

INDIA.

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART, B.A.

FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]

[OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.]

VOL. IV., No. 11.
(New Series.)]

NOVEMBER 1, 1893.

[SUBSCRIPTION, POST PAID,
Six Shillings per ann.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.		PAGE.
INDIANA: Paragraphs on Indian Topics, by "Fidus" ..	321	THE CANTONMENTS QUESTION, by Professor Stuart, M.P.	338
Lord Elgin	326	THE BEHAR CADASTRAL SURVEY, by Sir Roper Lethbridge,	
The Debate on the Budget	327	K.C.I.E.	339
Slavery in Assam	328	THE INDIAN CENSUS, by H. Morse Stephens, M.A.	342
The Defence of India	330	VILLAGE LIFE IN INDIA, by Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P.	344
The Case of Mr. M. M. Murzban	331	REVIEWS: Lord Clive	346
Riots and Inquiry: Featherstone and Bombay ..	332	A Students' History of India	346
Wanted: A Native Judge	332	A Bengali Statesman	347
Railway Construction in India	333	Indian Geography	348
OUR LONDON LETTER	334	Indian Cookery	349
The Civil Service of India	336	The Proposed Royal Commission: Press Opinions ..	350
CORRESPONDENCE: The Indian Labourer	336	Indian Fiscal Interests	352
SIMULTANEOUS EXAMINATIONS TO THE CIVIL SERVICE, by		BIBLIOGRAPHY of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects	352
Herbert W. Paul, M.P.	337		

Indiana.

Elsewhere in this issue will be found signed articles by Mr. Herbert W. Paul, M.P., on "Simultaneous Examinations to the Civil Service"; by Professor Stuart, M.P., on "The Cantonments Question"; by Sir Roper Lethbridge, K.C.I.E., on "The Behar Cadastral Survey"; and by Mr. H. Morse Stephens, M.A., on "The Indian Census." Some account is also published of a lecture recently delivered by Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., on "Village Life in India."

A highly instructive contrast may be drawn between the different courses pursued by the Government in regard to the riots in Bombay and at Featherstone respectively. At the end of August Sir W. Wedderburn made two distinct efforts in the House of Commons to secure the appointment of a mixed Commission of official and non-official members to investigate the causes of the riots between Hindus and Mussulmans, and to report on the best means to be adopted to remove those causes. The gravity of the subject was beyond question. The encounters had led to the loss of many lives, and seemed to have grown both in frequency and in intensity. Yet in spite of these considerations—or, if we may judge from the words of Mr. George Russell's reply, because of them—the demand for inquiry was refused. At Featherstone, however, where two lives were lost as the result of a sudden and temporary disturbance, inquiry was held to be necessary, a Commission was

been appointed, and has proceeded without delay to make investigations on the spot.

The words which Lord Bowen used on taking his seat at Wakefield the other day supply so close a parallel to the terms in which requests have been made for inquiry at Bombay that they ought to be placed on record. "Our investigation will," said Lord Bowen, "include in its scope an examination into the reasons which existed for anticipating disorder, the precautions adopted or which might have been adopted to prevent the same, the measures taken to suppress it, and the circumstances attending the deaths of" the two victims. No phraseology could express more aptly what ought to have been done in the case of the religious riots in Bombay and elsewhere in India. Lord Bowen added: "Our sole desire is to arrive at the truth; we are resolved to find it out, and we have no doubt we shall succeed in so doing." The rest of the speech with which the President opened the inquiry will be found in another column. It deserves to be remembered as expressing in the best possible way the method which must sooner or later be adopted in India in order to arrive at the truth and the whole truth in regard to the religious riots.

Apropos of this subject, a correspondent writes from Bombay: "The proposal to appoint a committee of inquiry on the religious riots has provoked shrieks of horror from the official organs. The bureaucracy dreads the notion of close and independent inquiry from outside. Many have been the

leading articles in their organs regarding Parliamentary interference in various matters, though, when it comes to some grievance of the Services themselves, they all cry aloud to obtain redress from the House of Commons. Parliamentary Committees are the *bête noir* of Anglo-Indians, especially after the humiliating apology which Lord Roberts has been compelled to make to the two American ladies. On the other hand, every leading organ of native public opinion in every part of the Empire is demanding full inquiry into the causes of the riots."

It is certainly to be hoped that the demand for inquiry will be renewed in Parliament. Whatever the truth may be, nobody who is in touch with native opinion will deny that ugly rumours are afloat in India as to the part played by officials in dealing with the whole subject of religious differences. The policy of "Divide and Rule" may possibly be the fantastic creation of disordered minds. What is certain is that a strong belief prevails in India that the policy is something far less abstract and remote. Circumstantial allegations are made to the effect that Muhammadans are exalted by officials at the expense of Hindus, that creed is pitted against creed, and sect against sect, to the end that signs of dissension may seem to justify rigorous rule. The police also are accused of flagrant malpractices, and it is confidently stated that evidence is abundant (though no man dare publicly adduce it) to back up the gravest charges. Now the mere fact that such a condition of feeling prevails, no matter with how little reason, constitutes in itself one of the weightiest possible reasons for prompt and independent inquiry. Moreover, the conclusion is irresistible that if disturbances of similar magnitude had occurred among any other subjects of the Queen, inquiry would have followed as a matter of course.

The non-success of the motion for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into civil and military expenditure in India has been severely commented on in the Indian press. The official journals are of course overjoyed, but it is with the satisfaction of the ostrich whose head is buried in the sand. The refusal of the Commission is short-sighted policy, for the demand for independent investigation cannot much longer be staved off. The part which Sir Charles Dilke took in the debate has caused hardly less surprise in India than it caused in the House of Commons. To say that the appointment of a Commission would weaken the Government of India is not exactly a satisfactory argument when the Government of India is known to have brought itself to the verge of bankruptcy and the population to the verge of starvation. But in justice to Sir Charles Dilke it ought to be stated that he has never

proposed to abolish the Legislative Councils. There appears to have been a telegraphic blunder by which the term "Legislative Councils" was substituted for "Indian Council." Needless to say, the people of India are highly amused at the recent political discovery that the Indian Council is a "cheek" on the Secretary of State!

Sir Henry Norman's withdrawal of his acceptance of the Viceroyalty has, as was to be expected, caused keen disappointment among the numerous opponents of the "forward" frontier policy in India. The native papers have expressed their regret at the cancelling of an appointment which, with very few exceptions, they hailed with satisfaction. The truth is that the feeling prevails in India that it is becoming more and more difficult to find a good Viceroy. There is an impression abroad that some able statesmen shrink from a task which has become so arduous and responsible that it can hardly be discharged with credit. A correspondent who has excellent opportunities of gauging native opinion writes: "Unless we get in the future strong Viceroys the chances are that we shall get 'humdrum' men who will be more or less plastic tools in the hands of the bureaucracy." "I for one," he adds, "would prefer to see the Viceroyalty abolished rather than that it should fall into this condition; then the strong hand of a capable Secretary of State might govern the Empire from Westminster." It remains to be seen what Lord Elgin will make of the splendid opportunities which are now open to an able ruler in India.

Acts of official tyranny are unfortunately no rare occurrence in India, but it is seldom that one hears of so gross a violation of justice as is reported from Balasore. It appears that Mr. C. A. Radice, Assistant Settlement Officer of Orissa, summoned Babu Rádha Shyam Nisant Mahápátra for failing to file a list of villages situate within his estate, and afterwards issued a warrant for his arrest. Even the legality of these proceedings was, as the Chief Secretary to the Government of Bengal admits, doubtful. There is no doubt whatever as to the illegality of Mr. Radice's subsequent conduct. He positively proceeded to arrest the zemindar himself, fired shots at his door, sealed the gate of his court-yard, and after a struggle, in which the zemindar was severely hurt, arrested him. Sir A. Macdonnell remarks the "grave irregularities" and the "deplorable" and "extraordinary indiscretion" of these acts, and the "vindictiveness" of Mr. Radice's later proceedings. Handing over his prisoner, a Brahmin, to a low caste syc, he compelled him to walk some miles to the police station, kept him without food until the next day, twice refused to accept bail, inflicted upon

him fines which exceeded the legal maximum, and, in short, heaped upon him a complication of unmerited indignities.

Mr. Radice may congratulate himself upon the lightness of his punishment. He is no longer to remain on settlement duty in Orissa, but, to quote the Lieutenant-Governor's order, to "be transferred to the headquarters of a district where he can be carefully supervised and controlled by the District Magistrate. He will forfeit his grade of Acting Joint-Magistrate, and will for a year receive no promotion, permanent or temporary. Finally, he will, for six months, exercise the reduced powers of an Assistant-Magistrate of the second class." But in addition to this degradation Mr. Radice will have the satisfaction of knowing that the letter of the Chief Secretary to the Government of Bengal containing these orders has been published with adequate prominence in the Indian press. I select only a few of its phrases as a warning to any other young officers who may not be disposed to temper their zeal with discretion:

"The extraordinary indiscretion of this episode calls for no comment."

"Not only did Mr. Radice act in defiance of the law, but also in a manner calculated to inflict gross and unmerited indignity on the petitioner."

"The procedure actually followed was opposed to law and absolutely indefensible."

"The imposition of the maximum fine allowable by law, the order imposing an additional fine which he afterwards discovered he had no power to levy, the illegal order requiring further recognizance in the excessive sum of Rs. 2,500 for the payment of a fine of one-fifth of that amount, the order requiring the fine to be paid before sunset, are evidences of a vindictive attitude."

I cannot leave this case without one word more. On the petition of Mr. Radice's victim, the Officiating Lieutenant-Governor ordered a full investigation into the facts of the case. Instead of instituting such an investigation Mr. Maude, the Settlement Governor of Orissa, was content to send to the Government of Bengal Mr. Radice's denials of the allegations made against him, and neither Mr. Maude nor the Commissioner of the Orissa division seems to have been at all impressed with the gravity of Mr. Radice's offence. On the contrary, although inquiry into simple matters of fact had been shirked, Mr. Maude appears to have devoted the whole of his official letter to showing that the complaint of the petitioner was exaggerated and to whitewashing Mr. Radice. The Chief Secretary goes out of his way to reproach Mr. Maude for this grave dereliction of duty, and now that Mr. Radice has been punished—light though his punishment is compared with his misbehaviour—it will be interesting to see what steps, if any, are taken to excite in his superior officers a more lively sense of the responsibilities of

their position. There are rather too many Mr. Maudes in India.

Appropos of Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt's valuable articles on the separation of executive and judicial functions in India—a reform of paramount importance—I notice in a recent issue of the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* a further reference to the Barisal case. It appears that the Secretary of State has not yet replied to the letter of the High Court in regard to this case of executive interference with a Deputy Magistrate on the ground that he had not shown a satisfactory percentage of convictions, but a document of considerable length has been received from the India Office, dealing with similar interference elsewhere. The letter is a very amiable, very careful, very useless attempt to hold the balance even. Lord Kimberley is "convinced that both of the high authorities, who are parties to the controversy embodied in the correspondence, in the action which they have taken have been animated by a sincere desire to promote the efficiency of the administration of justice in Bengal." Accordingly although Lord Kimberley is "very sensible of the difficulties with which the present Lieutenant-Governor and his predecessors have had to contend," he still "perceives that" the "judges of the High Court are laudably anxious to obtain the independence of the Courts." All this may be very judicial, but it hardly takes one "any forrarder," and the question is far too momentous to be dismissed in half-a-dozen impartially distributed compliments.

Upon one point, and one only, did Lord Kimberley permit himself to express a definite opinion. "I think it necessary," he wrote, "in the interests of the community that the administrative officer of whatever rank should abstain from publishing officially reflections upon the decisions and judicial acts of Magistrates and Courts of law." But this, after all, does not come to much. If judicial authorities are to have their conduct condemned by executive officers, the question whether censure is published is quite a minor one. As the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* says, "the mere condemnation of his judicial act, whether in public or private, is apt to demoralize a magistrate, and it is impossible to put a stop to this demoralization, unless the power of interference is completely taken away from the hands of the Lieutenant-Governor." But the subject cannot be adequately discussed within the space at my disposal. I am glad to state however that INDIA will shortly publish an article upon the question from the influential pen of the Right Hon. Sir Richard Garth.

Sir Richard Temple's amiable endeavour to prevent discussion on the report of the Departmental

Committee on the Indian Cantonments is, after all, likely to prove futile. Steps have, I understand, been taken to secure a debate on the subject during the autumn sitting of Parliament, and it is expected that the Government of India will be directed to make any transgression of the well-known resolution of the House of Commons a penal offence. Meantime the "British Committee for the Abolition of State Regulation of Vice in India and throughout the British Dominions" has reprinted, with useful explanations and notes the most important parts of the report, and a conference has been called to discuss the subject on Wednesday, November 1st—the day before the opening of Parliament. Mr. Stansfeld and other members of Parliament are expected to speak at the conference. I hear, also, that Lord Kimberley has already addressed to the Government of India an important despatch bearing on the conclusions of the Departmental Committee.

We are, so far as official information is concerned, just as completely as ever in the dark as to the object of Sir Mortimer Durand's mysterious errand to Cabul. During the past month a truth-seeking public has been entertained with almost daily accounts of the hospitality offered to members of the Mission, and of their progress along the prescribed route. A pedestrian match, or the daily bulletin of a fasting man, had not been more faithfully reported. But with the revelation of these highly important particulars the frankness of public instructors has ceased. For any information as to the scope of Sir M. Durand's powers, or the nature of his negotiations, the mere tax-payer asks in vain. "The hungry sheep look up but are not fed." It is curious that these inscrutable errands, like sudden desires to vindicate civilisation in South Africa by the extermination of the native tribes, commonly coincide with a Parliamentary recess. But the autumn sitting is at hand and no time should be lost before the Government is assailed with inquiries. It seems that one of the possible dangers has so far been avoided. The Amir's people have shown themselves worthy of the higher of the two contradictory estimates which the *Times* put upon their trustworthiness. Still, the other danger, at least, remains and the public ought to know, before it is too late, the instructions with which Sir M. Durand set out.

On 18th September the Civil Service Commissioners published the names of successful candidates at the recent examination held in London for admission to the Covenanted Civil Service of India. Fifty-six appointments were filled up, and among the successful candidates I am sorry to see that only one

name is obviously that of a native of India—Mr. Barzore J. Dalal who took seventeenth place. Among English names may be noticed several well-known in India, such as Macmichael, Cotton, Burn, Barnes, Sale, and Keatinge, and some of the others probably have Indian connexions. The Civil Service Commissioners have issued the usual notification as to the studies required from selected candidates during their year of probation at an English University. The chief changes are in the books set for study in the History of British India, among which Mr. H. G. Keene's "History of India" takes the place of Marshman's "History of India", and of Mr. Keene's previous work the "Fall of the Mogul Empire." I am not sorry that Marshman's somewhat antiquated work has been superseded, but what the Civil Service Commissioners are to be specially congratulated upon is their omission from the list of Dr. George Smith's "Student's Geography of British India"—a book that is hardly more embarrassing to the student than to the teacher. It was generally expected that a large number of Indians would be successful in the recent examinations. Out of thirty-two successful candidates in 1892 four were natives of India and, at the same rate, seven should have passed out of fifty-six in 1893. Yet instead of seven we only find one Indian name in the list. This is not encouraging. It looks as if the raising of the age to twenty-three would not produce the result of admitting a larger number of Indians to the Service. The just cry for simultaneous examinations in England and in India will therefore be sharpened.

By the death of the Master of Balliol, Professor Jowett, India loses a true friend. If he did not concern himself overmuch with questions of Indian politics, he strove to make Balliol the chief place of education in Oxford both for Indian Civil Servants on probation and for natives of India who came to prosecute their studies in England. Believing that it was England's duty to give of her best to India, Dr. Jowett exercised considerable influence in regulating the subjects of examination for entrance into the Covenanted Service, and took a special interest in the training of selected candidates during their period of probation in England. Indeed, he secured the grant of New Inn Hall as a place of residence for them, although the scheme was never carried out in practice. His kindness and hospitality to natives of India who entered at Balliol were so marked as to make some of his English undergraduates a little jealous, and it is worthy of record, as showing how far his influence extended, that both the retiring and the incoming Viceroy, Lord Lansdowne and Lord Elgin, are old Balliol men and favourite pupils of the Master.

It is really a pity that one cannot take out a patent to secure the advantages of original explanations. At present there are so many fertile brains whose invaluable products are lightly appropriated by the general public. In the case of the recent Hindu-Mussulman riots, for instance, the *Times* was at once able to account for the disturbances by reference to the demand for simultaneous examinations to the Civil Services. With not less splendid originality the riots were also set down to the credit of the Indian National Congress, and now the *Aligarh Institute Gazette* has invented a further diagnosis. The riots were due, it says, to the interference of Parliament in Indian affairs. Not satisfied with this flight of genius the *Aligarh Institute Gazette* proceeds, with proper dignity, to formulate the trinity of maxims which "should always be borne in mind in ruling India," as follows: "First, the rule that the majority should be followed, should be dropped. Secondly, the rules governing elections to the Legislative Councils should be amended in such a way as to enable Muhammadans to elect their own representatives. Thirdly, a greater proportion of Englishmen should be maintained in the Civil Service." After this Parliament will, of course, put up the shutters. The *Times* observes quite solemnly that the *Aligarh Institute Gazette* is "one of the leading Muhammadan newspapers in Upper India."

A few weeks ago the London Press was full of the praise of Mr. J. Cowasjee Jehanghir, of Malabar Hill, Bombay, for his munificent gift of 200,000 rupees—roughly £13,000—to the Imperial Institute. The donor comes of a wealthy Parsee family to whose public acts of generosity Poona, Surat, and Bombay bear eloquent testimony. I understand that the condition of the gift to the Imperial Institute was that it should be applied to the "special benefit" of India, and that India is accordingly to enjoy the benefit of an Indian conference-room at the Institute, and a great hall in which lectures will be delivered on Indian subjects during each winter Session. I don't know whether this is exactly the sort of "special benefit" which Mr. J. Cowasjee Jehanghir had in mind. It would, no doubt, be unhandsome to suggest that there are many poor and hungry people in India to whom £13,000 would be a fine windfall, or that the money would have gone some way towards defraying the expenses of the Indian cavalry which, of course for India's "special benefit", attended the opening of the Institute. These things lie in the lap of the august and venerable Council, and they preferred a conference-room and a great hall. Certainly, there should be no lack of subjects for lectures. The Memorandum drawn up by the Indian Parliamentary Party will

supply material for many winter sessions. In the intervening summers I suppose the great hall will be included in the Imperial Institute's globe-girdling scheme of smoking-concerts.

Most Englishmen are now familiar with the name—though some of them are not very successful in their attempts to pronounce it—of Kumar Shri Ranjitsinhji, the Indian Prince who has achieved at Cambridge that coveted University distinction, the Cricket "blue." I see that at a recent dinner of the "Old Higher Grade Cricket Club", held at Cambridge, Ranjitsinhji replied in a very apt little speech to the toast of "The Visitors." The proposer of the toast referred to him as "the most famous cricketer that they had ever had from India." Perhaps the most significant sentences in Ranjitsinhji's reply were those in which he urged that "he did not consider himself a foreigner in Cambridge. He did not consider that Indians were foreigners in England. That distinction had passed away long, long ago; and he thought that in time to come they would look upon each other as absolutely the same subjects under her Majesty the Queen." The *Cambridge Daily News* thinks that this was an eloquent plea for Imperial Federation—an opinion which does credit to the insight of the *Cambridge Daily News*. Without committing themselves to so precise an analysis—if, indeed, Imperial Federation can be spoken of as precise—observers may yet be interested to see how far cricket will help to bring Indians and Englishmen more closely together. Its uniting influence will probably be greater than many of the serious imagine.

I have received from Bombay a copy of the first series of the "Elphinstone College Union Lectures, 1891-92," compiled, by order of the Committee, by Rastam B. Paymaster, B.A. The little volume contains nine lectures by distinguished residents in the Bombay Presidency. It may seem a little invidious to select particular lectures for special notice as they deal with such different subjects as politics, poetry, literature, heredity, and educational policy. If I notice two or three in particular it is not because they are eminently better than the rest, but because they have to do with questions with which INDIA is specially concerned. The Bishop of Bombay, Dr. Mylne, contributes a short paper on "Examinations and how to deal with them". This question was referred to in a recent number of INDIA, when it was pointed out that many distinguished Indians are now questioning the advantages of the application of the examination system to India. Bishop Mylne is well qualified to treat this subject. He is a distinguished Oxford graduate, and was one of the first tutors of Keble College, which owed much of its

success to his energy. Admitting that examinations are an evil he thinks that they are a necessary evil, and gives hints as to how the evil can be minimized. Equally valuable is Mr. Justice Jardine's lecture, "The Educational Syndicate of Burma as a Substitute for a University." The learned judge gives much interesting information on the attempt to systematize higher education in Burma. The difficulties that stand in the way are clearly put, and due honour is given to Sir Charles Bernard for his attempt to found an efficient substitute for a University at Rangoon. When a Burmese University is founded, educated Burmans will look back with interest on the efforts of enlightened administrators to pave the way. Lastly, a word is due to an amusing address on "College Boys" by Dr. (Miss) Emma Brainerd Ryder, M.D.

The *Indian Textile Journal*, the leading technical periodical of India makes a new start from August 1st, 1893. Mr. Hugh Monie, who retired from the partnership at that date, continues to act as editor of the textile branch of the journal, while Mr. John Wallace, C.E., has been appointed editor of those branches which deal with engineering and science. The first number, published on August 22nd, reflects much credit on the new management. The articles are mainly technical, and, as might be expected in a journal of this sort published in Bombay, are chiefly devoted to the great cotton industry, which has recently made such vast strides. The printing and the general production of the journal are excellent. The proprietorship has passed into the hands of M. C. Rutnagar and Co., 27 Meadows Street, Fort, Bombay, and with the addition of Mr. Wallace to the editorial staff the *Indian Textile Journal* may expect a new lease of usefulness.

"A Dream and other Poems" by "Hafed," a little volume of thirty-four pages, is the latest instance of the activity displayed by Indians in English poetical literature. It does not differ greatly from the general run of poems in English published in India. A pessimistic tone, characteristic of modern poetry in Europe, seems to be exaggerated in India, and the poems of "Hafed" are all melancholy. They show the usual facility of language and a certain gift of poetical imagery which has been noticed before in other productions of the kind. Occasionally "Hafed" coins words with poetical licence which are hardly poetical, such as "chameleonic," but on the whole his command of English is considerable. The last poem is, in metre and sentiment, almost a reminiscence of Swinburne. The little volume is published by Srinivasa, Varadachari, and Co., of Madras.

Mr. Thomas Evans sends me from Mussoori the publications of the "Liquor Prohibition League." It was Mr. Samuel Smith who said "the demand for revenue is so urgent in India, its Exchequer is so poor, and the ease with which taxes can be raised by increasing the sale of alcohol is so tempting, that I believe this pest will spread in India as the opium trade has spread in China unless we make a supreme effort to arrest it now." The same opinion seems to animate the promoters of the League. They think scorn of "half measures." Such expedients have, they hold, proved a miserable failure; and the liquor traffic, being altogether evil, admits of no modification. Perhaps this will seem rather a large order to a good many people, and it may be doubted whether the temperance party in India would not have acted more prudently in advocating, for example, such a scheme of local option as that which finds favour with teetotallers in Great Britain. That, however, is their own affair, and I need not say that they will enjoy the hearty goodwill of all well-wishers of the Indian community in their efforts to mitigate the serious evils of the liquor traffic.

FIDUS.

LORD ELGIN.

OUR recent article on Sir Henry Norman's qualifications for the Viceroyalty was supplemented by a note expressing the hope that he might reconsider his withdrawal from the arduous duties of the office. No such step being taken, it devolved upon the Government to find another successor to Lord Lansdowne. It goes without saying that Sir Henry Norman's withdrawal added to the difficulty of the Government's task—a task that was difficult enough already in view of the demands which affairs at home promise for some time to make upon prominent members of the Liberal party. In these circumstances the choice has fallen upon Lord Elgin, and everybody will wish him success in the responsible office which he has undertaken. Those, at any rate, who hinted objections to Sir Henry Norman on the ground that he was too old, that he was not a peer, and that he had already had long experience in India, cannot repeat their criticisms in the case of Lord Elgin. The new Viceroy has not yet passed his forty-fifth year, he is the ninth earl, and his association with India has hitherto been chiefly hereditary. Recollections of his family may go far to ensure for Lord Elgin immediate popularity with more than one section of the public in India. Dr. Sambhu Chunder Mukerji probably expressed the opinion of many when he said recently that the appointment was satisfactory because, although India knew little of Lord Elgin himself, "his father's fine "presence and bluff, kindly manner, his friendliness

"to the natives during his short Viceroyalty, and "his firmness and justice were remembered," and hopes were entertained that "the son would act as "his father had acted." The late Earl was Her Majesty's plenipotentiary in two special missions to the Emperor of China, and before he was appointed Viceroy of India had been Governor of Jamaica, Governor-General of Canada, and Postmaster-General in Lord Palmerston's Government. Lord Elgin has been less conspicuous as a politician. He was Treasurer of the Household and Commissioner of Works and Buildings in Mr. Gladstone's administration of 1886, and is Lord-Lieutenant of Fifeshire, and a University Commissioner. The humble Dumfermline folk in the neighbourhood of Broomhall testify to his unflinching comity and friendliness, and there is no reason to believe that India will not find in him at once a competent and a sympathetic ruler. It may even prove that high responsibility may bring out brilliant qualities which have not yet had public opportunity of showing themselves.

THE DEBATE ON THE BUDGET.

We remarked in the last number of INDIA the regrettable circumstance that the Indian Budget had not come on earlier in the House of Commons or was not postponed until the autumn sitting. Mr. Gladstone had held out hopes that there might be for once adequate discussion of India's financial position. But the hopes were not realised, and as usual the debate took place at the close of the regular Session, and in a comparatively thinned and weary House. Nor was this the whole of the misfortune. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji had given notice that upon the motion to go into Committee he would move a resolution in favour of the appointment of a Royal Commission "to inquire into the economic condition of the people of India and their ability "to sustain the present cost of the Indian Government; and also to consider what financial relations "should exist between India and this country." The Indian Parliamentary Committee, which has given many signs of abundant energy, issued an urgent Whip and obtained a somewhat larger House than usually meets to discuss the Indian Budget. Now it happened that by the rules of the House only one amendment to the motion to go into Committee could be put to the vote, and Mr. A. C. Morton had given notice of an amendment relating to Indian officials' right of appeal to the Home Government. We do not wish to underrate the importance of the question which Mr. Morton raised, but it is much to be regretted that discussion upon it had the effect of preventing a division on Mr. Naoroji's proposal. On those occasions upon which the Indian Parliamentary Party has succeeded in pressing a subject to a division it has been conspicuously successful. Witness the case of the Madras and Bombay Armies Bill and the resolution in favour of Simultaneous Examinations to the Civil Service. In view not only of

these past successes, but also of the composition of the House during the discussion of the Indian Budget, there is good reason to believe that if Mr. Morton's amendment had not prevented a division from being taken, the Royal Commission for which Mr. E. H. Bayley, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Sir W. Wedderburn, Mr. C. E. Schwann, and others pleaded so forcibly might have been granted. As it was, the success which could not be commanded was at any rate deserved. Nobody who was present in the House of Commons during the debate or who has read reports of the speeches that were delivered, can be in a moment's doubt as to which side had the best of the argument. The most favourable construction that can be put upon Mr. George Russell's and Sir William Harcourt's replies is that their authors felt themselves compelled to say something, however feeble, in support of the official view. Mr. Russell objected to the appointment of a Royal Commission on the ground that such instruments of inquiry are often used for purely dilatory purposes, and that their proper business is to remove ignorance. Probably nobody appreciates the weakness of this reply more keenly than Mr. Russell himself. Just as if there were not a stupendous amount of ignorance (and worse) to be removed in the case of India, or as if any more expeditious method of inquiry were forthcoming! Sir William Harcourt appears to have framed an answer of equally transparent fineness. He opposed the demand for a Royal Commission because, as he said, the task proposed for it would be enormous, and while it was being discharged the foundations of government in India would be destroyed. But then, of course, Sir William Harcourt is not the man to shirk investigations because they are tedious or because they threaten to produce unpleasant results. In his case, as in Mr. Russell's, we are driven to the conclusion that his objections were designed simply to illustrate the weakness of the official position. In these circumstances, therefore, everybody who has a care for India must regret that the question could not be taken to the division lobbies.

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, in a speech of undeniable cogency, illustrated the appalling condition of impoverished India. Sir W. Wedderburn and Mr. Schwann took up the same point and pressed it home with all the force of expert knowledge. The refusal of a Commission of Inquiry can only be temporary. Sooner or later, and the sooner the better, the people of the United Kingdom will demand through their representatives that the whole truth in regard to their vast and distant Empire in India shall be brought to light. Enough, and more than enough, is known already to stimulate the desire for further knowledge. Under the government of the East India Company inquiry was made into the condition of the country, and the soundness of the administration, at intervals of twenty years. With the transference of the functions of government from the Company to Parliament, such periodic inquiry ceased, though the need of it appears to have grown. The last inquiry was held so long ago as 1853. In the forty years which have intervened large masses of the population have been brought to the verge of starvation, and the severity of taxation has grown—not with

their wealth, but with their poverty. Mr. Naoroji declared his belief that the British people are lovers of justice and fairplay. But they are not informed, and they do not take steps to inform themselves, as to the real state of the case. Members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee do not ask Parliament to take their statements for granted. Neither, on the other hand, are they content that India should always and only be regarded through the rose-coloured spectacles of Anglo-Indian officials. Sir W. Wedderburn, in the course of an interview recently reported in our columns, examined the increase in civil and military expenditure in India during the last ten years. Omitting all expenditure on railways and irrigation, he found that in 1883 the total Indian expenditure amounted to fifty-six millions, reckoning in tens of rupees. In 1893 the estimate had risen from fifty-six to sixty-eight millions—an average increase of more than a million a year. Now in 1882 the civil and military expenditure in the United Kingdom was 33½ millions, and in 1892 it had risen to 36½ millions. In other words, the increase in expenditure in the United Kingdom—the richest country in the world—has been at the rate of about 7½ per cent. in ten years; in India—the poorest country in the world—it has been at the rate of 30 per cent. The glaring disparity calls for some explanation, and Sir W. Wedderburn explains it by reference to the fact that in one case men are spending other people's money, while in the other case they are spending their own. "You know," he said, "how difficult it is for the advocates of economy in the House of Commons, to prevent waste, jobbery, and extravagance in the great spending departments at home, although here the taxpayer is the master, and these departments are his servants. But what must we expect in India, where the position is reversed, and where the great spending departments are the absolute masters; where the taxpayer has no voice at all in the expenditure; where his only function is to pay the taxes demanded from him? I believe that the Indian Civil Service is as honest and hardworking as a service as the world has ever seen. But it is demanding too much from poor human nature to expect that any class of men will systematically prefer the interest of the public to their own; and that they will readily initiate economies in the administration which mean the reduction of their own salaries, and the abolition of their own appointments."

We need not enter into further detail on the subject of India's needs. It is well that the case in its most distressing aspects was brought fully and forcibly before the assembly which after all, represents, or is supposed to represent, the will of the inhabitants of the United Kingdom. The recital of the sufferings and the struggles of India's poverty-stricken masses was not void of effect upon the House of Commons and it has had great effect in the country. The British elector, at any rate, is finding out that India, oppressed with unjust charges and reckless expenditure, debarred from her promised share in her own government, and teeming with millions of helpless persons in a condition of semi-starvation, cannot much longer subsist on the stereotyped formulas of the India Office and the antiquarian prejudices of

the Indian Council. The *Spectator* lamented in a recent article what it called the decay of the tone of empire in the British public. What it meant was that with the extension of the responsibility of government over a wider area of the population Jingoist and bureaucratic notions have received a check. It was an ancient saying that empire is opposed to the spirit of democracy. It is a modern truth that democracy is opposed to the spirit of that empire which consists in governing a country in the interests not of the governed, but of the governors. Hitherto India has been neglected largely because her true condition was a sealed book to the majority of those to whom the House of Commons is responsible. To-day the barriers of ignorance and consequent indifference are in process of removal, and it is impossible to think that Parliament will much longer dare to decline attention to India's claims. A sign of the times is the extraordinary number and variety of recent complaints that Parliament is beginning to interfere overmuch in Indian affairs. The would-be irresponsible official who used to dread departmental inquiry has lived to dread Parliamentary discussion. At such a moment the revival of the Indian Parliamentary Committee is a matter of first-rate importance. Since its recent start upon a new lease of life the Committee has not only shown signs of great energy and determination but has also proved itself to be backed by such numbers in the House of Commons as cannot lightly be disregarded by any Government. In supporting the demand for a Royal Commission members of the Committee set themselves the task of making out simply a *prima facie* case. They were abundantly successful in their endeavour, though for the moment it remains comparatively fruitless. But if their just demands should be much longer ignored it will become their duty to make out something more than a *prima facie* case. It is to be hoped that the Government will realise in time the truth of Sir W. Wedderburn's declaration that danger consists not in inquiry, but in the refusal of inquiry. Meantime the Committee will not be idle, as the Indian Council may shortly discover to its cost.

SLAVERY IN ASSAM.

THE meeting of Parliament for the autumn sitting offers an opportune occasion for returning to the subject of coolie-labour in Assam. The debate on the Indian Budget which closed the deliberations of the House of Commons before the adjournment included, among much other matter, of first-rate importance, a noteworthy discussion on this melancholy topic. That good friend of impoverished India, Mr. C. E. Schwann, seized the opportunity of directing the attention of the House to some of the leading facts connected with the hateful system of quasi-slavery in the tea gardens, and his able speech had the effect of drawing a significant reply from Mr. George Russell. The Under Secretary for India was not, indeed, able to give an immediately satisfactory assurance, but his words are so encouraging for the future that it is well worth while to strike the iron while it is hot. He said, as we reported in

the "Supplement" to our last issue, that the decision of the Secretary of State had not been actually given, "but when the House meets in November I think I shall be in a position to lay the whole of the correspondence on the table. I may say now," Mr. Russell added, "that the Secretary of State will instruct the Indian Government in a sense favourable to the coolies, and in the sense that contract labour should come altogether to an end." That is, we think, a highly encouraging statement, and the Indian Parliamentary Committee may be trusted to pursue the matter without loss of time. Mr. Schwann referred, in the course of his speech, to the judgment recently delivered by Justices Prinsep and Trevelyan, of the Calcutta High Court, in the case of one George Murray. It will be remembered that in August last Sir W. Wedderburn asked in the House of Commons a question relating to the same case. Upholding the conviction of Murray, a manager of a tea garden, for wrongful confinement of coolies, the Judges observed that the coolies in question were always "in a state of duress"; that they were "watched" at work "by guards" and at other times were "kept within a guarded enclosure"; that the treatment they suffered was such as to "reduce them for the term of their engagements to a state of slavery"; that Murray "had the assistance of the police"; and that "the circumstances of this case went to show the necessity for efficient inspection of the gardens." Mr. George Russell stated, in reply to Sir W. Wedderburn, that the tea-garden which was referred to was not in Assam, and that, so far as Assam was concerned, Lord Kimberley believed further inquiry to be unnecessary, although the attention of the Government of India would be called to the need of enforcing thoroughly efficient inspection. Perhaps we may infer from the words afterwards used by Mr. Russell in reply to Mr. Schwann that Lord Kimberley has, on further consideration, perceived the need of a more drastic remedy. Sir W. Wedderburn had suggested, on the occasion to which we have referred, that the Secretary of State would do well to order a full and independent inquiry into the present condition of the coolies in Assam and the general operation of the system of recruiting coolie-labour. Mr. Schwann also appeared to regard the subject as falling within the scope of inquiry by the Committee which he and his friends sought to obtain in the debate on the Indian Budget. If, however, it should be the case that the system of contract labour in Assam is, as Mr. George Russell is reported to have said, to "come altogether to an end," the need of inquiry will in some degree have been met by a more immediate remedy. We shall look for further information on this point so soon as the House of Commons reassembles, and it will behove members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee to obtain precise undertakings from the Secretary of State.

Meantime it is only too painfully evident that the present condition of affairs cannot be allowed to continue. But once more those who are jealous of Britain's fair fame in India find themselves confronted by general ignorance at home of the practices that are permitted to flourish abroad. English men and women are so far away from their Empire in

India, and are so much absorbed in other and nearer pursuits, that they remain contentedly ignorant of matters which really deserve their close attention. It is hard to think that, if any large number of them knew what wrongs are being put upon the ignorant coolies, they would not immediately demand redress. The remarks of Justices Prinsep and Trevelyan are but the echo of abundant testimony contained in letters, reports, and Blue Books. We published last June a letter describing the devilish process by which a young girl was kidnapped under pretext of marriage and sold into slavery on a tea-garden in Cachar. We published also a copy of the memorial from the Indian Association to the Government of India on the subject of the Inland Emigration Bill, in which the Indian Association easily proved from official statements that special legislation is no longer necessary for the supply of labour in the tea-gardens of Assam, and that Act I. of 1882 ought to be repealed and Act XIII. of 1859 declared inapplicable to Assam. There are, as Mr. Schwann showed, two classes of coolie labourers in Assam. First, there are "Act labourers," who have signed contracts for five years and are bound under penalty to fulfil their contracts. There are, in the second place, the "non-Act coolies," who are either free labourers or have signed contracts of brief duration. Now, it turns out that the "Act labourers" are to be found on the unhealthy plantations where free labourers decline to work. To continue penal laws for the control of such labour is, therefore, to bolster up the proprietors of unhealthy plantations and to enable them to obtain labour at less than the market price. This was not—ostensibly, at any rate—the aim of the legislation, and it is a gross injustice to the coolies. Even in 1886 the Deputy-Commissioner of Kámrúp held that Act I. of 1882 was no longer necessary in his district, "as only eleven gardens had availed themselves of its provisions, the improved communication rendering access to Bengal a matter of only two or three days' journey." The Deputy-Commissioner of the Assam Valley Districts expressed much the same view, and the Deputy-Commissioner of Nowgong said that the Act is most unpopular "in his district," that "the majority of the gardens work outside it," and that "the repeal of the Act would only affect a few unpopular gardens which would then have to spend more money to get coolies to go to them." Similarly the Chief-Commissioner of Assam, Mr. Ward, wrote in 1886 that "not a few officers consider that special labour laws for Assam are undesirable, and that both Act I. of 1882 and Act XIII. of 1859 might with advantage be at once repealed." Mr. Ward added, it is true, that "in remote and unhealthy tracts the planter cannot do without a Penal Act." But this observation can hardly be regarded as a fortunate argument against repeal. Most people will be disposed to agree with Mr. Porteous, late Sub-Divisional Officer of Káringanji, that "if a garden has disadvantages its owners should be prepared to pay to remedy them; it is no part of the duty of Government to provide them with cheap labour." Mr. Porteous added, significantly enough, that "the main effect of the Act is to keep down wages without, to any

"appreciable extent, bettering the condition of the labourer." Much other evidence is forthcoming, but we have probably cited enough. The whole of it goes to show that, in Mr. Ward's words, "the coolie is practically a slave for the whole period of his contract." Sir George Campbell clearly realised, as he shows in "Memoirs of My Indian Career," that the special labour laws paved the way for monstrous abuses.

In these circumstances it ought not to be necessary to show further cause for the remedy which Mr. George Russell's words seem to indicate. There can be no doubt that a system of thinly veiled slavery is flourishing in Assam, and the Inland Emigration Bill has not materially affected it. No remedy will avail short of the abolition of penal laws and the re-instatement of free labour in the position which it ought to occupy. Nobody save a few covetous planters will suffer by such a course. Penal labour laws are, at all times and in all circumstances, odious. They have only the barest pretext of justification where a new industry is fighting against special difficulties. In the case of tea-cultivation in Assam nobody regarded legislative interference with free labour as a permanent institution. "The transport of labourers to Assam, and the protection of those who enter into large contracts are," writes Sir W. W. Hunter in the *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, "regulated by law. But it is hoped that with the opening of railway communication with Assam, the necessity for such legislative interference will disappear." Not only have great improvements been made in the means of communication but the industry of tea-cultivation is now so well established that all reasonable excuse for penal laws has disappeared. On the other side the high rate of mortality in those gardens where "Act labourers" are still employed, the appalling conditions under which their work is carried on, and the countless abuses of "labour-recruiting" impose the gravest responsibility on supporters of the present system. It is to be noted that the Indian Association sought, in the memorial from which we have quoted, that Act XIII of 1859 should be declared inapplicable to Assam. Mr. (now Sir Charles) Elliott remarked in the Emigration Report for 1883 that "a contract may be enforced under this Act, though it is not in writing, though it is not stamped, though it is not registered, though it has not been presented for verification before any official, though there is no proof (other than what evidence is produced on the trial) that the labourer understood the terms of his engagement, though the terms may be manifestly unfair." The Inland Emigration Bill did not, however, discontinue the penal laws in Assam, whereupon the Indian Association supported the recommendation of the Bengal Government in favour of "initial registration in the districts where the coolies are recruited." Such registration would, it is obvious, mitigate the evils of the present contrivance by which coolies are registered away from their homes. But it is a palliative for an evil which ought to be removed, and the wonder is that it was not removed long ago. As we have remarked previously we fail to understand why the Society for the Protection of Aborigines did not long ago take

up a case which is not less but more grievous than the case of Kanaka-recruiting for Queensland, and which admits more easily of redress. The continuance of the abuse to which the attention of the House of Commons was directed in September casts discredit upon British rule, and discredit that is the more hateful because the grounds of it would be removed were the public only aware of their existence. Distant empire involves many responsibilities and subtle dangers, but it can never justify the existence of slavery under the rule of the nation to which Granville Sharp and Wilberforce belonged.

THE DEFENCE OF INDIA.

THERE is probably no more important question to the Indian taxpayer or to any other loyal subject of the Queen than the question relating to the defence of India. Yet no other question has been more hotly debated, or more carelessly confused. Nothing could be more certain than that India already possesses on her frontier a strategical position which is in every way suited alike to her needs and to her resources of defence. But there is a school—if so irregular an association may be dignified by that term—of politicians who are discontented with these natural barriers against attack, and eagerly advocate a "forward" policy that would have the effect of locating a struggle beyond the Indian frontier. The subject has of late supplied material for a controversy from which personalities have not been entirely absent. The controversy has, however, brought to light nothing which can reasonably commend the costly and uncertain schemes of aggression. Sir J. Acland and Lord Chelmsford have had to combat the somewhat vague assertions of experienced statesmen like Mr. George Curzon, and the result has been to emphasise with additional force the expediency—on every ground of prudence and economy—of keeping within the natural limits of defence and steadily refusing to embark upon dubious and possibly disastrous enterprises of extension. In the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* for October General Lord Chelmsford replied *seriatim* to the attacks of his most voluminous critic. Mr. George Curzon had asserted that this country had pledged to the Amir of Afghanistan the integrity of Herat, Maimana, and Andkui. Of these, the nearest point, Herat, is some 784 miles distant from the Indus. Mr. Curzon had not, however, condescended to an explanation of the way in which these obligations should be fulfilled. "A wild goose chase over Afghanistan" was as unattractive to him as it was to Lord Chelmsford. Yet he professed astonishment at advocacy of a scheme of defence in which the intrenched camp at Quetta played a prominent part. Lord Chelmsford recommended that two similar camps should be formed at Peshawar and on the road from Ghazni to the Indus. "The advantage of the position must," says Lord Chelmsford, "be patent to the meanest capacity. It must either be regarded by the Russians as so strong that they would hesitate to hurl themselves upon it; in which case it has fulfilled its purpose; or, if they determine to advance towards the Indus, they must either first make a direct

"attack upon the intrenched camps, and endeavour to capture one or more of them; or they must pass them by. In either case we should be able to come to close quarters with our enemy, which of course would be the object of any other plan of campaign that might be adopted. In the one scheme, however, we should be fighting on our own selected ground within comfortable distance of our supplies and reserves; which would not be the case in any more 'forward' scheme."

Sir Edward Hamley, in 1878, commended precisely the same scheme of defence, and in the following year pointed out its advantages in the House of Commons. Mr. George Curzon of course derides it, though he appears to be either unable or unwilling to formulate an alternative scheme. Lord Chelmsford remarks that if an advance towards Herat—"a wild goose chase over 'Afghanistan'"—be abandoned, Kandahar and Kabul are, on Mr. Curzon's suggested plan, the only other defensive positions on the Indian side. So far as Kandahar is concerned, General Sir Donald Stewart showed a dozen years ago how unsatisfactory its occupation would be both in a political and in a military sense. Kabul was found, as Lord Chelmsford says, to be an exceedingly weak position while it was occupied by the force of Sir Frederick, now Lord, Roberts in 1879-80. Yet Mr. George Curzon is extremely dissatisfied with Lord Chelmsford's scheme of defence. He thinks that it would signify a gross breach of faith to the Amir. But he does not himself advocate any advance upon Herat, Maimana, or Andkin. Again, he thinks that it would alienate the Afghan people from all possible alliance with us. The contention admits of only two objections, but they are formidable ones. In the first place, the Afghan people have hitherto resented any occupation of their country by our troops; and in the second place, Mr. George Curzon's own scheme, so far as he has formulated one, promises to have exactly the same effect. The rest of his criticisms turn out to be equally futile, and it is noteworthy that he and his friends have not dared to submit in precise terms any alternative policy. It is really time that, as Lord Chelmsford puts it, they should "show, by something better than a negative criticism, that they have really thought out to some logical conclusion the very intricate and difficult question of 'The Defence of India.'" The advantages of soaring in the lofty atmosphere of generalities are obvious; pursuing such a course one can continually criticise the schemes of others, applaud the "forward" policy of a vast army-spoiling for active war, and at the same time find a more or less secure retreat behind the ramparts of a non-committal policy which must not be explained for the simple reason that explanation would show it to be, not negative merely, but nothing.

THE Annual Report of the London Indian Society for 1892-3 is an encouraging document. It appears that fifteen meetings have been held during the year, and the number of members has risen from fifty-five to sixty-seven. The hon. secretary is Mr. Kabirrudin Kazi, of Gray's Inn.

THE CASE OF MR. M. M. MURZBAN.

IN the supplement to our July issue we reported a series of questions put in the House of Commons to the Secretary of State for India, by Sir W. Wedderburn, and the answers given by Mr. George Russell, relating to the case of Mr. M. M. Murzban, lately an Assistant Traffic Superintendent in the Indian State Railways Department. Among the answers given by the Under Secretary of State, it is said that "Mr. Murzban was not dismissed for misconduct or inefficiency, but that in 1888 it was decided, in the public interest, to reduce the establishment of the Traffic Department, and it became necessary to select officers for discharge. As the reports on Mr. Murzban had not been favourable, he was selected for discharge." What makes Mr. Murzban's case unintelligible, as viewed even from the standpoint of the Under Secretary of State, is the fact that all the District Traffic Officers under whom Mr. Murzban directly served as their Assistant, have, without any single exception, strongly recommended him for promotion year after year both before and even after his discharge. Moreover, the only two Traffic Superintendents who were in charge of Mr. Murzban's department on the N.-W. Railway have spoken of the action of the Government in strongly condemnatory terms. A perusal of their letters to Mr. Murzban leaves no doubt on this point. In one the Traffic Superintendent says:—"It is, of course, the old tale of caste prejudice. You are a Parsi, and therefore, not fit to associate with full-blooded English in India, though I have no doubt you have found that you are quite fit to associate with their superiors when you came to our own country. That is one of the curious enigmas for which there is no explanation. I do not think you will get any redress from the Right Honourable Viscount Cross." The same traffic superintendent writes in another letter: "You can easily settle what my remarks upon the half-yearly form must have been, for, unless they had been favourable, you would not have got incremental increase of salary." Similarly, the other Traffic Superintendent writes: "There can be no doubt that the stoppage of your increment was a most arbitrary proceeding, and as the ill-will of the powers that be can no longer affect you, I see no reason why you should not place your case before the Secretary of State, who alone can now deal with it. If you could only get it put before him by some M.P. or other influential man at home, there would be all the more chance of its being successful." In the face of these proofs from each of Mr. Murzban's immediate superiors, and the fact that all his district traffic officers strongly recommended him for promotion, it is hard to understand from what source the "unfavourable reports," originated. It is plain that the Secretary of State would do well to give the case his special attention, and institute a searching inquiry in order to arrive at the real facts which led to Mr. Murzban's discharge from the Traffic Department.

RIOTS AND INQUIRY.

WHAT IS SAUCE FOR FEATHERSTONE IS SAUCE FOR BOMBAY.

We comment elsewhere upon the remarkable resemblance between certain passages in Lord Bowen's opening speech in the Featherstone Inquiry, and the demand for investigation of the causes of religious riots in India. The whole speech is, however, so apt an exposition of the proper aims and the temper of such inquiries that we reproduce it in full:—

Lord Bowen, on taking his seat, said:—"My brother Commissioners and myself are here at the request of the Home Secretary, and by virtue of a warrant order he has issued, to hold an inquiry into the circumstances connected with the disturbances at Featherstone on the 7th of September last. Our investigation will include in its scope an examination into the reasons which existed for anticipating disorder, the precautions adopted or which might have been adopted to prevent the same, the measures taken to suppress it, and the circumstances attending the deaths of James Gibbs and James Arthur Duggan. We have come to perform this duty in the interests of the public service only. We have ourselves no preconceived opinion or bias whatsoever in the matter, and no connexion whatever with this locality or district. Our sole desire is to arrive at the truth. We are resolved to find it out, and we have no doubt we shall succeed in so doing, and we rely upon the good sense of all those who are more immediately interested, and on their belief in our complete impartiality, to enable us to obtain trustworthy and accurate information. Inside this court all expressions of feeling must be absolutely suppressed, and the evidence given, whatever its character, must be heard in such silence on the part of the audience as befits a serious inquiry. We are glad to understand that counsel are present. It may be convenient for them and for the public that we should state generally the procedure which, after reflection, we have determined to adopt. The testimony before us cannot be given upon oath, and we propose to reserve to ourselves as a rule the entire examination of witnesses, but we should wish to receive from our secretary any suggestion from the advocates present as to any questions or points to which, in the examination of any witnesses, they think our attention ought to be called, and we should hold ourselves free at any particular moment, and on any particular point, to invite any of the counsel present to aid us by putting any question themselves which we may, for any reason, think it advantageous to have asked by counsel. The inquiry shall be, as far as we can make it, thoroughly fair and complete. We have considered also in what way our examination of witnesses can be best begun, and it appears to us that it will simplify and shorten our labours if we take first one or two witnesses who can give us some consecutive and general account of the facts. First of all we intend this afternoon and at once to visit Featherstone Colliery, in company with one or more persons selected impartially to represent the conflicting interests concerned, not with a view of receiving any evidence or getting information except in open court, for none

such will be accepted by us from anybody, but for the purpose of making ourselves acquainted with the locality so as to enable us to better appreciate such evidence as will be given in open court hereafter. We have now nothing further to add except to invite the loyal co-operation of everybody present to assist us in our present public duty."

WANTED: A NATIVE JUDGE.

FROM A CORRESPONDENT.

THE administration of justice to our fellow-subjects in India forms one of the most important problems of government. Difficulties arise by reason of the variety of races, laws, customs, and social institutions prevailing in the East. We have preserved to the Indians their own laws in the matter of succession, inheritance, marriage, caste, and other religious usages and institutions. In the case of the Muhammadans, for example, their law must be administered in the matters specified, but Muhammadans themselves are divided into two great sects. Both acknowledge the paramount authority of the Koran; but beyond it their books of tradition and authority on legal matters are entirely distinct. They differ, indeed, much more than the Scotch and the English law, and their authoritative works are locked up in one of the most difficult languages of the world for a foreigner to acquire, namely, Arabic. One or two of the smaller authorities have been translated into English, but the greater and more useful works are open only to the Arabic scholar. Similar difficulties abound in the case of the Hindus. Their works of authority are again locked up in one of the most difficult of the dead languages of the world—Sanskrit. There are also difficulties arising from differences of social customs, manners, and usages, an intimate knowledge of which is essential for the correct determination of questions of fact which arise in almost every important case.

To obviate these difficulties our early administrators in India entrusted the administration of justice to judges aided by "native law officers" attached to each court. A Hindu and a Muhammadan law officer formed an essential portion of the establishment of each court, and these officers were consulted practically in the same way as that in which an English court takes evidence on a question of foreign law, with the material differences that these law officers gave not evidence, but opinions only. This was, perhaps, the best system that could be then devised, and it worked well enough for nearly a century. It was, however, found unsatisfactory in many respects, and it was thought desirable to leave the real decision of a question of native laws no longer in the hands of one who was not responsible for the correctness of the law laid down, but depended for it on the advice of his native law officers. Some of the works on native law were translated into English, and these officers ceased to exist. But soon afterwards it was found convenient to appoint some of the most qualified native lawyers to a seat on the Bench of the highest courts of justice in India—the High Courts of Judicature. The Royal Commission

which sat shortly before the establishment of these Courts, recommended, in submitting a scheme for their constitution, that a seat on the High Court Bench should be thrown open to native subordinate judges and native lawyers, known as "vakils." We accordingly find in 1860, the Secretary of State for India introducing the Bill for the "establishment of High Courts in the East Indies." The Bill became law shortly afterwards, and is now known as "Statute 24 and 25, Victoria, cap. 104." By Section 2 of this Statute the judges of a High Court may be selected from, amongst other persons,

"(3) persons who have held Judicial Office not inferior to that of a Principal Sudar Ameen or Judge of a Small Cause Court for a period of not less than five years; or

"(4) persons who have been pleaders of a Sudar Court, or High Court, for a period of not less than ten years, if such pleaders of a Sudar Court shall have been admitted as pleaders of a High Court."

Soon after the establishment of a High Court, Pandit Shambhoo Nath, a vakil of the Calcutta High Court, was selected for appointment as a judge of the High Court of Judicature in Calcutta. Though his tenure of office was not of long duration, his judgments as reported in the Bengal Law Reports show that he deserved the confidence of his countrymen and the Government. It is needless to recite the good work done by other native judges of Indian High Courts. Their names are well-known. In the Calcutta High Court the Honourable Justices Dwarakanath Mitra, Onukul Chunder Mookerji, Sir Romesh Chunder Mitra, M. L. Bose, Chunder Madhab Ghose, Dr. Gurudas Banerji, and Mr. Amir Ali, have sat as judges. Similarly, the Honourable Sir Muttuswamy Iyer occupies a seat on the Madras High Court Bench, and during his absence on leave in 1891, Mr. S. Subramania Iyer, a vakil on the Rolls of the Madras High Court, officiated for him. In the Bombay High Court, the Honourable Justices Janardan Vasudevji, Nanabhai Haridas, and the much lamented Mr. Kashinath Trimbak Telang, who died recently, have sat as native judges.

We now hear that Mr. Justice Mahmud, of the Alláhábád High Court, retires on the 25th November. Various native gentlemen have been suggested for appointment in the place of Mr. Justice Telang, but the intentions of the Government in respect of the vacancy likely to be caused by the retirement of Mr. Justice Mahmud are not known. According to the practice now prevailing in the High Courts of Judicature at Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, on the retirement of a native judge of a court his place is filled by a native of India. The rule has been carried so far that even in the case of a temporary vacancy a native of India has been appointed to act for a native judge on leave. This rule, however, was not adhered to so strictly in the North-Western Provinces. These provinces are under a Lieutenant-Governor who is a civilian. In November last Sir Auckland Colvin, their civilian Lieutenant-Governor, appointed a brother civilian (Mr. Aikman) to officiate for Mr. Justice Mahmud. Public protests against this appointment were unheeded. The appointment, however, was of a temporary character, and as it was fully expected that Mr. Justice Mahmud

would be able to resume his seat on the bench, no further action was deemed necessary. Much to the regret of his countrymen, Mr. Justice Mahmud now retires from public service, and the question of the appointment of a permanent successor arises. The claims of the natives of India to this appointment cannot be for a moment controverted. The principle was long ago conceded, and has been acted upon, that at least one native judge ought to sit on the bench of our Indian High Courts. It is the only appointment of that class which is open to a native of those Provinces. If the natives of Madras and Bombay enjoy the privilege of having one of their countrymen on the bench of the highest court of their Province, and if the natives of Bengal enjoy the privilege of having three such appointments reserved for them, it is but fair that, in the case of the natives of the North-Western Provinces, a similar privilege, enjoyed by them for the last ten years, should be continued, and that their native lawyers should have at least one seat on the bench of their High Court. Now civilian Lieutenant-Governors are, at times, inclined to make a retrograde movement. The freaks of the gentleman who holds that office in Bengal on the question of trial by jury are well-known, and it is to be hoped that he will be the wiser for the correction of his erratic conduct. Sir Charles Crosthwaite, who now holds a similar office in the North-Western Provinces, may reasonably be expected to be above such narrow notions, and a pardonable desire to see a brother civilian appointed to the Bench will hardly be permitted to warp his better judgment. The course which the local government in the North-Western Provinces may take in this matter will, however, be anxiously watched.

RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION IN INDIA.

AN interesting memorandum on the subject of railway construction recently issued by the Government of India is being much discussed in the dependency, and (writes the *Manchester Guardian*) deserves attention in this country also. It at once indicates the abandonment of the foolish policy of guaranteeing interest to private companies, and the Government's anxiety, nevertheless, to stimulate the investment of private capital in Indian railway extension. The memorandum embodies a series of new rules adopted by the Government for the construction of branch or "feeder" lines. Land for the railway and for stations, yards, offices, and warehouses is to be given free, and facilities will be afforded for procuring ballast, quarrying, brick making, and so on. It is suggested also that private companies engaging in such enterprises should be allowed to cut sleepers in the forests instead of importing steel sleepers from this country, as was done in the construction of the Bengal-Nagpur Railway. The Government will give all the information it possesses respecting projected lines, and place the surveys, plans, and estimates made by its own engineers at the service of syndicates or companies. Companies are also to be permitted to pay interest at the rate of four per cent. out of capital during the time of construction

and for six months after the opening of the line. This privilege is not without importance, as the State will retain the right of purchasing the line on repayment of the capital expenditure in fifty years, or on payment of twenty-five years' purchase after twenty-one years, the net traffic earnings of the last five years of the period being taken as the basis of computation. In consideration of the increase of traffic on the main lines which the "feeder" railways are expected to bring, a sum not exceeding ten per cent of such increase in the gross earnings of the main line will be paid from them to the branch company until the dividend of the latter reaches four per cent. The Government will make concessions only when the projects appear to have fair prospects of success, and it is hoped that this intention will be accepted by private investors as a guarantee that no rash enterprises will be floated by unscrupulous speculators. In other words, by merely granting the concession the Government will express confidence in the remunerativeness of the enterprise. The Government will retain the right to control the rates and fares and to supervise and inspect the lines, not only during construction but also when they are in use. It is doubtful whether these terms, though not without advantages to the investor, will attract the desired capital, unless it be raised in India. The British investor has been spoiled by the guarantee system of the past so far as Indian railways are concerned, and he has been discouraged by the uncertainties of exchange. Moreover, as the Government will in each case practically avow its confidence in the remunerativeness of the enterprise, will control the construction, working, rates and charges, and will desire ultimately to purchase, the investor may well ask why the Government should not itself construct the line and pocket all the profits.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

The name of Lord Elgin was mentioned in connection with the Governorship of New South Wales when the Earl of Jersey resigned. Ninth Earl of Elgin and thirteenth Earl of Kincardine, Victor Alexander Bruce can boast descent from a line of peers who have done the State service. The first peer was a statesman and a diplomatist in the reigns of Elizabeth and James. The seventh Earl, originally a general in the Army, was Ambassador at Constantinople, and there made the collection known by the name of the "Elgin Marbles," as to the retention of which there has been some difference of opinion.

The present Earl's father had a long and honourable record. He distinguished himself in the Government of Jamaica and Canada, and was engaged in important missions to China during the period of our very troublesome relations with that empire. At the time of his death he was Governor-General of India. The present Earl has been Treasurer of Her Majesty's household, and First Commissioner of Works. He is a graduate of Oxford, where he took a second in Moderations in

1870, and a second in "Greats" in 1873. Lady Elgin is a daughter of the ninth Earl of Southesk. Lord Elgin's appointment is among other things another example of the "expansion of Balliol." A Balliol man to Balliol man succeeds, and both—Lord Elgin as well as Lord Lansdowne—were favourite pupils of the late Master.

The death of Mahārāja Dhuleep Singh was quite sudden. There are five surviving children by his first wife, who died heart-broken in 1887, and two by the present Maharane, who is an Englishwoman. Elvedon, which has long been empty and shut up, will now have to be sold. It may not be easy in these times of depression to find a purchaser, for a man would need to be almost a millionaire to buy and maintain such a property.

English life spoiled the Mahārāja Dhuleep Singh. He might have made a model Sikh chief, but here he led a self-indulgent, useless life. Inclined to vanity, and fond of show and sensation, he was happy enough in England, so long as he had friends to flatter him. But his money gave out, for he never lived within his allowance of £25,000 a year, and as debts accumulated, friends fell off. Hence his melodramatic renunciation of Christianity and six years' feud with England. He excelled, however, in shooting game, an accomplishment in which Elvedon Manor gave him many opportunities to indulge.

Elvedon Manor estate lies near Thetford, in Suffolk, and extends over fifteen thousand acres. There was at one time some talk of securing Elvedon for the Prince of Wales, and to this day Norfolk people say it would have been a better purchase than Sandringham, for which the Prince's advisers paid far too high a sum to Mr. Spencer Cowper. Elvedon has been in the market for many years. Lord Iveagh once seemed a likely purchaser of the Suffolk preserves, on which, during one season, the late Mahārāja and his friends bagged 9,600 pheasants, 9,400 partridges, 2,000 hares, and 70,000 rabbits.

The Mahārāja called the Koh-i-noor "my diamond" to the last. This precious gem was "taken over" by this country on the annexation of the Punjab in 1849. The diamond weighs one hundred and twenty-three carats, and is of the estimated value of £120,000.

Mr. Herbert Woodfield Paul, M.P., whose article on simultaneous examinations to the Covenanted Civil Service will be found on another page, is one of the most brilliant of the new members of the House of Commons. He went up from Eton to Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and took a first in "Greats" a year before Mr. G. E. Buckle, now Editor of the *Times*, won the same distinction. Three years later, in 1878, Mr. Paul was called to the Bar at Lincoln's Inn, and has for some time been a leading member of the editorial staff of the *Daily News*. A pretty turn for epigram and paradox, and a deft use of literary allusion, always brighten Mr. Paul's polished periods, whether in speech or

in writing. In the House of Commons he has already made a reputation which reminds his friends of his undergraduate triumphs at the Oxford Union. Certainly, nobody has been more successful than Mr. Paul in redeeming politics during the past eight months from the House of Commons bore. His apt phrases and delicate sarcasms have on several occasions been oases in deserts of dreary debate. Mr. Paul is forty years old and married ten years ago the daughter of the late Mr. W. Ritchie, member of the Supreme Council of India.

Few pieces of news have lately excited more interest than the announcement published on October 5 that "Mr. Tom Mann, the well-known labour leader, is an accepted candidate for deacon's orders in the Church of England," that "he has received a title to the curacy of a large and important parish inhabited by the industrial classes," and that "it is expected that his ordination will take place at Christmas." Mr. Tom Mann is, of course, known chiefly for his good work in connection with the dock strike in London, and the statement that he was about to take orders in the Church of England excited general surprise, resentment in some Nonconformist Radicals, and satisfaction in many advocates of disestablishment and disendowment. As a warm supporter of the last-named policy, Mr. Mann seemed to its champions likely to prove a valuable ally within the Church itself. It appears, however, that the original announcement erred, as announcements will, on the side of the over-positive. Mr. Mann's intention was hardly quite fixed, and there has been no lack of efforts to dissuade him from it among personal friends who think him too good for the Church, and others who think the Church too good for him. It will be interesting, therefore, to watch the course of the experiment.

Probably the most notable event of the month in the theatrical world of London has been the production of "Utopia (Limited)" at the Savoy Theatre. The public is so much interested in the private concerns of its entertainers that the reconciliation of Mr. W. S. Gilbert and Sir Arthur Sullivan was enough of itself to secure popularity for their latest Original Comic Opera. But "Utopia (Limited)" has intrinsic claims as well. Never perhaps has Mr. Gilbert exhibited to better advantage his peculiar skill, which may be said to consist in transferring the humour of the stage from the sphere of action to the sphere of speech, nor Sir Arthur Sullivan his charming gift of light composition. Exquisite scenery and tasteful costumes complete a production for which it is already safe to predict a successful "run."

The cruel fashion of wearing feathers crops up time and again in the newspapers. It still flourishes and, if the "fashion papers" are to be trusted, threatens to become "quite the rage" this season. The answers that are offered to such indictments as Mr. W. H. Hudson's are manifold, though few of them call for notice. A woman who signs her letter "G. R. G." seems to imagine that she justifies a cruel practice among women by citing instances of

cruelty among men; and that, as women do not actually kill the herons, for example, they deserve no blame for buying and wearing "aigrettes." The arguments may not be very sound, but they are less odious than the carefully contrived cynicism of "R. D." who thinks that "better than many sparrows is one specimen of feminine beauty well adorned." It would be hard to think that smoking-room cynicism of this kind is common among women. The usual excuse of those whose beauty needs "well adorning" is that they do not know the price of pain at which their adornments are procured. No sane person is concerned to award the blame solely to women or solely to men, but to see a cruel fashion ended. Indeed, there is no reason why the revival of discussion on the habit of wearing feathers should not bring home to men and women their responsibilities in other fields.

It is stated that between January 17th and March 26th Archduke Franz Ferdinand d'Este shot about 2,800 head of game in his various hunting expeditions in India. The list includes almost every variety of animal and bird met with in India. Among the large game are five elephants, one buffalo, 43 black bucks, 39 wild boars, 20 tigers, and 17 jackals.

When the Council of Legal Education was initiating a new scheme of legal education for candidates for the English Bar, it did not neglect to provide for the special wants of large numbers of Indian and colonial students who enter at the Inns of Court. With rare exceptions these students are among the most industrious and hard-working to be found at the Inns. For the benefit of students who come from South Africa, Ceylon, and British Guiana, and intend to pursue their profession in those countries, Mr. F. C. Mackarness, of the Middle Temple, a former member of the Cape Bar, has been appointed by the Council to deliver a series of lectures on Roman-Dutch law, the system of law prevailing in those parts of the world, and Mr. Herbert Cowell, of the Middle Temple and the Privy Council Bar, will give a series of lectures on Hindu and Muhammadan law. Examinations will be held at the close of each course of lectures, and certificates of proficiency awarded to those who show competent knowledge of the subjects.

The annual return showing the mortality from wild animals and snakes in India in 1892, has been published. The loss of life from the former is 2,963 as against 2,861 in 1891; Bengal accounting for 1,664 deaths, the Central Provinces 317, Madras 316, North-West Provinces 233, Assam 209, and Bombay only 480. The death from snakes are 19,025 as against 21,389 in 1891. The provincial figures are:—Bengal, 9,120; North-West Provinces and Oudh, 4,566; Madras, 1,455; Bombay, 1,038; Central Provinces, 999; Punjab, 871; Burma, 543; and Assam, 208. Some 81,000 head of cattle are reported as having been killed, as against 70,000 in 1891, but these figures are of little value. About 85,000 snakes were destroyed, and Rs.9,700 were given in rewards, both figures being almost the same as those of the previous year.

THE CIVIL SERVICE OF INDIA.

THE following is a list of the candidates selected in 1892 who are declared by the Civil Service Commissioners to have shown a competent knowledge of the subjects of the final examination, together with the combined marks obtained by them at the final examination and at the open competition :—

Name.	Presidency or Division of Presidency to which assigned.	Marks at O.C. and final combined.
Hailey, Hammett Reginald C. ..	N.-W. P. ..	4,593
Hamilton, William Stirling ..	N.-W. P. ..	4,900
Anderson, Francis Geoffrey Hartnell ..	Bombay ..	4,110
Foley, Blanchard ..	Bengal ..	4,050
Goudge, Joseph Ernest ..	N.-W. P. ..	3,526
Forrest, Henry Telford Stonor ..	Bengal ..	3,608
Ingram, Gerald Constantine Win- nington ..	N.-W. P. ..	3,262
Watson, Hubert Digby ..	N.-W. P. ..	3,212
Gupta, Jnanendra Nath ..	Bengal ..	3,201
Allen, Basil Copleston ..	Bengal ..	3,131
Davidson, Ernest Robert Worth ..	N.-W. P. ..	3,100
Platel, John Joseph ..	Bengal ..	3,071
Edwards, Thomas Cecil ..	N.-W. P. ..	3,063
Gillespie, James Thomas ..	Madras ..	3,057
Couchman, Malcolm Edward ..	Madras ..	3,016
Robertson, Laurence ..	Bombay ..	2,722
Lys, William ..	Madras ..	2,630
Smyth, William John ..	Burma ..	2,599
Low, Charles Ernest ..	N.-W. P. ..	2,565
Pope, Phillip Joseph ..	Madras ..	2,391

The following candidates have shown a competent knowledge of the subjects of the literary examination, but have still to satisfy the Commissioners as to their ability to ride :—

Name.	Presidency or Division of Presidency to which assigned.	Marks at O.C. and final combined.
Arnold, George Frederick ..	Burma ..	3,754
Gruning, John Frederick ..	Bengal ..	3,685
Clarke, Robert Lucas Hyrapiet ..	N.-W. P. ..	3,657
Geldart, Wilfred Charles ..	N.-W. P. ..	3,624
Cotton, Julian James ..	Madras ..	3,585
Der Kirau Chandra ..	Bengal ..	3,545
Dewhurst, Robert Paget ..	N.-W. P. ..	3,161
D'Souza, Francis Xavier ..	Bombay ..	3,073
Maw, William Newton ..	N.-W. P. ..	2,896
Page, Horace ..	Bombay ..	2,859
Kitchin, Arthur James Warburton ..	N.-W. P. ..	2,721
Clarke, Leicester Annand Grey ..	N.-W. P. ..	2,476

Correspondence.

THE INDIAN LABOURER.

To the Editor of "INDIA."

SIR,—There is a large number of persons in India who will read with gratification, as many sympathisers have in England, the speeches by Mr. E. H. Bayley, Mr. Naoroji, Sir W. Wedderburn, and Mr. Schwann during the discussion of the East India Revenue Accounts on 20th and 21st ultimo. The contention of these gentlemen, who favour an inquiry into the condition of the Indian people by means of a Commission, is that no improvement has taken place in this condition—chiefly of the agricultural population—during the time in which the country

has been governed by the British. I have myself seen a great part of India during a service of twenty years in that country. I have marched thousands of miles in the Deccan and other parts of the Bombay Presidency, through a considerable part of Madras, and in the trans-Indus portion of the Punjab. I have lived years in Calcutta and Madras, and was familiar with the coast from Vizagapatam to Bismarrah. I have also been in Chittagong and its hill tracts. From all I have seen in those twenty years I feel constrained to agree with Sir W. Wedderburn that our government has not operated to ameliorate the condition of a large mass of the people. That gentleman states (quoting from official records) that forty millions of the people go through life without having their hunger satisfied. I have no doubt that this is the case.

But whether this deplorable condition is caused by the present system of official administration is, I think, open to doubt. I believe an inquiry which would go back a hundred years would show that the agriculturists were as poor then as they are now. The reproach to the present Government, or series of Governments, is that their condition is no better. It seems as if there were two causes immediately operating to retard a change for the better in their condition—(i) taxation; (ii) the unchecked multiplication of the people.

As regards the first, no one who looks into the matter can deny that when a poor man, living from hand to mouth, is taxed to the extent of more than half a month's wages in the year the burden is severe. The impost positively deprives him of a certain amount of actually necessary food.

The second cause is a very difficult one to deal with, since artificial checks to population are not consonant with a native's religious notions. As to measures which would indirectly help to improve the condition of the masses, Sir W. Wedderburn's name has long been associated with the proposal to establish agricultural banks to relieve the people of the pressure they suffer from the money-lenders, and this is a measure that has in many quarters been cordially approved. It is very instructive to study the tables of prices and wages published by the Government of India. In some cases wages have risen faster than prices in the period 1873–1890. But in some cases not so fast. This means deprivation of the necessities of life to a population so affected. In one case I have observed wages have stood still while the price of the staple has risen twenty-five per cent.

Have the population generally benefitted by improved communications? Very likely life statistics will show that by the insurance against famine the average duration of life has been increased; but such communications have at the same time caused a general rise in prices of which the producer has not in all cases received his due share. The work of the Congress in its endeavour to get justice done to the Indian labourer, the poorest of the poor, will be watched with much interest by many in England who know him and have an affection for him.

Your obedient servant,

Imperial Institute, S.W.

E. O. W.

October 13th.

INDIA

is published on the 1st of each month in London, and will be despatched to India by the mail preceding or succeeding the day of publication, according to circumstances.

Supplements will be published, free to subscribers, from time to time, containing VERBATIM reports of debates on Indian questions in Parliament, and documents of historical or current interest.

The subscription to INDIA is 6s. a year for England and 6 rupees for India, post free.

INDIA represents not only the political, but the literary and industrial revival of India, and appeals to all classes interested in the development of the country.

All contributions, whether articles or paragraphs, will be carefully considered, and, when used, will be paid for, if payment is requested at the time of sending. Unused contributions will be returned, if a stamped and directed wrapper or envelope is enclosed, not otherwise.

Correspondence on Indian subjects generally is invited, but all letters must be authenticated by the real name and address of the writer.

It is intended to establish a special department, called 'INDIA IN ENGLAND,' if correspondents will kindly forward information of interest regarding Indian students and other Indians resident in the United Kingdom.

The attention of publishers and editors of magazines is called to the scheme of publishing a monthly INDIAN BIBLIOGRAPHY, and their co-operation is invited.

All communications for the EDITOR must be addressed to the offices, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

All remittances, subscriptions, orders for copies, etc., must be addressed to the MANAGER, at the offices, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an ADVERTISING MEDIUM. All communications as to Advertisements must be sent to the Advertisement Manager, at the offices, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

COPIES of INDIA can be procured from the offices of the Paper, Mr. ELLIOT STOCK, Paternoster Row, London, E.C., and from Messrs. DEIGHTON, BELL AND CO., Trinity Street, Cambridge. And to order at any Railway Bookstall.

INDIA.

LONDON, 1 NOVEMBER, 1893.

SIMULTANEOUS EXAMINATIONS TO THE CIVIL SERVICE.

By HERBERT PAUL, M.P.

I GLADLY comply with the Editor's request that I should write a short article in INDIA on the subject of the resolution which I had the honour to move in the House of Commons last June, and which the House was pleased to adopt. The cordial expressions of gratitude which I have received from many parts of India, and which are too numerous for me to acknowledge individually, would have been more than an ample acknowledgment of far greater services than I have been able to perform. I am therefore the more bound to give my unknown friends the benefit of my opinion, for what it may be worth, on the merits and the consequences of the decision at which the House of Commons has arrived. The reason why I took the matter up is very simple. I had been struck by the extraordinary conduct of Sir Charles Elliott and Lord Lansdowne in curtailing the right of trial by jury throughout numerous and populous parts of Bengal for reasons so ludicrously inadequate as to be positively grotesque. I accordingly put some questions in the House to the Under-Secretary for India, and the end of it was that the obnoxious decrees were cancelled in Assam as well as in Bengal. Mr. Naoroji then asked me if I would join him in balloting for a place

on the Order Book, and would, if successful, propose a motion in favour of holding examinations for the Covenanted Civil Service of India in that country as well as in this. Approving of the proposal, I readily promised to do as Mr. Naoroji suggested.

I should like the natives of India who pay me the compliment of reading these lines to understand clearly what my position is. I will join in no attack upon the Indian Civil Service, of which Englishmen have good reason to be proud. I will not speak or vote in the House of Commons for any scheme, which does not commend itself to my own judgment, merely because the Indian National Congress supports it. I am not a member of any political organisation except the Liberal party, and I shall keep myself perfectly free to take my own line upon any Indian subject which may come before the House. But I thought, and I still think, that the present method of conducting the examinations for the Indian Civil Service is unjust to the people of India, and inconsistent with the assurances repeatedly given them by the Government of the Queen. If the question were one involving special knowledge of Indian affairs, I should not have presumed to raise it in Parliament. I have never been in India, and my knowledge of India is no greater than that of the ordinary more or less educated Englishman. But the right of all Her Majesty's subjects to compete on equal terms for the privilege of serving her in India is universally admitted, and rests upon a statutory foundation. Any intelligent person with the facts before him can estimate the extent to which this theoretical admission is practically carried out. The plan of holding simultaneous examinations is not a new one. It was recommended by a Departmental Committee of the India Office thirty years ago, it was urged upon the Government in the House of Commons by the late Mr. Fawcett twenty-five years ago, and it was rejected on very flimsy grounds by a Commission which sat in Calcutta six years ago. The present system excludes all but an infinitesimal number of natives from the Indian Civil Service, while those whom it admits must possess the purely accidental advantages of means and opportunity for coming to London on the mere chance of success. This does not strike me, and it did not strike the House of Commons, as fair and honest dealing. If it is inexpedient or unsafe that certain high and responsible appointments should be conferred upon Indian gentlemen, let the Government say so. But do not let them take back with one hand what they pretend to give with the other. The most grotesque arguments were employed against my motion in the House. One Anglo-Indian rested the whole case upon the alleged impossibility of examining candidates by word of mouth in the city of Calcutta. The real and the only objection is that the natives are supposed to be unfit for the Covenanted Civil Service of India. Yet there is not a man who will get up in the House of Commons and say so. Perhaps, for one thing, our opponents are afraid of the retort that there seems to be no danger in putting natives into any branch of the Service where the salaries are too low for Englishmen to accept.

The history of the Resolution is curious. Mr. George Russell spoke, and all the Ministers present voted, against it. No Liberal Unionist supported me, or showed the slightest interest in India. The Conservatives were hostile except one junior Whip, who may have got into the right lobby by mistake. I received invaluable aid from the Irish Nationalists. When the motion had been passed, there was a good deal of flutter. Mr. Balfour and Lord Randolph Churchill, who had not taken the trouble to come down and vote, wanted the Government to ignore the decision of the House. But Lord Kimberley ignored them. He acted like a Constitutional Minister, and in spite of vehement protests from his Council he sent the Resolution to the Government of India that they might report upon the best means of giving effect to it. The protests of the Council, which have been published, are very amusing. I never had the misfortune to shock so many elderly gentlemen at the same time before. But their indignation at the idea of an effete and antiquated body like the House of Commons presuming to interfere with the Government of India has got the better of their judgment. Some of them treat the Resolution as if it exempted successful candidates from the obligation of residence in England, which of course it does not. Sir John Strachey says that nobody in the debate dealt with the difficulty of employing one race in India to govern another. With this point I dealt myself, arguing that the contingency might easily be avoided, and I was followed by Sir William Wedderburn, who knows a great deal more about it than I do. I am afraid that the Indian Council will soon abolish the House of Commons, unless, indeed, the House of Commons should abolish the Indian Council. Their jurisdiction is purely financial and they have failed in their most obvious duty by allowing half the cost of the Opium Commission to be charged upon the revenue of India.

In the House of Lords all the former Secretaries of State for India denounced the Resolution in the strongest terms. The most violent of them was the Duke of Argyll who, when in office and a Liberal, spoke favourably of the scheme (though he preferred another, which has failed) and denounced the neglect of England to fulfil her promises to India. Much delay and obstruction may be expected from the Government of India. But a principle which the House of Commons has affirmed, and which a larger House would have affirmed by a larger majority, marks a stage of progress and will not be allowed to lapse.

H. W. PAUL.

THE CANTONMENTS QUESTION.

By PROFESSOR STUART, M.P.

THANKS to a manoeuvre of Sir Richard Temple's, Mr. Stansfeld was lately prevented from moving the adjournment of the House of Commons in order to call attention to the recent report on the rules regarding contagious diseases in the Indian cantonments. Mr. Stansfeld will doubtless take another opportunity. Meantime, the report of the departmental committee is before us, and it is full of

appalling facts. It appears that the resolution of the House of Commons calling on the Government of India to repeal the system of State regulation of prostitution has been grievously set at naught by the cantonment officials. We are not concerned just now to inquire into the rights or wrongs of the system further than to say that it has been shown to be injurious both from the moral and the physical point of view. The settled policy of the Imperial Parliament since 1883 has been to abolish all such regulations, and in pursuance of that policy the House of Commons passed unanimously in 1888 a resolution to that effect bearing upon India. The resolution was sent out at once to India, and the Indian Government, as well as the high military authorities, immediately accepted it as binding. It was not long, however, before it began to be rumoured in England that the whole system of compulsory medical treatment, registration, and licensing, against which the moral sense of the country had revolted, was being again re-established. Representations that were made to the Government at home met with the uniform reply that the resolution of the House was being carefully obeyed. The Indian authorities waxed indignant, and the Commander-in-Chief "desired to strongly repudiate what he considered to be most unfounded allegations." This was in March, 1892. But already two American ladies had visited many of the Indian cantonments. They had collected a large amount of evidence, and their friends in England were able to lay a sufficiently strong *prima facie* case before the Government to secure searching inquiry by a departmental committee under the chairmanship of Mr. George Russell. The report of the committee has been laid on the table of the House, and it was to support its conclusions that Mr. Stansfeld endeavoured to move the adjournment. The Government could not have failed to respond at once to his demand, and to undertake that legislation should be carried in India which would render impossible for the future such action as has disgraced the local authorities in the cantonments. A remarkable feature of the whole hateful business is the side-light it throws on the way in which India is governed, and especially the central military authorities' want of grip of their subordinates. Lord Roberts was evidently under the impression that his general order to carry out the resolution of the House had been scrupulously obeyed. "I travelled about every winter," he says, "and I always inquired how the rules were worked in the different stations and hospitals." When his lordship returned to England he allowed himself to be interviewed, and flatly denied the statements made by the American ladies. Even so lately as the first day of his examination before the departmental committee he was ignorant that in the cantonment of Meer the system of licensing and regulation was in full swing, and that up to May of last year registration tickets were issued to the women. Lord Roberts has since been compelled to confess that he was in the wrong. He certainly then behaved as a gentleman, and tendered a full apology for his mistake. His letter is the deathblow to the system; but we cannot help ask-

ing, if this is the state of ignorance at headquarters under our foremost general, what must be the state of mismanagement in Indian military affairs generally.

JAMES STUART.

THE BEHAR CADASTRAL SURVEY, AND THE SHAM CONFERENCE AT MUZAFFARPORE.

BY SIR ROGER LETHBRIDGE, K.C.I.E.

As it becomes more and more evident from day to day that the public conscience both of India and of England has revolted against the high-handed official tyranny of a small *coterie* in Bengal, the most frantic efforts are being made to confuse the issues, and to throw dust in the eyes of the British public. The facts of the new and oppressive taxation imposed by Sir Charles Elliott are patent and well-known in India; and every reader of the Calcutta press—whether in English or in the vernacular—must be fairly familiar with them. But in England it is not so. It is true that during the last Session of Parliament, the numerous motions and interpellations, brought forward by peers and members of Parliament friendly to the interests of the dumb millions of India, elicited many valuable admissions from the Secretary and Under-Secretary of State for India. The admissions and disclosures thus obtained have clearly aroused, on the part of the public at large, an amount of interest which—being only on such a remote subject as the welfare of the agricultural population of Behar—was entirely unlooked for by the Bengal Government. Numerous articles have appeared in the London and provincial press—all with one voice condemning the taxation involved by the Survey, and nearly all condemning the Survey itself, with its consequent extortion and litigation. These expressions of English public opinion, or some of them, have evidently penetrated even to the ambrosial heights of Darjiling and Simla; and there has been a considerable fluttering of the dovescotes. But alas, your true official despot is cocksure of his own infallibility, and sublimely unconscious of any popular right to criticise or question it—at any rate, he recognises none in India. There have been no repentances, apparently not even any qualms of conscience. There has only been a dogged hardening of the heart—"We will not let the people go!" To carry out this perverse and arrogant resolve, it has been necessary to make a determined effort to blindfold the Government of India, the Secretary of State, the British Parliament, and the British public. And so we have had, first, a sham "Conference" at Muzaffarpore; secondly, a bogus account, in the official *Gazette*, of the proceedings of that so-called "Conference"; thirdly, an audacious misrepresentation, both in the official documents at Calcutta and in the telegrams sent home, of the results of the "Conference"; and lastly, an article put forth in a London weekly paper, bearing almost unmistakable signs of official inspiration, in which all these shams and misrepresentations are collected and improved upon.

Now, I have before me as I write an elaborate

"Précis" of the proceedings of this so-called Conference at Muzaffarpore, drawn up by some of the most influential and responsible of the non-officials who were invited to attend, and who were present thereat—together with a full account of all the recent proceedings of the Bengal Government in the matter of the Behar Survey. I am told—and I challenge contradiction—that there is practically an absolute unanimity, among these non-officials, of condemnation, both of the Government proposals and of the misrepresentations that have been put before the British public—indeed, the telegrams to the *Times* have authoritatively stated this. I am told, further, that it would appear that this unanimity is largely shared by the officials of the districts concerned, if only the Bengal Government would consent to publish their opinions. I can only here give a brief summary of the "Précis"; which, however, is heartily at the service of any responsible official, or supporter of the Survey, who will use it in good faith. It will be observed that it directly traverses in every important particular all the statements put forth in the *quasi*-official article to which I have alluded.

And, first, as to the real nature and character of the meeting at Muzaffarpore. It had been loudly proclaimed that the Acting Lieutenant-Governor was going to Behar to "confer" with the chief representatives of the various classes connected with the land, zemindars, planters, rayats, on the burning question of the Survey. And it was generally assumed that he was going—as I put it in the August number of INDIA—"presumably to endeavour to arrive at some arrangement with these several classes less provocative of their extreme hostility than the arbitrary arrangements of his predecessor in office." Great hopes were naturally aroused among the sorely-tried and persecuted zemindars and rayats. But this is what the "Précis" of the non-officials says: "It is a misuse of language to call the meeting a conference. The President simply laid before the meeting two schemes for the maintenance of the Record-of-rights, and asked the non-official members which of the two they were prepared to accept. *No rayats' representative was invited, nor were the officials allowed to express their individual opinions.*" Truly, a "conference" after the official despot's own heart! And, of course, the non-officials were expected to vote for "whatever your Honour wishes." Fortunately, however, there were present Indian noblemen and gentlemen with too much self-respect, too much patriotism, and too much regard for the welfare of their poorer neighbours, to allow them to vote in this blind and servile fashion.

I have said that the non-officials were "expected" to vote in this way. But the Bengal Government seems to have gone beyond this expectation, and to have assumed that they really did so vote. For in the official report of the proceedings, the *Calcutta Gazette* actually stated that the views of the Government had been more favourably received by the zemindars and planters—the audacious misstatement did not go so far as to include the rayats—and that the "decision" (*sic*) of the Lieutenant-Governor had been accepted with "gratification." On this, the *Homeward Mail* aptly observes: "As for their grati-

fication, we may say that it is the kind of gratification a sheep might feel if it were offered the option of having its wool taken off with a knife or cut with the shears." Similar sentiments have been expressed by numerous other organs of public opinion, of all shades of politics; and that they are entirely justified is proved to the hilt by the following quotation from the "Précis" of the non-officials present at the Conference: "To this Conference no reporters were admitted, though a shorthand writer of one of the Calcutta papers had been expressly sent up to attend it. . . . The position at present is this—the Lieutenant-Governor adheres to his views, and the landed proprietors to theirs; and the Legislative Council will have to decide whether they will sanction a scheme involving fresh taxation, which is *universally condemned by both the rayats and the landlords.*"

But perhaps the ugliest part of the whole business was that telegrams and letters were sent home to the English press, giving a *couleur-de-rose* account of the results of the Conference—actually accentuating the "more favourable view," and the "gratification," of the unfortunate non-officials. And this disgraceful dodge was so far successful, that a respectable London weekly was induced to insert the article to which I referred above—which winds up with a quotation from the official *Gazette* about the "more favourable view" taken by the zemindars and planters, and thereon bases the conclusion that "further agitation, in or out of Parliament, should now cease!"

This article, faithfully echoing the suggestions and innuendoes of the Bengal Government—I observe they are very chary of making any definite charges—bases its defence of the survey on the cruelty and cupidity of the Behar zemindars, the "craft and cunning of the village agents," and the "ignorance and apathy" of the Behar peasants.

Now, first, of the zemindars. If this account be not a base slander, how comes it that the Collector of Champāran distinctly declares that rents throughout his district are extremely low?—and how is it that the Board of Revenue states that one of the chief dangers of the Survey is, that it may not improbably result in a general *enhancement* of rents? And how comes it that the head and chief of the Behar zemindars, the public-spirited nobleman who, above all others, has distinguished himself for his defence of the poor farmers of Behar against this Survey, has not only been chosen by popular election to represent this division of the Royal Legislative Council, but has also been unanimously elected by the non-official members of that Council to represent them in the Viceroy's Legislative Council? This Chief, the Honourable the Mahārāja Bahādur of Darbhanga, K.C.I.E.—who has before now effectively fought the battle of the zemindars as a nominated member of the Viceroy's Council, and will now with equal ability fight the battle of the rayats as an elected member—has indignantly repudiated the whispered accusation, not merely for himself, but also for the whole body of the Behar zemindars.

And secondly, of the "village agents." What is the very essence of this precious scheme of Sir

Charles Elliott's, but an elaborate device for subjecting every zemindar and every rayat in the country to the harassment and the extortions of these very "agents"?—and that not once for all only, on the occasion of the Survey itself, but every year, for ever, in the annual revision of the Record-of-rights?

And lastly, of the rayats themselves. If this pretence be true, how is it that the acknowledged representatives of the rayats, both in the Press and in the Associations of Bengal, angrily spurn the proffered boon, as the treacherous gift of a secret foe? How is it that the *Indian Mirror* denounces the scheme as a mean device for maintaining and aggrandising the Agricultural Department and for oppressing the rayats? How is it that the India Association—well-known to your readers as the friend and representative of the tenants—has passed resolutions strongly condemning the project? Above all, how is it that the Bengal Government did not dare to invite some representative of the rayats to attend the "Conference" at Muzaffarpore?

It is idle for the Government to pretend that the "ignorance and apathy" of the rayats are so great that they could not find a good representative. Even if this were true of the mass of the ordinary rayats—and it has been indignantly denied by Sir George Campbell and multitudes of other authorities, who have even advocated the appointment of "representative rayats" to the Legislative Councils—it is a notorious and admitted fact that there are in Behar numerous members of the rayat class, in full touch and sympathy with their fellows, who have received a good education in our colleges. And I am able to state, as a matter of fact, that some of these were actually present in Muzaffarpore at the time of the sham Conference, able and willing to state their views if permitted to do so by the Government.

This is what the "Précis" of the non-official members says on this point: "Great dissatisfaction has been created in the minds of all intelligent rayats at their not being consulted. Some say that it was impossible to get a true representative of the rayats, with sufficient education to be able to express his thoughts in English, and therefore no representatives of this class were invited at the Conference; but as a matter of fact there are numbers of pleaders in North Behar who belong to the cultivating classes and who have received a sound University training in English and law. It is believed that the Government was fully aware of the strong feeling that exists amongst the tenantry of Behar against the proposed taxation and the Survey, consequently they did not wish to have a rayats' representative whose vote against the measure would have been an effectual answer to all the Government statements about the Survey having been undertaken in order to protect the rayats' interests."

Sir Charles Elliott, in his letter to the *Times* in defence of his pet project, ventured on several hazardous predictions. Most, perhaps all, of these have subsequently been proved, by the stern logic of facts, mistaken. Everyone will remember his statement that the opposition was becoming "lukewarm"—and the prompt denial telegraphed home by the *Times'* own correspondent from Calcutta, on

the protest of the Behar Landholders' Association—but perhaps none of these allegations has been more signally falsified than that in which he declared that the indigo-planters would support the scheme “almost to a man.” In the August number of INDIA I stated my belief that the great majority of the “Farmer-Princes” of Behar were strongly opposed to the Survey; but I admitted the possibility of a small minority being misled by the attractions of the *kurtoulis* system of leases, and by the opportunity afforded by the Survey of acquiring a tighter grip on their rayats. To their honour be it said, these considerations have not weighed with them, and Sir Charles Elliott's prediction has been altogether falsified. The relations between the Behar planters and their rayats are generally so good that I believe it is now certain they will “to a man” take the part of their Indian neighbours, rayats as well as zemindars. It is stated that it was Sir William Hudson himself, the head of the planting community, who demanded, on behalf of the non-officials, that the local officials should be permitted by the Government publicly to state their individual opinions in the Conference; and nothing could well be more damaging to the cause of the Survey, than the refusal of the Government to accede to this very reasonable request.

It is now certain that practically every class and every section of the population of Behar—zemindars and rayats, Indians and Europeans, officials and non-officials—bitterly oppose this nefarious project. There is no doubt whatever that, if the Government adopts the suggestion offered by Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen and several other members of Parliament, and permits the official members of the Legislative Council to vote according to their consciences, any legislation to further the Survey will be ignominiously rejected. Such being the case, it seems incredible that this Government, or any Government, can contemplate the possibility of such a scandalous proceeding as the forcing of a hated measure through Council by the brutal weight of an official majority at the very moment when we are taking credit to ourselves for recent Council reforms. There are some members of Parliament who, in all sincerity, think that those reforms have not gone far enough in the direction of popularising the constitution of the Indian Legislative Councils. There may possibly be some—though I know of none—who think those reforms have gone too far. But however much opinions may differ as to the adequacy or inadequacy of the recent changes, I am very confident that there is no member, on either side of the House, who would willingly be a party to the infamy of stultifying British declarations, and dishonouring British honour, by such a proceeding as that which I am now deprecating. The Joint-Memorial of the Bengal Associations justly asked: “Is a heavy burden of taxation to be imposed on the agricultural community merely on official opinion, in a Province where there is a Legislative Council, and where no burdens can be imposed on the subject without legislative sanction? Legislative Councils are useless, if they are not to consider such important questions as these.” And for the Government to remit such a question to the Legislative Council,

and at the same time to order its official majority to vote down all opposition, would be worse than a crime—it would be a mean and dishonourable blunder of the first magnitude. That it would be challenged and denounced with one voice, from every quarter of the House of Commons, I believe to be certain. But I hope it is equally certain that not even the most stubborn of official autocrats would carry stubbornness and wrong-headed folly to such an extreme as that.

ROPER LETHBRIDGE.

POSTSCRIPT.

To the Editor of “INDIA.”

Since the above article was in type, a telegram from Calcutta has appeared in the *Times* of October 26th, stating that the acting Lieutenant-Governor, Sir Antony MacDonnell, has recorded a minute in defence of the Survey, in which he declares that the measure is needed for the protection of the rayats against “an illegal increase of rents,” which he alleges to have been caused “by the shortcomings of the landlords.” This statement of Sir Antony's ideas as to the purpose of the Survey, and its expected result, is so amazing, in view of what he himself wrote, by the pen of his secretary, Mr. Risley, no longer ago than last July, that the only comment I need offer upon it is to ask you, Sir, to place his two statements before the public in parallel columns. The public can then form their own conclusions.

TELEGRAM, October 26th,

LETTER, July 6th, 1893.

(Govt. of Bengal to Govt. of India).

Calcutta, Oct. 24.

Sir A. P. MacDonnell, the Acting Lieutenant-Governor, has issued a minute in defence of the Behar cadastral survey. He claims that the rayats were suffering from an illegal increase of rents in the absence of a record of their rights, and declares that it was the duty of the Government to remedy this state of things. He points out that surveys in other districts have checked abuses, reduced the number of lawsuits, and promoted good will between landlord and tenant. The Government was not called upon to contribute to the cost. The remedy was rendered necessary by the shortcomings of the landlords. In conclusion, the Acting Lieutenant-Governor declares that the memorial on the subject presented by the Zemindari Associations is inaccurate in all material points.—*Reuter.*

“By the Survey and record the landlords will gain substantially, not only in that the recovery of existing rents will be materially facilitated and its cost reduced, but by the increase of rents in cases where the Survey enables the landlord to prove that the tenant is holding land in excess of the area for which he is paying rent. In a very large proportion of the holdings in the Bettiah Raj, it is believed that such enhancement will be feasible; and although it is hoped that the Manager will not take advantage of the Survey to attempt a general raising of rents on this ground, it can hardly be doubted that the fact that he holds this power in reserve will tell in favour of the Raj in any question that may arise between it and its tenants. The presumption in favour of existing rents created by Section 104 (3) carries with it the consequence, that if there be a variation of the rent, it must be in the direction of an enhancement—unless power is given, under Section 112 of Act, to reduce rent (a power which it is invidious to exercise if it can be avoided,

and for which the Officiating Lieutenant-Governor does not now ask). The experience already acquired in the settlement of Wards' and private estates under the Act shows that, on the average, the Zemindars may count upon realising a return of from 12 to 15 per cent. on the expenditure incurred. *Regarded therefore as a mere investment, the making of a Survey and record-of-rights is a source of substantial profit to the landlords. . . .* So far, then, looking at the matter from the rayat's point of view, it will be seen that for a Survey and record which will lead probably to an enhancement of their rents, and certainly to a curtailment of the area within which the rights conferred on them by the Tenancy Act can take effect, the rayats will have to pay a sum amounting in the aggregate to one-half of the charges imposed upon the land."

"The Minute is endorsed by the Board of Revenue."
—*Reuter.*

Extract from letter of the Board of Revenue, May 28th, 1891 (Blue-book, p. 156):

"The Board think it probable that the grounds for reduction would be established in far fewer cases than those for enhancement. . . . The possibility of an enhancement of rent is, in the Board's opinion, a factor of great importance in the consideration of the present question. To the cost which would fall on the rayats on account of the Survey, and the incidental expenditure in stamps and legal advisers' fees, might thus be added in many cases a permanent charge on account of increased rents."

THE INDIAN CENSUS OF 1891.¹

By H. MORSE STEPHENS, M.A.

In the April number of INDIA a few remarks were made upon the first volume of "The General Tables of the Indian Census of 1891." These remarks were based upon the tables themselves, which were published without any commentary or explanation. It was therefore impossible to form a definite judgment as to the meaning of the copious masses of figures supplied. They suggested a few obvious reflections, but showed clearly that no startling surprise was

forthcoming as a result of the last Indian Census. It is always possible to build up elaborate theories from a careful study of statistical tables, but it is not wise to do so until the compiler has accompanied them with explanatory notes. If it is necessary to consider the point of view of a historian or a philosopher in order to discount his prejudices and his predilections, it is also necessary to observe the same discretion in dealing with a compiler of statistics. We would not for a moment imply that an official of such high and well deserved reputation as the Imperial Census Commissioner would allow his own theories or convictions to interfere with the absolute accuracy of the figures he supplies; it is rather in his exposition of the inner meaning of his statistics that we might expect to find traces of his personal leanings. For this reason it was prudent of Mr. Baines to separate his "General Report" from his tables in order that any investigator might be at liberty to study his figures before they read his commentary on them. But now that the "General Report" is published it is important to examine Mr. Baines' reflections upon the results of the vast task he has so successfully completed, for every word that he says is carefully weighed, and no one may dare to differ from his conclusions without laying himself open to the charge of impudent temerity.

Before analysing some of the features of Mr. Baines' "General Report" we must congratulate him upon his extraordinary success in dealing with the intricacies of his subject, and also congratulate the Government of India upon its good fortune in securing the services of such an exceptionally suitable man to fill the important office of Census Commissioner for India. Mr. Baines is no mere dry-as-dust statistician, but an able thinker and a singularly well-read man. It is delightful to find such an arid subject as census statistics treated with touches of light fancy as well as serious exposition. Dotted about in the pages of Mr. Baines' Report are quotations from the classical authors as well as from standard English and German writers; he even goes further afield sometimes for his illustrations, and makes use of a passage from a Romaic song with as much aptness as his references to better known literature. Again and again his "tags" from Horace and Virgil and Euripides light up the substantial fare provided in the main body of the Report, and give point to the interpretation of an elaborate series of figures. But in spite of his literary acquirements Mr. Baines is no mere pedant. On the contrary, he has a very wide grip of all Indian problems, and exhibits the power of treating them as a whole. It is an old complaint that Indian civilians are influenced in their attitude towards Indian questions by the particular circumstances of the province in which they received their training and of which they have the most thorough knowledge. Even Indian officials who have long served in the Supreme Government are not free from the taint of provincialism, and regard political and administrative questions from their own provincial point of view. Mr. Baines is singularly free from this defect. Though himself a Bombay civilian, he shows a very clear conception of the circumstances which prevail in other provinces, and but for a line

¹ CENSUS OF INDIA, 1891. "General Report." By J. A. BAINES, F.S.S., of the Indian Civil Service. (London: Printed for the Indian Government. 1893.)

in his preface it would be difficult to prove from his Report the province in which he had served. Comprehensiveness, luminous insight, and literary skill distinguish Mr. Baines' census report from any others yet issued, and it may be asserted without fear of contradiction that his Report is one of the most valuable contributions to a correct knowledge of India that have yet been published. Its interest causes all students of Indian questions to look forward impatiently to the "Decennial Statement of the Moral and Material Progress of India" which he is now engaged upon. It must be remembered that the census of India is not to be compared with the census of England or France. It is the census of a continent, containing about one-fifth of the population of the world, inhabited by many races speaking many languages and worshipping many gods. Further, only six per cent. of the population can read and write, which adds to the difficulties of enumeration, while the Oriental prejudice against the numbering of the people still exists to some extent. A census of Europe would present fewer difficulties than a census of India, and in proportion to the arduousness of the work should be the credit given to Mr. Baines and his assistants.

It is of course impossible to deal adequately with the Census Report in a short article. It must be carefully studied by all who take an interest in Indian questions, for it contains an armoury of weapons which will be freely and frequently used during the next ten years. It is necessary, therefore, to give some idea of Mr. Baines' conclusions though they differ somewhat from those generally received at present, because his authority will go far in the impending controversies on Indian questions.

First of all, Mr. Baines is distinctly an optimist. The bitter cry which has gone up, that the population of India was increasing (owing to local customs and the elimination or reduction of the three great checks to over-population, war, pestilence, and famine) faster than its means of subsistence, seems to him to be without general foundation. In this view he is in direct opposition to the sentiment of the Indian National Congress. It is incumbent on the supporters of the Congress to examine his remarks on this subject with very great care, for they may be sure that they will be the subject of constant reference. They might, perhaps, wait for the publication of the "Decennial Statement" in which, probably, Mr. Baines will be more explicit upon this point than the strict limits of the Census Report permitted. He summarises his conclusions on this most important point in the following sentences: "It may be gathered that the agricultural class, that is, the bulk of the population of British India, is not pressing too closely on its means of subsistence, except in a few special localities. In a part of Behar, and in a small tract on the Bombay coast, the local produce is insufficient for the inhabitants every year, and migration is adopted as a mode of relief. In parts of the Deccan the uncertainty of the season makes a pressure felt in circumstances where otherwise the land could bear the burden with ease. In the centre of the Gangetic valley there is a zone in which the margin of subsistence has been nearly reached owing

to, not simply the weight of numbers thrown on the land, but in part also to the liability of the tract to failure of rain. With these exceptions, the local resources suffice, and in several parts of India are year by year in excess of local needs, so that a large stock is always available for transport to places where it is wanted. Such is the problem in the present day, so far as the great mass of the people is concerned." (p. 41). This view is supported with many tables and an array of figures in the third chapter of the Report on the Movement of the Population. In this chapter the causes of variation in political, geographical, and climatic divisions of India are very carefully analysed, and in particular the birth-rate is intelligently tabulated. It has been so often asserted that the Indian habit of early and universal marriage tends to make the population too prolific that it is curious to note from one of Mr. Baines' tables (p. 73) that the annual rate of increase in India is only 0.93 per cent., and that India only stands twentieth out of the twenty-eight countries for which statistics are available in this respect. For instance the United States increase 2.48 per cent. annually, Saxony 2.00 per cent., England and Wales, despite emigration, 1.28 per cent., and Prussia 1.15 per cent. as compared with the ratio in India. It must be remembered that the practice of early marriage is balanced by the prohibition against the re-marriage of widows and the great mortality among immature mothers and their offspring. Mr. Baines concludes his chapter with saying: "We have every reason to assume that the present rate of increase amongst the people of India is well within their means of subsistence. If maintained, which of course it will not be, it would be seventy-five years before the population doubled itself, and the problem of their support would then, no doubt, be a hard one for our successors" (p. 85). This is an optimist's statement. Probably the discrepancy between the views of the Imperial Census Commissioner and of the Indian National Congress is to be found in the word "subsistence". The question of what is necessary for subsistence is now being fought out by the colliers in England, and it may be that Mr. Baines and Mr. Naoroji have very different views as to what is requisite for the happiness of the Indian rayats.

In the April number of INDIA attention was drawn from the figures published in the General Tables to the proportionately greater increase in the Native States than in British India, and it was suggested that this was possibly due to the fact that native rule was more congenial to the people than the British government. Mr. Baines devotes two pages and two tables to answering this criticism. He admits that 915,996 more persons, according to the statistics, migrated from British provinces to Native States than from Feudatory to British India. But he continues: "looking at the large omissions in the returns of the immigrants from the smaller groups of States such as those under Bengal, Madras, and the Central Provinces, it is clear that the difference is but nominal. It is to be expected that between now and the next census there will be a larger transfer of population from one political section of the country to the other, for there is no doubt that

unoccupied land of good quality exists in the States in far greater quantity than is left in the Provinces. The actual assessment in the former is said to be higher, but the system of realisation is less efficient and more elastic, a difference which has its recommendation in the eyes of the peasant" (p. 72). We do not intend to contest Mr. Baines' figures or his qualification of them, but we welcome his admission that elasticity in collecting the land revenue makes the Native States popular, and wish that this characteristic of their administration could be introduced into the British Provinces.

There is only room to touch here on one more chapter in the Report, namely, the sixth, on the Distribution of the Population by Literacy. In this chapter Mr. Baines speaks out plainly. He points out, after making due qualifications as to the difficulty of the subject, that in spite of the great efforts which have been made to promote education, only six per cent. of the population of India can read and write. Still more striking are his figures with regard to female education, for it is shown that, in his own words, "females imbued with some tincture of literacy" only amount to 57 in 10,000 or a little more than a half per cent. These figures are terribly disappointing and show that a long period must elapse before the Indian people can rank educationally with the civilised countries of Europe. This backwardness of India appears more vividly when a comparison is made with even the least advanced European States. Thus in Hungary 408 males and 283 females can read and write out of every thousand, in Italy, 377 males and 236 females, and in Portugal, 250 males and 108 females, whereas in India the proportion is only 109 males and 6 females. Even Ceylon appears favourably by the side of India for in that island 269 males and 29 females per thousand are able to read and write. Another interesting table on this subject contains details of the literacy of the different religions in India. From this it appears that the Parsees come first, followed at a considerable distance by Jains, Jews, Buddhists, and Christians compared with whom the prevalent Hindu and Muhammadan religions show to disadvantage. The whole of this chapter deserves careful study, and affords ample justification for those administrators who advocate increased educational activity.

It must not be supposed that these few remarks do more than draw attention to a very small portion of the contents of Mr. Baines' Report. There is much in it which will repay attentive study. We are reaching a period when facts must take the place of eloquent generalities, and the Census of 1891 collected a vast mass of indispensable facts. From them can be gathered many valuable arguments, but care must be observed in using them, for the mastery of statistics is not a gift granted to every man, and even where it exists it affords many a snare to the unwary, many a pitfall for the imaginative.

H. MORSE STEPHENS.

THE Vakils' Association for the North-Western Provinces has addressed a memorial to Lord Kimberley praying for the appointment of a native judge to succeed Mr. Justice Mahmud.

VILLAGE LIFE IN INDIA.

LECTURE BY SIR W. WEDDERBURN, M.P.

On October 18th, Sir W. Wedderburn delivered a lecture at Keith, Banffshire, on "Village Life in India." He said that he had chosen the subject of village life because he considered that it lay at the foundation of the whole condition of the people. There had long existed two popular fallacies with regard to India. One was that India was a rich country. The "wealth of Ind" had been proverbial long before the time of Milton, and it was true that India possessed great possibilities of wealth. But her resources were undeveloped, and her vast population of 280 millions were for the most part in a state of the most extreme poverty. Their average income was only three-halfpence a day, and they had no savings in money or grain, so that a single failure in the periodical rains caused a famine, and led to countless deaths by starvation. The other fallacy was that it was impossible for the general public of Great Britain to understand Indian affairs. It was said that races, castes, and religions differed so much in different parts of India that no one except official experts could form an opinion regarding their condition and requirements. But this was altogether a mistake. The great bulk of the population were peasant cultivators, grouped together in small village communities like rural parishes, and their economic conditions were very much the same throughout India. Each village community was self-governing and self-contained. The problem, therefore, was not so very difficult. It was how to make one village contented and prosperous, and we then should have the clue to the well-being of the whole of India. In order to understand the nature of the village community, it was necessary to bear in mind two facts—First, that its origin was purely agricultural, the central idea being the ownership of the village land; and secondly, that in its construction the Indian village was simply an expansion of the domestic unit—the united Hindu family—the members of which were united under the management of the father, owning and cultivating the ancestral lands in common. Manu, the great Indian law giver, said that the land belonged to him who first cleared away the jungle and brought the soil under cultivation. When, therefore, a man and his sons had performed this operation and enclosed a site for their own dwelling and the shrine of the family divinity, the foundations of a village had been laid. As the numbers increased and the sons had families of their own, the representative of the founder, under the title of patel, remained hereditary head of the village, exercising the executive power, while the real authority rested with the village Assembly, of which all the heads of households were members. As regarded the organising of the village, the patel, or head man, was assisted by a hereditary accountant, generally a Brahmin, who kept the village books, and under the orders of these two functionaries there was a certain number of village servants who carried out the administration in its various branches, collecting the Government land tax, maintaining order, managing the communal pastures and forests, regulating the distribution of

water from the irrigation tanks, and keeping the village clean. In India there was no poor law, as each family and village voluntarily maintained its own poor. Village officers and servants received in payment for their services a certain share of grain at harvest time, and the same mode of payment extended to the hereditary village artisans—the carpenter, the blacksmith, the weaver, the potter, the shoemaker, the barber, the washerman, and so forth, each of whom performed his professional duties for the benefit of the villagers, and received dues in kind, according to the ancient local custom. These hereditary artisans formed a guild in each village, and besides their ordinary services had an important part to play in the ceremonial at marriage and other festivities under the leadership of the carpenter, who was head of the guild. Sir W. Wedderburn referred to the modes of cultivation followed in India, describing the great skill of the peasant cultivators, who produced the finest quality of valuable products such as indigo, rice, opium, cotton, jute, tea, tobacco, and coffee. Unfortunately, they had fallen terribly into debt to the money lenders. Debt paralysed their industry, and their ancestral acres were sold by decrees of the Courts. Upon an average they had to pay the money-lenders twenty-four per cent. per annum. What was most needed was a system of agricultural banks which would give them loans on reasonable terms. At present India only took 1s. 6d. per head of British manufactures on account of the extreme poverty of the people. If they could take 20s. per head, our trade with India would be equal to our trade with the whole of the rest of the world put together, to the great advantage of the toiling masses both in India and in this country. The way to make India prosperous was to take care of the villages. Sir James Caird, who went to India on the Famine Commission, called the village organisation “the sheet anchor of Indian statecraft.”

Reviews.

LORD CLIVE.

Lord Clive and the Establishment of the English in India. By COL. G. B. MALLESON, C.S.I. (*Rulers of India Series*). (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. Price 2s. 6d.)

LITTLE that is new remains to be said of the character and the career of Robert Clive. Lord Macaulay has stamped a conception of Clive upon the minds of Englishmen which it would be hard to efface. Fortunately for the reputation of the “heaven-born general” Macaulay took a more just view of Clive than he did of Warren Hastings. The latter’s numerous apologists, in spite of their enthusiasm and ability, have failed to alter the popular conception of the first great pro-consul. Macaulay’s portrait has stuck fast in the popular imagination and no exposition of his errors of detail has been able to change it. With regard to Clive, there is no need to resort to sweeping criticism of Macaulay’s

account of him as presented in the famous essay, and the work of subsequent biographers has been rather to elaborate military details than to alter the general outline. Yet a series of “Rulers of India” which omitted a biography of Clive would justly cause surprise, and Sir W. W. Hunter has been well advised in including the present volume. Clive was, of course, no more a ruler of India as a whole than Albuquerque, or Duplex, or Mountstuart Elphinstone, but, like them, he influenced profoundly the fate of the whole peninsula.

A life of Clive being rightly considered necessary to the series no better man than Col. Malleeson could have been engaged to write it. Col. Malleeson has already done much valuable work on the period during which Clive established the supremacy of the English in India. In his “Decisive Battles of India,” his “History of the French in India,” his little volume on Duplex, and his large volume on Clive, published in 1882, he has shown a considerable knowledge of the period as well as literary skill in treating it. His difficulty in the present instance must have been to condense his knowledge, and to arrange his biography to the scale of the other volumes of the series. To say that he has been completely successful would perhaps be too high praise, but it would be difficult to point to any modern historian who could have done the work better. His book will probably not be as popular as some of the others in the same series for it does not fill a crying want, and has to run the risk of being compared with Macaulay’s famous essay. There is nothing absolutely new in the present volume, but Col. Malleeson is the first biographer of Clive who has been able to avail himself of the valuable researches made by Mr. G. W. Forrest into the Madras records. The light thrown by Mr. Forrest has been mainly upon Clive’s earlier days before he received a commission in the Company’s army. Mr. Forrest has shown that the popular conception of Clive as a turbulent young civilian is unfounded, and Col. Malleeson has judiciously adopted this view. So far is it from being the case that he was a noisy and violent young man that, as we learn from Mr. Forrest, the Madras Government reported of him that: “he is generally esteemed a very quiet person and no ways guilty of disturbances.” The main lines of Clive’s career are so well known that there was little new for Col. Malleeson to add, but he has skillfully incorporated some details from the interesting “Journal of Captain Dalton,” which was published in 1886, and others from Col. Broome’s “History of the Bengal Army.”

With regard to Clive himself it seems almost time that his panegrists should take account of the numerous occasions on which he was surprised. The greatest of all generals not only extricates himself from serious difficulties, but foresees positions of danger into which he is being led. Now Clive on at least three occasions was practically obliged to fight and to be victorious in order to save himself from irretrievable disaster. In the battle of Káveripák, outside Trichinopoly, and in the battle of Plassey victory alone saved Clive. That he showed the audacity of genius may be granted, but it may be doubted whether the greatest soldiers would have

allowed themselves to be placed in a position from which victory alone could extricate them. As a man of action Clive was superb, but (we say it with all deference) he does not appear to have had the most important of all military qualities, the power of seeing through the designs of his opponents. Clive's greatness as a soldier is unquestioned. His abilities as a captain seem to have been generally placed too high. He had an extraordinary intuition into the nature of Indian warfare, but would he have been equally successful against a great European general like Turenne, or Marlborough, or Napoleon? At the least his mistakes would have cost him dear, and he would not have escaped so easily. It is an old and true axiom of Turenne's that the greatest general is he who makes fewest mistakes. Clive's mistakes were many and glaring. He had the good fortune to contend against incompetent opponents and beside them he shone out as a veritable genius for war. Col. Malleon's sober account of the epoch-making battle of Plassey brings out once more into prominence the fact that the victory is more important on account of its results than for the talent displayed in obtaining it. It was a sleepy, sluggish sort of battle in which everything hinged on the desertion of Mir Jafar from his master Siraj-ud-Daula, and there was no great glory won on either side. A tamer inauguration of a great Empire could not be imagined, and Col. Malleon rightly gives more space to describing the fighting round Trichinopoly when Clive had foemen rather more worthy of his sword.

The little volume is, it need hardly be said, pleasantly written. Colonel Malleon is too skilled a workman to produce a bad book. It is also well proportioned and, where judgment is necessary in estimating either individuals or events, the author is never at fault. We wish, however, that Colonel Malleon would now make time to write the second and third volumes of his promised work on the founders of the Indian Empire. The first volume of this projected work, the life of Lord Clive, was published so long ago as 1882, and we are still waiting for its promised successors on Warren Hastings and Lord Wellesley. Colonel Malleon's activity and industry are such that we may fairly hope that these volumes will soon be forthcoming.

A STUDENTS' HISTORY OF INDIA.

History of India from the Earliest Times to the Present Day; for the use of Students and Colleges. By H. G. KEENE, C.I.E. 2 vols. (London: W. H. Allen and Co. Price 16s.)

IN our notice (February, 1893) of Sir W. W. Hunter's "Brief History of the Indian peoples," we made no attempt to compare the various short histories of India which are at present in circulation. There are many such histories, and each of them has some merit particular to itself. The demand for short histories of India, like the demand for short histories of England, originates in the requirements of educational authorities. It is well-known that few branches of literature are so lucrative as the compilation of school books. This is peculiarly the case with regard to history and other branches of science.

Whereas a large and expensive historical or scientific work can only expect a limited sale, the circulation, and consequently the profits, of a text-book which has the good fortune to be adopted by any large number of educational institutions are considerable. Hence it happens that writers who have made a reputation as historians often attempt afterwards to compile the more profitable historical school book. Professor S. R. Gardiner and Sir W. W. Hunter, who are both successful historians, have produced text-books as well as larger works upon the history of England and the history of India, and, just as Professor Gardiner has many rivals for the suffrages of the English school authorities in elementary books by schoolmasters, by University lecturers, by men of letters, by crammers, and by amateurs, so Sir W. W. Hunter has many rivals in catering for the needs of the Indian educational authorities. The chief of these latter as regards Indian history are the various Universities which prescribe the subject for their examinations. The historical text-books recommended are frequently changed, and a constant stimulus is thus supplied for the production of a really adequate elementary history of India. We do not propose to enter on the difficult task of comparing the numerous elementary histories of India which at present exist. But it may be noted that among Sir W. W. Hunter's rivals are men eminent in different degrees, among whom may be mentioned Sir Roper Lethbridge, Mr. Talboys Wheeler, Dr. Pope, and Mr. Ramesh Chunder Dutt, while Mr. John Adam of Pachaiyappa's College, Madras, has successfully inaugurated his series of "Epochs of Indian History."

Numerous as are the rival elementary histories of India, there is less competition in writing works on a somewhat larger scale. There are many volumes published for boys, at the price of two or three shillings, but there are comparatively few for more advanced students. Yet the gap is one which needs filling. The young man who has acquired an elementary knowledge of the subject needs a more advanced general idea before he can enter upon the study of special books on special periods. This is the gap which Mr. H. G. Keene has endeavoured to fill. Putting aside Marshman's work which in its full size is rather too long, and in its abridgment is rather too short, and the historical chapters in Sir W. W. Hunter's "Indian Empire," we find that the only predecessor of Mr. Keene's book which deserves mention is Meadows Taylor's "A Student's Manual of the History of India." It is the least attractive of Captain Meadows Taylor's numerous books on India. Admirable as a novelist, he had not had the experience in teaching which could have shown him the needs of students. The result is that his work is not useful for the teacher. It is ill-arranged and cumbered with proper names. He seems not to have learned the axiom that in a book for students every proper name must be connoted, or shown to mean something. Now Mr. Keene, though we are not aware that he has ever been engaged in the actual work of teaching, has yet had considerable experience as an examiner in Indian history. He examines the selected candidates for the Indian Civil Service and should therefore know what students really need.

A glance shows that his new book is far superior to Captain Meadows Taylor's, and the Civil Service Commission have wisely adopted it for the selected candidates for the Civil Service in place of Marshman's abridged history.

Mr. H. G. Keene is well-known as a writer on Indian historical subjects. More than one of his earlier works have attracted attention as serious contributions to history, and his "Fall of the Moghul Empire," his "Turks in India," and his "Madhava Rao Sindhia," in the "Rulers of India" series, have given proof of his powers of research, and his competence in writing history. It is hardly possible here to enter into a detailed criticism of Mr. Keene's new book. It must be tried as a book to teach from before judgment can be finally passed upon it. Experience alone can decide whether he has accurately gauged the needs of students who come to the subject of Indian history without more knowledge than is given by the reading of an elementary text-book. If his book fulfils the requirements of these students it will become a standard work for other readers who, though not students themselves, yet desire to get a sound general knowledge of Indian history. If, however, experience shows that he has not fulfilled these requirements, Mr. Keene will be superseded in his turn, as he has certainly superseded his predecessors.

But though it is necessary to suspend judgment until experience has been gained, it is imperative that one sweeping criticism should be made which must strike anyone who looks into the book for a single moment. Mr. Keene professes to have written a history of India in two volumes of nearly equal size, yet in the first volume he carries the story down to 1813, leaving only eighty years for his second volume. That is to say, he narrates not only the whole of the early history of India, but also the establishment of the British Empire in one single volume, and devotes the whole of his second volume to the extension of the British Empire. To put this criticism in more salient form, he sums up in four chapters the early history of India to the rise of the Moghul Empire, and the history of the Moghul Empire itself in two chapters, while he expends eighteen on the history of the British in India. His book is therefore really a history of the British in India, with an introduction summing up the previous history of the country. We are not blaming Mr. Keene on this account. No one knows better than he does that it is practically impossible for any one man to grasp the whole of the vast complex issues presented by Indian history. For English students his proportion is probably the most useful that could be made. English readers naturally wish to know the story of the British Empire in India, and need some enthusiasm before they enter the period of Muhammadan history, or the more complicated era which preceded it. But, as far as Indian readers are concerned, and especially Indian Muhammadans, it may be expected that some indignation will be felt at a work which mainly treats the story of the British Empire, and yet calls itself a history of India. Englishmen are only too apt, as it is, to regard the whole history of India before their arrival in the country as of no importance. But Indians do not

take this view, and if a great school of Indian native historians ever arises it is certain that they will lay weight on the fact that there were great dynasties and great empires before the English ever came to the East, and that they will regard the history of the British Empire as a mere episode in the long record of centuries. We repeat that Mr. Keene is not to be blamed for what seems to be a serious error. He deserves credit from one point of view in not devoting space to the early period on which authorities are few and trustworthy information is scarce. But, for all that, he must not be surprised if the title of his book is regarded in India as a misnomer, and even gives serious offence. It would have been easy for him to alter his title so as to express the contents of his book. It should be added in justice to the publishers that the book is excellently "got up," and illustrated by many useful maps and plans. It seems to be well written, and the author has avoided many conventional mistakes. He has also adopted an intelligent system of spelling based on that of the *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, but it seems somewhat superfluous to correct the old spelling of Oudh to Audd.

A BENGALI STATESMAN.

Rájá Digambar Mitra, C.S.I.: His Life and Career.
By BHOLANATH CHUNDER. (Calcutta: Hare Press, 1893.)

THERE have been three distinct generations of Bengali reformers, three successive groups of men who have led advanced public opinion in the most populous province of India, and it is time that we who daily study the thoughts and sayings of the third generation of Young Bengal should make an effort to appreciate the aims and deeds of their predecessors. The first group came into existence during the time of the great extension of native energies under Lord William Bentinck. The era of war was over, and the statesman who first devoted himself to the peaceful development of India showed ever a constant desire to improve the status of the native population. It was Lord William Bentinck who first consulted prominent native leaders before initiating a new political departure, and he received the reward of his confidence by obtaining their hearty co-operation in all his reforms. The Bengali leaders, of that epoch were men whose aims were rather social than political; they did not desire to acquire power, but rather to show their countrymen the advantages which resulted from an English education and initiate reforms which enlightened Western opinion believed to be imperatively needed in Bengal. Of this generation the most distinguished leaders were Ram Mohan Roy, Dwarka Nath Tagore, and Rájá Radhakanta Deb. Their task was to introduce European ideas into Bengal, and to pave the way for concerted action in the next generation. The next group of Bengal reformers were the men who formed the British Indian Association in 1851, and devoted their lives to the promotion of political interests in Bengal. Some of the giants of the former generation survived to assist the new development, and Rájá Radhakanta Deb was the first President

of the Association. The aims of the Association were purely provincial. They strove for the equality of Englishmen and Indians before the law, but did not grasp the conception of Indian grievances as a whole, or agitate for the adaptation of English political institutions to India. This generation had had the advantage of a thorough English education, and boasted of many orators, journalists, and statesmen of conspicuous ability. It is invidious to mention many names, but no one can contest the right of Mahārāja Rama Nath Tagore, Rājā Digambar Mitra, Ram Gopal Ghosh, Harish Chandra Mukerji, Kristo Das Pāl and Rājā Rajendra Lala Mitra to be numbered among them. These men in their turn have given way to the new generation of Congress leaders, who regard Bengal as an integral part of India, who demand the constitutional rights of British subjects, and whose opinions are politically far more advanced than their predecessors. Of this group of Congress leaders the best known representatives are Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, Surendra Nath Banerjee, and the eloquent brothers Mono Mohan and Lal Mohan Ghose.

Rājā Digambar Mitra, the subject of the biography under review was one of the principal members of the second generation, and his biographer has skillfully embodied in his book a very fair summary of the position and characters of his chief contemporaries. Indeed this is perhaps the most valuable portion of the volume. The actual life of Digambar Mitra would not have occupied much space had it not been supplemented by an appreciation of his place among the others. He was essentially a statesman. While eloquent journalists like Kristo Das Pāl and Harish Chandra Mukerji were urging needful reforms in the Calcutta press, while Sambhu Nath Pandit and Dwarka Nath Mitra were illustrating the acuteness of the Bengali intellect on the bench of the Calcutta High Court, while Rajendra Lala Mitra was pursuing the antiquarian studies which made him famous, Digambar Mitra was serving in the Bengal Legislative Council, and showing himself a legislator of high ability and independence. The second generation of Bengal reformers can justly boast of many illustrious names, and though their political ideas seem somewhat antiquated to the modern generation which has seen the rise and growth of the Indian National Congress, their services should not on that account be undervalued.

The details of the life of Digambar Mitra can be briefly summarised. Sprung from one of the three Kulin Kayasth families in Bengal, he received his early English education at the Hare School and the Hindu College. At college he came under the influence of Mr. Derozio, the brilliant young Eurasian poet, who so powerfully affected the minds of his pupils and impressed on them a sense of patriotism and courage. He was born in 1817, and on leaving college in 1834, he found it necessary, owing to his father's poverty, to make a career for himself. For four years he drifted from place to place in the Mofussil until he was appointed manager of the vast Zamindari estates of Rājā Kishen Nath Roy, the heir of Warren Hastings' confidential diwan and the husband of the Mahārāni Surnamoyi, whose charities are famous throughout

India. He managed these estates so well that in 1841 the Rājā presented him with a lakh of rupees. With this capital he entered into business, first as an indigo planter and silk manufacturer and afterwards as a stockbroker, and he ultimately accumulated a large fortune. His experience as an estate manager caused him to purchase several Zamindari estates, which under his skillful superintendence became most profitable. In 1851, when the British Indian Association was founded, he commenced his political life, and was appointed its first assistant-secretary. He served the Association loyally throughout its great days, when it really represented the advanced thought of Bengal, and he finally became its president in 1877. The political life of Digambar Mitra was practically that of the British Indian Association, which he represented on many occasions when the Government asked for the services of an independent native gentleman. His ability in this capacity was so manifest that he was selected to serve as a member of the Bengal Legislative Council from 1864-66 and from 1870-74. In 1875, during the visit of the Prince of Wales to India, he acted as Sheriff of Calcutta, being the first Bengali native gentleman to hold that office, and in the following year he was made a C.S.I. In 1877, when the Queen assumed the title of Empress of India, he was created a Rājā, and on 20th April, 1879, his useful life came to an end.

This summary shows the period covered by Digambar Mitra's political activity. Between 1851 and 1879 there were few subjects of importance on which he was not consulted by the Government; but his work in the investigation of the causes of the Bardwān fever, and the measures to be taken against that pestilence, deserve special record. In estimating his career it must not be forgotten first that he was a Zamindar himself, and second that he lived before the epoch of the Indian National Congress. To modern Bengali reformers he seemed at the close of his life to be conservative and reactionary; but nevertheless it should not be forgotten that he was one of the founders of the British Indian Association and one of its leaders at the time of its greatest political importance.

INDIAN GEOGRAPHY.

An Elementary Geography of India. By LIONEL W. LYDE, M.A. (London: Rivington, Percival, and Co. Price 1s.)

There is perhaps no want more keenly felt by those who are engaged in teaching Indian history than the want of an efficient geography of India. Dr. George Smith's "Students' Geography of India" can hardly be called a success. It discourages the learner by its masses of names, and its arrangement is so arbitrary that the teacher cannot use it as a textbook. To come to smaller and less ambitious works, the "Elementary Geography of India, Burma, and Ceylon," by Mr. H. F. Blanford, is an excellent volume as far as it goes. It is particularly full in the pages devoted to physical geography, and makes a feature of giving the railway systems; but it is weak on the political or administrative side. Professor D. T. Ansted compiled an excellent little

geography, which was published by Messrs. W. H. Allen and Co. some years ago, but it has not been revised for many years, and is now out of print. Far and away the best work yet done on Indian geography are the opening chapters of Sir W. W. Hunter's "Indian Empire." In them the functions of the rivers, which form so important a feature of the Indian geography, are so interestingly described that the pupil looks upon geography in a new light, and becomes an intelligent student. It is much to be wished that Sir W. W. Hunter would bring out those geographical chapters separately, with additions treating of historical and administrative geography. There would then exist what is so much needed—a really trustworthy, complete, and instructive geographical manual, adapted alike for the general reader and for teaching purposes. Mr. Lyde, in the volume under review, has not attempted to do more than compile a very elementary work, apparently for the use of middle schools. He acknowledges in his preface that his own pupils average from fourteen to sixteen years of age. The statement gives in a word the scope of his little volume. But Mr. Lyde is no ordinary schoolmaster. He announces on his title page that he is lecturer on commercial geography to the Oxford and Glasgow University Extension Boards, and devotes, as might be expected, much of his space to describing the natural products of India. He describes them, in the small space at his disposal, with singular accuracy. He not only gives a general sketch of the vegetable and mineral products of India, but subsequently, under each province, lays weight on this point. This is a most valuable characteristic of his book, for it brings home to English boys the extent of the resources of India. It is a sign of the times that the wealth of India is now being far more accurately gauged in England than it used to be, and the advantages of India for the investment of capital are being more thoroughly appreciated. It is right that pupils should be taught not only the height of Indian mountains, the length of the rivers and the size of the cities, but also which are the wheat districts and the rice districts, where are the tea gardens and the coffee plantations, and whence come the cotton and the Tasar silk, the teak, the indigo, the jute and the sandal wood. An idea of the size of India can be as clearly derived from the variety and number of its products as from a mere statement of the square miles it contains.

One excellent feature of Mr. Lyde's book is to be found in his constant references to familiar English facts. Little touches such as that Madras has almost the population of Manchester, that Calicut and Mangalore are about the size of Greenock and Yarmouth, illustrate Mr. Lyde's mode of treatment. Few people—even those who are well acquainted with the map of India—realise that the Native State of Travancore is as big as Yorkshire, that Coorg is about the size of Kent, or that the total area of the French possessions in India is rather more than that of the Isle of Wight. These homely comparisons are distinctly useful. The teaching of geography has in recent years become far more intelligent, and this little book is a capital specimen of the new type of school book which is now being adopted. Possibly with the existence of a little volume like this the

teaching of Indian geography may be introduced more freely into English schools, and if so Mr. Lyde has done good service to the cause of India, for English ignorance of Indian matters is perhaps the greatest enemy against which India has to fight. The Indian proper names are spelt in Mr. Lyde's book after the Hunterian fashion. The book is singularly well printed, and we have not discovered any misprints. Generally, it is creditable alike to the author and the publisher. What is now wanted is a book on a somewhat larger scale suitable for more advanced students, in order to replace Dr. George Smith's cumbersome and impossible "Students' Geography of India."

INDIAN COOKERY.

Anglo-Indian and Oriental Cookery. By Mrs. GRACE JOHNSON. (London: W. H. Allen and Co. Price 3s. 6d.)

THE ordinary English idea about Indian cookery is a vision of curry and mulligatawny soup. It is also a matter of common knowledge that from India come chutney, mango pickle, and guava jelly. Beyond that the imagination seeks no further. There is a vague notion that curry is always one and the same thing, and the subtle distinctions between the Bengal, Bombay, and Madras varieties merely irritate the Englishman who has not been in India. If an old Anglo-Indian comes to his table he feels it to be a duty to lay before him some specially prepared abomination of the British cooks which he dignifies by the name of curry, forgetting that his guest would much prefer the toothsome mutton or the appetizing salad after years of enforced curry-eating in the East. Many Anglo-Indians declare that a true curry cannot be made out of India, and they are justified in this supposition by the peculiar and varied nastiness of the concoctions made up under that name in England. In France what is called *kari* is more eatable but even less Oriental than the English version. But in both countries it is considered necessary that a true curry should be scalding hot with condiments and if it brings tears to the eater's eyes the cook's triumph is complete.

Everyone who has been in India knows that curry and mulligatawny soup do not form the only articles of Anglo-Indian diet. Our countrymen in India have grafted some of their national tastes upon the minds of their native servants and providers, and there has been evolved a sort of hybrid system including both European and Oriental dishes modified to suit the climate and the altered circumstances. The Anglo-Indian of a century ago was forced to live largely on the same staples of food that were consumed by the natives of India. To these, however, he added a larger quantity of meat. But in the matter of drink he maintained his pernicious European habits, and the large quantities of beer, wine, and spirits consumed did much to raise the death-rate to its abnormally high point. Now-a-days facility of communication and the new systems of preservation enable most European comestibles to be obtained in India. Potatoes and other European vegetables are grown in the hills and sent thence to

the chief centres so that it is possible for the Anglo-Indian of to-day to eat much the same food as that which he eats in England. But circumstances compel him to modify their preparation, and in this way the existing system of Anglo-Indian cookery has sprung up. In it can be seen the elements of European taste and of Oriental requirements, and the result is a peculiar growth which deserved to be chronicled. Mrs. Johnson in her preface announces her ambition to introduce some of the features of Anglo-Indian cookery into England itself. In her own words: "Housewives will find these recipes useful to vary the monotony of their usual fare. High-class cooks and caterers will find a solid help in them and much that is novel. . . . It must, however, be borne in mind that we cannot procure all the fruits and spices in their fresh state, and therefore have to resort to the best substitutes we can find; but much can be done by a person of intelligence and aptitude, and most of the things procurable in the English market answer fairly well." Eating forms such an important part of existence that gratitude is due to anyone who endeavours to vary the monotony of English cookery, and make English food a little more tempting. Great strides have been made in recent years to introduce French and Italian methods into England. It is no longer fair to accuse the English people as a whole of living on plain roast and boiled meat, and on solid puddings. But reform is still wanted in many middle-class households. French and Italian restaurants have done something to create a demand for more appetising viands, and cookery classes have done something towards training persons to supply the new demand. But, as has been said, there is still room for more improvement and Mrs. Johnson's volume indicates one direction in which it might be attained.

This little cookery book is not an exhaustive treatise on the fine art of gastronomy; it is simply a collection of recipes. It does not enrich the world by an addition to the class of writers of whom the most brilliant is Brillat-Savarin. Writers of the temperament of the famous author of the "Physiologie du Goût" have been few in the world, and though one may look yearly for his successor among the authors of cookery books, he has not yet appeared. Mrs. Johnson at any rate has no inclination to follow in his steps. She is severely practical, and though perhaps her book is the more useful on that account, it makes no attempt to rank as literature. But at the end of her eminently useful and succinct recipes for Anglo-Indian dishes she adds a few pages describing purely Oriental methods of preparing food. The dishes do not seem very tempting, and appear to demand a great number of ingredients, but there is a characteristic flavour of the East about them even in the enormous number of hours some of them seem to require in their preparation. This is a subject which we could have wished Mrs. Johnson to have treated at greater length, for a right appreciation of their cookery would do something to please the Indian people. The Briton's sturdy assumption that his cookery as well as his political ideas are necessarily better than anything originated in India, is one of those galling facts which tend to make him unpopular. Hitherto

the only treatise on Indian cookery with which we have been acquainted is one translated by Mr. S. Arnot, in Vol. i. of "Miscellaneous Translations from Oriental Languages," published by the Oriental Translation Fund in 1831. It contains much that is curious, and it is interesting to compare Mrs. Johnson's recipes in modern phraseology with the more quaint language of Mr. Arnot's translation. Perhaps some day an Indian Brillat-Savarin may arise to show the world the true inwardness of Oriental cookery.

THE PROPOSED ROYAL COMMISSION.

SOME PRESS OPINIONS ON THE RECENT DEBATE.

The *Daily News* said:—Sir George Chesney, who distinguished himself by the wise and statesmanlike observation that we could not hold India if the natives were armed, was unable to refrain from the cheap gibe at the expense of the Indian National Congress, which, with long-winded platitudinarians of his kidney, is so large a part of their stock-in-trade. He asked what useful suggestion the Congress had ever made. The answer is simple and easy. The Congress suggested the reform of the Viceroy's Council, and of the Provincial Councils which was adopted by the late Government, and is now law. Sir Andrew Scoble, who referred to his opponents with the courtesy and consideration of a gentleman, argued that natives could not be admitted to high administrative offices, because they might have to put down religious disturbances, and they would be sure to take one side or the other. We should like to know whether Sir Andrew has ever reflected how far this argument would take him. India is not the only country where religious riots occur. They are not even now unknown in Ireland, and half-a-century ago, they were not uncommon there. Will Sir Andrew Scoble say that neither a Protestant nor a Catholic could deal with these riots, and that the only man who can be trusted to face them is a man with no religion of his own? Why that is the very reproach levelled at Young Bengal. Sir William Harcourt, in one of those thoroughly Conservative speeches which he delights to make when he gets a chance, asked where the Government of India would be while a Royal Commission was inquiring into its foundations. It is rather the superstructure which the Commission would examine, and sooner or later the work must be taken in hand.

The Member for Finsbury does not (wrote the *Daily Chronicle*) draw a general indictment against the whole system of English rule in India. On the contrary, he acknowledges that it has conferred great advantages on India; and he would be content with the reform of its abuses without seeking to procure its abolition. He is justified in the complaint that the natives are not admitted to an effective share in the government of their own country. The upholders of the present system justify their attitude by the familiar plea that the subjugated races are not fit for the work of government. This plea has been the excuse of despotism in all ages and in all climes.

It was unsparingly employed to maintain the enslavement of Englishmen for many generations, and it served to delay every great measure proposed for their enfranchisement. The capacity for self-government is not so much a mental endowment as the result of acquired habits. Mr. George Russell, who represents the India Office in the House of Commons, is one of the ablest of our younger statesmen, and if he fails to accomplish anything for India it will not be for want of interest in the work of his department. But the truth is the India Office is inaccessible to popular influences, and a man in Mr. Russell's position is powerless unless he is backed up by public opinion in and out of Parliament. Mr. Naoroji is probably right in his contention that a Royal Commission would reveal a state of things in India which would compel the attention of Parliament and the country. At an earlier period of the Session a resolution was carried that examinations for the Indian Civil Service should be held simultaneously in England and India. We should like to know what steps, if any, the Secretary of State has taken to carry that resolution into effect.

The *Times* wrote:—It is not contended, we need hardly say, that there is no room for amendment in the finances or the administration of India. But a Parliamentary Committee or a Royal Commission does not furnish adequate means for discovering defects or for providing remedies. As the Chancellor of the Exchequer showed, with irresistible force, the initiation of such an inquiry, which must of necessity extend over many years, would place the Government of India on its trial, would destroy its moral authority, and would plunge the Empire into chaos. The allegations on which this extraordinary proposal is founded are, Sir William Harcourt said, "the slightest and slenderest"; but, even if they were far weightier, they would only impose upon the responsible ministers of the Crown the obligation of sifting them and dealing with them. The Government, as Mr. Russell declared, do not shrink from this responsibility, and are prepared to use all the resources in their power to extirpate or to mitigate any proved evils. But Sir William Harcourt was perfectly right in refusing to allow that responsibility to be shifted to any Commission or Committee whatever.

If (said the *Standard*) the Indian revenue accounts, which were yesterday submitted to Parliament by the Under Secretary of State, do little to modify the very general belief that the financial position in India was never more critical, the refusal of the Government to appoint what Sir George Chesney described as a roving Commission of Inquiry into the methods of Indian administration is a matter for unqualified satisfaction. Mr. Naoroji's proposal was distinctly mischievous. Not a single fact was adduced to show that such an inquiry is necessary or desirable; while, on the other hand, it is manifest that any investigation of the kind would impair the authority of the governing body, and act as a stimulant to the energies of a small but noisy section of the population which is busily propagating the highly seditious doctrine that our Indian subjects are crushed beneath the iron heel of a cruel and rapacious despotism.

The argument that a Royal Commission is called for because the masses have been reduced to a deplorable condition of unrelieved poverty was justly denounced by Mr. George Russell as untenable.

The *Star* wrote:—"Our system of government in India," said Sir W. Wedderburn yesterday, "is an administration by officials for officials." Within the limits of that sentence we have the key to a condition of affairs which must cause the most serious anxiety to every just and honest man. Yesterday and on Wednesday the little knot of members who have united under the name of the Indian Parliamentary Committee pleaded eloquently for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the civil and military expenditure at present involved in our Indian administration. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Sir W. Wedderburn, and Mr. Schwann, intimate though their knowledge of India is, do not ask the Government to take their statements for granted. But neither, on the other hand, are they content that Indian officials should for ever be judge and jury in their own trial. What is wanted is a mixed commission, consisting partly of official, partly of unofficial members, who shall investigate the facts for themselves. . . . There is a huge contradiction implied in our Constitution. We call ourselves democrats at home, but we are complacent despots abroad. The commission of inquiry must come. It was periodic under the East India Company, and it should be made periodic under Parliament. Meantime those—and their number is happily growing—who wish to see India more justly treated must keep "pegging away." The resolution in favour of simultaneous examinations to the Civil Service was a great gain. The abolition of the Indian Council will be a gain not less great. It is, at any rate, reassuring to think that in the Indian Parliamentary Committee India has an indefatigable body of competent and disinterested friends. Their work is making its mark, and we wish continued strength to their arm.

The *Westminster Gazette* said:—The proposal pressed upon the Government in the House of Commons to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the economic condition of the Indian people, and their ability to sustain the present cost of the Indian Government, as well as into the financial relations between India and this country, raises the question of the limits of Commissions. The suggested inquiry could hardly, as the speeches delivered in support of and against it show, stop short of putting the Indian Government on its trial and forcing it to defend its general policy and system before the Commission. The indictment would be preferred, the defence heard, and the judgment given—some day, for the magnitude of the inquiry seems alarming. And the composition of the Commission would not be easy. The old and honoured plan of appointing three agitators who believe everything, three officials who know something, and a prominent politician who knows nothing and believes less, would hardly produce a satisfactory tribunal for such a purpose. It is safe to say that, whatever may be the exact limits to the utility of Commissions, such a task as this lies out-

side them. Commissions are adjuncts to Governments, not substitutes for them: their proper object is to inform the mind of rulers, not to judge their actions or supersede their discretion. If the Indian Government is all wrong, as Sir W. Wedderburn seems to think, it is the Imperial Government which must put it right by its own action, and not sheltered by the authority of any Commission. Moreover, how would the sight of a Viceroy being cross-examined strike the Oriental mind?

INDIAN FISCAL INTERESTS.

THE writer of the article on "Indian Affairs" said recently in the *Times*:—"It is difficult to exaggerate the injury which is being done by the almost universal conviction in India that Indian fiscal and commercial interests are being unfairly dealt with in Parliament. We have refrained from further discussion of the anti-opium movement since the appointment of the Commission, because we have no desire to prejudice the issues which the Commission is appointed to investigate. But if Mr. Gladstone, or any responsible member of the British Cabinet, would take the trouble to glance over a single week's file of the Anglo-Indian and native Press he would find that the paltry question of the cost of the Commission is becoming a rallying cry in India. The telegrams of our Indian Correspondents, strong as they may read here, give a very temperate account of the violence and the bitterness of the agitation which this matter is exciting in India. We are straining the loyalty of the well-intentioned population of India, and we are furnishing a text to any ill-conditioned or disaffected classes, by shifting from our own shoulders a charge which we ourselves have created, and which we ought in honour and honesty to defray. In differences between a dominant power and its dependencies it is not the amount but the injustice of such a transaction which gives its sting to a people who have no means of constitutional resistance. Every section of the Indian community, from the British merchants and the most loyal of the Anglo-Indian and native newspapers down to the least instructed of the vernacular press, is becoming united in a conviction that Indian commercial and fiscal interests are habitually subordinated to English interests and to the exigencies of English party leaders. This conviction formed the gist of the farewell address of the President of the Bengal Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Mackay, as a member of the Viceroy's Legislative Council, the leader of a great and, for the time, triumphant movement among the European community, and during four years the President of the Bengal Chamber of Commerce, spoke with an authority which at this moment belongs to no other British merchant in India. "He especially warned his hearers," says our Calcutta Correspondent, "to be prepared to resist the attacks on the revenues and industries of India arising from party politics at home, or from snatch notes obtained in Parliament by faddists." If we turn to the Indian newspapers brought by recent mails, it is difficult to deny some sympathy to their complaints.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

(Extracted from the "REVIEW OF REVIEWS,"
WITH ADDITIONS.

NOVEMBER, 1893.

- ASIATIC QUARTERLY REVIEW (Oriental University Institute, Woking). Chelmsford, General Lord, "The Defence of India"; Michie, A., "The Alliance of China and India, Facts about the alleged Afghan Treaty"; Lethbridge, Sir Roper, "The Spoilation of Landlords and Tenants in Behar: the Cadastral Corvée"; Leitner, Dr. G. W., "Cow Killing in India and its Prevention"; Pennington, J. B., "The Evils of the Salt Monopoly in India and the Opium Agitation"; BOY'S OWN PAPER, (56, Paternoster Row). O'Martin, Rev. R. D., "Monkeys in India."
- CHURCH MISSIONARY INTELLIGENCER. Painter, Rev. A. F., "The Depressed Classes in India"; Neale, Rev. A. F., "Recollections of a Bengal Missionary."
- ECONOMIC JOURNAL (Macmillan). Harrison, F. C., "The Indian Currency Committee's Report"; Horton, Dana, "The Suspended Rupee and the Policy of Contraction."
- INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW (A Constable and Co., 14, Parliament Street, S.W.). Sheppard, G. F., "The Story of Lalla Koli"; Walker, E. O., C.I.E., "Indian Dancing Women."
- MACMILLAN'S MAGAZINE (29, Bedford St., Strand). "Parliament and the Government of India."
- NINETEENTH CENTURY (Sampson Low). Sorabji, Miss Cornelia, "The Parsees."
- THEOSOPHIST (7, Duke Street, Adelphi). Judge, William Q., "India and her Theosophists."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

(Extracted from the "PUBLISHERS' CIRCULAR.")

WITH ADDITIONS.

NOVEMBER, 1893.

- ARNOLD, SIR EDWIN, K.C.I.E. "The Book of Good Counsels from the Sanskrit of the Hippadasa." A new edition. (London: W. H. Allen and Co.) 7s. 6d.
- ARNOLD, EDWIN LESTER. "On the Indian Hills; on Coffee Planting in Southern India." Revised and partly rewritten. (London: Sampson Low, Marston and Co.) 7s. 6d.
- CUTHELL, EDITH AND BURRELL, CAPT. W. S. "Indian Memories: The Plains, the Temples, the Hills, the Zenanas, Camp Life, the Black Hole, the Mutiny, etc." (London: Richard Bently and Sons) 6s. 6d.
- DUBAND, SIR MORIMER, K.C.I.E. "Helen Trevelyan." New edition. (London: Macmillan and Co.) 3s. 6d.
- HUTTON, REV. W. H. "The Marquess Wellesley." ("Rules of India" Series). (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press) 2s. 6d.
- MALLESON, COL. G. B., C.S.I. "The French in India." New and revised edition. (London: W. H. Allen and Co.) 16s. 6d.
- SEATON, SIR THOMAS. "From Cadet to Colonel." New edition. (London: Routledge) 2s. 6d.
- SLEEMAN, MAJOR-GEN. SIR W. H. "Rambles and Recollections of an Indian Official." New edition, 2 vols. (London: Constable) 12s. 6d.
- TYACKE, MRS. R. H. "How I Shot my Bears: or Two Years Tent Life in Kulu and Lahul." (London: Sampson Low, Marston and Co.) 7s. 6d.

THE Undersigned, after a service of upwards of thirty years in various Judicial (Criminal and Civil) and Executive capacities under the Government of Bengal, has settled down in England. He is open to engagement as a Political and Legal Agent. PARBATI C. ROY, 13, Gloucester Road, Kew, London.

Printed by A. BUNNEN, 34 Boulevard Street, Fleet Street, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the India National Congress), at 54 and 55 Palace Chambers, London, E.W.