union of India—begun by a common servitude, strengthened by common hopes, and rendered effectual by the introduction of English as the common language of educated India; secondly, the example of government free from all taint of personal corruption; thirdly, the general peace, an advantage, however, exaggerated by Anglo-Indians who insisted on comparing the present with the stormy period of the break-up of the Mogul Empire; and fourthly, the perfect toleration granted to all religions. On the other hand the evils could be classed under two heads—poverty and political servitude. The former could not be attributed to over-population, extravagance or money-lenders. The population did not grow very fast, the people were extremely frugal, and many were fostered by our system. The three causes of Indian poverty and therefore of the sufferings due to famine were the ruin of the Native manufactures, the expensiveness of government, which necessitated heavy taxation, and the drain on the country caused by the tribute to England, the large sums which had to be paid there for home charges, pensions, interest on debt, etc. Moreover, there was the great military expenditure for wars beyond the North-West frontier, and for keeping up a vast garrison in India, now proved to be larger than necessary, since at a time when, if ever, there was danger, 10,000 men could be spared for South Africa. Wars on the North-West frontier were now happily no longer in favour, and Lord Curzon, who had once been a most strenuous advocate of the forward policy, had courageously and honourably supported a policy of peace. Mr. Swinny suggested as means of lessening the cost of Government and the Tribute (1) in British India the employment of more Indians in high posts and making easier the access to the Civil Service; (2) the extending and strengthening of the Native States. It was thought at one time that they would all be absorbed in the British Empire, but the rendition of Mysore opened a new era. In British India what was most to be desired was that Englishmen and Indians should work side by side, as in the High Courts of Justice. If India was destined to remain for ever a part of the British Empire it was necessary that its impoverishment should be stopped. If it was destined to fall away, it was equally necessary that it should be trained in self-government, and should retain friendly memories of its former masters. One thing the English should never forget: if illiberal maxims and methods of government were given free play in India, the liberties of England were doomed.

Imperial Parliament.

Friday, January 25.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

INDIA AND THE QUEEN-EMPRESS.

The Marquis of SALISBURY handed a message from the King to the Lord Chancellor, who read it as follows:—

The King is fully assured that the House of Lords will share the deep sorrow which has befallen his Majesty and the nation by the lamented death of his Majesty's mother, the late Queen. Her devotion to the welfare of her country and her people, and her wise and beneficent rule during the sixty-four years of her glorious reign will ever be held in affectionate memory by her loyal and devoted subjects throughout the dominions of the British Empire. The Earl of KIMBERLEY, in the course of his speech seconding the motion that "a humble address be presented to his Majesty to assure his Majesty that this House deeply sympathises in the great sorrow which his Majesty has sustained by the death of our beloved Sovereign, the late Queen, whose unflinching devotion to the duties of her high estate and the welfare of her people will ever cause her reign to be remembered with reverence and affection; to submit to his Majesty our respectful congratulations on his accession to the Throne and to assure him of our loyal attachment to his person; and further to assure him of our earnest conviction that his reign will be distinguished under the blessing of Providence by the anxious desire to maintain the laws of the kingdom and to promote the happiness and liberties of his subjects," said:—

My lords, a more sagacious Sovereign never reigned in this country; and if you consider the widespread influence which she exercised as a Constitutional Sovereign—if you consider that, year by year, her influence increased and that year by year up to the time of her lamented death the affection of all classes in the country was more and more displayed—I think you will say that the noble marquis did not exaggerate when he said no more successful, no more beloved Sovereign ever sat upon the throne of this country. (Hear, hear.) But there is something more to be said. Her influence and the admiration for her qualities extended far beyond this country. In India—that great Empire from which she derived one of her titles—in India, by all accounts, there is the greatest sorrow for her loss and the greatest sympathy expressed by all the Native Princes, and, I have no doubt, all the Native population.

We appear to have omitted the following notices of questions placed on the Order Book of the House of Lords during the recent brief Session by the Lord Stanley of Alderley; and in the interests of a complete record we give them now. No day was named for the asking of either question.

"The Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY—To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether, in consequence of a letter from Mr. Lyall, officiating magistrate of the 24 Pergunnahs to the Commissioner of the Presidency Division, stating:—

"I have no hesitation in saying that the culverts between Dum-Dum junction and Dum-Dum cantonment are ridiculously inadequate for the water they have to carry off. The difference in the water-level is nearly 2 feet at the opening themselves, and the water is roaring through as in a mill-race. I attribute a good deal of the unhealthiness of Sinthes and the insecurity of the crops to the north-west of B. C. R. line to this cause, and I think the B. C. Railway Company should be called on to provide adequate water ways." More adequate culverts have been provided? Also, who was the P. W. D. engineer who passed the plans for these culverts of the B. C. R. Company?"

"The Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY—To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India how many churches have been built for Scots Presbyterian soldiers, and at what cost, since the Highland soldiers returned from Dargal were refused admittance to the English Church."

PUBLIC MEETINGS ON INDIAN QUESTIONS.

THE WORK OF THE BRITISH COMMITTEE.

MR. DADABHAI NAOBOJJI'S ENGAGEMENTS.

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, indefatigable as ever, proposes to deliver addresses on Indian questions as follows:—

February 10.—Hatcham Liberal Club, opposite the London and Brighton Railway Station, New Cross, at 8 p.m.

February 26.—New Lansdowne Liberal and Radical Club, 1 and 2, Twenlow Terrace, West Street, London Fields, at 8 p.m.

March 10.—Reading: (1) To the members of the First Day Adult School, at 9.30 a.m.; (2) to the Castle Street Chapel Pleasant Hour Society, in the Chapel, at 3 p.m.

MR. CAINE AND MR. PILLAI IN CORNWALL.

Mr. W. S. Caine, M.P., and Mr. G. P. Pillai have arranged a series of Congress meetings in Cornwall as follows:—

February 4.—Redruth Liberal Club.

February 5.—Camborne Liberal Club.

February 6.—Falmouth: Annual Meeting of the Women's Liberal Association of Cornwall.

February 7.—Penzance: Public Meeting.

February 8.—St. Ives: Public Meeting.

Both gentlemen will speak at each of these meetings on Indian questions and Congress policy.

PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO INDIA.

To be obtained from

THE BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS, 84-85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

Reports of the Proceedings at the Annual Sessions of the Indian National Congress, from the 3rd to the 14th Session. 2s. each, post free.

The Skeleton at the (Jubilee) Feast (Congress Green Book L.), by Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN, Bart. (being a series of suggestions for the prevention of famine in India). Post free, 7d.

Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure: Evidence-in-Chief of the Indian Witnesses. (Congress Green Book II.) Post free, 1s. 10d.

The Proposed Separation of Judicial and Executive Functions in India. Memorial to the Secretary of State. With two Appendices. (Congress Green Book III.) Post free, 1s. 2d.

Two Statements presented to the Indian Currency Committee (1898), by Mr. DADABHAI NAOROJI.

Speech by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., in the House of Commons, August 14, 1894, on the Debate on the Indian Budget.

Ditto do. in the House of Commons, February 12, 1895, on the Debate on the Address.

Ditto do. on British Rule in India (1898).

Presidential Address by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., delivered to the Indian National Congress at Lahore, 1893.

Presidential Address by Mr. A. M. Bose, M.A., delivered to the Indian National Congress at Madras, 1898.

Speeches of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., President of the Indian National Congress, 1894-6.

Valedictory Address of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., delivered at Bombay, January 17, 1895.

Speeches of Mr. D. E. Wacha delivered at the 9th, 11th and 14th Sessions of the Indian National Congress.

Is the Government of India Responsible to Anyone, and if so to Whom? Speech delivered at Croydon by Mr. W. C. BONNETT.

The Famine in India. Speeches delivered at a Public Reception to Mr. Vaughan Nash on his return from the Famine Districts, July, 1900.

Mr. A. O. Hume's Farewell to India. Speech delivered at Bombay, 1894.

India Reform Pamphlet IX. The State and Government of India under its Native Rulers. 3d.

The Indian National Congress: its Aims and Justification. By ROBERT KNIGHT.

Indian Politics. A Series of Papers on Important Indian Questions by Prominent Congressmen. Post free, 4s. 4d.

A Needed Reform in the Indian Administration, by ROMESH C. DUTT, C.I.E.

The Bogey of a Russian Invasion. A Lesson from the Tirah Campaign, by Col. H. B. HANNA.

The High Courts and the Collector-Magistrates in India, by J. DACOSTA.

The Government of India and its Reform through Parliamentary Institutions, by J. DACOSTA.

Indian Polity: being Extracts from the Writings of Major Evans Bell.

Note on Sir J. Westland's Budget, 1894-5.

Note on the Explanatory Memorandum of the Secretary of State for India, 1894-5.

Note on Sir James Westland's Budget, 1895-6.

Note on Sir H. Waterfield's Tables, 1884-5 to 1894-6.

The Poor Man's Lamb: Famine Insurance for the Masses versus Exchange Compensation for the Classes.

REPRINTS FROM "INDIA."

The Judiciary and the Executive in India. Interview with Mr. Manmohan Ghose.

The Bombay Government and Higher Education, by the Hon. C. H. Setalvad.

A National Famine Grant, Letter from the London Indian Society to Lord Salisbury, 1900.

India and the General Election (1900). "Melancholy Meanness."

The "Over-population" Fallacy Again. No National Contribution?

A Selection of the Publications enumerated above will be forwarded to responsible persons or Associations in the United Kingdom for gratuitous distribution, on written application to the British Committee, Indian National Congress, 84-85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

To Political Associations, Literary Societies, Ethical Societies,

Etc., etc.

LECTURES and ADDRESSES ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

The British Committee of the Indian National Congress (84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.), is in a position to offer to Political Associations, Literary Societies, Ethical Societies, etc., etc., the services of Indian gentlemen, well qualified to place before an audience the facts relating to the condition of India and its people.

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

Associations or individuals desiring to arrange meetings on Indian questions are requested to communicate with the Secretary as below:—

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

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

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

Fe. 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, 1898.

P. O. GHOSE & CO., NEW MEDICAL HALL, MERRIVILLE

THE GRANHAMS, SHELFORD, CAMBRIDGE.

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

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.

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