

India

FOR THE

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, APRIL 26, 1901.

No. 175. NEW SERIES.
No. 287. OLD SERIES.

REGISTERED AS A PRICE..... ED
NEWSPAPER. BY POST. 9d

Notes and News	188	Mr. Pennell's Memorial to the Secre-	200
The Indians in South Africa	196	tary of State	200
Our London Letter	197	An Indian Famine Union	201
Notes from Bombay	198	Indian Famines and the Census:	201
The Condition of India: Address		Some Opinions of the Press	201
by Mr. Dababhi Naorji	199	Land Assessments in the Central	202
The Suspension of Mr. Pennell:		Provinces	202
Questions in the Bengal Legisla-		The Counter-vailing Duties on Sugar	203
tive Council	200	Indian Affairs in Parliament	203
		Advertisements	204

NOTES AND NEWS.

AS will be seen from our Parliamentary report, the Chancellor of the Exchequer in introducing his Budget last week made a slight reference to the proposal for a national grant towards the relief of famine in India. It was an inaccurate reference, for it attributed to Sir Henry Fowler a proposal which originated with the British Committee of the Indian National Congress acting in conjunction with the Indian Parliamentary Committee. But let that pass. The point is to notice once more how closely the interests of India are bound up with the course of British policy at home. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's argument was, to be sure, childish enough. Reduced to plain terms, it is something like this: "No doubt this Government has spent an appalling amount of money, but how can the Opposition complain when it is for ever urging proposals involving fresh expenditure?" The answer is, of course, that the Opposition has every right to complain if its proposals are intrinsically sound and have to be postponed because the Government has wasted public money. If a man is starving his children it is no excuse for him to say that he is nevertheless extending his estate and making gifts to his clergyman. But for the war, and but for the doles to landlords and parsons, the Treasury would have had no difficulty in providing a handsome contribution to the funds for the relief of famine in India. That is the fact which Sir Michael's remarks serve to bring into prominence.

A Correspondent writes:—The approaching visit of Lady Curzon to this country has given rise to considerable speculation in Conservative circles as to the probability of Lord Curzon's early retirement from the Viceroyalty. The voice of rumour has been encouraged by the contents of Lord Curzon's recent speech on the Indian Budget, in which he rather appeared to sum up the aims and the achievements of his official career in India. The general feeling is that he has attempted somewhat more than he has achieved and has forfeited in the process a certain amount of goodwill on the part of those to whom a Conservative Viceroy would naturally look for support. While this is the state of affairs in India it is also felt that a rearrangement of high political posts at home cannot be much longer delayed, and Lord Curzon's name is freely mentioned in this connexion. If Lord Curzon should in fact retire from the Viceroyalty in the course of a few months a question of some slight difficulty would arise with reference to the selection of a successor. But it is believed that this difficulty may be met through the return of the distinguished administrator who has given so much satisfaction to the loyalists in South Africa. How far Sir Alfred Milner's illness is of a diplomatic kind need not be discussed. But there are undoubtedly reasons which make it convenient that he should not return to South Africa provided that suitable political promotion can be found for him elsewhere. Such promotion it is suggested is likely to be found in the Viceroyalty of India, and it is pretty confidently anticipated in well-informed circles that Sir Alfred Milner will succeed Lord Curzon at no very distant date.

The Indian newspapers which have come to hand by
No. 17. VOL. XV.

the last mail give some interesting particulars concerning the arrangements made for the reception of Boer prisoners in India. As to the policy or impolicy of this transportation we say nothing. But it is important that no time should be lost before securing that none of the expense consequent upon it be charged upon the revenues of India. It is not, of course, to be supposed that any of the expenses directly and obviously incurred in the matter will be so charged. But previous experience warns us that unless special vigilance is shown some of the cost will, quite unintentionally, or at all events without deliberation, be thrown upon the Indian taxpayers. It is possible, for instance, that certain officers in the pay of the Indian taxpayers will be taken from their proper duties in order to discharge duties connected with the supervision of the prisoners. If so, the wages of such officers ought manifestly to be paid for the time being by the War Office.

The labour question in Rhodesia, which has been a thorn in the side of the exploiters for the past ten years, is getting very clamant. The introduction of Chinese has been so stiffly opposed that even Mr. Rhodes had to repudiate the idea expressly; and the Abyssinians had not rushed in to take advantage of the opening. At the meeting of the Chamber of Mines at Salisbury (March 14), Major Johnson stated that "they could not get legislation to make the Natives work, and, therefore, they must get the most suitable labour from elsewhere," otherwise (he learned in London) "no capital would be put forward." So he submitted this resolution, which was unanimously adopted:—

That the Chamber is of opinion that it is of vital importance to the future of Rhodesia in general, and the mining industry in particular, that there should be guarantees to European capitalists that an unlimited, not a spasmodic, supply, satisfactory and economical, of unskilled labour was available for the development of the mines of this country. That such guarantees can only be possible when arrangements have been completed for the introduction of Asiatic labour. That this Chamber urges upon Government the necessity of immediately taking steps to pass through the Legislative Council such permissive legislation as may be found necessary to provide for the importation, control, and compulsory return to their country and re-engagement of Asiatic labourers.

The desiderated labour is to be "Asiatic"—presumably excluding Chinese, and meaning specifically Indian—and it is to be "economical." A further resolution indicates the intention of the Chamber of Mines to be that this economical Asiatic "labour" shall be "quartered in compounds"; "that it shall be a criminal offence for any immigrant to be found two miles beyond the limits of the property where employed without written authority of the employer"; "that it shall be an offence punishable by heavy fine for an employer to use such immigrants in any skilled capacity"; "neither shall any such immigrant ever acquire real estate in Rhodesia, or letters of naturalisation"; and so forth. The attractions to men that have any inkling of freedom are tolerably conspicuous by their absence. But, of course, slavery is an ugly word in British ears, and it is not used. We shall wait now to see what the administrator will do with these precious resolutions.

Last week, in commenting on the "Indian Memorial Service" at Durban (March 1) in commemoration of her late Majesty the Queen, we mentioned that the Mayor of Durban presided, and that Mr. Khan, in proposing a vote of thanks, said that the Mayor "always took an interest in the Indian population of the town." From a writer in the "Natal Advertiser" (March 16) we now obtain the substance of the Mayor's remarks on the occasion:—

He strongly praised the loyalty of the Indian community.

and hoped the children present, their sons and daughters, would grow up as loyal as they, and become honoured citizens of the Empire. The picture before him was so impressive, with all these Indian children in their picturesque attire, come there to pay a tribute to their late lamented and glorious Queen, that it would never fade from his memory as long as life lasted. They were Indians, but they were sons and daughters of the Empire, and he, the Mayor, recognised no distinction of race and creed among British subjects.

"Such an expression of opinion from so important a functionary as the Mayor of Durban," adds the writer, "will show the Press of India that there is no tendency here to put in force or maintain any unnecessary restrictions as regards the Indian community, whose flourishing state, I think, reflects creditably on Natal and the freedom which it extends to them." Well, we shall see. Anyhow, we entirely agree that the Mayor of Durban's attitude does the highest credit to his humanity and common sense.

A telegram from Durban states that Lord Harris was presented (April 22) with an address by the Indians settled in Natal. We are not informed as to the contents of the address, but we can readily surmise that the British Indians seized the opportunity of engaging the interest of a former Governor of Bombay in their position in the colony. When Lord Harris returns home he will have an excellent opportunity of representing to his friends in the Government the just claims of our Indian fellow-subjects in South Africa. Mr. Chamberlain's difficulty hitherto has been that he could not urge the Government of the South African Republic beyond the terms of treaties or conventions, or interfere with the Natal Government's rights to determine Natal legislation in its own way. Now, however, he can write his wishes on a clean slate in the Transvaal, and thereby show plainly what he expects from the self-governing colonies on the same matter. Lord Harris, it may be hoped, will exercise his influence freely on behalf of justice to the compatriots of his former subjects.

The creation of the new frontier province and the consequent withdrawal of frontier affairs from the Punjab Government raise the question whether its influence was good or bad. The correspondence between the Government of the Punjab, the Government of India, and the Secretary of State in Council was published on April 1, and the "Pioneer" declares:—

At all events these papers demonstrate beyond all doubt that the Punjab Government did act as a restraining influence on the impetuosity of the frontier "forwards." For this reason we hold that Sir Dennis Fitzpatrick has done a public service in reminding the Government of India from his place in the India Council that with the constitution of the new province this influence will disappear, and it will be the business of the supreme Government to supply its place.

It is curious to note that Lord Curzon and Lord Elgin came to diametrically opposite views on the frontier province, the latter thinking the influence of the Punjab Government necessary, but as our contemporary says:—

It will occur to most people that for a Viceroy who was so deeply impressed with the importance of the Punjab brake in frontier affairs, Lord Elgin contrived to let the frontier coach get down hill at a perilously uncontrollable speed during his period of office.

Lord Curzon declares that the "forward" policy on the frontier is "superannuated." This is excellent, but it is well to remember that only three years ago Sir George White proclaimed that it was decreed by "inexorable fate" one of many instances of the failure of "the inevitable." The "Pioneer," while warmly applauding Lord Curzon's declarations, says:—

The Government of India in fact has not created a new policy, but has reverted to a policy of common sense after an aberration which lasted over a decade, and cost the country crores of rupees. For that reversion the credit is mainly due to a few distinguished Anglo-Indians, among them the late Sir Donald Stewart, and to a few writers in the public press, who steadily opposed the policy of interference and absorption at a time when to do so was by no means so popular as it is at the present moment.

But our contemporary does not think it worth while to mention that at the time when the bulk of Anglo-Indian opinion was supporting this aberration, Indian opinion was almost unanimously on the side of common sense. And yet we find that opinion constantly treated as unworthy of consideration.

In the debate on the Budget in the Viceroy's Council, the Hon. Rai Sri Ram Bahadur put forward five measures whereby, in his opinion, future famines may be prevented, or at any rate their severity may be to a large extent alleviated. These are:—

- (1) Distribution of taccavi or agricultural advances in time;
- (2) Establishment of technical institutes;
- (3) Establishment of agricultural schools;
- (4) Establishment of agricultural banks; and
- (5) Light and permanent or long-period settlements.

On most of these points he made important remarks, but not one of them received any notice from the Finance Minister in his reply. It may be that he imagined no reply necessary when the proposals involved at once a reduction of income and an increase of expenditure.

The hon. member laid stress on the distribution of taccavi "in time," and he pointed out that the remedy of technical education and industrial schools was one of the recommendations of the first Famine Commission, adding that "an institute for higher research, like the one proposed by Mr. Tata, of Bombay, is absolutely necessary to enable the people to learn the higher branches of science and develop the resources of the country." Referring to the lack of facilities for agricultural education, he showed statistically that "India in this respect cuts a very poor figure indeed" in comparison with Austria, Germany, Russia, and the United States. India, in fact, has but "five institutions of all kinds for agricultural instruction," and only one of these ranks even nominally as a college—the Agricultural College at Saidapet in Madras. It is really too ridiculous "in a vast continent like India, whose principal source of income is agriculture, and where about 90 per cent. of the population are agriculturists." The hon. member finds no comfort in the establishment of a Department of Land Records and Agriculture in every province, having for one of its functions, no doubt, "the supervision of the agricultural condition of the province, and the adoption of measures conducive to agricultural improvement." For these reasons:—

The Department has got no machinery at its command through which it can diffuse instruction in the first principles of agriculture among the villagers, or give them advice on the seeds to be sown, crops to be produced, and manures having great fertilizing powers to be used. There is at present a paucity of men capable of carrying out such work.

"The consequence is that the Indian cultivator uses the same implements of husbandry, and ploughs, sows, and reaps in the same manner as his ancestors did hundreds of years ago." In view of the eternal financial strain, one would think the Government might at length take agriculture in hand seriously. Perhaps it is among Lord Curzon's dozen subjects; he hopes, he says, to be able, "in the forthcoming summer or autumn," to deal with "educational reform—the placing of education in India, in its various branches, university, higher, secondary, technical, and elementary, upon a definite and scientific footing."

The Hon. Rai Bahadur Bipin Krishna Bose reviewed in considerable detail the economic situation in the Central Provinces as affected by the famine. He regards the outlook as very gloomy. Thus he says:—

It is estimated that the return of wheat will not go beyond a third of a normal return on a normal area, and that of linseed beyond one-fifth. In two districts which were very hard hit last year all the spring crops, except wheat, are said to have been wholly ruined. . . . The future is full of anxiety both for the people and the Government.

The land-revenue of the Central Provinces stood at Rs. 85,32,000 on October 1, 1899. It stands in the Budget at Rs. 80,67,000—a realisation of 94 per cent. being expected. But "in the year following the famine of 1896-97 the percentage of realisation was 82," and "the people are more resourceless now than they were after the previous famine." This throws light on the Budget estimate! Either the estimate will not be fulfilled or else the people will be harassed, for there is no hope of a bumper crop to relieve the situation. "I have ventured to draw attention to the matter," says Mr. Bose significantly, "as the subordinate officials directly responsible for the realisation are generally apt to be in-

fluenced in their proceedings by what they think Government expects of them than by the capacity of the people to pay." The reality of the distress seems to be very emphatically demonstrated by the remissions of debts in varying proportions. But Mr. Bose considers that even this relief "is not likely to lead to any lasting good unless it is accompanied by banking facilities"; and he does not think well of "the system that seems to find favour" (with the Government)—"the mutual credit institution based on the principle of co-operation" among the members—but declares for "the scheme formulated by the Government in 1884."

The Hon. Kunwar Sir Harnam Singh criticised severely the Finance Minister's conclusion as to the "recuperative power" of the country. Admitting Sir Edward Law's belief to be "certainly based on substantial facts," he contended "that this recuperative power and the economic conditions of the country are not so well assured as they have been represented to be" (in the Budget statement). The land revenue, as he points out, "is the only source of revenue that is on a stable footing," and yet it "is in a serious condition at present," and, in opposition to Sir Edward Law, he finds it no matter of congratulation "that the proportion of land revenue to the total of our resources shows a diminishing tendency." Sir Harnam Singh shows himself keenly alive to the prudence of having the money well in hand before launching out on expenditure that is not urgently necessary. In the same spirit the Hon Rai Bahadur P. Ananda Charlu points the only rational policy:—

True economic progress will and can come only from the colossal demands on the country's resources being considerably reduced, from the administrative machinery being cheapened a great deal, by the rayat being relieved of harassments of re-assessments and re-settlement, and, above all, by the growth, development, and multiplicity of industries which constitute a necessary complement of agriculture in working out the prosperity of a country, and which will converge towards producing what the Finance Minister has very properly called the highly satisfactory result, from an economic point of view, of substituting expenditure in India for expenditure abroad.

The opinions of the native members of the Viceroy's Council, being expressed in cautious and restrained language, carry implications of weight and deserve very much more serious consideration than they obtain in the Finance Minister's airy reply.

One of the chief Anglo-Indian papers, the "Friend of India," writes:—

On a consideration of the whole of the published facts, we are forced to the conclusion that, in the matter of its letter to the Local Government recommending the suspension of Mr. Pennell, the High Court did not act with that care and deliberation which were to be expected from such a tribunal in any case, and especially in a case involving such serious issues.

This strong comment is grounded on the Court's having only heard evidence against Mr. Pennell on his supposed refusal to deliver up the record in the Noakhali case, while he had no opportunity of offering any defence. It is, however, obviously unlikely that he intended any contempt of the High Court since the especial object of his journey to Calcutta was to hand over the records in his safety.

The Census has shown that since 1891 millions of the population have been swept away; but it is evident that this is chiefly due to the earlier famine. In 1899, which included the first months of the last famine, the death-rate was 31.34 or only four per thousand more than in the preceding year. No doubt the mortality was greater afterwards when cholera fell upon a people already weakened by privation, but to have had so low a death-rate in the earlier period was itself a triumph. In the same year, 1899, a thousand more persons were sent to gaol than in the preceding year, but this was little more than the average for several years, and less than half the number in 1897. Mr. Fraser is able to say: "It has now been proved that to take refuge in gaol is not necessarily one of the first results of famine."

Our readers will remember the interesting series of opinions on the "many merits" of the people of India,

which Mr. Alfred Webb gathered together from the writings of "people who have known them," and which we printed in our columns from September 15, 1899, onwards. Very naturally the articles were re-published in India by Mr. H. A. Talcherkar, of Bombay. The "Bombay Gazette" (January 17) has taken Mr. Talcherkar's patriotic brochure as the text for a yard of sarcastic jeering, which seems intended to be a humorous corrective of the booklet's alleged tendency "to flatter the Native." It says that "it does not occur to Mr. Talcherkar that much of that which he reproduces is mere flattery"; but it takes good care not to point out specifically what is "mere flattery" and what is not. Nay, it even quotes this comprehensive sentence from Mr. Seymour Keay—who certainly is as fully qualified to speak of the Indian character as any writer on the staff of the "Bombay Gazette," though its anonymous scribe sneers at him:—

They (Indians) are shrewd in business, acute in reasoning, thrifty, religious, sober, charitable, obedient to parents, reverential to old age, amiable, law-abiding, compassionate towards the helpless and suffering.

And does our contemporary deny this? Not at all. On the contrary, it implicitly admits that "this is true." What is the difficulty, then? "But is it true of all?" Why, on this principle of argument, it would be obviously impossible to make any general statement on any subject whatever. The "Bombay Gazette" certainly does not flatter the intelligence of its readers.

Mr. Talcherkar sends to us a brief reply, for which, he says, the "Bombay Gazette" is unable to find space. The excuse for not publishing his courteous remarks is not after the Indian manner; it is distinctively Anglo-Indian. Mr. Talcherkar states plainly the purpose of the opinions he publishes—a purpose obvious enough to the most limited capacity. He says:—

No nation is perfect on this earth, and the Indians cannot claim exemption from defects; but when it was found that they were, in some quarters, persistently painted blacker morally than they really are, the necessity arose of unearthing these testimonials to show that there is a bright side to the picture.

There is no possible answer to that, otherwise our contemporary would have been pretty sure to advance it. But Mr. Talcherkar goes farther, and issues something like a challenge. He writes:—

You are right in suggesting that I might have done a service to my countrymen had I shown their faults and failings along with their virtues and merits, for it is good to know our shortcomings as others see them in us. Though the task of preparing a compilation of faults and blemishes is always an unpleasant one, I am prepared to undertake it, provided the demerits are pointed out by Anglo-Indian and other worthies qualified by long residence in the country and a close acquaintance with the people to form a just estimate of the national character.

Here is a firm, though modest, challenge. We shall be interested to see our contemporary's answer. Both combatants agree on one point. At one point, the "Bombay Gazette" says:—

Our object is to show that, though Europeans may "vilify"—to use Mr. Webb's term—some Natives and some of their institutions, towards the bulk they are friendly—more friendly than at any previous period of Indian history.

And Mr. Talcherkar points out that in his preface to the book he "refers briefly to this happy state of affairs." We hope that they are right in this opinion. We should not have guessed it from the tone of our contemporary's treatment of Mr. Talcherkar's book.

Remittances on India for 60 lakhs were on Wednesday offered for tender by the India Council, and applications amounting to Rs. 6,22,75,000 were received at prices ranging from 1s. 3d. and 29 32nds to 1s. 4d. The following amounts in bills were allotted—viz., Rs. 21,95,000 on Calcutta, Rs. 21,39,000 on Bombay, and Rs. 16,66,000 on Madras, all at an average of 1s. 3.937d. Tenders at 1s. 3d. and 15-16ths will receive about 13 per cent. Later the Council sold two lakhs in bills on Calcutta at 1s. 3d. and 31-32nds. Last week remittances for Rs. 61,46,851 were sold for £407,434, making the total disposed of from April 1 to Tuesday night Rs. 1,24,64,978, producing £826,232. Next week 60 lakhs will again be offered.

THE INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

THE wrongs of the Indians in South Africa have already been set forth on many occasions in these columns. It has been shown how the British nation, while ready to enforce the claims of its European subjects in the Transvaal even at the cost of a long and bloody war, have turned a deaf ear to the complaints of its Indian subjects; nay, how the loyal colony of Natal has equalled; if it has not surpassed, the oppression of the Indians by the Republic. From time to time, also, attention has been called to particular phases of the question, such as the sufferings of Indian refugees and the threatened legislation against Indians at the Cape. But there are strong reasons for now returning to the subject. The refugees—at all events the European refugees—are beginning to go back. The settlement of the Transvaal is being considered on all sides; and the treatment of the Indians is attracting some notice in India. The question naturally divides into three heads: First, the position of the refugees; secondly, the future status of British Indians in the Transvaal; and thirdly, their status in the remainder of South Africa, and more especially in the self-governing colony of Natal.

The English public has heard a great deal about the hardships of the Uitlanders during their hasty journey from Johannesburg at the time of the outbreak of the war. Opinions have differed as to the accuracy of these stories, and as to the possibility of obviating the hardships undergone, regard being had to the numbers that had to be conveyed at once, the congested state of the railway line, and the natural precedence given under the circumstances to soldiers and munitions of war. But among the fugitives were some of whose sufferings there could be no doubt—sufferings caused not by the bad arrangements of the Boers or the circumstances of the case, but by the laws of Natal. That colony, the nearest British soil to Johannesburg, was the natural refuge of the fugitives. But its laws forbade the entry of British Indians except on conditions which few of the exiles could fulfil. Thus the easiest route was closed to them, and they had to make their way round by Delagoa Bay, or to remain stranded in that pestilential climate. For at Delagoa Bay a new difficulty presented itself. Free admission to Natal was no more possible by sea than by land, and the masters of vessels bound for Durban would not venture to accept Indian passengers. Some of them were even taken on board in the hope of such a passage, and then carried to India. But to many India was a strange land. They were the descendants of families that had come from India one or two generations before. They had themselves been born in Natal, and had passed their lives in South Africa. They had no friends in India, and they were now carried to subsist on the charity of strangers in that plague-stricken and famine-stricken country. At length the heart of Natal relented, and the regulations controlling Indian immigration were suspended so as to admit the Indian Uitlanders, but not until immense suffering had been experienced and much ruin had been caused.

It would seem, then, that when the question of the return to Johannesburg arose the Indians in consideration of their sufferings were entitled to specially favourable treatment. But, even leaving what they had undergone out of account, they might at least claim equality of treatment with their European fellow-subjects, since they had been expelled for the same cause, as subjects of the British Crown. And though they were refused permission to fight in the British ranks, men of Indian blood showed equal bravery as stretcher-bearers in succouring the wounded—bravery so splendid as even to sweep away for a moment in a wave of generous admiration the prejudices of the people of Natal. Yet it would appear that the Indian refugees are now being treated with gross unfairness. Our correspondent cabled from Durban on April 16, as follows:—

Hundreds of European civilian refugees, male and female, have been allowed to return to the Transvaal, and shops that do not belong to Indians are open. The authorities offered some months ago two "permits" for the thousands of Indian refugees, but none have been granted yet. The Indian refugees are in consequence suffering severely.

Not a slur has been cast on the loyalty of the Indians. No charge of misbehaviour is alleged as an excuse for this favouritism. Thus do the champions of equal rights begin the administration of the new territories.

But if the industrial life of Johannesburg resumes its old course, the Indians, or some of them, will again return. The vacant places will again be filled, and the second of the three questions will come to the front—the future status of British Indians in the Transvaal. In the old times we were told that the treatment of the Indians by the Transvaal Government was beyond the reach of the Colonial Office. They were as much subjects of the Crown as the other Uitlanders, but no forcible representation of their grievances was made to those who ruled in Pretoria. It is true that the Marquis of Lansdowne has told us since the war began that none of the iniquities of the Boers so roused his indignation as their treatment of the Indians. But in the time when these grievances of the Indians were still in existence we heard very little of that kind of talk. Expressions of helplessness, coupled with scarcely-veiled indifference, was the general answer of the Home Government. But such helplessness can no longer be urged. The old authorities have passed away. The Transvaal is, we are told, to be administered for a time as a Crown Colony, and therefore directly by the Colonial Office. Now it is admitted that, whatever be the faults of the Colonial Office, it like the public opinion of this country, is more inclined to take a broad view of the rights of subject peoples than in the public opinion of our colonies. Therefore, by its general traditions, the Colonial Office is bound to see that the Indians are treated with full equality before the law; by the declarations made at the commencement of the war, it is bound to abrogate the oppressive laws of the former Government; and by its position in the new "colony," it will have complete power to do so.

Nor must it be forgotten that the action of the Colonial Office in the Transvaal will be an example, and, it may be, a warning to the rest of South Africa. If it is seen that the old oppressive laws against Indians are revived in their full force, or even that there is a discrimination against Indians as compared with other civilised inhabitants, it will be an encouragement to the Colonists in Natal to maintain the odious laws that still exist there, and to those of the Cape to imitate them in restrictive legislation. If, on the other hand, the Home Government determines that all the old regulations of which the Indians complained, and which so deeply moved the tender heart of the present Foreign Secretary, shall be swept away for ever, then that determination must inevitably be felt far beyond the Transvaal borders. The Colonial Office failed to interfere on behalf of the Indians in the Transvaal. It has refused to interfere in Natal, but in the new colony it will have to consider neither the risk of war with a powerful State nor the danger of offending a self-governing colony. It will be on its own ground and master of the situation, and great will be the shame if justice is not done.

As has been already said, this subject is now attracting considerable attention in India. On it all parties are agreed, and Anglo-Indians and Indians unite in demanding an equitable treatment for their fellow-subjects of Indian race. One great Anglo-Indian organ, the "Times of India," has again and again urged the claims of the Indians. Another, the "Friend of India," now joins in on the same side. It recalls the proclamation of Sir George Napier when Natal was annexed to the Empire:—

There shall not be, in the eye of the law, any distinction or disqualification whatsoever founded on mere distinction of colour, origin, language, or creed, but the protection of the law, in letter and in substance, shall be extended impartially to all alike.

Such were the promises of Sir George Napier's proclamation. But, as our contemporary points out, the laws of Natal not only belie these promises but are different from those of other colonies. Elsewhere special laws against Indian immigrants are treated as exceptional and temporary, designed to protect the European character of the colony. When the immigrant has adapted himself

to his surroundings, "no race distinction is legally recognised."

That is a reasonable and a just arrangement. In Natal, on the other hand, the existing law makes a perpetual race distinction, extending to all descendants in the male line.

But this is a violation not only of Sir George Napier's proclamation but of the maxims current in South African politics and of the promises of the British Government. "Equal rights for all white men" has given place to "equal rights for all civilised men," and who shall say that the Indians are not civilised? The British Government put forward as its great object in the war the redress of the wrongs of its subjects. How great will be the shame if those wrongs remain unredressed, and if the iniquities denounced under the old rule are restored under the new.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

WESTMINSTER, Thursday.

"Would to God," exclaimed Oliver Cromwell when he was at any time thwarted by Parliament, "that I had remained by my woodside to tend a flock of sheep rather than have been thrust on such a Government as this." Sir Michael Hicks-Beach is not a Cromwell, but he certainly speaks of the Government of which he is a responsible member in something of the Cromwellian strain. He finds himself the wrong man in the wrong place. Or, is it that he regards the other nineteen in the Cabinet of Twenty as misplaced geniuses? No great stretch of fancy would be required to conceive Sir Michael in the character of the twelfth jurymen whose opinion of his colleagues was summed up in the drastic observation that he had never in his life met eleven such obstinate fools. "I stand among them, but not of them," says the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in the words of the poet, "in a shroud of thoughts which are not their thoughts." At least, that is what he might say if he were as rhetorical as he is certainly outspoken. Sir Michael's political friends have been reciprocating his contempt by enlivening the week with rumours of the impending resignation of this plain-dealing Minister. Perhaps the wish was father to the whisper.

Why is the Chancellor of the Exchequer unpopular? Simply because of his office. He fell out of favour eighteen months ago because of a suspicion that he was trying to hold the purse-strings too tightly. Lord Salisbury himself did not scruple to hint that the spending departments were thwarted in certain legitimate enterprises by the parsimony of the Treasury. And now the so-called skinflint is universally denounced as spendthrift. In short, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach doubles the parts of candid friend and scapgoat. He reproaches his colleagues with the extravagance that has landed them in a deficit of £53,000,000, and is himself abused for the necessary measures he has adopted to meet an estimated expenditure in the current year of over £180,000,000. Yet after all the new taxation represents a small proportion of the needs of the moment. Its principal features are an import duty of two shillings a hundredweight on sugar, an export duty of two shillings a ton on coal, and an addition of twopence to the income tax, yielding in all an extra revenue of £11,000,000. Compared with the £60,000,000 which the Chancellor proposes to raise by loan this immediate exaction seems almost trivial.

In the first stages of the war, Ministers were all optimists; now they are all pessimists. They vie, indeed, with one another in their efforts to intensify the gloom of the situation. Sir Alfred Milner himself emerges in the role of a Cassandra. Things, he says, have been going from bad to worse for six months past. The period of retrogression, it is interesting to note, covers the date of the general election and of Lord Roberts's reiterated assertion that the war was over. The Chancellor of the Exchequer underlines the darkest passages in the High Commissioner's review of the campaign, and declares with a certain grim satisfaction that it can no longer be described as a small war. It has already cost us more than the Peninsular campaign, and twice as much as the Crimean war, and it is still costing us, as Mr. Brodrick

admitted the other night, £1,500,000 a week. Moreover, we shall probably have to pay for it out of our own unaided pockets. Sir David Barbour has sent home a discouraging report of the fiscal resources of the conquered territories. South Africa has been brought to the verge of ruin, and he sees no prospect of any substantial contribution to the Imperial revenue from that quarter for years to come. And for all these things, strange to say, the country seems inclined to hold Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, of all men, to a vengeful account.

No Budget of recent years has evoked so furious a storm. For the present, the opposition comes chiefly from the coal districts. Cardiff declares that it will be ruined if its export trade in coal is hampered by a tax, while Northumberland and Durham threaten to close down their mines rather than contribute of their natural wealth to the expense of the war. From one point of view, South Wales deserves more sympathy in its distress than the North of England. Northumberland was conspicuous for its full-blooded Imperialism at the last election, and even Durham was infected. Wales, on the other hand, pronounced with singular emphasis against the policy of the Government. It seems rather hard that so heavy a proportion of the tax should fall on a part of the country that distinguished itself by protesting against the cause of it all. But there would seem to be little doubt that on this point the Chancellor of the Exchequer is preparing to climb down. After all he has obtained borrowing powers for £60,000,000, and as posterity is quite unrepresented in the House of Commons the temptation to add more and yet more to the National Debt, rather than incur the unpopularity of increasing current taxation, becomes almost irresistible.

Monday's proceedings in Parliament were an agreeable relief from the financial debates of the week, but the net result of the discussion was unsubstantial. Mr. Roche had left a sick-room and had travelled as an invalid from Ireland to move a resolution calling for the establishment of a Catholic University in that country. His devotion was rewarded by a debate consisting almost entirely of speeches in support of his proposal, not the least remarkable of which was one in which Mr. Balfour again strove to convert his party to the Nationalist view. But on this as on some other important questions Mr. Balfour's attitude is altogether paradoxical. As an individual politician he supported the resolution, while as a member of the Government he intimated that if it were carried to a division he should be compelled to vote against it. Mr. Redmond ridiculed this fantastic plea, but in the end permitted the resolution to be negatived.

Ministers may or may not be riding for a fall, but their conduct within the last few days has certainly been open to suspicion. On the first night of the Budget debate the Government Whips allowed their majority to dwindle to about a third of its normal proportion, and next day they repeated the achievement. Dissatisfaction might account for part of the defection, but the real cause was undoubtedly the indifference of the Chancellor's colleagues to the prestige of that Minister's Budget. Rumours of a crisis in the Cabinet were the inevitable sequel to this peculiar manifestation of Ministerial disunion. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach was reported to have tendered his resignation. But there was no need for Sir Michael to do anything of the kind. He had obtained his way, and if his resignation was threatened at all it must have been before and not after the introduction of the Budget.

Doubtless the Government are sick enough of the hopeless task that they have set themselves. Now that they have got the ship into a difficulty they would be only too glad to escape responsibility by entrusting its navigation to other hands. So, at least, say those shrewd observers who analyse the controversies of the chamber in the cooler atmosphere of the Lobby. If the country could see in the Opposition the material for an alternative Ministry Lord Salisbury would probably be out of office within a few weeks. But while the Liberal party at large has closed its ranks the Liberal leaders are still paralysed by some impalpable influence. When the present Government commits the happy despatch—which

it will probably do before long by sacrificing its head—it will almost certainly be succeeded by one of the same complexion under the leadership of the Duke of Devonshire. Mr. Chamberlain has waited long for his chance and has tried to find it first in one party and then in another, but it is generally acknowledged that with all his versatility he is as far removed as ever from the goal of his ambition.

One of the most singular characters who ever sat in the House of Commons has just been removed by death. Dr. Tanner was chiefly known to the British public as the ringleader in innumerable Parliamentary disturbances. He must have been suspended some scores of times. Always on those occasions he made a point of pausing at the door to inform his fellow legislators, in the style of Coriolanus, that it was he who banished them, not they who made an exile of him. But despite his professed contempt for Parliament Dr. Tanner was only truly happy within its walls. He had been warned at the beginning of this year that he must go abroad if he wished to prolong his life. He came to Westminster instead, conscious, it is true, of the danger, but willing to face it rather than remain out of the fight.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

MR. PENNELL AND THE GOVERNMENT.

THE BUDGET.

[FROM AN INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

BOMBAY, April 6.

The week is devoid of any public event of importance. The Bengal Native Press is hammering away at an extraordinary action of the chief actors in the post-Pennell drama. While that outspoken judge is undergoing official punishment, even before he is heard, by way of suspension from office, the Native Press in Calcutta is vigorously demanding of the High Court and the Supreme Government the grounds on which that suspension is made. Is it in the public interest? Is it in the interest of the punished officer himself? Is it in the cause of truth and justice? Or is it in the interests of the distinguished Service and the Administration that the action can be justified? No answer has as yet been forthcoming. No doubt a kind of an answer will come in later. But its nature may be easily anticipated. The High Court will no doubt defend itself under its own rules and regulations, while the Supreme Government will pose as the injured innocent. Discipline, and all the rest of the hollow official cant, with which we are so familiar, will be dragged in to support its measures. The official organs will cry aloud that the Government of India is a heaven-sent Daniel. Its judgment is the judgment of Rhadamanthus. The voice of justice and reason will be drowned. The noise of the clamant courtiers will be re-echoed in England. It will reverberate in the columns of the inspired Press from Cornwall to Orkney. And then? Why the deluge will work out the destruction of the man who dared to call a spade a spade. In India it is dangerous to utter the bare truth. Aye, as far as the Native Press goes it is rank sedition. So let us all wait and watch the final action.

But it seems that the nemesis of events for the last few years is too strong for the strongest Government in Asia. We went on crying for years that poverty stalked nakedly and woefully in the land. But it was a cry in the wilderness. The trumpet voice of famine, however, twice within four years was successful enough in making the wilderness resound with its own doleful wail, till at last the highest authority in the land has had to declare the fact; albeit glossed with that tinge of official optimism which is the badge of the administrative Pharisees.

Similarly, the voice of the people has been loud these many years past as to the sins of omission and commission of a branch of the public Service. The tyranny of the Executive in its capacity as prosecutor, jury, and judge has been a crying evil. But it was not heeded till at last the Rangoon outrage case and the O Gara case made it clear that that tyranny was real, and must be removed sooner or later. And as if to pursue this long-lived evil, nemesis has been dogging its footsteps

till at last the Chupra and the Noakhali incidents have made the administrative Pharisees shake in their shoes. Well did the poet sing:—

Good grows not like a tree from one sole root.
But evil grows up side by side with good,
And out of evil Nature brings us good.

Thus doth the ordinances of nature, which are eternal as they are true, override all the laws of mortal man, the creature of a day.

As to the Budget, I see you have already indited your criticism, and have been able to detect, even more clearly than some have viewed it here, the optimism of our Budget-makers. Whether it is Barbour or Westland, Dawkins or Law, each and all have demonstrated to perfection that they are no more than superior book-keepers. As such they never can soar to those broad heights whence the true statesman in matters of finance surveys the situation, takes cognisance of the real facts underlying the superficial phenomena of so-called "recuperativeness," and draws his own conclusions as to the poverty of the people. I might, if time permitted, write chapter on chapter exposing the fallacy lurking in each statement made by the Finance Minister in his monograph on the so-called "economic progress." He says that "close examination of certain material facts will afford further proof" that recuperative powers are "no idle assumption." I say that they are. But let me put my own view in the form of queries.

(1) As to imports and exports. Can any sound inference as to the real commercial progress of the people be drawn from merely exhibiting superficial figures of imports and exports for a triennial period, especially a period which has become notorious for the severest famine of the century?

(2) What are the scientific data on which to base the theory of the commercial prosperity of any country?

(3) Can India, which is a debtor country, and withal subject to foreign rule, be ever commercially prosperous when the naked fact of an annually increasing indebtedness and unfavourable balance of exports is to be clearly seen?

(4) Can the abstraction of at least thirty crores of the national produce of the country, year in and year out, without the slightest hope of return, ever point to "recuperative" resources or tend to any material accumulation of the surplus national capital which in other countries develops true trade, arts, industries, and manufactures?

(5) Is it true that the large imports in piece goods, in metals, in railway and building materials, in sugar, and so forth, are entirely or mostly on account of foreign capital temporarily invested in the country?

(6) Is it true that the large exports in rice, in cotton, in jute, in oil seeds, in tea, and so forth are entirely or mostly on account of foreign capital temporarily invested in this country?

(7) If true, where would the so-called commerce of the country be, if there were an absolute withdrawal of that foreign capital?

(8) Apart from these facts, where is the evidence that, in the consumption of the articles required by the masses, there has been any progress worth speaking of during the last 25 years, "pari passu" with the growth of the population?

(9) Are the masses in a position to buy to-day even a single yard more per annum of Lancashire goods than they were in 1875?

(10) How much of the metals now imported belong to foreign capital, and how much to indigenous capital?

(11) Has the State ever taken out fair statistics of the percentage of imports and exports belonging to Native States? Has it done so similarly for the foreign capitalists? And has it found out what is the real share of the people of British India; and, if so, what was that share per head of the population in 1875 and in 1900?

(12) Has the consumption of salt per head of the population since 1886-87 increased or diminished? Was it not 33,729,954 maunds in that year, and was it not 35,366,018 maunds in 1899-1900? In other words, is it not the fact that in 1886-87 the consumption per head was 2.12 lbs. and in 1899-1900 1.96 lbs? Is that a sign of the prosperity of the masses or a deterioration in their condition?

(13) Is it not the case that during the last 15 years, say, since the forcible seizure of Upper Burma, old taxes have been enhanced and new taxes imposed? And is it, therefore, surprising if, owing to this increased taxation, the percentage of land revenue to total revenue is shown smaller? Moreover, what of the 105,000 square miles of new land added to British India since 1885 by reason of the seizure of Upper Burma? How much land revenue has come to the State on account of this new territory? How much has the State put on to the Treasury through waste lands brought under cultivation; and how much by enhancement of settlements in the Rayatwari districts; and has the State any accurate data of the total indebtedness of villages and districts where revenue enhancements have been made during the last 15 years?

(14) Is it not the fact that old taxes have been enhanced and new taxes imposed since 1886 on the ostensible plea of "low exchange"? Has not the licence tax been converted into an income tax? Has not the duty on salt been enhanced from Rs. 2 to 2½ per maund? Has not the duty on petroleum been increased? Have not import duties on almost all kinds of articles been re-imposed, inclusive of those on cotton goods? Is it not the case that this enhanced and new taxation gave the State between 1886 and 1893 2.24 crores per annum; and from 1893 to date an additional annual revenue of 3.74 crores, or, in other words, that the State to-day has a fresh revenue of 6 crores?

(15) Was not this enhanced and new taxation of 6 crores ear-marked? Did not Viceroy after Viceroy give solemn promises that it would be all remitted as soon as finances permitted?

(16) Has the Government ever remitted taxation, though the exchange difficulty according to its own statements has disappeared, and the gold standard and gold currency have been a complete "success"?

(17) What would be the financial condition were this ear-marked taxation of 6 crores expunged from the Budget?

(18) And has not the Government committed breach of faith with the tax-paying public so far? Has it not at the same time, under pretence of exchange, collected this taxation and used it to a large extent on unproductive military expenditure? Could that expenditure otherwise have mounted up to 24 millions, starting from 17 millions in 1885, when in view of the seizure of Upper Burma the Government added 30,000 troops, and when it has under one pretext or another carried on trans-frontier wars, made border tribes the country's enemies, and vastly increased the permanent military charges?

(19) Without this taxation would not the Government of India have been in a bankrupt condition?

(20) Can it be truly said that, because minor heads of revenue and the post-office and telegraph services have shown better receipts, therefore the condition of the country is prosperous? Are these irrefragable evidence of the greater prosperity of the people?

(21) Is it true that larger balances at post-office savings banks signify greater prosperity? If so, may it be asked how is it that the deposits per head which came in 1889-90 to Rs. 164 have since steadily gone down till ten years later they came down to Rs. 125? Is that phenomenon to be seen in the savings of people in Europe, in the United Kingdom, and in the United States?

(22) Are the railways a really paying concern? What about the net loss to the State of 55 crores.

There are many other questions besides these which I would ask the Imperial authorities honestly to answer if they are prepared to prove that the Indian people are to-day more prosperous than they were 25, or even 15 years ago.

THE CONDITION OF INDIA.

ADDRESS BY MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI.

[FROM OUR OWN REPORTER.]

At a public meeting held at the North Chamberwell Radical Club and Institute on Tuesday evening, April 23, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji delivered an address on the "Condition of India." The chair was occupied by Dr. Macnamara, M.P., and among those on the platform were Mr. Facey, Mr. O'Connor, Mr.

Shampton, and Mr. W. C. Wade, secretary of the Metropolitan Radical Federation.

The Chairman, who on rising to open the proceedings was received with cheers, spoke at some length in an unfavourable tone upon the new taxes proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. In introducing Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji he said he was sure the whole meeting was anxious to extend a most hearty welcome to the distinguished representative of the Empire in the East, who was about to address them (Cheers).

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, who was loudly cheered, said, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am very pleased to have an opportunity of speaking to this Club, and I am quite sure that I shall receive a very sympathetic hearing. In dealing with this question I have been helped a good deal by your chairman, who has told you in what you are involved at present, by the expenditure of £100,000,000 last year, and who has reminded you how keenly you feel the pinch. You will, therefore, have much more sympathy with me when I talk, not of a hundred millions, but of thousands of millions. The subject to-night is the condition of India, and I will ask you to consider it in two aspects. I take the economic aspect first. The last report of the Indian census shows that something like twenty-five or thirty millions of human beings who should be existing are not existing now. That is a terrible state of affairs, and that has followed the British rule over nearly one hundred and fifty years. The question naturally arises, what is the cause of it? No other country connected with you, none of your colonies, is losing its citizens in the way in which we are losing them. They are not reduced to that extreme poverty which prevents us from even having one penny halfpenny per head to save the life of a man for one day. It is for you as electors of this country, you who have the sovereign power in your hands, to see why such a result has taken place. This state of things would have been otherwise but for the system of government to which we have been subjected during the last century and a half. In forming the British Indian Empire—and the formation of empires is no child's play, as the experience of the last year or two has taught you—Indian money was only used. Thousands of millions of our money have been spent in the formation of that Empire. You have not spent a shilling in the formation of that Empire. Not only that, but the blood that was shed in its formation was Indian blood. In addition to this, you have been regularly draining and bleeding us of millions of money. You may well ask yourselves this simple question:—If England were subjected to such depletion, to such bleeding, what would be your condition? Would it have been any better than ours is? This bleeding was estimated at the beginning of the last century to be something like three million pounds per annum. This yearly bleeding has gone on increasing incessantly, until at present it is something like thirty or forty million pounds. If there were an end to this bleeding we would have some time to recuperate; but it has been continuous, always running, and there is no chance for the people to recuperate. What other result can this continuous bleeding have than to impoverish the people more and more every year, till at last they must be swept away, to speak like him, as has happened during last year and the year before? It is for you to consider whether you who have the sovereign power in this country should not use your power to put an end to this disaster, for it is upon your heads that this blood must lie. You have not derived that benefit from India which you might have done had a more righteous course been adopted. These thirty or forty millions, which are extracted from India every year, do not go to make you any better off; they go into the pockets of the capitalists. You have to consider this fact, that the effect of this treatment of India and the bleeding that is going on there only benefits a certain class. The great masses of the people do not derive the benefit which they have the right to derive. You are carrying on wars in order to create new markets, and there is a great desire to create markets in order that the working men of this country may get work. Now, in India you have three hundred millions of civilized people, whose civilisation goes back thousands of years, people who were clothed in purple and gold when your ancestors were wandering about naked. That civilisation is not lost. It is only in the last century and a half that they have been brought to their present state. Here are three hundred millions who might be customers; and if we could become your customers you would not have enough hands to satisfy our demand for your goods. If we were treated justly we should become prosperous by our own industry. Australia has protection against you, and in the face of that protection you send to Australia something like six pounds' worth of goods per head per annum. The trade of India is perfectly free. If you have goods to send there, there is nothing to prevent you. If you make three hundred millions of people your customers your benefit will be ten times more than at present. Mr. Bright once put it very significantly to a Manchester audience. He said if you were selfish, if you wanted to seek your own ends, by all means seek them, but you could not have your own good except through the good of India. There are, he said, two ways by which you can benefit yourselves—either by plunder or by trade. At present you are benefiting from us by plunder; if that benefit were produced by trade just imagine what it would be. Suppose we were able to enjoy what we produced, and were able to buy even one pound's worth of your goods per head per annum, then your trade with us would amount to three hundred million pounds' worth, which is the amount of the whole of your trade with the whole world at present. We

would then have a fraternal and a commercial connexion with each other. But we have been continuously bled for the last one hundred and fifty years, and this bleeding is always running, and increasing, and what was five millions at the beginning of last century is now six times that amount. You are the sovereign power; you have the votes of this country. The democracy have the majority of the votes. The democracy maintain that they uphold progress, peace, and justice; and if they can do that, if they can give us justice, we shall have a very great blessing indeed. I hope that the Radical portion of the community will exercise their full power, and that they will not play into the hands of those who are reactionaries, who are satisfied that the world is good enough for them. Both for the sake of the three hundred millions deprived of their votes and for yourselves it is your duty to understand your power. But now I come to the other condition, the political condition. Britain claims that Britons shall never be slaves; but is it her ambition that she should make others slaves? What is our condition in India? We are told that we are British subjects. We are not British subjects; we are simply British helots. We are told that our Government ruler is despotic; but our present rulers are despotic with a vengeance. Their despotism has far worse effects than that of those old despots. There never was a single production of the country which was carried out of the country by these despots of old. Whatever the people produced in the country stayed in the country. The practice at the present day is to carry away as much wealth as possible (Hear, hear). I appeal to you as Englishmen who claim to be men of honour whether this system of government is based upon justice. I now ask you to see what our political position is. In 1833 the great question arose, how was India to be governed? There was a long discussion on the subject, and it was threshed out from every point of view. It was maintained that if ever India rose to such a pitch as to become independent entirely, it would be clearly England's duty to permit this, without keeping her under her heel. It was settled at that time that India should be governed on lines of justice and righteousness. In that Act of Parliament it was distinctly stated that there should be no distinction of race, creed, or colour in the government of the country. That Act is as dead a letter to-day as if it had never existed. The charter was renewed again in 1853, when the complaint was made by Mr. Bright that the Act passed in 1833 was a dead letter. The Executive Government never even took the trouble to go into it. Whatever it was that caused the Mutiny, that outbreak was suppressed for the most part by Indians themselves. It was then that that great proclamation was made in which the declaration of equal treatment of the races was made far more emphatically. The proclamation said that you held yourselves bound to the Natives of Your Indian territories by obligations of duty, and that those obligations would be a mutual blessing; it was further stated that the people of India should be freely admitted to offices in your service, which they might be fitted by education, ability, and integrity, duly to discharge. That was in 1858. In 1862 similar promises were also made. But in practice it has been the reverse. The British policy, as it has been proclaimed to the world, was to give equality of political privilege to raise the Indians to British citizenship, and it is that hope and desire which keeps the Indians at this time from despair. I have lived among Englishmen for nearly forty-five years. I know what their wishes are, and know what our advantage will be if we remain connected with them not as British slaves, but as British citizens. You maintain that there should be no taxation without representation, and you all believe here that we are governed in that way. I ask you to act in the future. I am not crying for the past. You must insist that your members do India justice. It appears to you again, and I feel that you, the democracy, have the power in your hands. As Englishmen it is your duty to do what is right in the interests of humanity itself. If you do not do it, then hereafter you will have no excuse. I now come to the Legislative Council. The whole thing is a farce. The Government has its majorities. The result is that the small number of Indians cannot influence in the slightest degree the taxation. It is said that India is the most lightly taxed country in the world, and that India pays no more than five shillings per head per annum. But the annual production per head in India is only twenty rupees or two pounds. Englishmen produce forty pounds per head per annum, and out of that they have to pay fifty shillings for taxation. But if you consider for a moment you will see that the burden is far greater on the Indians (Hear, hear). Ladies and gentlemen, I have had much pleasure in placing before you the condition of the people of India. Famines are not caused through a scarcity of food in India, but because the people have not the means to procure the food. I appeal to your humanity just as much as to your honour and your justice. The Indian question must be looked into. If only the righteous principles declared in 1833, 1858, 1877, and 1887 were carried out great benefit would indeed be derived. If we remain a part of the British Empire we can benefit you as well as ourselves politically, economically, and morally in every way to an extent of which you have not the slightest conception (Cheers).

Mr. Fahey moved the following resolution: "That in the opinion of this meeting the system of Government in India is diametrically opposed to the principles initiated in the Act of 1833, and the proclamation of 1858, and that the faithlessness of the British Government in this matter is the primary cause of the misery and suffering now prevailing in India, and great injury not only to the Natives, but also to the people of this country, who would derive substantial benefits from

the happiness and prosperity of their fellow subjects in the Indian Empire."

Mr. Wade seconded the resolution, which was ultimately agreed to.

THE SUSPENSION OF MR. PENNELL.

QUESTIONS IN THE BENGAL LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

At the meeting of the Bengal Legislative Council held on March 30 the following questions were asked by the Hon. Babu Surendra Nath Banerjee:—

(a) With reference to the suspension of Mr. Pennell, late District and Sessions Judge of Noakhali, will the Government be pleased to state whether it consulted the law officers of the Crown before suspending him?

(b) If it did not, then having regard to the strong differences of opinion expressed in the newspaper press as to the legality of the suspension, will the Government be pleased to consider the propriety of doing so now?

(c) Will the Government be pleased to state what further action it proposes to take with regard to Mr. Pennell, and whether he will be tried under Act XXXVII of 1850?

I have the honour to call attention to the following observations made by Mr. Pennell in his judgment in the murder case recently disposed of by him:—

"Mr. Corbett was nominally punished with the stoppage of his promotion for one year. No sooner were the Government orders issued than he was transferred from the undesirable station of Backergunge to Ranchi, which is well known as a sanitarium, and he has remained there ever since. Further, the last Civil List shows that he has been put back over the heads of all the police officers of his year, with the exception of Mr. Justice Stevens' son, who were confirmed before him."

Will the Government be pleased to state if the statements made in the last sentence of the above extract are true? If so, how is it possible to reconcile them with the stoppage of Mr. Corbett's promotion?

I have the honour to call attention to the following extract from the judgment of Mr. Pennell in the murder case:—

"An expression of the Lieutenant-Governor's severe displeasure was conveyed to Mr. Bradley, whose conduct, in the opinion of the Governor-General in Council, 'amounted to little short of persecution, and was a flagrant abuse of the authority with which as a police officer he was entrusted.' Between the first and second of these verbal castigations Mr. Bradley was appointed to officiate as District Superintendent of Police of Muzaffarpur, the prize district of Bengal, in succession to a very senior officer who is Mr. Bourdillon's brother-in-law, and there Mr. Bradley has remained up to date."

Are the statements made in the above extract substantially true? If so, how is it possible to reconcile a communication of the displeasure of the Government with Mr. Bradley being permitted to retain police charge of what is described as "a prize district of Bengal"?

Has the attention of Government been called to the following observations made by Mr. Pennell in his judgment in the murder case?

"The Police Department is the most 'genteel' of the refuges for the prostitutes in the Indian Empire, and that there is hardly a man in high place out here who has not got in that department some relative, of whom perhaps he may not be very proud, but whom he has no wish to have on his hands."

The Hon. Mr. Buckland replied: "Government decline at present to answer any question regarding Mr. Pennell or his judgment."

MR. PENNELL'S MEMORIAL TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

We give below the text of the Memorial which Mr. Pennell has addressed to Lord George Hamilton:—

No. 3 SUSPENSION.

From Mr. A. P. Pennell, suspended Civil Servant,

To the Secretary of State for India in Council.

Dated United Service Club, Calcutta.

March 21, 1901.

My Lord,—I have the honour to state that I am a member of the Covenanted Civil Service of India of fifteen and a half years' standing, and that I was till recently District and Sessions Judge of Noakhali, in the Lower Provinces of Bengal.

2. In my capacity as such I delivered on February 15 last a judgment in a murder case in which I deemed it necessary to direct the prosecution for forgery and perjury of a European (or Eurastan) District Superintendent of Police named Reilly, and as the Local Government had endeavoured, during the pending of the case, to intimidate me with a view to prevent my directing this prosecution, I thought it necessary to expose in my judgment the attempt made by Sir John Woodburn, the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, and by Lord Curzon of

Kedleston, the Governor-General, to burk the case commonly known as the Chupra case, which formed the subject of certain questions by Lord Stanley of Alderley in the House of Lords on May 14 last. I also took occasion to denounce the sycophancy of the higher Judiciary in this country, which alone renders such attempts on the part of the Executive authorities possible.

3. Mr. Reilly was committed to jail on February 15. The Local Government applied to me on February 16 to release him on bail, although the Crown is the nominal prosecutor, and although it was the case for the Crown in the murder trial that Mr. Reilly was guilty of the crime laid to his charge. This attempt failing, the Chief Justice of Bengal, Sir Francis Maclean, wired to me the following morning (a Sunday) through the Registrar of the High Court enquiring why Mr. Reilly's application for bail was refused, and urging me to carefully reconsider my order. Neither the Chief Justice nor the High Court had at that time been moved judicially on behalf of Mr. Reilly, and I am confident that your lordship's legal advisers will assure you that Sir Francis Maclean's action in sending me this telegram was an illegality of so flagrant a nature as to justify his being disbarred. I refused to do what Sir Francis Maclean wished, and the consequence was that Mr. Reilly remained in jail till February 21, when he was released under telegraphic orders of the High Court.

4. On February 28 I left Noakhali for Calcutta with the records of the murder case, which contained numerous important exhibits vitally affecting the Lieutenant-Governor, and which for that reason I wished to make over to the High Court myself to secure that it should not be tampered with. Sir John Woodburn was so anxious that I should not do this that he sent two urgent telegrams, within two hours of each other, ordering me to remain in Noakhali, although the courts were closed on account of the census, and I could do nothing there. His anxiety only confirmed me in the belief that the course I was taking was necessary in the interests of justice, and I therefore proceeded to Calcutta with the record, in spite of his telegrams arriving on the night of March 1.

5. Till the morning of February 28 the record, a most voluminous one, had been in the Copying Department of my office, being copied for the accused and others entitled to copies. It was neither made up nor indexed, and to make it up would be a work of some days. Moreover, one of the accused had been sentenced to death, and under the Indian law it is necessary that when a Sessions Judge passes sentence of death he should submit his proceedings with a letter of reference for the High Court's confirmation. No such letter has ever been written.

6. On March 2 my clerks and myself were engaged in making up the record. On March 3, a Sunday, Sir Francis Maclean made a daring attempt to possess himself of the record extra judicially. He sent a Mr. Chapman to my hotel to get it from me. This Mr. Chapman was then a private individual, but he had not long ceased to be Registrar of the High Court, and it was not known to most people, and Sir Francis Maclean may have thought that it was not known to me that he was no longer the Registrar. Your legal advisers will tell you that Sir Francis Maclean, or the Chief Justice of Bengal (if it be assumed that he was acting officially), has no power to send for records in this way, and that his action was both illegal and improper. Mr. Chapman showed me an autograph letter from Sir Francis Maclean to himself, directing him to get the record from me; but he would not give me the letter or let me take a copy, and said he was not supposed to show it to me. He also admitted that he was no longer Registrar; as I raised objection to the informality of the whole proceedings, Mr. Chapman suggested (this was not in the letter) that if I could not trust him I should make over the record to the Chief Justice himself. I therefor showed him some of the more important exhibits, and said that before giving him any final answer I would consult Mr. P. L. Roy, a leading barrister of Calcutta, who is an intimate friend of mine. Mr. Chapman then went away. I myself went to see Mr. Roy, who advised me to go to Sir Francis Maclean's house and make over the record to him there. I accordingly went with my clerks and the records to Sir Francis Maclean's, but the latter, after keeping me waiting for a long time, sent me a note in the third person to the effect that "the Chief Justice of Bengal is unable to see Mr. Pennell, and desires that any communication which the letter may wish to make should be made to him through the Registrar of the High Court." My submission is that although Sir Francis Maclean wanted to get hold of the record privately, he did not want his getting hold of it privately to be known.

7. On the evening of the following day (March 4) I was suspended from my office by the Local Government by letter No. 1481 A. B. (copy annexed) "on the recommendation of the Honourable the Chief Justice and Judges of the High Court." It will be seen that no charges were framed against me, that I was not asked to furnish any explanation and that no limit to the period of my suspension is indicated.

8. On March 11 I addressed to the Chief Secretary to the Local Government a letter (No. 1 Suspension) of which a copy is annexed, enquiring whether it was in contemplation to

frame any charges against me, and whether I should be allowed to submit any explanation or to be heard in my defence.

9. In reply, the Local Government informed me in their Chief Secretary's letter No. 1872 A., dated March 13 (copy annexed), that they have at present no further information to communicate to me.

10. I represented these facts to the Government of India in a letter (No. 2 Suspension) of March 18, of which a copy is annexed, and asked that that Government might be pleased to direct the Local Government either to reinstate me without delay or to inform me what the charges against me are and to give me reasonable facilities for defending myself against such charges. I also asked that if the Government of India intended to reply at all the reply might be sent me not later than 2 p.m. to-day, so that I might, if necessary, communicate with you by this mail.

11. I have received no reply. Lord Curzon, as well as Sir John Woodburn, is implicated in my judgment, and I do not expect any justice from the authorities in this country. I, therefore, represent these facts for your information, and pray that you will be pleased to direct that I be at once reinstated and that substantial amends be made to me for the way in which I have been treated for trying to do my duty as a judge according to my lights.

12. I further beg that your lordship will be pleased to communicate your orders by telegram to the local authorities, as unless I obtain satisfactory redress within ten days of the time when this week's mail is delivered in London it is my intention to proceed to England without further delay, there to lay my grievances before the King in Parliament and in particular before that House of Commons which represents people like myself.

13. A copy of this letter is being submitted to you through the ordinary channels. I send this copy direct to save time.

ENCLOSURES.

1. Reprint of judgment in the Noakhali case.
2. Letter No. 1481 A. B., dated 4/3/01, from the officiating Chief Secretary to the Government of Bengal, with its enclosures (including copy of letter No. 600, dated 4/3/01, from the officiating Registrar of the High Court).
3. Letter No. 1 Suspension, dated 11/3/01, to Chief Secretary to Government of Bengal.
4. Letter No. 1872 A., dated 13/3/01, from officiating Chief Secretary to Government of Bengal.
5. Letter No. 2 Suspension, dated 18/3/01, to Secretary to Government of India, Home Department.

AN INDIAN FAMINE UNION.

SOME OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

The *Pilot* writes (April 13) : Sir William Wedderburn is not always a wise counsellor in Indian matters, but the change in the character of Indian famines to which he has this week called attention is one of great gravity. There is no difficulty, he says, in bringing grain to the famine-stricken districts; "the difficulty is that the cultivators have no means to purchase." They no longer hoard grain, they have no ornaments left to sell, and they already owe the grain-dealer more than they can ever hope to pay. This is a far more serious state of things in the long run than any physical obstacles to cultivation or carriage. Irrigation might remove the one, railways or roads might remove the other. But how is the poverty of the cultivator to be relieved? How is he to be put in a position in which he can buy the means of supporting life? Sir William Wedderburn bids us "carefully examine all reasonable proposals" before we pronounce Indian famines inevitable. But what is a reasonable proposal for making the tens of millions of Indian cultivators solvent? If Sir William has an answer ready it is to be hoped that he will give it.

INDIAN FAMINES AND THE CENSUS.

SOME OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

THE "OUTLOOK."

The last text of Lord Curzon's Budget speech received by the last mail shows it to be a remarkable utterance dealing within a comparatively brief compass with all the chief subjects of administrative and political interest. With the frontier scheme we were already well acquainted, but a particular interest attaches to the figures the Viceroy gives concerning the condition of the Indian cultivator and the average income per head of the population, and to his conclusive refutation of the economic heresies of Mr. Horace Bell, who would impose a tax on exports to check the action of railways in exporting food grains during times of scarcity. It is indeed satisfactory to learn that Lord Curzon estimates the average income per head of population at thirty rupees against Lord Cromer's estimate of twenty-seven rupees in 1882, and of course a fact

upon which we have previously insisted will also be borne in mind, that in India all the family earn something, so that, allowing four breadwinners per family, Lord Curzon's present calculation gives every adult male on an average an income of ten rupees a month. Further, in 1880 there were 194 millions of acres under cultivation, and in 1900, 217 millions, while the yield per acre of food crops has in the interval risen from 730 to 740 lbs. Prices, moreover, have been so equalised by the extension of railways that, while twenty years ago grain in North India was selling at three times the price obtaining in the South, to-day wheat which can be bought at twelve seers in the Punjab costs no more than ten seers a thousand miles away.

Lord Curzon, referring to the Census just concluded, says we cannot be happy in face of an increase of population less than would otherwise be expected, owing to the ravages of famine. But, in fact, the figures of three enumerations afford no sufficient data for determining any normal rate of increase in India, and if the figures for long periods were available it would probably transpire that the increases of the last two enumerations were altogether exceptional instead of being, as is now assumed, more or less normal. In fact, we have no idea in what proportions the population increased in former times in normal seasons, but we do know that famines which were then more local nearly wiped out the population of districts affected, and we know from our own observations, made in the last twenty-five years, that seasons of scarcity impair the fertility of the people and largely reduce the birth-rate, to which cause, more than to actual starvation, the lower rate of increase in the last ten years is probably due.—(April 20.)

“DAYLIGHT” (Norwich).

We are too prone to believe that peace and prosperity follow our flag, and doubtless in this case as in so many others the wish fathers the thought. So we accept the results of our rule without any serious enquiries into the *status quo*. However, the returns of the recent Indian census should furnish us with dates for questioning our too easy faith, as its statistics clearly prove that during the decade just past the population of British India has only increased by about 4,000,000; whereas had its normal increase taken place, the numbers added would have amounted to 32,000,000.

This startling deficiency is the more ominous as the normal increase is never more than about one per cent., this low rate being due to the high death rate, which more than neutralises the proper results of the very high birth and marriage rates. Famine is but too plainly doing its evil most effectually in our greatest dependency. The famines occurring during the last ten years are credited with causing a reduction of twenty millions in the population of the afflicted areas. We are too ready to impute all this loss of human life to climatic causes, overlooking the notorious facts which negative this view of these evils.

We find that during the two years just past—years marked by one of the worst famines yet experienced—our Government netted a surplus revenue of over £4,000,000. This huge profit created by the industry of a starving people proves gross mismanagement in some quarter, as it furnishes undeniable proofs that neither climate nor labour can be justly accused nor held responsible for the loss of the millions of lives due to famine.

The connexion between famine and the return from one industry alone, that of agriculture, may be inferred when we remember that the annual land tax payable to the British Government amounts to about £25,000,000, and with some other taxes forms a portion of over £30,000,000 of Indian tribute annually finding its way out of India without securing any returns; while those who created all this wealth by their increased labour and frugality had not enough to eat as they worked, and could not spare one penny to lay aside for their future wants.

It is bad economy to grind human beings after the fashion we are now forced to note in British India, and some of the cash spent on furthering costly warfare would have been better spent on restoring the balance between labour and its reward within our Indian Empire.

We too often forget that our national honour, as well as credit, is involved in the question of our success or our failure in the administration of the affairs of our subjected nationalities. We refuse these people self-government on the plea that we can replace it with government of a better type; consequently it behoves us to secure prosperity unless we are content to incur suspicions of sinister aims or very gross incapacity. From this dilemma there is no escaping. If Crown colony government means big revenues plus starvation we are in honour bound to change the system.—(April 20.)

LAND ASSESSMENTS IN THE CENTRAL PROVINCES.

The following letter from Mr. B. K. Rose to the Editor appeared in the *Times of India* (Overland Edition) of April 6:—

Sir,—During the recent debate on the amendment to the Address, moved by Mr. Caine, the Secretary of State said: “If it ever could be brought to his notice, or that of the Viceroy,

that there was any evidence to show that in any particular district the land assessment was too high, or that there was any other cause for the deterioration of the people, he could assure hon. members that either he or the Viceroy would undertake that there should be a thorough investigation.” I beg you will kindly allow me a little space to give publicity to a few facts taken from official papers which show how greatly the Central Provinces have deteriorated within recent years under the stress of two most acute famines and several years of scarcity of varying degrees of severity. Let me first give the results of the census just over. It shows that whereas between 1881 and 1891 the population in the British districts had increased by about 9½ lakhs, or 9·61 per cent., it has decreased between 1891 and 1901 by about the same number, or 8·71 per cent. Thus, at the close of a cycle of twenty years the population is found to be almost the same as it was at its beginning. If one district, Sambalpur, which had a splendid rice crop in 1896 that enabled it to profit largely by others' misfortunes, and which had no famine but only scarcity in 1899, be excluded the population is actually found to have gone down since 1881. Two other districts are shown to have gained to some extent. Taking the province as a whole and allowing for the normal increase which would under ordinary circumstances have taken place, the loss of population is represented by 9·61 + 8·71 = 18·37 per cent., or nearly two millions.

Proprietary right in land was first recognised at the settlement which took place in the sixties. The assessment as then imposed was on the whole light, and the progress the province made during the next twenty-five years was satisfactory. It may be said to have touched its high-water mark of prosperity in 1893, after which the cycle of lean years began. During the above period cultivation had increased by 27·7 per cent., and population by 28·39 per cent. In some of the most severely affected districts, such as Saugor and Damoh, cultivation had grown by over 40 per cent. In one district, Balaghat, it had more than doubled itself. In sad contrast with this I give below a table showing the percentage of decrease of cultivation and population in twelve districts between 1893 and 1900:—

District.	Percentage of Decrease of Cultivation.	Population.
Saugor	32	20
Damoh	25	12
Jubbulpur	21	9
Maunla	10	12
Seoni	23	12
Narsingpur	13	14
Hoshangabad	22	10
Batal	30	11
Wardha	15	4
Bhandara	26	11
Balaghat	41	13
Bilaspur (Khalasa)	13	15

The total decline in cultivation in the province, excluding Sambalpur, has been a little less than two million acres, or about 12 per cent. The cropped area in some districts has actually retrograded to the figure of the old settlement of 1865-68. Inferior crops have also taken the place of superior ones. Thus the normal wheat area of 4 million acres had by 1899-1900 shrunk to 1½ million acres. The average export of wheat during five years ending 1893 was 7 million maunds. In 1898-99, the year preceding the late famine, it was 2½ million maunds. During this period of decline the loss of cattle, one of the principal items of agricultural wealth and resources, has been great, as is indicated by the rise in the export of hides and skins. For five years subsequent to 1893 it was on an average double of what it was in 1893. During 1899 it was three times as much, and the same high figure was maintained in 1900.

I have no desire to enter into controversial matters, but will take for granted that the enhancements of the new settlement, which in many cases were admittedly heavy, were fully justified by the state of things as they existed when they were imposed. But there can scarcely be any reasonable room to doubt that they have now in many cases ceased to be such as the people can pay without being hard pressed. I understand that many of the revenue officers examined by the Famine Commission at Nagpur practically admitted as much. Permanent abatements as distinguished from temporary remissions have, as far as I can gather, been already granted in parts of one or two districts (Saugor and Damoh). Proceedings with a view to abatement are in progress in another district, Hoshangabad. The Commissioner of Settlement said before the Famine Commission that where there was reason to suppose that there has been permanent deterioration enquiries would be made with a view to reduction of revenue. I venture to submit that the needed relief ought to come early. The task of recovering the lost ground even with the kindest of monsoons is beset with difficulties. The people must borrow largely to win back to the plough the land that has gone out of cultivation and part of which has become overgrown with noxious weeds, which it is difficult and expensive to eradicate. But unless the landholders feel assured that they will be able to keep to themselves

a proper share of the fruits of any improvement they may make, and thus be in a position to pay back the debt that will have to be incurred for the purpose from the profits earned, matters will, I am afraid, be allowed to drift.

Nagpur, March 31.

B. K. BOSE.

THE COUNTERVAILING DUTIES ON SUGAR.

The following letter from Mr. J. M. Maclean appeared in the *Westminster Gazette* of April 17:—

Sir,—I wish some member of Parliament would ask Lord George Hamilton to lay upon the table the comparative statistics of the importation of sugar into India which are referred to by Sir Edward Law in his financial statement. It is a remarkable circumstance that these figures do not appear in any of the reports of Sir Edward Law's statement which have reached this country; at all events, I cannot find them in any of the Indian papers, which give a full report of Sir Edward Law's speech, with its illustrative tables. We have the Finance Minister's own comments, but these are not the same thing as the actual figures, any more than the comments of the English authorities on Botha's conversation with Lord Kitchener are equivalent to the Boer leader's own words. If we had the statistics we might make our own comments, which would, perhaps, differ widely from Sir Edward Law's.

Enough, however, is said in the financial statement to justify the conclusion that the countervailing duties have not been in success. The Finance Minister adopts an apologetic tone in speaking of them, and says we have only had two years' experience of their workings. But surely this ought to be enough. If the duties were going to be the salvation of India they would have begun to produce their effect already. But, beyond bringing in a small amount of revenue to the Indian Exchequer, some £120,000 a year, they have utterly failed to do any good. They were introduced with a great flourish of trumpets both in India and at Westminster as a first step towards revolutionising the commercial policy of the British Empire and destroying the fetish of Free Trade. It was claimed for them that they would revive the sugar industry in India and save the colony of Mauritius from the disastrous effects of a terrible rivalry with bounty-giving States. Now, anybody who knows anything of India is aware that the importations of foreign sugar into India form only a hundredth part of the quantity consumed in the country. India might produce sugar enough to supply the whole world if the growth of the indigenous sugar-cane were properly encouraged and the juice properly extracted; and even now, careless as the culture of the cane may be, enough sugar is grown to yield to 300,000,000 people the greater part of their daily food. It is now reluctantly admitted in India that the countervailing duties have had no effect in either increasing the area planted or the quantity of sugar turned out.

Have, then, the duties benefited Mauritius? I do not know why that colony should be so dear to us as to make us willing to tax the Indian people in order to increase the prosperity of the people of Mauritius. There is only a scanty sprinkling of Englishmen resident in the island, the population of which consists almost entirely of planters of French descent and of Indian coolies. Still, the Act was passed ostensibly for the sake of Mauritius, and it would be interesting to learn the results. This, curiously enough, is hidden from us. Sir Edward Law says that "the United Kingdom, and the interested British Colonies, the Straits Settlements, Hong Kong and Mauritius, have had their full *proportionate* share in the remarkable increase of importation into India during the expiring financial year," but the greatest relative advance in the supply of sugar has been made by Germany." The bounty-giving countries, therefore, still hold their own in spite of the duties. It is worthy of passing notice that Sir Edward Law, in his summary, includes the United Kingdom. But this country produces no sugar, and can only be exporting transhipped cargoes of beetroot sugar in order to evade the duties. Similarly, Hong Kong and the Straits Settlements do not grow cane sugar themselves, they only import it from China or the Malayan Peninsula. Mauritius does grow her own sugar, but Sir Edward Law expressly states that she is no better off with the duties than she was without them. The result of the Act, he says, is that the Indian Government takes for itself a sum equivalent to the bounty, "whilst the Indian consumer pays no more for his sugar than he would have to pay if the bounty system were abolished." Clearly, therefore, the planter of Mauritius cannot now sell his sugar at an increased value, and the Act is a dead letter. How Sir Edward Law has come to the conclusion that Germany, Austria, and France go on exporting sugar to India in increased quantities without making any profit on it is more than I can understand. It is only one more proof of the old saying that two and two may make four in England, but they occasionally make five in India.

I hope that if Sir Michael Hicks-Beach has a moment to spare he will examine carefully the operation of the countervailing duties in India before attempting to follow here the example of the Indian Government. I hope, too, that before he is tempted to forswear all the Free Trade principles to which

he has hitherto been so staunch, and to lay an unhallowed hand upon sugar he will bear in mind Disraeli's oracular warning, "Strange that an article of produce which delights infancy and is the solace of old age should so frequently be the occasion of political disaster."—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

J. M. MACLEAN.

Imperial Parliament.

Thursday, April 18.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER ON THE PROPOSED FAMINE GRANT.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH, in the course of his Budget statement, referring to the alarming increase of public expenditure, said:—I think that this increased expenditure is necessary or I should not be standing at this box to-day. But I would venture to remind the Committee that that has been the opinion repeatedly expressed, not only by great majorities in this House, but by the constituencies in the country. (Hear, hear.) I do not care where you look. Let us take the Navy expenditure. I do not care where you go in Great Britain, and I do not care what the political complexion of your meeting may be, I venture to say that one thing will be popular in that meeting, irrespective of political opinion, and it is that we must have a strong Navy. (Cheers.) Hon. members opposite are equally responsible, and rightly responsible, with us for the increase of expenditure that is taking place upon our NAVY. (Opposition cries of "No, no.") Now, let us come to the ARMY. Why, if there was one thing that both parties agreed upon in canvassing the country at the last general election, surely it was that there must be great reforms in our Army—(cheers and counter-cheers)—and reforms cost money. (Opposition cries of "No, no.") They must cost money. (Renewed cries of "No, no.") When my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War made his proposals to the House early this Session what happened? Why, I think the leader of the Opposition himself—I am certain that the right hon. gentleman the member for the Forest of Dean did object to the proposals as insubstantial—(cries of "No, no.")—because they did not include the most costly of all expenditure—an addition to the pay of the Regular Army. (Hear, hear.) Then I come to the expenditure on the Civil Services, the Post Office and the Telegraphs. Why, Sir, from all quarters during the past five years, from every quarter of the House, including that quarter (the Irish benches), there have been continued proposals for increased expenditure under this head. There is one matter, perhaps, in which hon. members opposite may think they could promote a saving, and it is in the grant under the Agricultural Rating Act—(Opposition cheers)—a matter of a million and half a year—(hear, hear)—an important sum. (Hear, hear.) But just look what the demands of hon. members would be on other matters. Why it was not very long ago that the right hon. gentleman the leader of the Opposition bound his party, including, I suppose, the right hon. gentleman the member for West Monmouth, to adopt the system of compulsory land purchase in Ireland. (Sir W. Harcourt shook his head amid laughter and cheers.) I looked round and took it that the silence of the right hon. gentleman the member for West Monmouth gave assent. (Hear, hear.) The party opposite, above and below the gangway, are as any rate pledged—(cries of "No, no.")—to the adoption of something of that kind which must involve increased expenditure. (Cries of "No.") I turn to the right hon. gentleman the member for Wolverhampton. He has always advocated, backed by the sentiment of the great body of the House, the giving to India of five millions sterling when the finances of India are in an infinitely better position than our own. We have proposals from various quarters to expend money from the Exchequer in aid of great towns, to solve the difficult and important problem of the housing of the working classes, to improve the Port of London, and, above all, to promote the great work of education. (An hon. member.—"It is all profit.") Never mind; it is expenditure. I am not questioning the profit of any of these matters—that would not be a fit argument for a Budget speech—but I would not be a fit argument for a Budget speech that what hon. members opposite might possibly save under one head they would certainly expend under another.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS.

Notice has been given of the following questions:—

MR. GARDNER.—To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether it is ascertained that numbers of European refugees have been permitted to return from Natal to the Transvaal and open their shops there, but that no permits have been granted to refugees being Indian British subjects; And, whether he will make enquiry as to the reasons for this difference in the treatment of traders, and give such instructions as may be required.—(Thursday, April 25.)

MR. SCHWANN.—To ask the Secretary of State for India, whether he has taken measures to secure that none of the charges consequent upon the detention of Boer prisoners in India, for example, the salaries of persons employed in their supervision, shall be charged on the revenues of India.—(Thursday, April 25.)

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 I.), 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, 1898.

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, 1894-5.

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. BONNERGEE.

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 ROBERT 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.

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 1894-5.

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. Setalwad.

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?

The "Shimness" of the India Office.

"Mainly a Question of Money."

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.

"THE PEOPLE OF INDIA:

Their Many Merits by Many who have Known Them."

Mr. Alfred Webb's articles reprinted in pamphlet form from "INDIA."

A copy will be sent free on receipt of 1d. stamp to cover postage. Secretaries of Political Associations, Clubs, Literary Societies, in the United Kingdom may obtain copies for distribution on application.

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

In India, applications should be addressed to
Mr. HARCHANDRA A. TALCHERKAR,
52, Veronica Street, Bandra, Bombay.



is what its name implies

FEVER DESTROYER.

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

North Bagan Barracks, Devonport. I beg to endorse a charge on the Jwara-Hari. Some in India and Africa have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER. I know.

G. B. WOOD, Capt. 25th North Staffs Regt. "Jwara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now take it up for a dozen per value payable parcel. I think there is more than might in it.

G. L. NARSINGA RAO

for INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Dadabhai Municipal Councilors Office. I have much pleasure in stating that your "Omni-Carpore" was found very useful for Cholera. I taken it in the early stage.

G. S. SHENIVASA, Chairman.

1-1/2 lbs. of "JWARA-HARI" and "OMNI-CARPORE" pans. Rs. 1/8 Rs. 2/6 Rs. & 1/2 per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors.

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY.
43, KING WILLIAM STREET, LONDON, E.C., AND
27 SECOND LINE BEACH, MADRAS.



THE GRANHAMS, SHELFORD, CAMBRIDGE.

W. A. DOUGLAS RUDGE, B.A., 1ste 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 Ramesh C. Dutt, Esq., C.I.E., and Dadabhai Naoroji, Esq., in London.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

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

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

DR. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma, Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—21st March, 1899."

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

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.

Subscription in England:—

April 1 to End of Year (Post free), 7s. 3d.

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

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

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