

# India

FOR THE

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, MAY 3, 1901.

[REGISTERED AS A] PRICE..... 2d  
NEWSPAPER. [By Post, 3rd]

No. 174. NEW SERIES.]  
No. 965. OLD SERIES.]

Notes and News .....	205	Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji on the Cause	211
The Anglo-Indian Despotism .....	208	and Curo of Famine .....	213
Our London Letter .....	206	Indian Affairs in Parliament .....	213
Notes from Bombay .....	210	The "Investors' Review" Famine	215
India and the National Liberal		Fund .....	215
Federation .....	210	Public Meetings on Indian Questions	215
Return of Mr. Pennell's Memorial	210	Advertisements .....	216

## NOTES AND NEWS.

**L**ORD AVEBURY, in his speech at the annual dinner of the Royal Colonial Institute (April 24), had something to say of the expenses of empire, which is well worth notice:—

We often heard of the Imperial Exchequer, Imperial funds, and the Imperial forces. As a matter of fact there were no such things. There was an Exchequer for Great Britain and Ireland, an Indian Exchequer, a Canadian Exchequer, and so on, but there was not an Imperial Exchequer. In South Africa we had supported our fellow countrymen who were oppressed and defrauded, and had defended two of our colonies which were attacked. This had cost us thousands of valuable lives, added many millions to our taxes, and over £130,000,000 to our debt. We might make such sacrifices cheerfully because we felt it was our duty, but obviously we could not do so over and over again. No one could say what part of the Empire would next be attacked, where the next danger might arise. It was clear that the weight of responsibility for the Empire must eventually be borne by the Empire as a whole, and not by any part.

Has Lord Avebury considered, one wonders, the contributions which India makes in various ways towards the payment of the expenses of the British Empire? When has the United Kingdom paid for an Indian war? And how many are the military enterprises, undertaken for Imperial purposes beyond her borders, of which India has borne the whole cost? Take, again, the army in India, a large part of which is manifestly an Imperial reserve to be drafted to South Africa or China or elsewhere in times of crisis when, if ever, one would expect the full strength of a truly Indian army to be needed in India. India, too, built and wholly maintains the India Office and pays the salary of the Secretary of State for India. Where is there a parallel in the Empire? And, above and beyond all these contributions, there is the annual "tribute" of many millions from India which goes to enrich certain classes in the United Kingdom and increases the yield of the income-tax beyond the dreams of the Treasury. We hope Lord Avebury will look into the matter. If so, he will probably find that, however sound his main argument may be, there is still a limited sense in which it is true to speak of "the Imperial Exchequer, Imperial funds, and the Imperial forces"—in the sense, namely, that there is a sort of partnership, though it is a "leonina societas," between wealthy England and the indigent taxpayers of India.

We are glad to see that the annual report of the National Liberal Federation contains more than one reference to India, though it is much to be regretted that no resolution concerning India is included among those which are to be submitted to the Council at Bradford. We reprint on another page the passages in the report which have to do with Indian questions. "The closest examination," we read, "ought to be made to see if any readjustment of the financial system of India could be devised which might mitigate the recurrence of these national disasters"—that is, famine and the diseases it brings. That is good so far as it goes. But of course what is really wanted is the "closest examination" of the economic causes of famine with a view not merely to mitigate but to prevent recurrence. Elsewhere the report contrasts the Government's policy of doles to favoured classes at home with its refusal of a grant towards the relief of famine in India. No one disputes, the report says, that the growth of national expenditure "is worth

the gravest public consideration, but what is lamentable and disgraceful is that it should be remembered by Tory Ministers when they are asked to come to the rescue of famine-stricken India and conveniently forgotten when they are invited to dip their hands into the taxpayer's money in order to provide doles for their friends." Precisely. And the odd thing is that these same Ministers love to call themselves "Imperialists."

The "Times of India," one of the leading Anglo-Indian organs, adds to the many services it has lately rendered by devoting four and a half columns to a masterly review of the case of Mr. Pennell, from the pen of an "Indian, Civilian." The writer begins with a summary of the Chupra case, in the course of which he says:—

... it must be borne well in mind that not till the attention of the Supreme Government had been forced by publicity in England, and not till the Bengal Government in turn were called upon by the Viceroy to deal with the matter, was any action taken except to transfer Mr. Pennell and to hush up the case.

Then the resolution of the Government of India on the Chupra case is dealt with, and the Noakhali murder case follows. Next come some weighty remarks on the real question before the public, and on the treatment of Mr. Pennell by the Bengal authorities. The writer concludes with these words:—

The policy of ignoring public—even if Native—opinion has little to recommend it, and in insisting on the right of the public to know the truth about the conduct of their paid servants of whatever grade, we feel confident of the assent of all classes.

It is impossible to deal here with the whole article, but two points demand particular notice. The first is the exposition of the great political cleavage which lies beneath the case. It is in fact the battle-ground of two political schools. To one school, the people of India are to their rulers as sheep to the shepherd, to be protected from all calamities, so that by their prosperity "the well-being of the flock may yield the maximum of profit to the shepherd." But "they are ever to remain sheep, and ever inferiors." The other school consider the people of India as children, it may be now unfit to rule, but capable under sympathetic guidance of growing into men and equals. "To the one party the gulf is ever fixed; to the others it is ever being bridged." It is to be noted that by the Delhi Proclamation the British Government in India is pledged to the latter policy. But the former is practically in the ascendant, and "for an outspoken judge to wound by his comments the pride of the dominant race" is worse than for an official "to conduct himself disgracefully in a murder trial."

The other point is a question of fact whether the decision to remove Mr. Pennell to Noakhali was arranged by the Lieutenant-Governor, as officially stated, "long before he ever heard of the Chupra case." The writer by a careful comparison of dates and circumstances arrives at the conclusion that, unless something besides the judgment occurred between October 9 and 16 to account for the transfer, "it seems certain that the Bengal Government must be convicted of a public falsehood." The Bengal Government, not being able to assail Mr. Pennell openly for his political views, "seems to have resorted to the ignoble expedient of a falsehood." The writer warns us that, though Mr. Pennell may have been guilty of "deplorable excesses in language and action," these "must not bind us to the serious issues which these occurrences raise," independent as they are of the personal factor. Meanwhile the Lieutenant-Governor has returned Mr. Pennell's memorial to the Secretary of State, on the ground that four paragraphs contain "disrespectful and



improper language." Two of these paragraphs refer to the Lieutenant-Governor himself.

On his visit to Aligarh, Lord Curzon spoke most sensibly and emphatically to his audience at the Anglo-Oriental College, and through them to all the Mahomedans of India. He told them, in picturesque phrase, that "to be without education in the 20th century would be as though a knight of the feudal ages had been stripped of helmet, spear, and coat of mail," praised the work done at Aligarh, and urged the Mahomedan Princes to concentrate their popular benefactions on education. So far good. Lord Curzon also seized the occasion to glorify the educational policy of the Government:—

If British dominion in India were exterminated to-morrow and all visible traces of it wiped off the face of the earth, I think its noblest monument and proudest epitaph would be the policy which it has adopted with respect to education.

True, that policy was happily determined, not without considerable opposition. Lord Curzon spoke of its scope in these terms:—

We have truly endeavoured to fling wide open the gates of the temple of knowledge and draw the multitudes in. We have sought to make education not the perquisite or prerogative of a few, but the cheap possession of the many. History does not record any similarly liberal policy on the part of a Government differing in origin, language, and thought from the governed.

I do not believe that we shall ever have a Viceroy or Lieutenant-Governor who will desire to close by an inch the open door, or to drive out a single human being who has entered in.

But did not the Romans throw open all the avenues of military and political promotion to the peoples they subjected to their domination? An Illyrian or a Spaniard could rise to be Emperor of Rome: when shall we see a Native Indian Viceroy or Commander-in-Chief? Are not the Indian Universities as yet only examining bodies—boards of a class that, as Lord Curzon said, would never give them "that lofty ideal of education, the sustained purpose, and the spirit of personal devotion" associated with "Universities of an ampler character"? Is not Mr. Tata's magnificent scheme for a Research University with a view to the resuscitation and prosperity of Indian industries practically at a standstill on the very threshold of inauguration simply for lack of a little pecuniary support, which many people think should naturally come from Government? Is the secondary education of the country in a flourishing condition? Is not the public expenditure on elementary education the merest pittance? And, when the young men do get educated, what are they to do with their education? Is the Government developing the country in such a way as to open careers for them—as the forgotten Romans did for their conquered subjects? The principle so rhetorically vaunted by the Viceroy is unimpeachable, and indeed highly creditable—as well as inevitable; but the carrying of the principle into action can scarcely be brought within the scope of legitimate triumph. Perhaps Lord Curzon will turn his attention to the point. It affords large scope for his energy.

The Gaekwar of Baroda, speaking at the annual prize-giving of the Grant Medical College in Bombay, gave the Government the credit of recognising that the provision of medical aid was the duty of the State, but had to point out "that still more might be done in this direction by bettering medical aid and sanitation in the villages, and imparting some knowledge of Western science to the hakims and similar classes, who are often the only kind of physicians within reach of the Indian poor." Here is an enormous field for the expansion of practical education—a field crying for occupation in the interests of the masses of the people. Yet the Gaekwar had to note with regret the restriction of the numbers in attendance at a similar college at Poona, presumably for lack of Government assistance. Lord Curzon, in his zeal for the Government policy of education, will no doubt look into this case. The Gaekwar, whose intense personal interest in the welfare of the people is well known, judiciously insisted that "the pressing need of India" in this regard "is a working knowledge of the first principles of health and sanitation." He even went so far as to say plainly this:—

We make great show and spend much money in caste festi-

ties and Shradddhas, but, to my mind, the finer reverence, the truer Shradddha, is that done to the living by surrounding them with comfort, guarding their health, and prolonging their lives.

Commonplace enough, no doubt, from the English point of view; but in India such a public declaration is remarkable indeed, and significant of a far-reaching intellectual movement that has many aspects of the deepest national importance. By the way, if the Gaekwar had been mewed up in Baroda and never come to Europe how likely is it that he would ever have spoken in such courageous and modern terms?

In one respect the position of the Indians has changed for the worse since the earlier days of the Company's rule. The exclusion of "interlopers" was a great benefit. Not only are the commercial classes and still more the planters in a position in which they are unhampered by the feeling of responsibility which still affects the officials in their intercourse with the Indians, but they are gradually gaining more and more influence with the Government in all matters relating to their interests, often conflicting with those of the Indians. Thus the "Tribune" declares:—

Sad experience has taught us that the Government of India is not strong enough to carry to completion any measure, however just, against the opposition of the Anglo-Indian community, official or non-official.

This is a strong declaration, but the changes made in the Assam Labour Bill at the instance of those who gave voice to the wishes of the planters afford only too much justification for it.

The strong appreciation by the Indians of Mr. Cotton's conduct in so strenuously championing the cause of the coolies at the Viceroy's Legislative Council continues to manifest itself. On his return to Assam the people gave him a warm reception, and presented him with an address. In it they speak of him as the champion of the "poor voiceless coolies," and assure him that his "single-handed and heroic fight for justice and humanity" will never be forgotten by the Indians. The "Mahratta" far away in the Decan, commenting on this, points out that Mr. Cotton has been able to do what few have succeeded in doing—to command the respect of the Government "by sheer ability and trustworthiness" and at the same time to earn the appreciation and gratitude of the people.

The "Tribune" reminds us that, in discussing the question of the secretariat and its too voluminous records, it must not be forgotten that India is a country ruled by alien rulers. This of necessity greatly increases the amount of official writing; for just as Indian schoolboys have to do additional work because they have to learn many things in a foreign tongue, so, also, many official writings which were originally in the vernaculars have to be done into English for the benefit of British officials. And again the English head of a department is often dependent on the notes of his Indian subordinates, who know the people of the country and their ways, to an extent which he would not be were he administering the affairs of his native land.

Mr. J. D. Rees, C.I.E., contributes an interesting, and very fair, article on "The Native Indian Press" to the May number of the "Nineteenth Century." He points out the importance of the Native papers, which are "completely ignored" over here, and he admits at once that "the Indian Press, though critical, is not, with rare exceptions, disloyal, that great ability is evidenced by the articles published, and often an independent judgment, which does credit to editors who know too well exactly what line will be taken by almost all their subscribers." He does justice to the courageous, though (in his view) "inappropriate 'pro-Boer' attitude" of the Indian Press:—

Never before in its history did the Indian Press brush aside all smaller issues, forget all its disagreements with the Government and its servants, and offer up one loud, continuous, and evidently sincere prayer for the speedy arrival of that victory which they never doubted would be ours. Never have denunciations of Russia been more frequent, and never have we heard less of "the treasure vainly poured out upon the frontier" than at this epoch. The only complaint made was that Indian troops were not allowed to share the present dangers and eventual triumphs of the campaign.



With regard to the famine he acknowledges that "all allow that the Government has made efforts on the whole as successful as they are gigantic and unprecedented," but he argues against "many, most perhaps," because they "protest that the causes of famine are not to be sought solely in the capricious and unfavourable character of the seasons." His argument, however, will not disturb anybody; it is ill-founded, and indeed self-contradictory. But that is another matter.

The plague administration that has commended itself to the Indian Press—"the isolation-at-home and trust-in-people system," as the "Indu-Prakash" terms it—is, we are interested to observe, spoken of by Mr. Rees as "at once practicable, acceptable, and, so far as we know, far more efficacious than compulsory segregation and other restrictions and interferences which are as dangerous as they have been proved to be futile and exasperating." Mr. Rees sums up opinion on the question of an Imperial famine grant in the words, "We want no more than financial justice, and we can pay our way." The summary is quite fair. We have strongly pressed for a grant in these columns, not in essential disagreement with the Indian Press, but in view of the immediate necessities and the indefinite postponement of "financial justice." Mr. Rees says that "the Budget shows that, with a loan, they can pay" their way. Yes, "with a loan." And it is "the Budget" that "shows" it. All this indicates how far India is from a clear, just, and stable system of finance. On the "English and Native question," Mr. Rees might only too readily have found more striking illustrations. He properly remarks that "historians and others do not always distinguish with sufficient clearness between the mutinous sepcys and the Indian villagers, who were by no means universally unfriendly, and very frequently saved the survivors of the Mutiny at the risk of their own lives." He admits that "some exasperation" is not unnatural when a leading Anglo-Indian journal states "that the Hindu lies by preference, and that the deep-seated canker at the heart of Indian life is its hopeless want of honesty, its unexampled mendacity." "Such," he adds, "was not the opinion of Slocman, Lawrence, Outram, Fayerer, and many others of their class, nor indeed is it my own." These are a few samples of a variety of points illustrated in the article. Mr. Rees could not be expected to paint his subject "with the warts"; perhaps the warts might have not been permitted to disfigure the "Nineteenth Century." But one is thankful for so much from, and in, such quarters. The general result is eminently to the credit of the Indian Press.

Mr. A. H. Fraser, the Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces, may well feel proud of the story of his first year's administration as revealed in his first Annual Report. He was appointed on the eve of the famine of 1899-1900 to a charge which had not yet recovered from the famine of 1897. Then the administration of Sir Charles Lyall failed to save the people. Mr. Fraser succeeded. As the "Friend of India" says:—

The son of a missionary who spent his life in the Central Provinces . . . his intense sympathy for the people he had lived amongst was well known. His selection amounted, then, to a declaration that cost what it might, Lord Curzon had resolved that the horrors of the Central Provinces famine of 1896-97 should not be repeated in 1899.  
And this at least was accomplished.

The Uganda Rifles have a battalion of Indians, Punjabi Mahomedans, who enlist for a term of years. Several of the Bombay Regiments since 1895 have also had two companies of Punjabi Mahomedans. Now a few weeks ago orders were given to recruit for the Uganda Rifles, as a relief would soon be needed to supply the place of men whose time had expired. The officers entrusted with this duty were, according to the "Pioneer," given a free hand to visit all the Bombay regiments containing Punjabi Mahomedans, and to select such men as they thought proper. Of course they selected the best, careless of the indignation of the regimental officers. But these were not the only people injured. India found some most efficient men taken from her army, men whose training she had paid for, but of whose services when

trained she was thus deprived. In fact, India has to pay for the training of troops for Uganda.

That Coopers Hill College needed reform is admitted by the "Friend of India." The proportion of one teacher to four students is alone enough to prove it. Yet this is scarcely a justification for the action of the Secretary of State. After neglecting reform for five years he sprung a curt notice of dismissal upon half the Professors without a word of warning. Yet the recommendation of Sir Charles Bernard that at the next vacancy a separate President should not be appointed, a plan which would have saved £1,000 a year, was ignored. The India Office should have set to work five years ago to introduce savings which would have gradually increased.

Instead, the Secretary of State, after neglecting his duty for five years, suddenly wakes up to the conviction that something must be done; acts hurriedly and harshly, and then, to console the dismissed Professors for his management, gives them liberal compassionate allowances at the expense of the Indian taxpayer.

So the Indians have to pay, first for an over-staffed college from which they were themselves almost excluded, and then for its hasty reformation.

The "Tribune" warns its readers that if Indians are to have their due share in the government of their country, it will be necessary for them to show their fitness not only by passing examinations but by developing other characteristics, including a readiness to make sacrifices for their country. The Moguls could promote Hindus to high office, but the two races were much nearer to each other than are the English and Indians to-day—nearer socially, intellectually and morally, with this additional bond of union that both looked upon India as their mother country and their home. By striving and not by praying is the condition of a people to be raised. It is in the struggle for self-improvement that the greatness of a nation comes out.

Miss Hester White's "Mountains of Necessity" (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons) opens rather crudely, and is somewhat restricted in scope, but it eventually presents a vivid picture of certain Anglo-Indian types and a certain sphere of Anglo-Indian life. The characterisation is distinctive and firm; Miss White knows her ground; and with experience of composition and construction she may one day produce a much stronger work. The story turns on the "convenient" marriage of a tolerably firm-minded lady, rather self-centred (though anything but selfish) by hard circumstances, with an experienced Major—cantonment magistrate at Gurm-pore—on the shady side of forty, who is supposed to be dying, and who cares nothing for her personally, but simply wants somebody to get the benefit of his grudging subscriptions to the officers' families pension fund. Of course, he does not die, thanks partly to the nursing of the lady, but essentially to the exigencies of the story. The interest lies in the working out of the loveless relation. The incidental glimpses of Indian life are true to fact, and often effectively presented. The novel will while away a lingering hour, though it will bear no comparison in point of variety and workmanship with Mr. Sydney C. Grier's "The Warden of the Marches," which we referred to recently—a work that ranks with the best Indian novels we have come across since the late Mr. Alexander Allardyce's "The City of Sunshine."

Remittances on India for 60 lakhs were on Wednesday offered for tender by the India Council, and applications amounting to Rs. 4,58,70,000 were received at prices ranging from 1s. 3d. and 29-32nds to 1s. 4d. The following amounts in bills were allotted:—Rs. 16,27,000 on Calcutta at an average rate of 1s. 3.938d., Rs. 41,40,000 on Bombay at an average of 1s. 3.956d., and Rs. 2,33,000 on Madras at an average of 1s. 3.937d. Tenders at 1s. 3d. and 15-16ths received about 9 per cent. Last week remittances for Rs. 67,27,659 were sold for £446,984, making the total sold from April 1 to Tuesday night Rs. 1,91,92,657, realizing £1,273,216. Next week 60 lakhs will again be offered.



## THE ANGLO-INDIAN DESPOTISM.

MR. LEONARD COURTNEY, in his admirable volume on "The Working Constitution of the United Kingdom and its Outgrowths" from which we cited some passages a fortnight ago, indicates in outline how shadowy is the control of Parliament over the administration of India. It may be worth while to look somewhat more closely into the matter, as we doubt whether the irresponsibility of the India Office and the Government of India is clearly understood, at all events by the public at home. "It has," Mr. Courtney says, "been part of the overruling mind which has shaped the organisation of Indian government to make it not too responsive to the varying temper of the House of Commons." He proceeds to point out that no part of the expense involved in the government of India comes before the House of Commons in Committee of Supply. True, the Indian accounts are laid before Parliament two years after date. But no motion regarding them is necessary, and only the most formal motion is in fact proposed. "If," Mr. Courtney adds, "the salary of the Indian Secretary were submitted, like that of the Colonial Secretary, to a vote, the opportunity for a real debate would be given which, experience suggests, would be used rather than abused." The refusal to adopt this course betrays, he suggests, "too great a jealousy of the House of Commons." It is interesting to find Mr. Courtney attributing the existing arrangement to that cause. Two opposite explanations have at various times been put forward, but there can be little doubt that Mr. Courtney's view is accurate. The question at issue was reviewed, concisely enough, in the debate which took place in the House of Commons last February upon the Report of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure. The Commission had unanimously recommended, among other things, that the British Exchequer should contribute towards the cost of the India Office an annual sum of £50,000, which is roughly the equivalent of what the British Exchequer pays every year for the Colonial Office. The reason assigned for this recommendation in the Majority Report of the Commission was "in order that there may be no ground for allegation that India is treated less favourably than other parts of her Majesty's Empire." The Minority Report—signed by Sir William Wedderburn, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, and Mr. W. S. Caine—expressly recommended (para. 35) that "in order to maintain the controlling authority of the House of Commons over Indian expenditure the salary of the Secretary of State for India should be placed upon the British Estimates." But the Majority Report abstained from any such definite proposal. It stated (para. 234) that the contribution "may be made the subject either of a charge on the Consolidated Fund, or of an annual vote in aid of the home charges of the establishment of the Secretary of State. A choice between the two methods of procedure involves a question of policy." The theory was that the Royal Commission had nothing to do with questions of policy—a theory which, however, frequently broke down. But it would at least have been quite in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission if Lord George Hamilton's salary, among other charges, had been placed upon the British Estimates.

The recommendation was ignored for a reason which must remain a matter of inference. When the India Office came to discuss with the Treasury the various grants-in-aid suggested by the Royal Commission, it dealt merely with the total amount, redistributing it under new heads, and ignoring—one might almost say concealing—the proposed contribution to the annual cost of the India Office. The reason assigned by the India Office, in the official correspondence, for this redistribution was as follows:—"It appears to Lord George Hamilton that this opportunity might with advantage be taken to put an end to certain minor payments that are now made by India, and thus to simplify the accounts between the two Governments." But when, in the subsequent discussion in the House of Commons, Lord George Hamilton had to explain why he and his colleagues had refrained from placing upon the Estimates a vote for the India Office, nothing was said of the simplification of accounts. Instead he dwelt upon the "appalling" in-

crease of national expenditure and painted a lurid picture of the disadvantages which might accrue to India if British taxpayers paid his salary. Here are his words:—

If that was the case with expenditure for which the House was responsible, what would be the position of the unfortunate Indian Secretary, who had under him an enormous "personnel," if a sum representing his salary was placed on the Estimates? He would have every conceivable motion made from different parts of the House for increases in the salaries of the numerous civil and military servants of the Indian Government.

A Conservative member promptly interjected that such motions would not be in order. But that did not disconcert Lord George Hamilton. "The hon. member," he retorted, "was well aware that there were many methods by which pressure could be put on a Minister." The afterthought was singularly feeble, because such pressure can obviously be employed under the existing system. But let that pass. Lord George Hamilton's reason for keeping his salary off the Estimates was that he feared an increase of Indian expenditure. Very different, however, was the reason assigned by Sir Henry Fowler, who spoke next in the debate, and who put the matter frankly on what Mr. Courtney describes as jealousy of the House of Commons.

The Government of India (Sir Henry Fowler said) was a very difficult and complex piece of administrative and legislative machinery. It was devised by great men fifty years ago. Under it India had been well and wisely governed, as he thought, during the last half century, and if the House of Commons was going to introduce new principles and ideas, and to deal with Indian expenditure as it dealt with English expenditure, it would have imposed on itself a duty which it would not be able to discharge. . . . Above all they would have taken the first step towards making Indian questions details of administration—the subject of party conflict in this House.

"Too great a jealousy of the House of Commons," says Mr. Courtney. Sir Henry Fowler's argument may be paralleled by the remarks of the quasi-official "Pioneer" in 1897, when public meetings at home were passing resolutions in favour of a national grant towards the cost of the war beyond the North-West frontier. Here is the illuminating passage:—

The mischief of Parliamentary interference with Indian affairs has been conspicuous and serious in the past; but it would be exaggerated a hundred-fold if the British workman came to think that as he was paying for the Indian concern he had an indefeasible right to control its working.

If, then, it be asked why, in spite of the Royal Commission, the salary of the Indian Secretary is not placed upon the British Estimates, there are two answers. Lord George Hamilton says: "Because we fear an increase of expenditure for India." Sir Henry Fowler says: "Because we distrust the House of Commons."

There need not probably be much dispute as to which is the more serious reason. But Sir Henry Fowler's remark about "party conflict" deserves notice. His fear is that, if the present arrangement were changed, the Opposition would oppose in Indian questions as it opposes now in other questions. That Indian questions are already in a peculiar sense party questions cannot be denied. For the Secretary of State is a member of the Cabinet which, in order to exist, must have the confidence of the Parliamentary majority. When, therefore, an Indian question is discussed the Secretary of State is able to secure a majority, not on the merits, but by means of the party machinery. To defeat him is to defeat the Government of which he is a member. It follows that there can be in the House of Commons no censure of any act of Indian administration or legislation except in the form of a vote of censure upon the Government of the day. This is true even of the debate on what is called the Indian Budget. On the motion submitted to the House with reference to the accounts no contentious division is possible, because the motion merely says that the totals are as stated. Nor is this motion necessary. The Act for the Better Government of India (Section 53) provides that the accounts shall be presented to Parliament. But no resolution is required, and, as Lord George Hamilton truly said last February, "it is not in the least necessary by law or otherwise for the Secretary of State to make his annual statement." Amendments may be moved in the debate on the Address, or on the motion to go into Committee, or there may be motions for the adjournment of the House. But success in any of these cases involves a defeat of the Government, and therefore the motion is resisted by the whole strength and machinery of the Par-



liamentary majority, not necessarily by any means because the majority approve of the piece of Anglo-Indian policy under discussion, but because they do not wish a vote of "no confidence" in their Ministry to be carried. It is well to realise these facts. Whether we regret it or approve it, we must recognise that the whole machinery for the government of India is an "imperium in imperio"—an island of uncontrolled despotism set in a sea of popular institutions. And, indeed, the matter would not be changed essentially if the proposal to place the salary of the Secretary of State upon the British Estimates were carried out. Motions for reduction of salary would still, if successful, be votes of censure, and would be resisted accordingly. The advantages of the change would be incidental. There would be, as Mr. Courtney puts it, an opportunity for a "real debate." It would not be relegated to the last hours of the Session, and the procedure would be of the kind with which members of the House of Commons are familiar. But the Secretary of State and the vast congeries of interests behind him would still be secured by the party "Whips" against effective control or censure from Parliament. Let us face the facts, however unwelcome. The Government of India is a strong man armed, an irresponsible despot, observing in theory certain forms and ceremonies suggestive of responsibility while enjoying in practice the substance of uncontrolled power.

#### OUR LONDON LETTER.

WESTMINSTER, Thursday.

Party leaders on both sides seem at present to be seized with a desire to demonstrate the failure of party government. The Unionists are in, and they are evidently longing to be out; while the Liberals, having been out for nearly six years, appear to be in mortal dread lest by some unexpected turn of the wheel they should find themselves in. A perplexing situation is complicated by the fact that party warfare goes on very much as usual, the Tories denouncing the pretensions of the Liberals while the latter exhaust the resources of invective in criticising the performances of the Government. If the controversy is all a sham it has an astonishing "vraisemblance." But every now and again some voice rises above the din of battle, exhorting the political world to realise that its heroes are pasteboard soldiers, engaged in a war of marionettes. The singular thing is that this cry should generally be raised by the firebrand from whom his side have a right to expect a call to arms.

Diminishing majorities testify to the failing courage, or the growing indifference, or the internecine jealousies of the Ministerialists. Not for the first time in the history of his association with his present colleagues, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach finds himself ostentatiously cold-shouldered by every other member of the Government. Those gentlemen sought to punish him for his exposures of their extravagance by allowing the earlier majorities on the Budget to run down to a third of the normal Ministerial strength. The inevitable result was promptly forthcoming in a relaxation of party discipline, manifested in a still further shrinkage of the majority on questions where an overwhelming display of superior force would have been welcome. The rank and file being indifferent absent themselves; Ministers, being divided refuse to stand shoulder to shoulder; and meanwhile the Opposition locks on, praying in one breath for success and in the next that that particular prayer may not be granted.

Dissatisfaction on the Ministerial side came to a head in somewhat curious fashion, in the debate on the salaries of the law officers. A few years ago those fortunate personages received fixed salaries, amounting in the case of the Attorney-General to £10,000, and in that of the Solicitor-General to £9,000. This was an example of Mr. Gladstone's economy. Apparently, the Conservatives thought it savoured of cheeseparing. At all events, when they came in they resolved to treat the salary in each case as a mere retainer, and to supplement it with fees for work done. Last year under this arrangement the Attorney-General netted nearly £20,000, and the Solicitor-General about £11,000. No serious defence of the practice was offered. Mr. Balfour trifled with the theme and embroidered it with jests. His followers generally were silent,

although Mr. Gibson Bowles contrived to utter at least one cutting gibe in the remark that after all nobody could complain if Sir Robert Finlay and Sir Edward Carson instead of accepting requital for their services, like other Ministers, partly in money and partly in honour, preferred to take it all in money. What the House of Commons thought of the arrangement was shown by the fact that the Ministerial majority fell to thirty-three.

According to Mr. Herbert Gladstone, who speaks with the authority of chief Liberal Whip, the Government, feeble as it is, embodies the only possible administration on which the country can depend. The Liberals even if they would simply cannot offer themselves as an alternative Government. They are hopelessly outnumbered in Parliament, not united among themselves, and, if the truth were known, too seriously infected with the lethargy of the hour to contemplate with enthusiasm the task of cleansing the Augean stables which would form part of their inheritance. Nevertheless, the Liberal party, being human, does not like to be reminded of those patent facts, least of all when the reminder comes from one of its own leaders. Mr. Gladstone, accordingly, has been severely criticised for his candour, and has found it expedient to issue an explanation, the charm of which proves to be that it shows the culprit to have meant exactly what he said. This is so rare a thing in politics that in gratitude for it the fault has already been pardoned.

Everyone knows, of course, that there is an alternative to the present Government, but the choice in the meantime lies between Hatfield and Highbury, unless, indeed, the Duke of Devonshire should at length succeed in the attempt which he first made more than a score of years ago to form a Whig administration. Before long, politicians will probably find themselves confronted with a crisis involving one or other or all of those considerations. The Cecil influence is waning. Lord Salisbury may almost be regarded as a valetudinarian, while Mr. Balfour displays as complete an indifference to his Parliamentary duties as if he had been pierced by one of Cupid's darts. The present state of things cannot last. Mr. Chamberlain is distrusted, and his political friends say that he is impossible. But at all events he is a vital force, and by mere force of circumstances, by a law as irresistible as that of gravitation, he is almost bound to reach the goal of his ambition unless either the Whigs or the Radicals make up their minds to sacrifice personal comfort on the altar of patriotism.

A paragraph published in last week's INDIA, to the effect that in the event of Lord Curzon's resignation of the Viceroyalty his successor might be found in Sir Alfred Milner, has naturally attracted a good deal of attention. Generally speaking, opinion is altogether favourable to the arrangement which was then foreshadowed. Lord Curzon, it is felt, would be the right man in the right place on the Treasury Bench of the House of Commons. He would greatly strengthen the Conservative element in that quarter, and in the not improbable event of Mr. Balfour's withdrawal to the House of Lords would step as by right of inheritance into that statesman's shoes as leader. Equally appropriate would be the transference of Sir Alfred Milner from South Africa to India, where, taught by bitter experience, he would doubtless abjure the principles of the Forward school and apply himself to redeem his reputation by reverting to the sound canons of statesmanship which gained him his laurels in Egypt.

If Sir Alfred Milner were Viceroy of India at present one of his first actions would probably be to veto the proposal of the Government to send the Boer prisoners to Ahmednagar. It would be interesting to know what Lord Curzon thinks of this singular experiment. One can readily imagine what kind of impression the Boers will derive from their experience of English rule, as it will be exemplified to them here, over a subject race. Ministers, of course, resent every whisper of an objection to the scheme as a species of blasphemy. To quarrel with the Equator would indeed be a heinous offence if the Equator were girdled by the Union Jack. In the same way any reflection on the climate of any part of British India seems to be regarded as a prelude to matricide. The British flag flies under many skies, but wherever it flies, say our stay-at-home Britons, the climate must be good enough for anybody. To deny that proposition is to write oneself down a pro-Boer.



Chief among the new theatrical enterprises of the week is the production at the Savoy Theatre of the late Sir Armand Sullivan's last opera, "The Emerald Isle." The death of the composer interrupted his task, and many of the numbers are orchestrated by Mr. Edward German, who is also responsible for a portion of the vocal score. It would be difficult, however, to say where Sullivan left off, and German began. The rotund completeness of the whole work is one of its best qualities. If the libretto were only half as good as the music the opera would be almost worthy of the praises that have been showered upon it by good-natured critics. But Captain Basil Hood, with all his brilliancy as a punster, is certainly not a W. S. Gilbert. The best that can be said of him is that he does not stand in the way of the ballet-master, the vocalists, or the scene-painter, and that in a modest way, he actually supplements the efforts of those so-called supernumeraries, and is entitled to his own share in the credit for a superb production.

## NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

### LORD CURZON'S HOLIDAY.

#### THE CASE OF MR. PENNELL.

[FROM AN INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

BOMBAY, April 13.

The Viceroy is still in the Shikar Camp, having already proved himself a fair Nimrod by shooting eight tigers in the dreadful jungles of Nepal. He has been taking a long holiday. But it is permissible to ask whether it is a holiday, and nothing but a holiday. Is there anything behind this innocent game of shooting wild tigers? They say the politics of Nepal are troublesome. Recent Chinese events and the welcome which a party of Russians met with at the hands of the Llama, who had hitherto been proclaimed to be impenetrable to foreign barbarians, are said to have alarmed the Indian Foreign Office. Is the Viceroy amusing himself with his gun while his Foreign Office is carrying on high affairs of State with the border King of Nepal? We may see the outcome of this holiday when the Viceregal Camp is once more pitched on the breezy heights of Simla. The Viceroy is a statesman of great activity. One cannot say what prodigies he may achieve in his cool retreat for the Kingdom of Nepal. But let me not be Cassandra. Who ever thinks of incorporating that kingdom, as the Punjab was incorporated in the British Empire fifty-two years ago? Only visionaries or people suffering from political dyspepsia think of such an event.

Next, there is the Pennell affair. It is still engaging the vigorous attention of the Bengal Press, which has put many an ugly question in criminal law to the authorities. But these are silent. Their oracles are mute. Meanwhile "An Indian Civilian" has written a long letter to the "Times of India," in which he very ably puts the crux of the whole affair. Without meandering into the intricacies of the law, he clearly brings to the surface the principal facts which have imparted extraordinary interest to the case. Reading between the lines, one gathers that in the main he agrees with Mr. Pennell as to the abuse that has for years crept into the administration of criminal justice in this country. There is a note of sympathy which is indeed refreshing and which, moreover, informs us that in the serried ranks of the "Johukum" civil servants of the day, there are still to be found a few who have not only the courage of their convictions, but are level headed and unimpassioned enough to take a calm and judicial survey of the entire system and point out where lie the abuses that need reform. Anyhow, it is certain that as the Pennell affair develops, as it must, there will be much searching of heart. That the sympathy of India is with the unfortunate judge, who is now being made the victim of a kind of official persecution, goes without saying. Whether later on means will be taken to stifle that just sympathy remains to be seen. Neither the hushing up of the case nor the whitewashing of the highest officials will tend to remove the stigma. The task before the Imperial Government is of no ordinary nature. But it is to be hoped that in the present instance Lord Curzon will deal out punish-

ment to all concerned with an even hand. The action of his Government in the Chupra case has in no way exalted its character. The way in which some of those who were mixed up in the affair were promoted some time after the "milk-and-water" condemnation of their conduct has created a feeling of great distrust. That feeling would be immensely aggravated should it happen that the Viceroy again fails to rise to the occasion. He should faithfully practise what he preached in the Bombay Town Hall in November last—namely, that the Viceroy in India is bound to hold the scales of justice even between contending parties. Be the parties before him who they may, he must be blind to them. He has only to examine into the merits of the case and pass his impartial verdict on the actors therein. It will be in the Viceroy's final judgment that the country will try to discover what is the real conscience of the British Indian administration.

Two sturdy experts continue to analyse the land revenue policy of the Government. The Hon. Mr. B. K. Bose discourses on the iniquities and burdens of the revenue survey settlements in the Central Provinces, and Mr. "J" on those of Bombay, in the columns of the "Times of India," which, since the days of the last famine, has been rendering great public service to the country by keeping its columns open to writers on both sides. The recent letters of "J," so full of authentic data, and so closely reasoned out, deserve special mention.

## INDIA AND THE NATIONAL LIBERAL FEDERATION.

The twenty-third annual report of the National Liberal Federation which is to be presented at a meeting of the Council at Bradford, on May 14, contains more than one reference to India.

The introductory paragraph concludes as follows:—

"The death, suffering, and distress which famine and disease have produced in India are again to be deplored, and the closest examination ought to be made to see if any readjustment of the financial system of India could be devised which might mitigate the recurrence of these national disasters."

The paragraph upon "the Government's Home Record" refers to India in its review of the Session of 1900:—

"It need hardly be said that the Session did not pass without another dose—this time to the Irish landowners. The little Rent-charge (Ireland) Act ripped open the settlement arrived at in 1872, provided for the future that the rent-charge in Ireland should vary as the price of rent instead of as the price of corn, and, as the result, took from the Irish Church Fund a sum estimated at £50,000 a year. This last of the series of the doles was as indefensible as any which preceded it. By contrast with the whole policy of which it was only the latest example it should be noted that the Government absolutely declined to make an Imperial Grant in aid of the Indian famine. The line taken up by the Government in resisting this demand was one of severe correctness, and Ministers with one consent were found giving little homilies on the alarming growth of national expenditure. No one disputes that this growth is worth the gravest public consideration, but what is lamentable and disgraceful is that it should be remembered by Tory Ministers when they are asked to come to the rescue of famine-stricken India and conveniently forgotten when they are invited to dip their hands into the taxpayer's money in order to provide doles for their friends."

Incorporated in the annual report is a summary of the proceedings of the General Committee at Rugby on February 27. This summary includes the Indian resolution (already reported in INDIA) which was adopted on the motion of Mr. Romesh Dutt, seconded by Miss A. Garland. Unhappily the resolution is not to be found among those which are to be submitted to the Council at Bradford.

## RETURN OF MR. PENNELL'S MEMORIAL.

We printed in our last issue the text of the Memorial addressed by Mr. Pennell to the Secretary of State. It appears from the Indian journals to hand by the last mail that the following letter has been addressed to Mr. Pennell by the Bengal Government:—

From C. E. Buckland, Esq., C.I.E.,

Officiating Chief Secretary to the Government of Bengal.

To A. P. Pennell, Esq., I.C.S.,

Calcutta, April 2, 1901.

Sir,—I am directed to return herewith your Memorial No. 3 on your suspension, dated March 23, 1901, addressed to the



Secretary of State for India in Council, and to request your attention to the enclosed copy of rules in force about the submission of memorials addressed to the Right Hon. the Secretary of State for India.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor regrets that he is unable to forward your Memorial until the disrespectful and improper language contained in paragraphs 2, 3, 6, and 11 is omitted.

I am particularly to refer to the following expressions, namely:—

Paragraph 2.—“To expose in my judgment the attempt made by Sir John Woodburn, Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, and by Lord Curzon of Kedleston, Governor-General of India, to burke the case; and to denounce the sycophancy of the higher judiciary.”

Paragraph 3.—“An illegality of so flagrant a nature as to justify his being disbarred.”

Paragraph 6.—“A daring attempt to possess himself of the record extra-judicially; that his action was both illegal and improper. He wanted to get hold of the record surreptitiously, and he did not want his getting hold of it surreptitiously to be known.”

Paragraph 11.—“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.”

Should you desire to submit a revised Memorial addressed to the Right Hon. the Secretary of State for India, I am to request your attention to rules 2 and 8 of the enclosed notification.—I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

C. K. BUCKLAND,

Officiating Chief Secretary, Bengal Government.

### MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI ON THE CAUSE AND CURE OF FAMINE.

Under the heading “The Grand Old Man of India at the Free Christian Church” the “Croydon Chronicle” of Saturday last (April 27) prints the following report:—

Through the kindness of the Rev. John Page Hopps, Pastor of the Free Church, Croydon, who lent his pulpit last Sunday evening to the Hon. Dadabhai Naoroji, rightly called the Grand Old Man of India, the late Member for Central Finsbury addressed an appreciative audience on the tragic subject of “The Indian Famine, its Cause and Cure.”

Mr. Naoroji, after expressing his gratitude for being invited to speak, and alluding to the sanctity of the place, said:—“You have lately heard the result of the Census in India, and what an awful result it is. When you are told that something like 30 millions of people that ought to have been in India are not there, does it not disclose an awful state of things, sufficiently alarming to make one think and ponder over it? Our close connexion, the many ties that bind us, must make you ask the question: Why is it that after 150 years of British rule, carried on by an administration whose efficiency has been lauded up to the skies, but whose expensiveness has been grinding down the people to the dust, the result of that British rule should be such as we see at the beginning of the twentieth century? The cause is not far to seek. We believed that under a nation which was renowned for its justice, honour and philanthropy, we would be better off than was possible under an Asiatic despotism. But our hopes had been rudely dispelled. Unfortunately from the very earliest times the action of Britain in India had been based upon greed. I would not dwell longer on this part of the subject at present, as it would not redound to the credit of the British name. I would first rather say a few words on some of the great benefits that the British rule has conferred on us.

Fortunately, or unfortunately, all the benefit that we have derived from the British connexion is from a study of the British character. The institutions which you have taken with you and introduced into our country would have borne golden fruits, and we should have reaped all the benefit as you have been doing here, but to our misfortune we have been denied every bit of this good result. The system of government that has been adopted in that country is the root of all our misfortune and makes completely nugatory your best efforts to further some of our highest welfare. Among the benefits of the British rule, if there is one thing more than another for which Indians are grateful, it is the education you have been giving them. It has enabled me to come here and to make known to you what my countrymen want me to tell you. It has laid the foundation of that structure which will one day be known to the world as united India. It has wiped of the first dividing line that kept Indians apart from one another. Formerly there was not a common language, no common vehicle of thought. The Bombay man did not understand a Bengal man, and a Punjabee was as unintelligible to a Madrasse as if he belonged to another country. But now English was the common language. All Indians now understand one another and freely interchange their ideas and views as to whether their common country has one hope, one fear, one aim, one future.

You have, I dare say, heard of the Indian National Congress. At this Congress Indians from one end of the country to the other meet together to discuss their political condition, to communicate with each other and become as it were a united na-

tion. The Indian National Congress is the recognised exponent of educated India. If India had been heterogeneous before the Congress is the proof that it is advancing rapidly towards homogeneity. It was the education that you are giving us that first demolished the dividing line that separated us from one another and is now welding us together into a nation. The Indians now stand up to tell you where your rule has been defective. It is our duty to tell you so, for the welfare of us both depends upon a clearer and truer knowledge of that fact.

The Civil Service of India which constitutes the Civil portion of the administrative machinery, and to which belong men of eminent talents and character, is anything but a blessing to us. The very abilities of these men, as I will show you later on, are in the way of the progress and prosperity of the people. It is a most melancholy fact that after 150 years of connexion, after being governed by men of such ability and integrity, the evil system of government that has been imposed on us should nullify your best efforts for our well being and bring your great possession to bankruptcy and ruin.

I may warn you that I am not saying anything about the Native States. I only want to speak about British India, namely, that part of India which is under your direct control. During the middle of the eighteenth century when the English had the revenue administration under the Native rulers of the day, from the very commencement of the connexion between England and India the system of Government adopted had been one of greed and injustice. Those who went there went with the sole object of making fortunes, and so long as they accomplished that they cared little what occurred to the people. The hard words with which I have characterised the early British rule are not mine. They were the words of the honourable Englishmen and Anglo-Indians who, for years, had been crying in the wilderness against the system under which India was ruled. In the last century the Court of Directors themselves and the Governor-General of the day wrote dispatches in which they described acts of the grossest corruption and oppression, and abominations of every kind which were inflicted upon the poor Indian. Such cruelty towards the governed, and such corruption on the part of the Governor, as recorded in one of their minutes of those days, have been unknown in any country or at any age.

These enormities gradually led to a careful consideration of the question of the policy which should guide the British in India. And it was then also that draining away of the wealth of India into England began, which has not only not ceased, but has increased with increasing years, wiping off millions at a time, with an ever-increasing frequency. The drought was not the real cause of the famine in these days, for if the people had no food in one place and they had money, they could buy what they wanted from elsewhere. This question of famines was for that reason becoming one of the burning questions of India and England, and it would grow one day into the biggest domestic question of the time, and would be the paramount question of the great British Empire. With India England must stand or fall. I would give you my authority for the statement. It was Lord Curzon—the nobleman who was now ruling India as Viceroy for England—Lord Curzon had said: “If we lose our Colonies it does not matter, but if we lose India the sun of the British Empire will be for ever set.” No truer words were ever uttered. Without India England would be a third or fourth rate power, with this gradual deterioration of the country, now almost bordering on desolation. This was noticed very soon after the British took India. There was a survey made of the country for nine years, from 1807 to 1816. The reports lay buried in the archives of the India House for a long time till they were unearthed by Mr. Montgomery Martin, who, in the course of a review of the reports, says, “It is impossible to avoid remarking two facts as peculiarly striking, first, the richness of the country surveyed; and second, the poverty of its inhabitants.” Against this continuous drain which has now all but deprived India of its life-blood he raised his warning voice in the early years of the last century. He said: “The annual drain of three millions on British India has amounted in 30 years at 12 per cent. (the usual Indian rate) compound interest to the enormous sum of 723 millions. So constant and accumulating a drain even in England would soon impoverish her. How severe then must be its effect on India, where the wages of a labourer are from twopence to threepence a day!”

The drain which at the beginning of the century was three millions now amounts to over 90 millions a year. Mahmood Ghazni, who invaded and plundered India 18 times, as historians say, could not make his whole booty so heavy as you take away in a single year; and, what is more, the wound on India inflicted by him came to an end after the 18th stroke, while your strokes and the bleeding from them never end. Whether we live or die, 30 millions' worth of produce must be annually carried away from this country with the regularity of the seasons. Heavy as the fine was which Germany inflicted upon France in the last Franco-German war, once the money counted down France was set at liberty to recoup herself. But in our case the bleeding never ceases. How was India treated even in the last famine? Eighty-five millions of people were affected by the famine directly, and many more were indirectly affected by it. Yet they were being called upon to find two hundred millions of rupees yearly to pay the salaries, pensions, etc., of the European officials, military or civil, before they could have for their own enjoyment a single farthing of their own produce. And if they only took the trouble to make the calculation it would be discovered that India had had to pay thousands of millions for this purpose already. Was it to be wondered at then that India was falling and that the famines



were becoming worse each time they recurred? The fact was that rowdys the slightest touch of drought necessarily caused a famine, because the resources of the country had been so seriously exhausted. It was only when a famine took place that any interest was excited in this country in India. As a matter of fact there was a chronic state of famine in India of which the people of this country knew nothing. And even in years of average prosperity and average crops scores of millions of Indians had to live on starvation diet, and did not know what it was to have a full meal from year's end to year's end. It was only when a crisis like the present one was visited on this Government was forced to intervene, and to try to save the lives of the dying people by taxing these very people. The condition of India was an impoverished condition of the worst possible character, and one could hardly realise the poverty and misery in which scores of millions of Indians lived. But if England were placed under a similar system of government, would its condition be any better? No! Even England, wealthy as she is, could not long stand the crushing tribute of a foreign yoke which, because we are a conquered nation, we are forced to pay. Suppose the French took this country, they would take the higher posts, both civil and military, with their own people, they would bring French capital to develop our industries, carried away with them all the profit of their investments, leaving to the natives of this country nothing more than the wages given to mere manual labourers; suppose that, in addition to that, you had to pay a tribute (in deed though not in name) of 30 millions sterling every year to France; why, even you, wealthy as you are, would be soon reduced to the wretchedness of our want and woe, to be periodically decimated by plague and famine and disease as we are. Now put yourselves in our place and judge whether we are British subjects or British helots. Our misfortune is that our Anglo-Indian rulers do not understand our position. Even Lord Curzon, our Viceroy, said the other day, in the course of his speech at the Kolar goldfields, that we ought to be very grateful to the British people for developing these mining industries. But these millions of the Kolar goldfields belong to the British capitalist, who is simply exploiting our land and wealth, our share being that of the heaver of wood and drawer of water.

How was the Indian Empire obtained by you? It has been generally said that you have won it by the sword, and that you will keep it by the sword. You have not won the Indian Empire by the sword. During these hundred and fifty years you have carried out wars by which this great Empire has been built up it has cost hundreds of millions of money. Have you paid a single farthing of it? You have made the Indians pay every farthing. You have formed this great British Empire at our expense, and you hear what reward we have received from you. The European army in India at any time was comparatively insignificant. In the time of the Indian Mutiny you had only forty thousand troops there. It was the two hundred thousand Indian troops that shed their blood and fought your battles and that gave you this magnificent Empire. It is at India's cost and blood that this Empire has been formed and maintained up to the present day. It is in consequence of the tremendous cost of these wars and because of the millions on millions you draw from us year by year that India is so completely exhausted and bled. It is no wonder that the time has come when India is bleeding to death. You have brought India to this condition by the constant drain upon the wealth of that country. I ask anyone of you whether it is possible for any nation on the face of the earth to live under these conditions.

Do not believe me as gospel. Study for yourself; study whether what I have stated is right, and, then, whether the result is logical. And the result, as revealed by the last census, is that thirty millions of human beings are not where they ought to have been. But in spite of such a gloomy outlook I do not despair. I believe in the inherent notions of justice and humanity of the British people. It is that faith which has hitherto sustained me in my life-long work. In the name of justice and humanity then, I ask you why we to-day, instead of being prosperous as you are, are the poorest and most miserable people on the surface of the earth. Like India, Australia is a part of the British Empire, and, unlike it, prosperous. Why is it that one part of the Empire should be so prosperous and the other dwindle down and decay? Our lot is worse even than that of the slaves in America, in old days, for they had an interest in keeping them alive, if only they had a money value. But if an Indian died, or if a million died, there was another or there were a million others ready to take his or their places and to be the slaves of the British officials in their turn. Who was responsible for all this? You reply, "What more can we do? We have declared that India shall be governed upon righteous lines." Yes, but your servants have not obeyed your instructions, and theirs was the responsibility, and upon their heads was the blood of the millions who were starving year by year.

The principle and policy that you laid down for the government of India is contained in the Act of 1833, which we reckon as our Magna Charta. There is one clause in it which admits us to full equality with you in the government of our country. Referring to this clause, one of the men who were responsible for passing this Act, Lord Macaulay, said: "I allude to that wise, that beneficent, that noble clause which enacts that no Native of our Indian Empire shall by reason of his colour, his descent, or his religion, be incapable of holding office." This generous promise which held out hopes of equal employment to all, which did away with distinctions of creed and colour, has remained to this day a dead letter. This promise was repeated over and over

again. Nothing could be plainer, nothing more solemn, than the Queen's Proclamation of 1858, when the Crown took the country from the hands of the East India Company, and from which Proclamation I will read to you only three clauses:—

"We hold ourselves bound to the Natives of our Indian territories by the same obligations of duty which bind us to all our other subjects, and those obligations, by the blessing of Almighty God, we shall faithfully and conscientiously fulfil."

"And it is our further will that, so far as may be, our subjects, of whatever race or creed, be freely and impartially admitted to offices in our service, the duties of which they may be qualified by their education, ability, and integrity, duly to discharge."

"In their prosperity will be our strength, in their contentment our security, and in their gratitude our best reward. And may the God of all power grant to us, and to those in authority under us, strength to carry out these our wishes for the good of our people."

But all these promises and pledges have remained a dead letter to this day. The violation of the promise of the Act of 1833 is the first step, the keeping to this day inoperative the pledges contained in the Proclamation of 1858 is the second step, towards unrighteousness. Indians are kept out from their share of the administration of their own affairs just as much to-day as before the passing of that Act. Some of the most eminent statesmen here have drawn your attention to your wrong doing. Mr. Bright pointed out the gross and rank injustice of not holding simultaneous examinations both in India and England; and in this connexion the late Lord Derby, when Lord Stanley, once asked, in the House of Commons, how they would like to send their children to India for two or three years to qualify themselves for, and pass, examination there for employment here. The highly expensive Military and Civil Service which is foisted on our poor land we can neither afford to keep nor do we need. If the country ever rebelled, the hardly thirty thousand civilians dotted amongst a hostile horde of about three hundred millions would be the first to suffer. The safest policy and the truest statesmanship was voiced in our Sovereign's Proclamation when she said "in their contentment will be our security." While you here lay down in plain and unmistakable language the charter that would raise us and endow us with the power, privilege and freedom of British citizens, your servants in India make that charter a dead letter, deny to us those powers and privileges and freedom which you have empowered them to give to us, and we are made to feel that we are not British subjects, but British helots. Here, under reasonable conditions, almost every man has a vote; there two hundred and fifty millions of us have not one. Our Legislative Council is a farce, worse than a farce. It was generally believed that this Council gave to the Indian people something like what they in England enjoyed in the way of representative government, and that by those means the people of India had some voice in their own government. This was simply a romance. The reality was that the Legislative Council was constituted in such a way as to give to the Government a complete and positive majority. The three or four Indians who had seats upon it might say what they liked, but what the Government of India declared was to become law did invariably become the law of the country. In this Council the majority, instead of being given by the people, was managed and manipulated by the Government itself. But matters were even worse than this. The expenditure of the revenues was one of the most important points in the political condition of any country, but in India there was no such thing as a Legislative Budget. The representative members had no right to propose any resolution or go to any division upon any item concerned in the Budget, which was passed simply and solely according to the despotic will of a despotic Government. The Natives of India had not the slightest voice in the expenditure of the Indian revenues, and the idea that they had was the first delusion on the part of the voters of England of which they can't be disabused too soon.

But this most solemn farce of preaching and proclaiming the most righteous Government for us, and at the same time not restraining your servants from practising what is exactly the contrary, is not confined to our Legislative Council. The right of our own men to take part in the Government of their country as soon as by their character and education they should give evidence of their fitness to do so, has been repeatedly granted by the British public and Parliament, but it has as often been defiantly denied to us by your disobedient servants in India. One of the means by which this has been done, given us by holding examinations for the Indian Civil Service simultaneously in India and in England. But this privilege, though recommended for the last time by a Resolution of the House of Commons so recently as 1893, is yet denied to us. As early as 1860 a Commission made up of five Members of the Council of the Secretary of State was appointed to consider this question of simultaneous examinations, and this is what they said:—

"Practically the Indians are excluded. The law declares them eligible, but the difficulties opposed to a Native leaving India and residing in England for a time are so great, that, as a general rule, it is almost impossible for a Native successfully to compete at the periodical examinations held in England. Were this inequality removed, we should no longer be exposed to the charge of keeping promise to the ear and breaking it to the hope."

I will give only one more opinion of a former Governor-General, the representative of his Sovereign in India. Lord



Lytton, referring to this same question of holding simultaneous examinations, said in a confidential minute:—

"The Act of Parliament is so undefined, and indefinite obligations on the part of the Government of India towards its Native subjects are so obviously dangerous, that no sooner was the Act passed than the Government began to devise means for practically evading the fulfilment of it. Under the terms of the Act, which are studied and laid to heart by that increasing class of educated Natives whose development the Government encourages without being able to satisfy the aspirations of its existing members, every such Native, if once admitted to Government employment in posts previously reserved to the Co-venanted Service, is entitled to expect and claim appointment in the fair course of promotion to the highest post in that Service. We all know that these claims and expectations never can or will be fulfilled. We have had to choose between prohibiting them and cheating them; and we have chosen the least straightforward course. The application to Natives of the competitive examination system as conducted in England, and the recent reduction in the age at which candidates can compete, are all so many deliberate and transparent subterfuges for nullifying the Act, and reducing it to a dead letter. Since I am writing confidentially, I do not hesitate to say that both the Governments of England and India appear to me up to the present moment unable to answer satisfactorily the charge of having taken every means in their power of breaking to the heart the words of promise they had uttered to the ear."

Even on comparatively lower grounds than that of justice and truth you ought to resent and reform the Government of India. You are a commercial people. What you gain by trading with us, if I go into figures, that alone will tell you how poor we are. Australia, with about six millions of people, buys about 25 millions worth of articles of you per year; while we, with a population fifty times over again, hardly manage to buy even thirty millions. You sell to us per head of population only eighteen pence per year; if we were rich enough (and to make us rich or poor entirely rests with you) to buy only one pound per head per year, you could have sold to us alone 300 millions worth of goods, which is your annual trade with the whole of the world. The subject of a Native Prince in India is richer than a British subject and buys more of your goods. You launch into expensive wars in South Africa and elsewhere to create a market, while here in your own Empire you have a market ready on hand, the largest, the most civilised, the most thickly peopled portion of that Empire.

I now must conclude. I hope this cruel fate, the present system of Government which is at the root of all our evil and suffering, should for your sakes, for the sake of justice and humanity, be radically changed. The educated classes at home are throwing in their whole weight on the side of the continuance of our connexion. This connexion is a blessing to us if you would only see that it be made, as you intended your servants to make it, a blessing to us; ponder over it, think what is your duty, and perform that duty.

Rev. Page Hopps, who said that he knew Mr. Naoroji for the last twenty years, thanked him in the name of the congregation, and contrasting in a few words the attitude of the nation towards the disfranchised outlanders in Africa and the disfranchised Indians in their own country, brought the proceedings to a close.

## Imperial Parliament.

Friday, March 22.

### HOUSE OF LORDS.

#### MR. MALABARI AND THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

We give below a full report of the discussion which was summarised in our issue of March 29:—

**LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY:** My Lords, I wish to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India if the Indian Government will relieve the Director of Public Instruction of Bombay from the task of reporting on Native publications in the Government of India, and if the India Office will make some amends to Mr. Malabari for the charge of sedition so unjustifiably cast upon Mr. Malabari in the Director's Official Report of July 24, 1900. What happened was this: In a letter dated March 31, 1899, the Government of India desired the Director of Public Instruction in Bombay to report on Native publications in the Presidency. This was a task and a duty which had been too long neglected by the Indian Government. For many years, commencing before 1848, this duty in respect of Hindustani literature was well performed annually by M. Garcia de Tassy, Professor of Hindustani in the School for Oriental Languages held in the National Library of Paris. After his death this annual Report ceased. There is every reason to believe that the Government of Lord Curzon intended to supply this deficiency, and did not intend that the Director of Public Instruction should hunt for sedition. In any case the Director—I hope the Government will mention his name, because he ought to get the credit or the discredit for what he has done—selected out of all India the one man least amenable to any accusation of disloyalty or disaffection.

Mr. Malabari has long been the editor of the "Indian Spectator." I have read that paper for many more than seventeen years, for it was recommended to me by Sir Louis Mallet, Under-Secretary in the India Office, who left that office from falling health in 1883. He always read that paper, and I be-

lieve his successor had an equally high opinion of it. I was speaking to a member of the Secretary of State's Council the other day, and I stated that Mr. Malabari was the most pro-British editor in India. He replied that if not the most, it was certainly as pro-British as any of the other editors. What did the Director do? Did he seek to form an opinion from the editorial or other articles in the "Indian Spectator" written in English, upon which we could all form an opinion? No, he raked up a Gujarati poem written by Mr. Malabari twenty-five years ago, when he was not yet twenty years of age; he casts doubt upon whether Mr. Malabari wrote it himself on the ground says the Report, that "it is difficult to believe that a Parsee could write such pure Gujarati," he then mistranslated the poem and accuses it of "inciting the people of Gujarat to cast off a yoke which presses on them heavily." I may observe that the Bombay Government has refused to produce the translation upon which the Director of Public Instruction founded his criticism. This incident happened during an interregnum between the departure from Bombay of the late Governor (Lord Sandhurst) and the arrival of his successor, so that, properly speaking, neither one nor the other can be said to be answerable for what was done by the Bombay officials.

The "Times of India" on November 1, 1900, published a translation of the poem by Mr. Kabraji, editor of the "Rast Goftar," a justice of the peace, Fellow of the Bombay University and a Gujarati author and critic of distinction. Needless to say, this translation does not bear out any of the imaginations of the sedition-hunting Director of Public Instruction. When the Director endeavours to find fault with particular words he becomes ridiculous. He translates "pagar" as "official salaries"; the word—a Portuguese word—means "any payment," as Mr. Malabari says of it in Gujarati, and it is the same in its original language. The next blunder of the Director worth noticing when he forces the word "rajamala" to mean "Sovereign" or "Government," whilst it means "office work." What Mr. Malabari says he meant was:—The work of administration is not suited to you; or, you are not capable of administrative work, because of the indolence of the Gujaratis; not that the Sovereign or the Indian Government was not fit for the Gujaratis. "Raj" is an Indian word meaning "Rule" or "State"; and the Director evidently does not know what "amala" means or to what language it belongs. It is Arabic, and means, literally, "workmen"—those who do anything; and in India it is used for the low-paid officials of the courts and Government offices. In order to translate this word as "Sovereign" or "the Government," the Director must have taken the Sanskrit meaning of "amala," which is "spotless," sometimes applied to a woman. But it requires all the conceit of an Indian civil servant to suppose that any outsider would apply the epithet "spotless" to the Indian Government, which, since the time of Warren Hastings, has acquired more spots than the leopard.

Cardinal Richelieu is reported to have said that he could hang any man upon a few lines of his writing. The Government of Bombay could do it with greater ease; it can select any meaning from the various dialects of India. An ex-Bengal civilian wrote to me that "rajamala" means a Royal garland or necklace, and that "pagar" means a mound or a field raised above flood level. So you see how easy it is for a man with an imperfect knowledge of the languages like this Director to go hunting for sedition. The whole of the criticism of the Director is preposterous, and ought to have been withdrawn and apologised for. Mr. Malabari's paper was mentioned as one of the most loyal papers in India by Sir Alexander Mackenzie, Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, during the discussion of the Seditious Acts in the Viceroy's Council in 1897 or 1898. Mr. Malabari's writings were not only the reverse of sedition, but were most moderate in tone. He wrote a great deal against the infant marriage of the Hindus, but without irritating them, though perhaps he rather bored them. To tax such a writer with sedition is enough to goad him or his friends in that direction. Surely the Government will make some "amends" to Mr. Malabari, and express some regret for the trouble he has been put to. The proper attitude of an Englishman who has been put to the proper attitude of a sedition writer ought to be that shown in the story of the Frenchman who asked his English friend how much longer he expected to be able to write as he was doing, without getting shut up in prison; the reply was that he had been trying to find that out for a long time, but that he had not yet reached the limit.

**THE EARL OF HARDWICKE:** My Lords, I am sorry I cannot follow the noble Lord through his interesting disquisition on the past history of the Hindoo languages, but will address myself to the question on the Paper. In the first place I should like to explain, very shortly, the circumstances that led to the occurrence to which this question refers. In 1899, shortly after the arrival of Lord Curzon in India, the Government of India were anxious that the annual review on the Native publications in the different provinces should be conducted in a more interesting manner, and they desired that the Director of Public Instruction should supersede the Government Librarian, who had previously carried out this work, and that he should write these reviews in a style that was both literary and informing. They met with some opposition from the various provinces to this proposal; but it was eventually agreed, at any rate so far as Bombay was concerned—and as the question refers only to Bombay—nevertheless to include in the provinces that the Government Librarian should draw the notice of the Director of Public Instruction to any publications that he thought worthy of being noticed in the annual review. It was also decided that as the Director of Public Instruction could not possibly be expected to be familiar with all the different Indian vernaculars,



it would be advisable for him to pass those publications on to experts, and if possible to Native members of his own Department, who, having studied the books, were to make a short statement to the Director of Public Instruction, and with this material in his hands he was then to endeavour to carry out the wishes of the Indian Government in writing reviews of an interesting and informing character.

In 1900—in the month of July, I think—the annual review appeared, having been prepared in the manner I have sketched out; and in this review there was a criticism of a poem by Mr. Malabari, written in the Gujarati vernacular. Mr. Malabari took exception to the character of this review, which stated that certain passages in the poem were of a disloyal character, and wrote a complaint to the Bombay Government. The noble Lord asked me the name of the Director of Public Instruction. His name is Mr. Giles. Having given the matter every consideration, the Bombay Government came to this conclusion, and issued it as an answer to Mr. Malabari—

“His Excellency the Governor in Council is of opinion that Mr. Giles acted with propriety in calling attention to the poem in question, and is also of opinion that the Director of Public Instruction has, in his letter of September 29, justified the criticism to which Mr. Malabari takes exception. Beyond expressing their readiness to accept Mr. Malabari's assurance that he did not intend the writings to convey any unconstitutional suggestion, they do not think it necessary to make any further remarks on the correspondence.” This matter is a purely local one. No communications have passed between the India Office and the Government of Bombay on the subject, so that when the noble Lord asked me whether the Indian Government will relieve the Director of Public Instruction of Bombay from the task of reporting on Native publications to the Government of India, my answer must be that the Secretary of State has no information as to the intentions of the Government of India in regard to this matter; and, with regard to the second part of this question, “whether the India Office will make some amends to Mr. Malabari for the charge of sedition so unjustifiably cast upon him in the Director's official report of July 24, 1900”—my answer must be that no one knows better than Mr. Malabari that if he has any cause for complaint he must address the Secretary of State on the matter. The Secretary of State has heard nothing from Mr. Malabari of any sort or kind, and in these circumstances there is no ground for the suggestion that my noble friend the Secretary of State should make any amends at all.

**Lord REAY:** My Lords, I shall not enter upon the philological merits of the case; I rise simply to give my opinion of Mr. Malabari. When I was connected with Bombay there was no one in that Presidency more loyal than Mr. Malabari. I frequently read the “Indian Spectator,” and I can say that nothing ever appeared in that paper which could, in the remotest degree, be construed as disloyal. Mr. Malabari criticised the Indian administration in a friendly spirit and with great intelligence. He also freely criticised his countrymen. Mr. Malabari was an ardent and prominent advocate of social reform, and as such he naturally made many enemies. I have seen a translation of the incriminating verses, as published in the “Times of India,” in the month of November last year, and I must say that I cannot find anything in the poem which can be considered as seditious. In it Mr. Malabari urges his countrymen to be more self-reliant, and not to neglect arts and industries. I suppose that no exception can be taken to anyone who urges the Natives of India to apply themselves more to industries than they are doing; the Government of India have on many occasions shown the importance they attach to the development of industries. Mr. Malabari belongs to a category of persons who criticise the Government, but who do so with the object of strengthening our rule in India, and of making it more popular. I cannot see that in doing so we should not accept any criticisms which he makes in a friendly spirit. There are very few men in India who exercise their judgment in that independent and moderate manner, and I think it is the duty of the Government to encourage them, because, unless you encourage them, you give an indirect encouragement to those who are actuated by entirely different motives. I trust, therefore, the Government will see their way to place some other construction on this poem than that which—no doubt in perfect good faith—has been placed upon it by those who have dealt with the matter.

**Lord SANDHURST:** My Lords, as my noble friend has referred to the loyalty of Mr. Malabari, I should like to say that during the five years I was Governor of Bombay Mr. Giles served under me as Senior Inspector, and also as Director of Public Instruction during the last two years of my term of office. He belongs to the Uncovenanted Service, and I am sure the Government has no more loyal subject than Mr. Giles, whose knowledge of Gujarati is extensive, and whose sympathy with the Gujarati natives is extreme.

The Earl of NORTHBROOK: My Lords, I should like to add my testimony to that which has been given by the noble Lord who has been Governor of Bombay (Lord REAY) as to the loyalty of Mr. Malabari. I have known him for many years, and have constantly read the “Indian Spectator,” of which he is editor. I have seen in that paper not the slightest traces of disloyalty to the Government. It is a paper that has been well conducted, criticising occasionally in a fair manner the acts of the Government, but in no sense disloyal. In point of fact, it is perfectly incredible to suppose that any Parsee can be disloyal to the Government of India. I should like to make one remark, and one remark only, upon this matter with respect to the merits of the case. I must say that in my opinion it is a very

strong measure indeed for any Government officer to dig out a poem written twenty-five years ago by a man in Mr. Malabari's position.

The Earl of HARDWICKE: Is the noble Lord certain of that? I have no information that the poem was written twenty-five years ago.

The Earl of NORTHBROOK: Mr. Malabari says that the particular poem to which exception was taken by Mr. Giles was written twenty-five years ago. I think it is rather too bad to dig out a poem after all those years. If a very young man had written a foolish poem, I do not think after twenty-five years it should be dug out and attacked. I believe that the highest authorities in Gujarati are of opinion that the poem does not bear the interpretation which the Government official has placed upon it. However that may be—I am absolutely unable to form an opinion myself, not being a Gujarati scholar—I am satisfied of this, that nothing could be more foreign to the feelings of Mr. Malabari than that he should be “concerned in writing anything of a disloyal character towards the British Government.”

The Earl of HARDWICKE: My Lords, I hope that in my reply to the noble Lord I said nothing which may induce your Lordships to think that I or the Secretary of State have any opinion either one way or the other in this matter, because no form of communication has been made to the India Office. I have certainly seen the translation of the poem, and I have my own opinion. I have certainly seen the comments that have been made in the review, but inasmuch as the Government of Bombay have made a statement to Mr. Malabari, which I have to read, and Mr. Malabari has not thought it necessary to communicate with the Secretary of State on the matter, I can only repeat that I see no reason why my noble friend the Secretary of State should interfere in the matter.

Thursday, April 25.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

### BOER PRISONERS IN INDIA.

Mr. SCHWANN asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had 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, should be charged on the revenues of India.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The Government of India have been instructed that “all cost will be borne by Imperial Government.” I have not considered it necessary to give more detailed instructions.

### COOPERS HILL COLLEGE.

Mr. WALTER PALMER asked the Secretary of State for India if he would inform the House whether the new members of the Board of Visitors of Coopers Hill Engineering College had yet been appointed by the University of Oxford, Cambridge, and London, and whether the Committee of the Board of Visitors, including the three new Visitors, would forthwith enquire into and report upon the working, discipline, and constitution of the College, and the relations of the Visitors, President, and Teaching Staff: And, whether he could assure the House that the Report of their enquiry would be laid before the House, and an opportunity given for discussion during the present Session.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and London have been requested to nominate representatives to the Board of Visitors of the Royal Indian Engineering College, and as soon as these nominations are made I shall ask the Board of Visitors to appoint a Committee for the purpose mentioned in the question. I should have no objection to publishing their report, but I cannot now undertake that a day shall be set apart for its discussion.

### SIXTEEN DEATH SENTENCES.

Mr. CAINE asked the Secretary of State for India if his attention had been called to a sentence of death which had recently been passed upon 17 men by the justices of the North West Provinces for the murder of two persons living in the Etah district, against which appeal was taken to the Judges of the High Court, with the result that the sentence of death had been confirmed in the case of 16 of the convicted men, one sentence being commuted to penal servitude for life; if so, had the Viceroy revised the sentences in any way with a view to abating the number of persons to be executed.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I learn from the Government of India that in the case referred to sixteen persons were originally condemned to death by the Sessions Court, and the sentence was confirmed in the case of all sixteen by the High Court of the North-Western Provinces. The sentence of death has, however, been commuted by the Lieutenant-Governor to one of transportation for life in the case of twelve out of the sixteen. No appeal has been preferred to the Viceroy in the case.

### BRITISH INDIANS IN NATAL.

#### DISTRESS AMONG REFUGEES.

Mr. CAINE asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he was aware that numbers of European refugees had been permitted to return from Natal to the Transvaal and open their shops there, but that no permits had been granted to refugees being Indian British subjects: And, whether he would make enquiry as to the reasons for this difference in the treatment of traders, and give such instructions as might be required.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: I was approached in reference to this subject by Sir M. Bhowagregree some time ago, and in deference to his request I telegraphed to Sir A. Milner for information.



Friday, April 26.  
HOUSE OF COMMONS.  
BOER PRISONERS IN INDIA.

Mr. SCHWANN asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would make enquiry as to the suitability of the climate of Ahmednagar, in India, to which place the first batch of Boer prisoners was said to have been consigned, at this season and during the summer months, for men not acclimatised to the heat of the district indicated, in order to prevent undue suffering and perhaps undue mortality.

Mr. FLYNN asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether a batch of Boer prisoners of about 500 had been deported to Ahmednagar, in the Bombay Presidency; and, if so, having regard to the heat of this locality and to its scanty water supply, would the Government consider the propriety of removing these prisoners of war to some less unhealthy place.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The Viceroy of India undertook after consultation with the local authorities to send the Boer prisoners to suitable places, and Ahmednagar has been selected as one of them. A British regiment is permanently quartered there, and I never before heard that the place is considered to be unhealthy.

INLAND PARCEL POSTAGE.

Lieutenant-Colonel TUNNELL asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Government of India would consider the advisability of making any reduction in their rates for inland parcel postage; and, whether some reduction was actually contemplated within the last two years.

Lord G. HAMILTON: Proposals submitted by the Government of India for reducing the rates of inland parcel postage are now under the consideration of the Secretary of State in Council; and I hope that they will very shortly be approved.

Monday, April 29.  
HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE MANAGEMENT OF ESTATES IN BENGAL.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India, with reference to the Commission of Enquiry recently held at Calcutta to enquire into the management of estates by the Administrator-General of Bengal, whether the Commissioners had upon the Table of the House.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have no information as to whether the Commission referred to in the question has submitted its report. That report when submitted will be for the consideration of the Government of India, and until I have seen it and the orders passed upon it by that Government, I am unable to say whether it can be laid upon the table.

LIGHTS IN THE RED SEA.

Sir JAMES FERGUSON asked the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he could inform the House of any progress in the negotiations for the provision of four additional lights in the southern part of the Red Sea in the fairway of vessels to and from the East, and of a light in the Gulf of Aden; and, if there was any change in the intentions of his Majesty's Government in regard thereto.

Viscount GRANVILLE: As the outcome of the negotiations which took place upon the subject, the Turkish Government undertook the construction of the four lights in the Red Sea, under the auspices of the Lighthouse Administration; and it was understood that the work of construction was to be actually commenced in January last. The Government of India have decided to improve the Ras Marshag light near Aden. The question of a new light on Socotra and of an improved light on Obstruction Point, in the island of Perim, is under consideration between the Imperial and Indian Governments. The general policy of his Majesty's Government with regard to the question remains unchanged.

BOER PRISONERS IN INDIA.

Mr. HAVILAND-BURKE asked the Secretary of State for War whether he was aware of the arrival of 500 Boer prisoners of war at Bombay and their despatch to Ahmednagar; and, seeing that the Ahmednagar district was last year so famine-stricken that one in every four of the population was on Government relief, and was also subject to a water famine, and that these conditions still to some extent prevailed in the district, which was liable to cholera, plague, and other Oriental diseases, whether he would consider the advisability of interning these prisoners of war in a more suitable district.

Mr. BRODRICK: Ahmednagar has been selected by the Indian authorities as a healthy place at which British troops have been stationed without ill-effects for a long period of years. All arrangements have been made for a proper water supply and for the health of the prisoners.

Mr. SCHWANN: Is it not a fact that there was famine in this district last year, and that famine nearly always breeds disease?

Mr. BRODRICK: Of course famine has existed in the whole of India, but there has been no special famine in Ahmednagar.

Tuesday, April 30.  
HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Railways and Irrigation Works).—Address for "Return showing the estimated position, as regards capital expenditure, of the several Railways and Irrigation Works under construction in India on March 31 1901, and the proposed expenditure thereon during 1901-2."—(Mr. Price.)—Return presented and to be printed (No. 147).

East India (Income and Expenditure).—Address for "Return

of the net income and expenditure of British India, under certain specified heads, for the eleven years from 1889-90 to 1899-1900."—(Sir Henry Fowler.)—Return presented and to be printed (No. 146).

COOPERS HILL COLLEGE.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON asked the Secretary of State for India whether it was proposed to carry out the recommendations made by the Board of Visitors of Coopers Hill College, in their report on the retirement of certain professors, that in the case of Mr. McLeod every consideration should be shown him in the matter of his retiring pension, and that in the case of Mr. Hearson the amount of his retiring allowance should be increased.

Mr. O'MARA asked the noble lord which of the two contradictory reports of the Board of Visitors this question referred to and which of the two contradictory reports would be carried out.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I think that if the hon. gentleman opposite had paid a little more attention to the two reports he would see that they are in no sense contradictory. With regard to the question asked by my hon. friend, I have to say that the Council of India are considering Mr. McLeod's retiring allowance, the desire being to give him the full amount possible under Civil Service regulations. Mr. Hearson has a pension from the Admiralty in addition to that proposed for his service at Coopers Hill College. I doubt, therefore, if any increase will be sanctioned to the amount already approved.

BOER PRISONERS IN INDIA.

Mr. FLYNN asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had any information showing Ahmednagar to be an unhealthy station for European troops, and that troops stationed there had suffered from enteric fever; and, if so, would the captured Boer prisoners be deported to some more healthy part of India.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The Viceroy reports to me as follows:—"There is no foundation for rumours about the unhealthiness of Ahmednagar. The rate of admission to hospital per thousand is actually less than that of Kasauli, Ranikhet, and Dalhousie, all of which are hill stations occupied by British troops; and is approximately the same as in Poona and Umballa, where British troops are stationed throughout the summer." In these circumstances I see no reason for altering the arrangements which have been made.

RAILWAYS AND IRRIGATION.

Sir JOHN LENG asked the Secretary of State for India what were the amounts, in tens of rupees, of capital expenditure on railways, water storage, and irrigation allocated for these purposes respectively in the financial statement for the year ending March 31: Had sanction been given to the construction of a broad-gauge line to complete through communication between Bombay and Karachi, and at what point from or near Ahmedabad was such railway to start on the route through the Rann of Kutch and the districts of Tur-Parkar: And, what would be the length of such new line and the total cost in tens of rupees.

Lord G. HAMILTON: Assuming the question to relate to the year ending March 31, 1902, the answer is, for railways Rs. 6,505,400; water storage and irrigation (not shown separately) Rs. 1,128,000. 2. A broad gauge line has been projected from Viramgam, on the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, through the Rann of Kutch to Hyderabad, in Sind, but its construction has not yet been sanctioned. 3. The length of the line would be 365 miles, and the cost has been estimated at Rs. 3,240,000.

INDIAN TROOPS AT TROPICAL FORTRESSES.

Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE asked the Secretary of State for War whether he could state which were the tropical fortresses at which it was proposed by his Army organisation scheme to substitute Indian regiments for British ones.

Mr. BRODRICK said that Indian troops would be quartered at Hong-kong, Singapore, and Mauritius, but not to the exclusion of British troops.

THE "INVESTORS' REVIEW" FAMINE FUND.

We take the following from the current issue (April 27) of the *Investors' Review*:—

Subscriptions to our little fund, from which not a penny is deducted for advertisement in newspapers or any other kind of charges, may be sent to A. J. Wilson, at this office; cheques to be crossed "Union Bank of London, Indian Famine Fund."

Amount previously acknowledged .. ..	£950 16 2
J. Stanley, Esq., Paddington, per India .. ..	0 2 0
	£950 18 2

PUBLIC MEETINGS ON INDIAN QUESTIONS.

On May 5 at the Brixton Discussion Forum (Raleigh College Hall, Saltoun Road, Effra Road, Brixton, at 11.30 in the morning) Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji will open a discussion upon "The Condition of India."

The series of successful meetings recently addressed by Mr. G. P. Pillai and Mr. J. M. Parikh were arranged by the National Reform Union, of which Mr. A. G. Symonds is the energetic secretary. This was made clear in the report of Mr. Pillai's meetings printed in INDIA, but a like announcement in regard to Mr. Parikh's meetings was inadvertently omitted. We are always glad to mention the excellent work of Mrs A. G. Symonds and the National Reform Union, whose services in connexion with Indian questions are most valuable.



## 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, 1893.

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

**Speeches of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P.,** President of the Indian National Congress, 1894-5.

**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. O. BONNERJEE.

**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 ROSESH C. DUTT, C.I.E.

**The Bogy of a Russian Invasion.** A Lesson from the Turah 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. Maomohan Ghose.

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

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

**India and the General Election (1900).**

**"Melancholy Meanness."**

**The "Over-population" Fallacy Again.**

**No National Contribution?**

**The "Slimness" 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.

## IMPORTANT NOTICE.

### SUBSCRIPTIONS to "INDIA" 1901.

#### WHY NOT SUBSCRIBE NOW?

A limited number of new Subscribers can still be supplied with copies of INDIA from the beginning of the present year. SUBSCRIPTIONS (POST FREE) SIX RUPEES.

PREPAID Subscriptions for the REMAINDER OF THE YEAR should be remitted direct to the Office in London at the following rates, which include postage:—

May 1 to end of year . . . 4 rupees 9 annas.

June 1 to end of year . . . 4 rupees.

*Do you want to know by every mail what has been done in Parliament concerning India?*

*Do you want to see special reports of public meetings in England concerning India?*

*Do you want to read what the British Press is writing about India?*

—The Journal "INDIA" will tell you.

Remittances should accompany every order.

Address:—THE MANAGER OF "INDIA,"  
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS,  
WESTMINSTER, LONDON, 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. HARICHANDRA A. TALCHERKAR,  
52, Veronica Street, Bandra, Bombay.

*The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is one shilling 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:—*

*May 1 to End of Year (Post free), 6s. 9d.*

*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 STOOK, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. BOWEN, 1 & 2 FLEET COURT, LONDON, E.C. and Published for the Proprietors at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.