

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]

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

VOL. VIII., No. 5.]
(NEW SERIES.)

MAY, 1897.

[Subscription, Post Free—
SIX SHILLINGS PER ANNUM
IN INDIA, SIX RUPEES.]

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Indiana: Notes on Indian Affairs	129	A Case for Enquiry	145
The Rayat and his Rackrent, by Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart., M.P.	135	Ruskin	146
The Health of British troops in India, by Alfred Webb..	137	Our London Letter.. .. .	148
A Famine Budget, by H. Morgan-Browne, LL.B. . .	138	British Indians in South Africa	150
A Strong-Minded Hindu, I.—by W. Martin Wood ..	140	Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure: Evidence of D. E. Wacha and G. K. Gokhale	153
The Secretary of State for India	142	"Counsellors of the Empress"	158
The Congress and "The Times"	143	Review: The Story of India.. .. .	158
Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects..	144		

Indiana.

WE print on another page the full text of Mr. J. P. Goodridge's reply to the statement, published in the *Times*, that supporters of the Indian National Congress had not contributed to the Famine Relief Fund. Nobody who knows anything about the Indian people could charge them truthfully with lack of generosity or of neighbourliness. If there is no poor law in India, that is, as Sir William Wedderburn lately pointed out, because Indians help one another. A more hospitable and liberal people, up to the limit of their resources, is not to be found. But the *Times*, and some official authorities who ought to know better, have endeavoured to discredit the Congress in the eyes of the British public by accusing, first the organisation as a whole, and then the individuals who compose it, of failing to subscribe to relief operations. No accusation could be more wanton or more grotesque. It is leaders and supporters of the Congress who have been most liberal and most energetic in India, not only in raising funds, but also in organising the various local committees, whose co-operation has been of inestimable value in combating the famine. When, therefore, the *Times*, having given currency to this calumny, received a complete and authoritative contradiction, its plain duty was to give to the truth not less publicity than it had given to inaccuracy. Even so, the original offence would not have been fully repaired, as

the mischief had been done. The *Times*, however, seems to have understood differently the obligations of honour and the methods of journalism. It published only a mutilated fragment of Mr. Goodridge's letter—which, therefore, we now reproduce in full.

Mr. GOODRIDGE, who lately returned to England, has discharged an important public service in India by visiting some of the famine-stricken districts and frankly criticising the methods of the authorities. It is to be hoped that he will shortly lay before the public at home the results of his investigations. These appear to have been conducted chiefly in the Central Provinces, where, as a retired civilian, Mr. Goodridge was on familiar ground. His letters to the *Pioneer*, the *Statesman*, and other journals reveal a condition of things in the Central Provinces of which official optimists like Lord George Hamilton must be completely ignorant. Mr. Goodridge has, in consequence, drawn upon himself a characteristic rebuke from some Anglo-Indian censors. They accuse him of "casting to the winds the traditions of the Service"—meaning, apparently, that when he saw culpable mismanagement and neglect of duty he ought to have held his tongue. Mr. Goodridge's rejoinder is brief and to the point:—

"I am not aware that I have in any way exceeded the bounds of fair criticism, or have been wanting in the consideration due to late colleagues. Many whom I have since met have expressed full agreement in all that I have said. If one of the traditions of that Service is that a former member

must in all cases refrain from criticising late colleagues, even in a time of famine, when he sees much going on around him to the discredit of British administration, then it must be confessed that I am prepared to cast all such traditions to the winds. But if, as I think, I had carefully abstained from taking action in order to bring the true state of things to public notice, I should have acted selfishly and cowardly, and not according to what I conceive to be the best traditions of the Service."

Mr. Goodridge's chief contentions with regard to the Central Provinces are (i) that there were frequent and sufficient warnings of the approach of famine long before it reached an acute stage; (ii) that these warnings were either not noticed or ignored; (iii) that when the wandering of emaciated persons set in, and heavy mortality had ensued, the measures adopted were inappropriate and inadequate; and (iv) that the present modes of relief are ineffective and wasteful. This is a grave and categorical indictment of the conduct of the authorities in the Central Provinces, and it is brought by an "expert" whose competence and responsibility nobody would impugn. Yet Lord George Hamilton permits himself to say that there is no evidence, official or non-official, to show that relief operations have been in any way insufficient.

"THE elements of famine," said the "Caught Napping." Orissa Famine Commissioner, "are much the same everywhere. It is entire ignorance of the whole subject which produces disaster." Mr. Goodridge declares that, although the famine of Orissa and Madras were followed by full enquiries, the results of which were circulated in an easily accessible form, the same errors and omissions are nevertheless to be found in 1896 as in 1866 and in 1876. In spite of the clearest proofs of impending famine throughout the year, and the warnings of the Famine Commission, the Government of the Central Provinces had up to October, 1896, done nothing but call for reports and undertake a few insignificant measures of relief. The authorities regarded the work offered by the Saugor-Katni railway as adequate for relief purposes, but Mr. Goodridge gives a very different account of it:—

"The railway work is in the usual way given to contractors at specified rates, and they sub-let to petty contractors, who deal with the people. Task work is given and it is impossible for persons not accustomed to this particular kind of hard labour to earn more than an anna a day, and generally it is much less. Many complained loudly to me that at the time of payment they were given a pound of millet and told that there was no coin for payment, and that if they were not satisfied with that they could leave the work. The demand for employment being generally in excess of the supply, the villagers are entirely at the mercy of these petty contractors, and are glad if they can get a mouthful of food for their day's labour. Women and children get so many cowries for a basketful of earth removed. They all declared in the presence of the contractors that they could not earn sufficient to keep them in health, and this seems to be admitted on all hands."

As for the stereotyped official theory that the majority of the wandering skeletons and of those who die in famine houses come into British territory from adjoining native states, Mr. Goodridge says:—

"I did not find this to be correct on my visit to the Damoh Famine House. For out of a total of 858 inmates, 547 belonged to the Damoh district, 76 to other Central Province districts, 25 to the North-Western Provinces, and 211, or about one-fourth, to the adjoining Native States. In British frontier districts it is the custom to say that dacoits come from Native States (where they are harboured) and raid British territory, but when one crosses the border precisely the same complaint is made against the British police administration."

"Caught napping" is the verdict which, in Mr. Goodridge's opinion, the historian will be compelled to pass upon the Government of the Central Provinces with reference to the famine. The question at once suggests itself—will that verdict apply to the Central Provinces alone? Side by side with Mr. Goodridge's letters and articles, it is useful to read the corroborative evidence given by a correspondent "C" in the *Pioneer* of March 14th. Having dissected the official method of dealing with statistics of mortality, this writer adds a practical suggestion:—

"What this mortality really means, the extent of the desolation and ruin this famine has wrought, can only be accurately ascertained in one way, and that is by taking a census, say in January, 1898. It would be three years short of the ordinary period, but the 1901 census would not be indispensable, and the value of such a census would be far greater than the cost of carrying it out."

Perhaps somebody will ask Lord George Hamilton in the House of Commons what steps it is proposed to take in order to obtain a correct estimate of the mortality due to the present famine.

That Blessed Word— "Privation." QUESTIONS in Parliament with reference to famine mortality have hitherto produced very little result. Lord George Hamilton has, as a rule, been content to put off his interrogator with a promise of "further papers." But these papers, which were issued on the eve of the Easter recess, are more important for what they omit than for what they contain. Of the latter, much had already appeared in the newspapers. What had not so appeared consists chiefly of belated provincial reports. It will be necessary, therefore, to resume the cross-examination of the India Office, and in this connexion we may well reproduce the following passage from the letter signed "C," which was printed in the *Pioneer* of March 14th:—

"There has lately been published a circular—I think by the Government of India—which reveals a distinct intention of concealing the mortality from famine—a deliberate project for 'cooking' the statistics. The gist of the circular is that officers whose duty it is to report deaths from famine are not to report them as deaths from starvation unless it can be clearly established that the victims have had no food for several days. Where this proof is wanting the deaths are to be shown as deaths from privation. What the exact meaning of privation

will hereafter be defined to be is an interesting speculation. But that it will be something quite apart from starvation or famine is very clear. It is also very evident on the least consideration that, except in rare instances, it will be impossible to prove that a dead man has had no food for several days unless a *post mortem* examination is held, and in the majority of cases this would mean bringing a body some miles to the nearest dispensary where there was a qualified surgeon or physician. How often a subordinate official would be at the pains to do this when he could save himself all trouble by entering on the report this mystic term 'privation' is easily calculated by anyone who has any knowledge of the ways of subordinate police, medical or civil officers, such as head constables, assistant apothecaries, and naib tehsildars and kotwars."

Lord George Hamilton said the other day that if Mr. Leuty thought the present famine "could pass over India without raising the mortality above the level which obtains in normal times," he stood alone in that opinion. But if the injunction of this circular is carried out, there may, after all, be no deaths due to "starvation"—at any rate, in the official reports.

MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI has summed up the defects of the present system of Indian Race," administration in India as depriving Indians of "wisdom, work, and wealth." Mr. G. K. Gokhale, the accomplished Professor of History and Political Economy in Fergusson College, Poona, dwelt upon this point emphatically and usefully in the evidence which he recently gave before Lord Welby's Commission. "The excessive costliness of the foreign agency is not," said Professor Gokhale, "its only evil. There is a moral evil which, if anything, is even greater. A kind of dwarfing or stunting of the Indian race is going on under the present system. We must live all the days of our life in an atmosphere of inferiority, and the tallest of us must bend in order that the exigencies of the existing system may be satisfied. The upward impulse, if I may use such an expression, which every school-boy at Eton or Harrow may feel, that he may one day be a Gladstone, a Nelson, or a Wellington—and which may draw forth the best efforts of which he is capable—that is denied to us. The full height to which our manhood is capable of rising can never be reached by us under the present system. The moral elevation which every self-governing people feel cannot be felt by us. Our administration and military talents must gradually disappear owing to sheer disuse, till at last our lot, as hewers of wood and drawers of water in our own country, is stereotyped." This is, we think, a statement of the case which should appeal strongly to the English people.

By way of illustrating "the practical A Monopoly monopoly of all the higher posts by for Europeans. Europeans" in all departments of administration, Professor Gokhale laid before Lord

Welby and his colleagues a striking analysis of the Civil List of Bombay Presidency for the present year. The table, which tells its own tale, is reproduced here:—

Covenanted Civil Servants, or, as they are now called, Civil Servants of India.—The total number of these Civil Servants attached to Bombay at present is 156, out of whom only five are Indians, these five having entered by the competitive door in England. There are, besides, eight statutory Indian civilians. The Members of Council, the High Court Civilian Judges, the Commissioners of Divisions, the Secretaries to Government, the senior Collectors are all Europeans. There is one Native among the District and Sessions Judges, and one Acting Junior Collector among Junior Collectors.

City Magistrates.—There are four City Magistrateships, two on Rx. 800 a month and two on Rx. 500 a month. The two former are held by Europeans (not Covenanted), the two latter by Natives.

Land Records and Agriculture.—There are six posts in this Department with a salary of over Rx. 400 a month. They are all held by Europeans.

Forest Department.—There are twenty-nine posts in this Department with salaries ranging between Rx. 400 a month to Rx. 1,600 a month. They are all held by Europeans. There are nine Europeans even below Rx. 400 a month.

Salt.—There are twelve posts with salaries ranging between Rx. 400 and Rx. 1,130 a month. Only one of these is held by an Indian.

Post.—The Postmaster-General is a Civilian. There are eleven posts under him with salaries above Rx. 400, out of which seven are held by Europeans.

Telegraph.—There are twelve posts in this Department with salaries ranging between 400 and 1,000 rupees, and they are all held by Europeans. There are moreover forty posts between Rx. 100 and Rx. 400 a month. Of these also thirty-six are held by Europeans.

Revenue Survey.—There are ten posts in this Department with salaries above Rx. 400. They are all held by Europeans.

Accountant-General's Department.—The Accountant-General and Deputy Accountant-General are Civilians. There are five posts under them with salaries ranging between 400 and 1,000 rupees, four of which are held by Europeans.

High Court Judges.—Out of seven Judges, two are Natives.

Government Law Officers.—There are seven Government Law Officers, of whom six are Europeans. Four of these get Rx. 2,000 and above, one gets Rx. 1,000, and the sixth man gets Rx. 250. There is only one Native among these, who is paid Rx. 300 a month.

Officers of the High Court.—There are fourteen officers with salaries ranging between 400 and 2,500 rupees a month. Of these six are Natives.

Prison Department.—The Inspector-General draws Rx. 2,000 a month and there are under him eleven officers receiving Rx. 350 to Rx. 1,200 a month. They are all Europeans.

Cantonment Magistrates.—There are eleven such magistrates with salaries ranging from Rx. 100 to Rx. 1,250 a month. They are all Europeans.

Police.—There are fifty-four officers in this Department with salaries ranging between Rx. 250 and Rx. 1,800 a month. Of these only three are Natives, and they are all drawing Rx. 250 a month. There are, moreover, five officers in charge of Railway Police. They are all Europeans and draw salaries ranging between Rx. 350 and Rx. 1,000 a month.

Education.—The Director is paid Rx. 2,500 a month, and under him there are forty-five officers receiving between Rx. 400 and Rx. 1,500 a month. Of these only ten are natives, and with one exception, they get either 400 or 500 a month—

the one gentleman mentioned as an exception is a Native Christian and draws 633 rupees a month.

Ecclesiastical.—There are thirty-one paid officers in this Department. They draw between Rx. 400 and Rx. 800 a month and are, of course, all Europeans.

Medical.—The Surgeon-General draws Rx. 2,500 a month, and there are under him fifty-nine officers drawing salaries between 400 and 1,600 rupees a month. Out of these only four are Natives.

Sanitary.—There are seven posts in this Department with salaries between Rx. 400 and Rx. 1,200 a month. They are all held by Europeans.

Political.—There are sixty-six officers in this Department, drawing salaries ranging between Rx. 400 and Rx. 3,500 a month. Only two of these are Natives, one of them drawing Rx. 400 and the other Rx. 450 only.

Public Works.—There are eighty-three officers in this Department, drawing salaries between Rx. 250 and Rx. 2,500 a month. Of these twenty-three are Natives.

The Subordinate Judgeships and Deputy Collectorships are the only branches of the public service which are free from this practical monopoly by European officers.

MR. H. N. HARIDAS writes: "It was admitted by the Secretary of State in his speech on the question of sending Indian Forces to the Soudan that 'from time to time charges were put upon India in excess of the interests which India has had in former expeditions; (INDIA, August, 1896, Supp. p. 60). The Indian Government have also complained from time to time that they are made to pay towards objects which have nothing to do with the interests of the country. Sometimes, as in the case of the Soudan expedition, the Indian Government contend that they should not pay at all. In other cases they contend that they should pay a part only; and in others that the part which the Indian Exchequer is asked to contribute is unduly burdensome. The decision of these various points involves the consideration of issues of great legal, constitutional and financial importance. No doubt, *bona fide* differences of opinion are likely to exist between the authorities in India and the Cabinet in England. Ministers of the day have always some Imperial policy, sound or unsound, to advance, and in their enthusiasm for that policy they cannot look at it from the standpoint of India, but are unconsciously led to impose burdens unjustly and even illegally on the revenues of India. It is, therefore, of great importance that for the adjudication of such questions there should be an independent tribunal, before which both the parties might appear. The necessity of such a tribunal was frankly admitted by Lord Salisbury. But before we pronounce on any new tribunal to be constituted for the purpose it may be interesting to examine the provisions already made by law for such contingencies. To do so we have to trace the legal relation in which the Government of India stood before 1858 to the authorities at home. The

direction and control of authorities in India were vested in the Court of Directors and the Commissioners for the Affairs of India, created by 33 Geo. III. cap. 52, sec. 2, their powers being defined by the same Act. Thus, there were two independent bodies or corporations (for the Board of Commissioners, known as the Board of Control, was nothing more than a corporation)—creatures both of statute, exercising in some cases concurrent, in others exclusive, jurisdiction. The directors were bound to carry out the orders of the Board of Commissioners, but they were not bound to carry out all. The Board of Control or the Commissioners had their jurisdiction limited by the Statute that created them. If we assume that this Board, under the influence of the Cabinet of the day, sent an order which they had no legal right to send, the Directors might either obey the order or disregard it. It is not my object to discuss what legal liabilities the East India Company would have incurred in case they obeyed the order. But this is certain, that no court of law or equity would have allowed them a shelter under the orders of the Board of Commissioners. On the other hand, if the orders were disregarded, the Board of Commissioners, if they wished their orders to be enforced, would have no other course but to proceed in the courts against the defaulting Directors (as they did by applying for a writ of *Mandamus* from the judges of the King's Bench in *R. v. East India Company*, 4 B, Act 530), or to petition the Privy Council, as the North-West Company of Canada did for the repealing of the letters patent issued to the Hudson's Bay Company (*Forsyth Const. Law*, p. 389). In either case the Directors would have been able to advance proper arguments in support of their conduct, and to obtain the judgment of a competent judicial tribunal on points in dispute between themselves and the Board of Commissioners.

Why not the Judicial Committee? "SINCE no Statute had expressly taken such cases out of the cognisance of the Superior Courts of Law, such courts were competent, and the only competent tribunals, to decide these questions, and they did exercise their jurisdiction twice against the Court of Directors (*Maxwell*, p. 151-2-3). This really was the state of the law, if the Act that created the Board of Commissioners had not made some further provision for the determination of differences between the Board and the East India Company. But the Legislature of the day thought fit to give some means by which the East India Company themselves might insist if they chose upon a reference in such matters. Sec. 16 of the Act of George III. enacted, among other things, that " . . . if the said Board shall send any orders or instruc-

tions to the said Court of Directors, to be by them transmitted, which in the opinion of the said Court of Directors shall relate to points *not connected with the civil or military government or revenues*, then on any such occasion it shall be lawful for the said Court of Directors to apply by petition to His Majesty in Council touching the same, and His Majesty in Council shall decide *how far the same be or be not connected with the civil or military government and revenues of the said territories and possessions in India*, which decision will be final and conclusive."

The italics are mine. Suppose that at that time the Commissioners had asked the Directors to send an Indian force to Suakin, and the Directors were of opinion that the expedition had no connexion with Indian interests, or they wished it to be established 'how far' the expedition was connected with Indian interests, they could have had the judgment of the Privy Council on those points. Now, this section, so far as reference to the Privy Council is concerned, became inoperative because the powers and duties of the Commissioners and the Directors were combined in the same official in 1858. The effect of the Act of 1858 was to make such reference difficult, as the Committee of the whole Privy Council could not be moved under this sec. 16. The only tribunal that can exercise this jurisdiction is the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The repeal of sec. 16 of 33 Geo. III., c. 52, does not affect in the least the power of the sovereign and the jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee over such questions conferred upon them by 3 and 4 Will. IV., c. 41, sec. 4. The Judicial Committee is not an unfit body for the determination of questions relating to the action of executive bodies. Only recently it pronounced its judgment on an action of the Cape Government, declaring a certain proclamation issued by the High Commissioner to be *ultra vires*. It has pronounced on a reference from the Queen—obviously under sec. 4—its judgment on a petition upon the action of the Government of Nova Scotia. It will be clear, therefore, that the suggestion advanced by Sir W. Wedderburn in his article on this subject was quite consistent with old traditions and old statutes. We have a tribunal created by the law which has been admitted to be efficient for the purpose we have in view. Our only difficulty is to approach the tribunal. If Lord Salisbury is sincere, and I am sure he is, in his desire to have questions of apportionment, etc., adjudicated upon fairly and impartially, he has only to lay down rules by which reference should be made to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council under sec. 4 of the Privy Council Act of 1833. The making of such rules requires no new legislation, and no recommendation from any Royal Commission."

MR. PICKERSGILL (who, if rumour may be trusted, narrowly escaped appointment as a metropolitan magistrate) called Lord George Hamilton's attention in the

House of Commons on April 12th to the union of judicial and executive duties in the same officers in India. The precise form in which Mr. Pickersgill raised the subject is, perhaps, open to some criticism, and Lord George Hamilton was able to give an evasive and useless answer. The system by which the detective becomes also the public prosecutor and the judge is no new thing in India. But it is none the more palatable on that account. Lord George Hamilton said that in his judgment the existing law required no alteration. That is, on the face of it, a contradiction of what he said in the Indian Budget debate last year—namely, that the Government of India was working in the direction of the proposed separation. Or does Lord George mean that judicial and executive duties can be separated in India without the aid of legislation? Perhaps he will explain the point in his reply to the deputation of jurists and others who are shortly to wait upon him in order to present a memorial praying for the reform of the existing system. One thing is certain. No reform will be satisfactory to public opinion in India, or in this country, which does not draw a clear line between judicial duties on one side and executive duties on the other.

THE little volume, "Incidents in Indian and Memories of the Mutiny," edited by Mr. F. W. Pitt (London :

Kegan Paul) appears to be a somewhat injudicious outcome of hero-worship. The author looks up to General W. R. E. Alexander, late commander of the 1st Bengal Cavalry, as a hero. But he seems to be innocent of warlike experience, as well as of literary capacity. One would stretch a good few points, however, in favour of a writer who could furnish additional details of any portion of the drama of the Mutiny. But it is difficult to glean anything fresh or definite from these pages. At page 80 our hopelessness was relieved for a moment by the statement that "Captain Alexander and his fellow-fugitives know a phase of the Mutiny that yet requires its historian," but only for a moment. Why, in the name of common sense, does not Mr. Pitt constitute himself that historian? What is his book for else? To be sure, he informs us that Captain Alexander went here and went there, and some trifling incidents are mentioned—among which, of course, we do not include the distressful tragedy of relatives in the country. Probably the biggest thing in the way of active service mentioned by Mr. Pitt is a reconnaissance of the enemy by Captain Alexander with five-and-twenty men five-and-twenty miles out, "after consultation by the officers of the regiment," but pending—and, as it turned out, in opposition to—the judgment of the general officer in command, Sir T. Seaton, who was then some distance off. The

The Detective
as Judge.

movement was successful, and the enemy was dispersed. But obviously it was a most risky experiment. Be that as it may, Mr. Pitt speaks exultingly of the return of "the conquering hero," and remarks, apparently by way of complaint, that "for this service Captain Alexander received neither reward nor thanks from the Government." To our judgment, nothing could well be more preposterous; and we are not inclined to look so complacently as Mr. Pitt does upon the next day's receipt of Sir T. Seaton's belated direction that "on no account was the offensive to be taken with so small a force." We do not think with him that "complete victory justified the action." Apart from military judgment and sense of proportion, however, it is most tantalising to find such looseness of dates and inattention to detail. "Mrs. Alexander went to Agra"; we thought she was in Agra at the moment. "About the end of October Captain Alexander was directed to raise some mounted men for duty in the Agra district"—"Alexander's Horse," in fact—which he did. Next sentence we learn that "they joined Sir Colin Campbell's force at Futtehghurh, and remained several days, but, Etawah being threatened, they were ordered off there post-haste," and so on for pages without a definite date. But the junction with Campbell at Futtehghurh could not have taken place except between January 3 and February 1, at any rate more than two months after the direction to raise the force. When Lieut. Alexander, the captain's only brother, was killed at Allahabad, Mr. Pitt says he "rode alone, and rode to his death." Why not set down the precise fact that *three* of his men followed him? It would not detract in the slightest from "Paddy's" gallantry. We know he would have ridden alone, but then he didn't, and history does not permit the embellishment of romance. In the first sentence of chap. x., and again in the last sentence of chap. xiii., we learn that Major Alexander was appointed commandant of the famous Bengal Cavalry regiment, originally known as "Skinner's Horse." The whole of the intervening narrative consists of scrambling notes of the fortunes of Skinner's Horse under the original Skinner and his brother; there is not a syllable more about Major Alexander. We are not surprised to hear of "Colonel" Skinner half-a-dozen years before it is related that "for these services Major Skinner was promoted to the rank of lieutenant-colonel." In 1876 Colonel Alexander retired from active service with the rank of Major-General, and for many years he and Mrs. Alexander have devotedly busied themselves in ways of Christian benevolence at Burgess Hill, in Sussex. There can be no question but that General Alexander has had experiences which would amplify usefully the known facts of the Mutiny period, and that he played his

part with ability and honour. Unhappily, this scrappy, inexact and ineffective narrative fails to produce such an impression as we cannot but think would be produced by a sufficient and satisfactory sketch. It reminds us, both as to Mr. Pitt's performance and as to his representation of General Alexander, of Edmond About's young officer, who "*n'a pas perdu son temps en voyage—il a ramassé des coquilles.*" We cannot accept it as worthy of the general, nor yet as possessing more than a slight minimum of historical value.

UNDER the title "On the Threshold of Three Closed Lands: The Guild Outpost in the Eastern Himalayas" (Edinburgh: R. and R. Clark. London: A. and C. Black), the Rev. J. A. Graham has written an unpretentious and solid little sketch of missionary work. The three closed lands—lands closed to missionary activity—are Nepal, Tibet, and Bhutan. In the wedge between the three, at Kalimpong, a Mission Guild in connexion with the Church of Scotland was established in 1870. The first baptism took place in 1874. Now there are 2,396 native Christians in 40 congregations, and 2,406 scholars in 81 schools, guided by a staff of 11 European missionaries (four of them ladies), 30 catechists, and 96 teachers. Sir Charles Elliott has good ground, then, for stating, in the introduction which he contributes to Mr. Graham's little volume, that the missionaries here "have been unusually successful in converting the simple tribes from their animistic or Buddhistic beliefs to the Christian faith." Sir Charles has been there several times, and has made himself intimately acquainted with the work done and doing. Besides the church and the school operations, there is a hospital under a medical man, which contributes its share of Christian persuasion. The affairs of the church of Kalimpong are managed by its own panchayat in the spirit of self-government; the branches established in the various villages are almost, if not altogether, self-supporting; and the missionaries are keen to proselytise. Thus the church possesses what Sir Charles Elliott calls "three distinctive notes of true Christianity." The description of the place and the folk and the missionary operations is most interesting, and Sir Charles Elliott testifies to the "complete candour" of Mr. Graham's account of the quality of the Christians: "there are men and women of all sorts," says Sir Charles, according with Mr. Graham—"some weak and doubtful, some of distinguished purity of life and character." We should not have believed that there was any wheat if we had not heard of the admixture of tares. It is stony soil enough up there, but the plants seem to have taken fairly firm root.

THE RAYAT AND HIS RACK-RENT.

BY SIR W. WEDDERBURN, BART., M.P.

There is an irreconcilable difference of opinion regarding the condition of the Indian rayat. Lord George Hamilton and Sir H. Fowler describe him as a fat and prosperous person, very lightly taxed, pleasantly conscious of "the infinite benefits of British rule." On the other hand I assert, and Indian public opinion is with me on this point, that he is a wretched starveling, "ruined, despairing, embittered," crushed by burdens too heavy for him to bear, and paralysed in his industry by the operation of laws altogether unsuited to his condition. Here is a clear and simple issue of fact. Why should this issue not be tried? I have challenged enquiry by moving an Amendment on the Address, the most public and formal way in which such a challenge can be conveyed; but enquiry has been refused. Lord George Hamilton does not find the season convenient. As regards the famine he is too busy dealing with the symptom to make a diagnosis of the disease; not realizing that this is the method of the quack rather than of the physician. I must therefore wait, and continue placing the facts and figures before the public. Perhaps when a few hundred thousands, or millions, of these fat and prosperous people have died from starvation, the House of Commons may be willing to spare a few minutes to reconsider its decision that no enquiry is necessary.

What I asked for by my amendment was, not a roving Commission, but a careful local enquiry in two or three typical villages of each Province, in order to ascertain the real facts regarding the rayat's economic condition. I took my illustration from the work of the bacteriologist, and pointed out that the individual rayat must be put under the microscope, in order to detect the microbes which blight his industry, and I indicated the nature of the mischievous organisms to be sought for. In the March number of INDIA I brought some light to bear on the microbe which has its nidus in the harsh and unsuitable system of collecting the land revenue. This month I will deal with the land revenue itself, the microbe of rack-rent, which is the originating cause of the rayat's woes; and I will show (1) that the instructions of the Secretary of State limiting the amount of the Government demand are entirely disregarded in practice, and (2) that by arbitrary enhancements of rent the rayat's improvements have been confiscated, and he is compelled to make up the Government demand by stinting himself and his family in food, and by borrowing from the money-lender. For proof of these statements I will now refer to official documents.

The principle which was to govern land assess-

ments was first distinctly formulated in an elaborate despatch from the Court of Directors dated 17th December 1856. It was then declared that

"the right of Government is not a rent which consists of all the surplus produce after paying the cost of cultivation, and the profits of agricultural stock, but a land revenue only, which ought, if possible, to be so lightly assessed as to leave a surplus or rent to the occupier, whether he, in fact, let the land to others or retain it in his own hands."

The Government claim was in fact to be not a rent but a tax upon rent. In 1864 Sir Charles Wood reaffirmed this principle, and went beyond the Court of Directors by fixing 50 per cent. of the net produce as the amount ordinarily claimable on account of the Government demand. Now, these assurances of 1856 and 1864 have never been withdrawn by any Competent Authority. They constitute, in fact, the Magna Charta of the peasant cultivator; and the friends of the rayat should never cease to appeal to them, and to claim that either the principle therein laid down should be effectually carried out in practice, or else that some more suitable method should be adopted, based upon ascertained facts and according with the customs and wishes of the people. If the rayat, after paying the assessment, were left with the wages of labour, the profit of his stock and improvements, and one half of the true rent, he would have nothing more to ask for. And we may safely say that if, like the Irish tenant, he were able to enforce this limitation by suit in the Civil Courts, there would exist no Agrarian question as between the Government and the rayat; and the foundation would be laid for a contented and prosperous body of peasant proprietors. But unfortunately the principle laid down in these declarations has not been carried out in practice; the application having been left to the judgment or caprice of the Settlement Departments in India, a special agency the reputation, and even existence of which depends upon its success in expanding the Government revenue. Hence the rates levied usually absorb, not the half, but the whole of the rental, besides eating into the profits of capital and the wages of labour. The shearer of the Indian sheep, disregarding his master's orders, not only takes the whole of the fleece, but allows his shears to bite deep into the skin and into the flesh.

That this is admitted will be seen from a very important document which forms Appendix I of the report of the Famine Commissioners; a document which may well be studied by those who desire to understand the causes which render the rayat powerless to withstand even the first attacks of famine. The appendix referred to reproduces, under the modest title of "Notes on Indian Land Revenue," a group of Minutes recorded in 1875 by the highest authorities at the India Office; the general question being, What is the nature and limit of the Govern-

ment demand under a rayatwari settlement? and, Under what circumstances may an enhancement be equitably claimed? The discussion originated with the proposal of Lord Hobart, the Governor of Madras, to stop absolutely the enhancement operations of the Settlement Department, "which with more propriety might be called the Unsettlement Department." He wisely deprecated the disturbance, loss, and vexation, involved in the periodical re-assessment of every field of a vast peasant proprietary, and with all the earnestness of strong conviction advocated a statesmanlike policy giving to the cultivators the full enjoyment of their improvements, and securing their lasting attachment to the British Government. It is upon these proposals that we find recorded a valuable Minute of Sir Louis Mallet, Permanent Under Secretary of State, followed by Sir George Campbell, Sir Henry Maine, Sir H. Montgomery, Sir Erskine Perry, and Sir Bartle Frere, the debate being closed by Lord Salisbury, then Secretary of State for India.

There is not here space to give even the substance of these Minutes. But it may be noted that no one among the writers even pretended to think that under existing arrangements one-half the net produce is really left with the rayat. It was in fact admitted that Sir C. Wood's rule had become "a mere paper instruction." But I will quote the words of Sir Bartle Frere, himself a Revenue officer, as to what the Settlement Departments really have done and are doing in India. His opinion was that throughout India the State demand rarely, if ever, fulfilled the requirements of the India Office instruction, or could be rightly described as limited to a fixed share of the true rent:

"The reader," he says, "of much of the literature relating to Indian land revenue would suppose that it came for the most part, or at least very frequently, under this class as a true land tax. But with the exception of a very few localities, almost infinitesimally small in proportion to the total area which pays land revenue in India, such a true land tax is practically unknown."

In the opinion therefore of so experienced an administrator as Sir Bartle Frere, compliance, in this vital matter, with the instructions of the Secretary of State was "practically unknown." Dealing with the Bombay Presidency, of which he had been Governor, Sir B. Frere describes the assessment as coming for the most part under the three following economic classes: (a) *a land tax fixed more or less arbitrarily*, and absorbing a varying proportion of the true rent; (b) *a full rent*, leaving nothing to the cultivator but the wages of his labour and the interest on his capital; and (c) *a rent and something more*, trenching on the wages of labour or the profits of capital. With reference to this last class he observes:

"It might seem almost impossible that the Government

demand should now amount to what is defined as class (c), rent and something more, but in my early years, when assessments were high and prices low, I often met with whole districts in the Dekkhan where the cultivator could not pay the Government demand without trenching on his own wages as labourer, to the extent of his having less for himself than a hired labourer would require."

To Sir Bartle Frere's three classes Sir Louis Mallet adds another, for he says:

"I am also informed that in many cases lands have been assessed which barely pay the cost of cultivation and yield no rent at all."

This may be called class (d) *where the land yields no rent at all*, and the assessment is taken wholly from that portion of the crop which represents the wages of labour. And to these four classes I must regretfully add yet a fifth and still more grievous case, class (e) *where the total crop is insufficient to pay the cost of cultivation*, and where the assessment must be paid out of wages earned elsewhere or from cash obtained from the money-lender. That this class (e) not only exists, but that it embraces the vast majority of holdings in the Dekkhan, will be clear to anyone who will take the trouble to study the bulky and doleful literature which has accumulated round the case of the distressed rayat: the report with appendices of the Dekkhan Riots Commission; the report of the Famine Commissioners, with the evidence taken before them; and the enquiries and debates in connection with the Dekkhan Agriculturists Relief Act. Here facts and statistics will be found in abundance, showing that the pauperism of the ordinary rayat is an increasing evil; that it is a necessary consequence of his present economic position, and that it primarily arises from the absolute insufficiency of the total produce of the land to maintain the existing population and to meet the demands of a costly European administration. Instead of improving, matters are steadily getting worse; for the fertility of the land is becoming exhausted; the population to be supported is increasing; while the demands of the Government are constantly enhanced.

To illustrate the process which is going on I will give the exact figures with regard to a couple of typical villages, the detailed condition of which was investigated by a judicial officer under my own personal observation. The first is the village of Nepti—a village containing a fair amount of irrigated land and favourably situated on a road near the town of Ahmednagar. As regards each holding the inquiry ascertained in detail the amount of the assessment, the cash expenses of cultivation, and the cost of family maintenance, together with the value of the produce and the amount of income derived by the occupant from other sources. And from the totals it appeared that the gross produce of the whole village was worth Rs. 12,001, and the income

from other sources was Rs. 3,731, giving a total income of Rs. 15,732. On the other hand, bare family maintenance amounted to Rs. 11,345, the cash expenses of cultivation to Rs. 3,007, and the assessment to Rs. 2,392, giving a total of Rs. 16,744 as the outgoings of the village. In ordinary years, therefore, the income was insufficient to meet the expenditure. And there was besides a total debt on the village of Rs. 33,132, which represented a further annual charge for interest of Rs. 7 or 8,000, and indicated a steady progress towards absolute ruin. In villages where there is little or no irrigation the case is still worse. Thus in the neighbouring village of Chás the total crop was found to be worth Rs. 7,939; whereas the cost of cultivation, including maintenance, amounted to Rs. 12,136. Here the assessment could not have been paid at all had it not been for the considerable sum of Rs. 4,619 earned by labour apart from agriculture; by carrying grass and firewood, by working on the roads, by cart-hire, and by other miscellaneous employments rendered possible by the vicinity of a large town. Such supplementary means of livelihood are, of course, wanting in secluded villages far away from any large market or centre of industry. It may be noted that about the same time Mr. Irwin, in his book "The Garden of India" made similar calculations for one or two typical villages in Oudh, with similar result; and he gives it as his opinion that the only way the peasant makes both ends meet is by stinting himself in food and eating less than is necessary for health. And the conclusion is that by reason of exhausted soil, increasing population, and excessive revenue demands a condition of things has, in a large portion of India, been produced a full degree lower than that described by Sir Bartle Frere as existing in his early days.

Now I would ask any sane person, Is a peasantry so situated in a condition to invite large and wholesale enhancements of the revenue demand? One would have thought not, but that is not the wisdom with which we are governed. In all the recent revisions the fiscal screw is being vigorously applied by the revenue authorities:

"Half-ignorant, they turned an easy wheel,
That set sharp racks at work to pinch and peel."

One or two specimens must suffice here by way of illustration. In the Assam Valley districts the authorities managed to create serious agrarian disturbances by a general enhancement amounting to 53 per cent. In deference apparently to the disturbances the enhancement was reduced to 32 per cent. In the Bombay Presidency there existed a Standing Rule of the Department that enhancements should not exceed 33 per cent. upon a whole Taluka, 66 per cent. on any one village, and 100 per cent. upon any individual holding. Surely such a

scale of increased rent should content the greediest landlord. But not so the Government. Not long ago in the House of Commons I questioned Sir H. Fowler regarding the case of the Kolaba District, where the increase on the whole Panvel Taluka was 44·8 per cent, in certain villages over 100 per cent., and in certain individual holdings over 1,000 per cent. He had to admit the correctness of the figures, but upheld these rack-rents. If redress cannot be got in such cases, what hope is there for others?

I have stated a few grim facts, which cannot be denied; and again I ask for enquiry. Such an investigation as I have described at Nepti and Chás need not take away a single man from famine duty; and the cost would be quite trifling: indeed experienced retired officials could be found to do such work out of mere charity and pity. But the high authorities to whom we appeal scorn such humble methods: they will not wash in Jordan, and be clean. They prefer heroic methods, and their idea of heroism seems to be noisy self-praise, contempt for the opinion of others, and resentment of outside criticism. In my humble opinion there would be more heroism in regret for past failures, anxiety to learn, and patient research into the causes which are bringing sorrow and death into the homes of the poor.

THE HEALTH OF BRITISH TROOPS IN INDIA.

By ALFRED WEBB.

It must be evident to all that a supreme effort is now being made in military and medical circles to bring about the re-establishment, in India at least, of the hateful C. D. Acts. On all hands we find the "rawhead and bloody bones" being paraded of the advances of a loathsome disease amongst British troops, and the nation is being adjured to set at naught the "canting hysterics of old maids," and to be guided by the advice of men of the world. Professor Stuart, M.P., Mr. H. J. Wilson, M.P., the author of "The Soldier and his Masters," and others have effectually dealt with the broad aspects of this question. There is one certain effect upon quiet people at home that the urgings of the friends of the Acts is certain to have, which has not perhaps by the friends of the Acts been sufficiently considered.

Whatever is the cause, whatever is to be the cure, we are appalled by the facts of the case. One writer has gone so far as to inform us that in one distant cantonment in India where none of the cares of medical supervision were available, practically all the men, in the course of a year, contracted the disease.

Every effort has of late years been made to elevate the Service, and attract young men of good character into the army. All who enter must take their chance of service in India. If the modes of life of the soldier there are such, if the temptations there are so great, that the contracting of a disease resulting from vice is not to be considered any blemish on the character, surely there is not a father or mother, a sister or brother, that would not rather see a beloved relative beneath the sod than exposed to such chances of moral contamination! The advocates of the necessity of these Acts are striking the most serious blows ever aimed at the character of the British army. The doctrine and the experiences upon which civil life is carried on are that every young man has it in his power, aided by the grace of God, to keep himself pure as his female relatives and friends. No one who has any regard for his self-respect; for his virtue (which is above all material considerations), should enter the army if the chances are vastly against his there conserving his purity. If the descent of young soldiers into vice in India is so likely that provision must be made for it, and the way made easier and pleasanter, we have no right to maintain a British army there at all. The effect upon the soldiers themselves may be bad enough, the reflex effect upon this country worse still. If it is the fact that few of the many thousand soldiers who annually return after Indian service return free from the contamination of disease, or if free, so not through abstention from vice, but through vice being rendered physically harmless—no girl, however humble, should consider her future happiness safe in wedding a soldier who has served in India. Habit in vice is everything. The system of the C. D. Acts must stand or fall together in India and at home. The tendency of such regulations undoubtedly is to increase the practice of vice. If habits fostered in India establish their raging mastery over young men, what is likely to be the result upon their return home, where none of the "protecting safeguards" are to be found?

The more the subject is considered the more clearly will it be recognized, that the slightest approach towards "regulation" tends down a path ending in a quagmire of unutterable horrors. Surely the evidence laid before us through the devotion of Mrs. Andrews and Dr. Kate Bushnell must not be allowed lightly to pass from our minds. Surely that brought forward in the enquiry which preceded the abolition of the Acts still stands. "Give a free hand to India" on this question, and we shall soon again have "Christian" Colonels sending forward precepts to have supplies of sufficiently handsome girls in readiness at next cantonment. If a "free hand" is given it will not be to "India," whose "heathen" conscience is higher on

this subject than that of too many professing Christians, but to a section of a military class, fallen out of touch with the standards of morality inculcated in the homes of England, Ireland and Scotland—standards enjoined by Christ, and which everyday experience proves possible of adherence to by men of all dispositions, under all circumstances, in every quarter of the globe.

A FAMINE BUDGET.

BY H. MORGAN-BROWNE, LL.B.

Nowhere is the evidence of the severity of the present famine stronger than in the figures disclosed by Sir James Westland when making his financial statement in the Viceroy's Council on March 19th last. Taking the figures in the Revised Estimate for 1896-97 and the Budget Estimate for the current year together, the present estimated cost of the famine amounts to nearly Rx. 10,000,000. Of this, more than half represents money spent in relief, and the rest, remissions—or are they only suspensions?—of land revenue, loss on railway receipts and other indirect charges which are due to the prevailing distress. These eloquent figures attest not only the gravity of the present crisis, but the real, if somewhat tardy, awakening of the Government to the needs of the situation. Let us hope that this gigantic sum expended in relief—Rx. 5,607,000, according to Sir James Westland—is both necessary and adequate. Three important considerations belong to this question. Have the Government of India by their failure to recognise in its early stages the magnitude of the existing evil, increased the cost of those remedial measures which the Imperial Government, in opposition to the strong representations of the local Governments, seemed reluctant to take before their hands were forced by public opinion in India and in this country? Have they, after this first delay, in their efforts to make up for precious time that had been lost, still further increased, without corresponding gain to those afflicted, the heavy burdens already reposing on the impoverished Indian taxpayer? And, finally, have they, in an untimely spirit of economy, not only increased expenditure, but shown themselves niggard, and therefore tortious, trustees of that "sacred trust," the Famine Insurance Fund or Grant, which they obtained from the people for this very purpose? These are questions which can only be fully answered when the time for "reporting" on the famine has come. Whatever else they may do or not do, the Government of India will "report" to admiration. It is well in the meantime that these three salient points should be kept in view.

We must never forget that, while the need of the sufferers in the famine districts is dire and instant, the need of the general population in good years, as in bad years, though not so great, is yet great and

constant. Second only to the misfeasance of a faulty, or parsimonious, or dilatory organization for relief, would be that of hasty, ill-considered and extravagant squandering of the general taxpayers' exiguous resources. Further, there is a real danger that the undoubted financial strain of a great famine may serve to conceal the normal condition of Indian Finance. That normal condition during the last decade has been one of progressive taxation, of enhanced assessment of the land revenue, and of chronic increase of civil and military expenditure. While, therefore, making every allowance for the present pressing financial difficulties of the Indian Government, and while hoping that those difficulties are being met in a manner at once humanely adequate and financially economical, it behoves us to examine the figures of the Indian Finance Minister as carefully as though no legitimate reason for increased expenditure and yawning deficits existed.

In concluding his review of the financial situation, Sir James Westland referred to the fact that the cost of the famine was so much greater than the declared deficits, and upon this based the hope that when famine and plague have passed away, financial progress will be resumed. We propose to test this assertion of real underlying financial progress, by the facts and figures at our command. It should be observed, however, that the mere fact that but for the famine there would be surpluses is not of itself a sufficient indication of financial progress. It would undoubtedly be evidence—and most gratifying evidence so far as the Treasury is concerned—of an improvement in Indian Finance *qua* finance. But between that kind of "improvement" which is so pleasing to Indian Finance Ministers, and that substantial amelioration of the financial burden of government to the Indian taxpayer, there is a wide gulf fixed. A surplus which is brought about by additional taxation can only be styled an "improvement" by ignoring the point of view of the taxpayer. And no credit rightly attaches to the Government for a sudden decrease in expenditure which is brought about by a convenient but uncontrollable rise in the rate of Exchange between England and India. Loss by Exchange has been the burden of every Indian financial statement these many years; the *χρηός* has been clear and strong. Gain by Exchange has been the feature of the last two budgets; but the *ἀντιχρήριον* seems somehow scarcely audible and singularly weak. Truly, Indian Finance Ministers are an ungrateful race! When, putting aside the cost of the famine, we find the taxes imposed to meet the loss by Exchange repealed to meet the gain by Exchange, and financial equilibrium supervening—then, but not till then, shall we deem it time to congratulate the Government of India on their good fortune or their economical administration, or both.

Let us turn to the figures. First of all, let us see what was the financial position in 1894-5, the year when the average rate of exchange was the lowest on record. The following figures—except where it is expressly stated to the contrary—are the gross figures, taken from the ordinary statement of the accounts of the Government of India, published in India and laid before the British Parliament.

FINANCIAL POSITION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA. ACCOUNTS, 1894-5.

(i) Revenue.

Land, Opium, and Tax Revenue	Rx. 63,585,000
Other Receipts	Rx. 31,602,000
Total	Rx. 95,187,000

(ii) Expenditure.

In India	Rx. 63,775,000
In England	£15,707,000
Exchange:—	Rx.
On Remittances ..	13,068,000
Exchange Compensation, and Sterling Pay of Troops ..	1,944,000
	Rx. 15,012,000
Total	Rx. 94,494,000
Surplus	Rx. 693,000

Compare with this, the financial position as revealed in the Budget Estimate for the year 1896-7:—

FINANCIAL POSITION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA. BUDGET ESTIMATE, 1896-7.

(i) Revenue.

Land, Opium, and Tax Revenue	Rx. 65,214,000
Other Receipts	Rx. 32,407,000
Total	Rx. 97,621,000

(ii) Expenditure.

In India	Rx. 67,530,000
In England	£15,909,000
Exchange:—	Rx.
On Remittances ..	11,860,000
Exchange Compensation, and Sterling Pay of Troops ..	1,859,000
	Rx. 13,719,000
Total	Rx. 97,158,000
Surplus	Rx. 463,000

Now, the difference between these two years, which was not due to expansion of the revenue or to economies effected in the expenditure, was as follows:—

Increased Customs Duties	Rx. 1,000,000
Decreased Cost of Exchange—	
On Remittances	1,208,000
Exchange, Compensation, etc. ..	85,000
	1,293,000
Unearned Financial Improvement	Rx. 2,293,000

There were, of course, numerous other differences: growth of revenue, of railway receipts, etc., and a

very large increase of expenditure in India (exclusive of exchange), which very nearly absorbed the whole of what we have called the Unearned Financial Improvement. But the Revised Estimates for 1896-7 are far better for the Treasury than the Budget Estimates given above, as there was a further clear gain of Rx. 1,329,000 upon exchange. So that for the Revised Estimate of 1896-7, the Unearned Financial Improvement amounts to no less than Rx. 3,622,000 [*i.e.*, Rx. 2,293,000 + Rx. 1,329,000], to which a rising exchange contributed no less than Rx. 2,624,000. Again, for the Budget of 1897-8 the unearned improvement compared with the accounts for 1894-5 is still more, as exchange for 1897-8 is estimated to be better by Rx. 1,360,000 over the Budget Estimate for 1896-7. Thus for 1897-8 we get an unearned improvement of Rx. 3,653,000 [*i.e.*, Rx. 2,293,000 + Rx. 1,360,000]. Altogether, then, in these two years the Indian Treasury, by no effort of its own—save that of imposing new taxation—has had Rx. 7,275,000 additional resources, compared with 1894-5, with which to meet the strain of the present visitation. This calculation, it must be repeated, takes no account whatever of the ordinary growth of the Revenue, of increased receipts from the commercial services, of the savings on the debt services, or of any economies, which may have been made, or which ought to have been made, with taxation at the high level it has now attained.

Now we can better estimate what solid ground exists for the Government of India's self-congratulation. Sir James Westland states the account thus:—

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA IN ACCOUNT WITH THE FAMINE.

FOR THE TWO YEARS 1896-7 AND 1897-8.

To Loss of Revenue	Rx. 4,115,000
Expenditure on Famine Relief ..	Rx. 5,607,000

Total Cost of Famine	Rx. 9,722,000
Portion of Cost of Famine met out of Ordinary Resources ..	Rx. 5,271,000

Deficits (2 years)	Rx. 4,451,000
--------------------------	---------------

But this statement needs correction on the face of it. Even in 1894-5 there was an expenditure of some Rx. 600,000 on famine relief and insurance—which is doubtless suspended, or rather included in the total of Rx. 5,607,000 given above. This makes the *extra* expenditure on famine relief due to the famine about Rx. 4,400,000, and the account should be stated in this way:—

Loss of Revenue	Rx. 4,115,000
Famine Relief	Rx. 5,607,000
Deduct Insurance Suspended	1,200,000
	<hr/> 4,407,000

Total Extra Cost of Famine ..	Rx. 8,522,000
Portion of Cost of Famine met out of Ordinary Resources ..	Rx. 4,071,000

Deficits (2 years)	Rx. 4,451,000
--------------------------	---------------

Now we will state the account as it presents itself to us, following to its conclusion the line of argument we have taken above:—

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA IN ACCOUNT WITH THE FAMINE.

FOR THE TWO YEARS 1896-7 AND 1897-8.

Total Extra Cost of Famine ..	Rx. 8,522,000
Total Unearned Financial Improvement, as shown above ..	<hr/> 7,275,000

Excess Cost of Famine, or Legitimate Deficits (2 years) ..	Rx. 1,247,000
--	---------------

We see, then, that with ordinary prudence the deficiency of Rx. 4,451,000 in the two years need not have exceeded Rx. 1,247,000. By ordinary prudence we mean this: When expenditure had reached the high level of 1894-5, after a rise of unprecedented rapidity during ten years, with taxation at its admitted limit, and with exchange a constant source of financial anxiety, it would have been only ordinary prudence to have confined the increase of expenditure to the natural increase of the revenues, and to have kept the unearned improvement in the finances for the purpose of reducing taxation at the earliest opportunity, or of meeting some such calamity as that which has now befallen the country. Had this course been pursued, the present heavy deficits would have been less by Rx. 3,200,000 at least. It is conceivable that by heroic measures—such as one does not expect from the Government of India—the whole cost of the Famine to the present time might have been met without deficits; but we do not expect too much, and we will content ourselves with pointing out what might have been the financial position to-day, had the dictates of ordinary prudence been followed.

A STRONG-MINDED HINDU.—I.

By W. MARTIN WOOD.

Vishvanath Narayan Mandlik, C.S.I., born in 1833, died in 1889, familiarly spoken of in Bombay as "the Rao Sahib," occupied a conspicuous place in the public affairs of Western India during the three decades sixty, seventy, and eighty. And now a substantial service has been rendered by his (adopted) son, Mr. Narayan V. Mandlik, B.A., in publishing a copious collection of his father's "Writings and Speeches," with a "Sketch of his Life," by Mr. Dunadur Ganesh Padhye, M.A. The character and attainments of this typical Mahratta Brahmin are well summed up by his biographer thus:—

"This eminent man, whose career we have traced from his birth in a small village in the Kankan to his rise to the highest position a native can rise to—the position of a learned man, a successful member of his profession, an author of great eminence, and a politician whom the people trusted and the Government called to counsel and showed unmistakable signs of respect and esteem for."

Vishvanath was a native of Maruda, in the Rutenageri district of the Southern Konkan. His ancestors were connected by marriage with the

Peishwas of the Deccan, who, with most of his counsellors and commanders, the consolidators of the Mahratta empire founded by Sivaji, came from the same rugged and picturesque sea-coast territory. His grandfather, Dundopunt, was a *Sabha* (provincial governor) under Baji Rao, the last of the Peishwas. To that ancestor Vishvanath owed his early training in the Hindu cult. At ten he went to the Anglo-Vernacular School at Ratnagari, where he acquired his first knowledge of English and the rudiments of Western education. At fourteen, in spite of difficulties, but encouraged by his schoolmaster, Ramchundar—a man who left his mark in the locality—the stripling made his way to Bombay, where he entered the Elphinstone Institute. There he soon secured a Clare scholarship and other prizes, enabling him to prolong his student course. That institute was then (1848-50) in its prime, under the energetic influence of its professors, Harkness, Green and Patton, the memory of whom is still gratefully cherished in Western India as the energetic pioneers there of collegiate education. Vishvanath's facility in mathematics was such that he was entrusted with charge of the classes during the professor's absence. Having completed his course, and passed the highest examinations then existing, he was strongly advised by Professor Patton to come over here and enter the competition for the India Civil Service, then newly opened to all citizens of the British Empire. As may be supposed, this was quite out of the question, for no proposal to cross the *Kala-pani* (black water) could be listened to for a moment by the young student's orthodox Hindu relatives. Even when he shortly afterwards received an offer of official employment in Sindh, it was with much difficulty that his friends consented to his leaving for what was to them, at that period, "a distant unknown land"; but they gave way. This proved the true starting-point in Vishvanath's public career; and in the circumstances of this transfer to Sindh may be traced the earlier strands of that affinity of sterling qualities in his own character with that strict uprightness and sense of public duty which were exemplified in the European officers his superiors. It was the late General Sir Le Grand Jacob, then Political Resident at Hyderabad in Sindh, who had asked the principal of the Elphinstone Institute to send him a youth as personal assistant. That eminent political officer, as the biographer remarks, "took a liking to his young and able assistant, and his interest in him never slackened while life lasted." Long after General Jacob's retirement the present writer used to hear Vishvanath speak with the highest respect of his early exemplar and steadfast friend, and quote from his letters to him on public affairs. Later on the young assistant, who rapidly acquired the language of the province, was brought into contact at Karachi with the then Mr. Bartle Frere, as also with his coadjutor, the late Hon. James Gibbs, with whom also Vishvanath subsequently worked in Bombay, in the delicate and arduous service of organising James Wilson's first income-tax, then a fiscal novelty in India. Both these eminent Civilians recognised the valuable qualities of their energetic Hindu subor-

throughout life; though, at a later period, Vishvanath's steady advocacy of the claims of his own class, the Khote landholders of Rutnageri, used to try severely Sir Bartle Frere in his character as one of the founders and eager vindicators of the Bombay Land Revenue Survey system. In the meantime the young official had passed through the duties of Subordinate Judge, Educational Inspector, and Curator of the Government Book Department; and in connection with these semi-scholastic appointments he did much service in editing and revising some of the school books of the period.

In 1862, being then nearly thirty, Vishvanath saw that, as administrative arrangements then stood, there was little prospect of further advancement in Government service; his energy and instinct of public capacity were strong within him; so he resolved to strike out a new course for himself. He soon passed the High Court pleaders' examination, and in 1863 began to practise on the Appellate side of the Court, which had then recently superseded the old *Sadar Adawlut*. At that time very few of the Indian advocates knew English, in which the new pleader was skilled; while, on the other hand, very few of the English judges were really versed in Indian civil law. Hence his progress was both rapid and secure. As his biographer justly remarks, "few could equal his industry, zeal, and argumentative power, and fewer still his punctilious punctuality and fearless advocacy." His independence, also, in dealing with suitors, his clients, was none the less marked; "touts" could do nothing with him, as "he cared less for money than for professional honour and his high ideal of duty and punctuality." It is mentioned as an illustration of the latter quality that on one occasion, having been unexpectedly detained in the Court at Bombay when he was due to defend a case in the Sessions Court at Poona, he chartered a special train, and duly arrived at the time appointed for him to appear. Also, in one of the Khote cases heard at Rutnageri, he had been outrun by the Government pleader; but on that occasion he chartered a special steamer in time to meet his appointment.

During the course of this part of his career he became the champion of his colleagues the Indian advocates; and to his exertions was mainly due the passing of the Legal Practitioners Act, which admitted native advocates to plead before the Original side of the High Court. In 1873 there was an opportunity for his being appointed to an acting Judgeship of the High Court; but what was regarded by the authorities as his too pronounced independence of character and his activity in public affairs were sufficient to account for his being passed over in favour of less demonstrative lawyers. He could scarcely have regretted this exemption from judicial office, seeing that he was thereby left free to devote his energies to the civic, literary, and political duties that claimed his earnest attention, more and more, as his character matured and his knowledge of public life extended. In this latter direction he gained much facility through what was only an incidental public service, the establishment, in 1864, of an Anglo-Marathi journal, the *Native Opinion*, his name was not attached to it, was

known to the official, as well as the popular community as "the Rao Sahib's paper." In its tone and trenchant treatment of current questions it well represented the virile character of himself and his race; and, though many competitors have since entered the field, the journal faithfully maintains the traditions of its founder.

Our review of Vishvanath's middle and later career as an author and "man of affairs" may be conveniently entered on by reference to his notable and very concise work, "Adoption *v.* Annexation; with Remarks on the Mysore Question," published in England, as well as in Bombay, in 1866. It was suitably dedicated to Sir George Clerk, whom the Rao Sahib had known as twice Governor of Bombay, whose name will live in history as one of the best of the old Company's men. Sir George Clerk, step by step, manfully resisted the revolutionary policy of annexation; and he was Lord Canning's chief counsellor in finally reversing that baneful policy after the political deluge that had strewed the empire with its wrecks. The Rao Sahib's essay took the form of a thorough refutation of the Duke of Argyll's and Sir Charles Jackson's pleas for the Dalhousie régime; and, as it combines with its masterly political arguments an exposition of Hindu law relating to adoption and "lapse," it will always remain one of the text-books of that fundamental Indian question. It is reproduced in the present memorial volume. Its concluding sentence runs thus:—

"For the British nation to permit mere land-hunger to turn itself from the scrupulous observance of treaties is a descent from the spiritual to the material—a lapse from monotheism to idolatry which must, in time, corrupt the governors and the governed, to the certain ruin both of India and England."

When this was written the fate of Mysore was hanging in the balance, which happily turned the right way, with the best results to Mysore and for England's reputation.

(To be continued.)

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA.

FROM A PARLIAMENTARY CORRESPONDENT.

One often wonders what the intelligent foreigner must think of the selection which this great Empire makes of the men who are to rule over it, and, if the foreigner is puzzled to know why certain men are chosen for high office, still more must the natives of distant colonies and dependencies search in vain for some acceptable reason for the choice of the men whom, apparently, the nation delights to honour. The people of India, after something like two years' experience, are no doubt looking curiously for the qualities which have placed Lord George Hamilton in the highest office, controlling the destinies of millions of his fellow-subjects. They are secret and hidden, and will never be discovered by the plain man who connects talents with power and looks for some proof of statesmanship in the men who obtain the highest prizes in the ranks of statesmen. The truth is that Lord George belongs to one of those "reigning families" whose hereditary right to the comfortable

and profitable posts in the service of the Crown seems to be more safely established than even the hereditary monarchy itself. The Hamiltons have sat very near to the fount of honour and public emoluments almost from the beginning of English history. Whenever there has been anything to give away, they were always close at hand. They have no record throughout all the centuries of any great act of statesmanship or any great service to the State, but a steady stream of titles and honour, lands and profitable posts has flowed upon them from public sources. Lord George is one of the younger sons of the Irish branch of the family, who have been known for centuries in Ireland as "the hungry Hamiltons." Not that they ever suffered the actual physical hunger which has been the inheritance of so large a proportion of the Irish race, but because, although they seemed always to have the first choice in whatever there was to be given away, they were always ready for more. The estates which maintained them were all gifts from the Crown, the property of dispossessed Irishmen or disendowed churches. The fortunes of the family were founded by a judicious change of allegiance at a critical moment in the history of Scotland, and at all the troublesome changes in English and Irish history the Hamiltons have come out on the winning side. Thus it happens that Lord George's elder brother, the present Duke of Abercorn, who is the head of the family, is one of the only two peers who enjoy independent peerages in the three kingdoms. It was the father, the late Duke, who received the highest honour possible for a subject in the form of a dukedom, for no apparent reason. It was characteristic of the family genius that they were the largest beneficiaries under the Irish Land Purchase Acts of ten years ago, which were never meant for them at all. Tired of the Irish land question, the British Parliament opened the purse-strings, and granted £5,000,000 to enable the poor cottier tenants to buy out their equally poor landlords. It was thought that the money would all go to the small men on the barren lands, but some five or six of the biggest and most prosperous landlords managed to divide about a million between them. Of course, the Duke of Abercorn was one, and, equally of course, he obtained the lion's share, no less than £250,000 going into the Hamilton pockets. There must be some reason for this phenomenal success.

Lord George is a tall good-looking man of gentle manners and refined appearance—now fifty years of age but looking less. His distinguishing characteristics are a soft voice and delicate hands. His political career is an epitome of that of his family. Scarcely was he of age when he not only entered Parliament, but entered it for one of the safest seats in the country, one of the gifts usually reserved for service-worn veterans. And now, without the worry of the recurring election contest which troubles most politicians, and the adverse chances of which drive them from public life—without a thought of elections or electors—Lord George is established in Parliament for life. Without having displayed any striking public ability, the moment his party came into power he stepped over the heads of all his fellows into office as Under Secretary for India. This post he held

from 1874 to 1879, and on the first opportunity he secured promotion to the more independent and more lucrative post of Minister of Education. His party was driven from power, but on its return in 1885 he stepped up again into one of the great prizes, at the head of a "spending department," as First Lord of the Admiralty, and held the post as long as his party held office, until 1892. Now when the Tories have returned once more he is established in one of the most honourable and most lucrative posts as Secretary of State for India. It cannot be said that in any office he has distinguished himself. No great deed, no brilliant effort of statesmanship, no strenuous labour for reform has marked his career. The personal charm, the soft yielding to permanent officials and colleagues, the skill in discovering just how little worry and endeavour will carry on the ordinary work of a department on the old lines, have always made his path easy and comfortable. This has been, and will undoubtedly be, his career at the India Office—a gentle turning away from all difficulties, and an unerring instinct for the action and policy which will least disturb the thoughts or comfort of the Secretary of State and secure the peaceful enjoyment of not unrewarded position with the smallest possible effort. That is the Hamilton tradition, which strews the path of a Hamilton with roses and has done so for centuries. Remarkable charm of manner, coupled with a keen eye for substantial advantage, has made Lord George one of the most successful men of his merits in both public and private life. He is the husband of one of the most beautiful and charming wives that move in London society, and he has secured a Cabinet pension of £2,000 a year. A few pensions are provided for ex-Cabinet ministers who, having passed their lives in the service of the State, are in necessitous circumstances. Lord George is certainly the youngest, and probably the least necessitous, who ever claimed the pension. But he had no difficulty in making the necessary declaration, and so, if he never does another stroke of work for the public, he is quartered on the public purse to the tune of £2,000 a year for the rest of his days.

In the face of these private personal qualities, it is not necessary to pursue the useless task of looking for anything worth recording in his public life and deeds. The *Daily News*, commenting a few days ago on Lord Salisbury's absence from England, said truly enough that if Lord George Hamilton took a trip to Iceland nobody would be the wiser. The apparent blunder in tactics of his revolt from his colleagues on the famous debate in 1895 on the Indian cotton duties was one of the most striking incidents in his public life. But it paved the way for his promotion to his present office; and however much he was at variance with his colleagues in the House of Commons, he was acting in accord with the wishes and instructions of Lord Salisbury, and Lord Salisbury is the man who appoints Secretaries of State. The Hamilton instinct never fails. It must have been disagreeable to play a leading part in that discreditable intrigue, but he obtained his office, and a cynic might say that perhaps—in view of what he went through to serve his chief—for once he earned it.

THE CONGRESS AND THE "TIMES".

PROTEST BY MR. J. P. GOODRIDGE.

The following letter was addressed to the Editor of the *Times* by Mr. J. P. Goodridge (formerly a member of the Indian Civil Service, now a member of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress), in reply to a false statement telegraphed from Calcutta and printed in the *Times*. The letter was dated Jubbulpore, February 11th. As the *Times* omitted some of the most material portions of it, we reproduce the letter here in full:

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE 'TIMES.'"

"Your Calcutta correspondent telegraphed to you on the 6th ult. as follows:

"'With regard to the recent action of the National Congress which amounts to a condemnation of the Government famine policy, it should be noted that the leaders of the agitation have not so far raised or subscribed a single rupee to any fund for the relief of their distressed fellow-countrymen. Their sympathy has only been shown by the passing of Resolutions and the spending of money in telegrams to England. If the National Congress were a real power its leaders would be able to raise an enormous sum, but its organisation is merely one for political agitation with which the bulk of the people are out of touch.'"

"As this statement is false both in fact and in the insinuation which it conveys, I beg that you will, out of fairness to the Indian National Congress, permit me to say in your columns that all the delegates from the Jubbulpore division of the Central Provinces, where famine exists in its most acute form, had, before the date of the telegram, contributed, not once, but on several occasions, to famine funds raised at Jubbulpore and other places in the Central Provinces. I myself contributed towards the maintenance of famine houses in no fewer than three districts, Jubbulpore, Sangor, and Damoh, and during a period extending as far back as June, 1895, when, even then, there were unmistakable signs of starvation. And if it will be of any interest to your correspondent or to any else I will add that the aggregate sum of my subscriptions amounted to over Rs. 400. I am now on a tour in the famine-stricken districts of the Central Provinces, affording what aid and relief I can, both in money and by personal tions to the starving, and am therefore unable to communicate with other delegates (in time to be by this mail) as to whether they have also subscribed to famine funds, but this I can say with further reference, that Mr. W. S. Caine had before the Congress meeting subscribed to the Balaghat famine fund. Now, sir, I beg to protest against this mode of warfare. Your correspondent may surely be expected to take some pains to verify the news he sends home. It is not understood to be a party newspaper, and it may perhaps be impossible to find a correspondent who has not his own views on most questions of public interest, and who will not colour his telegrams accordingly, yet I think that all persons will say that your correspondent is well below the belt when he telegraphs as fact what is only a rumour, of which he could not possibly have obtained worthy information without enquiry, in a manner, too, which did not admit of being promptly contradicted if his statement were

and before it had served the purpose intended by its dispatch. The telegram was sent in support of the policy of the Government of India, and in order that no famine fund should be opened as urged by the National Congress, and this end was to be attained by showing that the telegram sent to the Secretary of State by the Congress was worthless as proceeding from a body of men who were not themselves prepared to subscribe a single rupee to a famine fund. Telegrams are not wired back to India, so that those who knew that the statement was false and conveyed a wrong impression had no opportunity of contradicting it till the mischief had been done. It is with weapons of falsehood and misrepresentation like this that this National movement is being combated. The columns of the Anglo-Indian press teem with charges of every sort of moral obliquity brought against those who take an active part in the National Congress, or even express sympathy with it. This literature is, of course, specially prepared for those who, while knowing but little of the movement are yet prepared to resist to the last gasp all reforms in the government of this country. No one here thinks it worth while to take any notice of such misrepresentations. But I think, as a delegate of the Central Provinces, and also as a member of the British Committee of the National Indian Congress, I ought not to permit this false and misleading statement, made by a responsible person such as your correspondent, to pass unnoticed. I beg, too, Sir, that you will permit me on this occasion to observe that Lord George Hamilton was ill-advised by the India Office when he adopted so uncompromising an attitude to the national movement as to say in a recent debate in the House of Commons that the National Congress is always ready to attack British rule. This must have been said in forgetfulness of Lord Lansdowne's expression of opinion to the effect that the National Congress is a constitutional movement of reform, representing what in Europe would be called the extreme Liberal party (I am quoting away from books, and cannot give the precise words used). At the last Congress I had the opportunity of meeting hundreds of educated Indians all parts of the country, and what struck me forcibly was the extraordinary loyalty to the British rule and hearty appreciation of British rule manifested by all I spoke with. I am, therefore, able to say that Lord George Hamilton's statement a complete misstatement. Whatever may be said of the leaders of the movement, they are almost to a man well-meaning persons. They know better than any one can know that their interests are better served by British rule than could possibly be served by any other form of government. This movement, at its commencement, was ridiculed and declared to be merely a debating society, and as not to be treated seriously. But when many of the leading men of the movement were also to be found in the councils of the Government of India, in the local legislatures, sitting on the bench, leaders of the bar, merchants and princes, this line of attack was abandoned, and the Congress is now pelted with the most abusive epithets that official spite can invent, and is termed 'veiled sedition.' If

ever a charge was falsely brought against a patriotic and honourable body of men, it is this. Many of them have served their Queen and country with honour and distinction, and now enjoy a pension from Government, but still devote their money and energies to the cause of their country in the way they think she may best be served. I have lived amongst these people for more than a quarter of a century, and I say this, that her Majesty has no more loyal subjects than her Indian subjects. If Lord George Hamilton or any other fair-minded person will read the proceedings of the Congress, he will see that British rule is not attacked, but, on the contrary, is heartily appreciated, and is regarded as affording the sole hope of this country ever being raised up from its present state of degradation and poverty. The Congress is the exponent of the educated and public-spirited portion of the people of India. It does not attack British rule, but, in a moderate and constitutional manner, places before the rulers of this country the views which it holds on various important topics—principally fiscal and administrative reforms—with which the people are so greatly concerned. If the educated classes of India—the most characteristic creation of British rule—ever forget their mother and become disloyal (which God forbid), England will have to thank politicians like Lord George Hamilton and those who inspire these thoughtless and unwise utterances.

"Yours faithfully,

"J. P. GOODRIDGE,

"Late Indian Civil Service.

"Jubbulpore, 11th February, 1897."

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

APRIL, 1897.

- CHURCH MISSIONARY INTELLIGENCER. Pane, Rev. J. B., and others, "Special Missions in India."
- INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW. (A. Constable and Co., 2 Whitehall Gardens, S.W.) Elliott, Sir Chas., "Famine Relief in India." Imad-Ud-Doulah, Nawab, "Social Intercourse in India."
- MACMILLAN'S MAGAZINE. Trevor, Col., "The Famine in India."
- MADRAS REVIEW. Banon, Capt. A., "India's Military Frontier." Vaithianadham, N., "The Place of English Education in India." Natesan, G. A., "Intellectual Life in Modern India."
- NEW CENTURY REVIEW. "X," "The Indian Famine." Carpenter, Edward, "India, the Wisdom-Land" (Poem).
- NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. Arnold, Sir Edwin, "The Famine in India."
- POSITIVIST REVIEW. Beesly, Edward S., "The Indian Famine."
- PROGRESSIVE REVIEW. "The Famine-Makers in India."
- TO-MORROW. Bhowaggee, M.M., "The Indian Famine."
- WESTMINSTER REVIEW. Keene, H. G., "India: John Bull's Eastern Estate."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

APRIL, 1897.

- THORBURN, B. S. (Bengal Civil Service)..... "His Majesty's Greatest Subject." (Constable).. 3s. 6d.
- The India List and India Office List for 1897. (Harrison and Sons)..... 10s. 6d.
- BURGESS, JAS..... "Archæological Survey of Western India." Vol. VI. (William Griggs and Sons)net 20s. 0d.

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, MAY, 1897.

A CASE FOR ENQUIRY.

For the moment the Indian famine has ceased to occupy public attention and to fill the columns of the daily papers to the extent which is due to its importance. The rapid development of events in Greece and the Balkan Peninsula has filled Europe with the apprehension of a war into which the Great Powers may possibly be drawn, and vivid personal anxiety has for the time being left no place for sympathy. Unfortunately, it cannot be affirmed with any appearance of truth that interest in the Eastern Question has blunted the sensibility of the Indians to their own terrible sufferings. Though we might venture to predict that the famine reached its highest point last month, still there are few signs of any great or immediate decline in its severity. Purely temporary causes have from time to time contributed to effect a diminution of the numbers on relief in various districts, but the net result of these fluctuations is only a very slight improvement. The high-water mark was apparently reached in the second week in March, when 3½ millions were on relief. Statistics a week later showed a decrease of a hundred thousand, due chiefly to the withdrawal of hands for the collection of the harvest in the North-West Provinces, and to

the reduction of the famine wage in the same district in consequence of the easier rates of grain. A still further improvement appeared a week later, the celebration of the Hooli festival coinciding with more extensive harvesting; but the firmness of grain rates indicated that the decline in numbers on relief was not alone an altogether reliable test of the actual state of affairs. Consequently, one is not surprised to find that the second week in April, while showing an improvement of more than a quarter of a million as compared with the maximum a month earlier, is rather worse than the week preceding; and the further deterioration which appears in the statistics of April 22nd, largely absorbs the previous gain, and again brings up the famine roll to very little short of three millions. The reports of the spring harvest afford little ground for sanguine hopes of the future. Rajputana alone has produced a good crop, most other districts are reported fair, or fair to good, while Central India, Bundelkhand, and Gwalior are bad, and prices, on the whole, are stationary. The ebb has probably begun, but its progress is, and must be for a considerable time to come, very slow.

Details of the measures taken by the Government to combat the famine may be obtained at the cost of great pains from the two voluminous Blue-books, the second of which appeared after lengthy delay and innumerable promises just before the Easter recess. It is to this volume that the Secretary of State for India has repeatedly referred his importunate questioners in the House of Commons, and under the circumstances it was not unnatural to anticipate that it might prove interesting to students of Indian problems, even though it was a Blue-book published by the India Office. But the reader must frankly confess a sense of disappointment. Nobody will deny that in this volume of 230 pages the Indian Government has fully maintained its reputation for the capacity to present a certain amount of information in a hopelessly indigestible form, but the previous Blue-book on the famine was alone sufficient to establish that reputation beyond all fear of cavil. As an answer, however, to the enquiries made in the House of Commons, these "Further Papers regarding 'the Famine and Relief Operations in India'" are practically useless. They merely carry out the official policy of evasion, which the delay in their publication was doubtless intended to subserve. Analysed, they consist of seven pages of telegrams, most of which have already appeared in the newspapers, the last being dated March 15th, and about 220 pages of hopelessly belated dispatches and reports. To the questions which have been repeatedly pressed in the House of Commons as to reference to mortality due to the famine, and to evade which the Secretary of State

given promises of information in "further papers," there is really no answer. In Burma, we are told, "no deaths have taken place directly or indirectly "due to starvation." In the North-West Provinces a few cases are admitted, and some others regarded as "possibly due to starvation." It is also allowed that the high mortality in Jhansi "possibly indicates "a reduced vitality and lower standard of living." When the official reports are compared with the accounts of unprejudiced witnesses on the spot, the conclusion is forced upon non-official minds that there is, on the part of the Government, a persistent attempt to ignore or to gloss over awkward facts. It is impossible to conceive what end can be served by the obstinate concealment or official denial of the worst aspects of the calamity. The course pursued by the Government can only be due to the ostrich-like belief of bureaucrats in their own infallibility and their wilful deafness to outside suggestions.

This "irreconcilable difference of opinion regarding "the condition of the Indian rayat"—to quote Sir William Wedderburn's words in another column—is a question of fact which calls for enquiry. It is not enough to apply mere temporary palliatives. The root of the disease must be sought and destroyed. What is the Mansion House Fund, the paltry half million which is arousing jubilation in journals like the *Times*, compared with the millions which are spent annually on military objects in which India has not a vestige of interest, or exported, in the form of pensions, home charges and the rest, to England? As well might one apply salve to a sore while the patient was bleeding to death from a wound. Sir William Wedderburn follows up his investigation of the mode of collecting the land revenue with an examination of the land revenue itself, and, by an analysis of official documents, some of them even drawn up under his own observation, he reaches some notable conclusions. The Court of Directors laid down the rule in 1856 that the right of Government should be merely a tax on rent, and the limit was further defined in 1864 as fifty per cent. of the net produce. But even this very moderate ideal has never been carried out, except in very few localities. The Settlement Department depends for its very existence on its power of expanding the revenue, and the natural result, steady enhancement of assessment, followed. By successive stages the land tax has been a tax on rent, a full rent, and a rent plus something more. All three stages are co-existent in India to-day, but the first has come near to being a mere survival of better days. What the "something more" is, Sir William Wedderburn points out by reference to definite cases and incontrovertible facts. It is in many cases a tax on the wages of the labourer; in some cases the land really yields no rent; in some cases the land does not even repay the

cost of cultivation it is a tax on wages raised by other means; very often on money obtained from the money-lender in the hope of more prosperous times. The rayat reduced to absolute starvation by the supersession of the general order and exorbitant enhancement has not even the right of appeal to a civil court. And when his friends in Parliament make enquiry concerning the injustice of which he is the victim a despotic bureau merely vouchsafes the reply that it has pleased the wisdom of the Secretary of State to set aside the Standing Rule, and that no interference is proposed. The enquiry suggested by Sir William Wedderburn's amendment is plainly one which is urgently needed, and that, too, while the disease is still in full activity. Justice and common sense alike forbid that it should be postponed to a period when a temporary amelioration of the condition of the rayat may induce forgetfulness of the underlying canker of which the existing misery is only a symptom aggravated by fortuitous circumstances.

RUSKIN.¹

"UNTIL either philosophers obtain the kingly "power, or those who are now called kings and potentates become imbued with an adequate measure of "genuine philosophy, there will be no deliverance "for cities, nor, I believe, for the human race." The words are the words of Plato, idealist, visionary, unpractical Plato, ringing out their oracular message across the centuries; but they might well be the words of our living prophet, uttered with not less earnestness but with a more hopeless sadness from his retreat at Coniston. The cry for "one still strong "man in a blatant land—one who can rule and dare "not lie," has been wrung from many strenuous souls, who feel that, in spite of the multitude of counsellors, the people are perishing for lack of guidance. On Carlyle's lips it took the form of many an angry paradox, as when he cried out upon the blindness of our forefathers in leaving Robert Burns to be algauger at Dundee, instead of committing to him the destinies of the empire. When Mr. Ruskin speaks it is generally in softer tones; as when, in "Sesame "and Lilies," he contrasts the power of those who "do and teach" and of those who "undo and "consume," whose power, at the fullest, is only the power of the moth and the rust. "Suppose kings "should ever arise who at last gathered and brought "forth treasures of Wisdom for their people!"

But the likeness between Plato and Ruskin does not end with this demand, so strange to the practical man, that philosophy, wisdom, ideas, should bear rule in the State. It has many other aspects, and

¹ *Fors Clavigera*. Letters to the Workmen and Labourers of Great Britain. By John Ruskin, LL.D. New Edition, in four vols. (London: George Allen.)

extends even to Plato's dislike for those who set a price upon that which is above price, and accept pay for the teaching of wisdom. "All good judging" and all good preaching," says Mr. Ruskin in "Fors," "must be given gratis. The professional sale of justice and mercy is a deadly sin. A man may sell the work of his hands, but not his equity nor his piety." Their humour is another point of resemblance—that humour which, playing upon the most serious themes, relieves the else intolerable tension, and for which their reward is this, that the unsympathetic reader supposes them to be flippant. And in one respect, at least, the literary careers of the two men have been singularly alike. In both the artistic instinct was originally supreme and gave way gradually to an overmastering earnestness. The critical historian of Greek literature admires the brilliance of Plato's earlier dialogues and the constructive imagination of the "Republic," and speaks disparagingly of the "Laws" as a monument of declining power. So the critic of English literature will bestow his applause on "Modern Painters" and dismiss "Fors" with a depreciatory sentence. But the cause of the change in both cases has probably been the same—no decline of artistic power, only an earnestness that deepened with years and prompted to an act of self-sacrifice, the greatness of which is quite beyond the understanding of common men. Plato's famous quarrel with the poets, as Mr. Gilbert Murray has pointed out in a suggestive passage in his new book on Greek literature, was no quarrel with bad poets merely, as we have often tried to persuade ourselves, or with a low ideal of poetry. It was a breaking with poetry altogether, and on the part of one to whom poetry was more precious than to most. There lies the pathos of it. Poetry, it seemed to him, the poetry that he loved, stood in the way of the search after truth; and poetry must go. Was not this the resolve that definitely shaped itself in Ruskin's mind, as he found that the world approved his style, treasured the rare editions of his early works, learnt by heart his "purple patches," and then went its way regardless of his teaching? Among the present writer's most cherished remembrances of his Oxford days is the hearing of Mr. Ruskin's lectures on "The Art of England." At the close of one of these Mr. Ruskin showed his delighted audience a recent drawing of his own "to prove that there was skill in the old hand yet." There are many passages, both in those lectures and in "Fors" and in "Praeterita," which show that "there was skill in the old hand yet," had he still had the heart to employ it. We shall come nearer to the understanding of Ruskin's life and writings—how sadly he has been misjudged by some of the best of his contemporaries, let the epithet, "feverish," applied to him by Matthew Arnold, bear

witness—if we keep in mind this likeness to Plato. And when we read again Plato's pathetic description of the philosopher—himself surely—who "has seen the madness of the many, how that there is no one who ever acts honestly in the administration of States, nor any helper who defends the cause of the just, by whose aid he may be saved," and who retires from public life "under the shelter of a wall, in the storm of dust and sleet which the driving wind hurries along," we may find a new application for it in our own age and country.

And all the time the disheartened man of letters had "builded better than he knew." As Plato saw his disciples carrying off some fragment of his teaching, some dialectic subtlety or other, and following it out to the exclusion of the rest, or even perverting it to some dishonest end, so Ruskin must have watched with pain those who made of the insight into painting and architecture which they owed to him only a means of heightening their selfish æsthetic enjoyment. But the seed which he had sown was taking root in all manner of unexpected places. Slowly but surely his teaching has revolutionized political economy. The old political economy, blameless and even admirable as were the aims of its professors, had helped in a sense to poison the springs of life. It had corrected the fallacy that "wealth" and "money" were convertible terms, only to fall into the deadlier fallacy that "wealth" meant "material possessions and the ability to acquire them." Against this doctrine Ruskin's voice was lifted, in "Unto This Last," in emphatic dissent: "There is no wealth but life:—life including all its powers of love, of joy, of admiration. That country is the richest which nourishes the greatest number of noble and happy human beings, and that man is richest who, having perfected the functions of his own life to the utmost, has also the widest helpful influence, both personally and by means of his possessions, over the lives of others." This does not sound very paradoxical now, perhaps. It is hard to realise with what suspicion and contempt the book that contained it was received. Christianity then, as at other times, was saying very much the same thing in other words—"Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness." But it is possible for even sincerely religious people to keep their religion and their way of looking at life in curiously separate compartments. And just at this time, as we know from the "Self-Help" books so characteristic of the period, professing Christians were apt to lay a disproportionate stress on the conclusion of the text—"all these things shall be added unto you." We have all ceased to believe that the development of industrial competition straight to the millennium. The ste

would perhaps have convinced us by this time had there been no Ruskin to teach us, but at least we have learnt the lesson sooner for his teaching, and saved some preventible misery by restrictive legislation. Not that he worked alone, even amongst workers with the pen; Charles Kingsley and Mrs. Browning wielded a great influence; but Ruskin's teaching, if less popular at first, went further and prompted more of those inconvenient self-questionings, the stings of the Socratic gad-fly, that are the surest stimulus to real reform. Perhaps even now it is our theory that has advanced, rather than our practice. "We do but skin and film the ulcerous place" in our social life. But where theory leads, practice will follow, if with a lame foot. And the silent leavening of English life, in all classes, by those who have assimilated a large measure of Ruskin's ethical teaching, is a good beyond calculation, though it passes unnoticed. "It is quite possible"—we read in "Fors"—"for the simplest workman or labourer for whom I write to understand what the feelings of a gentleman are, and share them if he will; but the crisis and horror of this present time are that its desire of money, and the fulness of luxury dishonestly attainable by common persons, are gradually making churls of all men." Here and there a working man has heard and obeyed the summons; and far as "a little candle throws its beams" the good deeds of these quiet heroic lives have "shone in a naughty world," and helped to arrest the churl-making process. Nor is there reason, finally, to suppose that the teaching has been wasted upon those who seem very slow of response to it. Walter Bagehot, a true man of the world, but illuminated by culture to a degree very unusual in men of the world, said that Dr. Arnold's teaching was very bad for the sensitive, too impressionable Clough, but the best possible thing for the average boy, "the small apple-eating animal whom we know." So the practical man, with his contempt for ideals, owes the idealist something after all—nothing less, perhaps, than that softening of his hard nature which saves him from becoming quite intolerable.

Of the four handsome volumes of "Fors" it only seems necessary to add that they are indispensable for a complete study of Ruskin's life and work, and that they contain many delightful treasures of wit and wisdom and beauty. Those who know little of Ruskin's moral teaching will, however, find more systematic and perfect exposition of it in such works as "Unto This Last" and "The Crown of Wild Olive."

It is a great mistake, and indeed I think it is a mistake, to suppose that you can regard the army as a thing upon which you can indent for general purposes.—Lord Ripon.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

Some particulars with reference to the two Indian witnesses, Mr. D. E. Wacha and Professor G. K. Gokhale, who have recently given evidence before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure may be of interest, especially as arrangements are being made for them to address meetings in England on the Indian question before they return home.

Mr. D. E. Wacha has been one of the hon. secretaries of the Bombay Presidency Association since its formation in 1885 "for the advocacy and promotion of the public interests of India by all legitimate and constitutional methods." He is also Joint General Secretary of the Indian National Congress, a member of the Bombay Municipal Corporation, the managing agent of a large and flourishing cotton mill, and a member of the managing committee of the Bombay Millowners' Association. Mr. Wacha is a well-known figure at meetings of the Congress, and of the Bombay Provincial Conference, and one of the most energetic and capable contributors to the Indian press.

Professor G. K. Gokhale is hon. secretary of the Deccan Sabha, an association established in Poona for the promotion under British rule of the political interests of the Indian people. He was for seven years hon. secretary of the Poona Sarvajanic Sabha—a political association of a similar kind—and honorary editor of its quarterly journal, dealing chiefly with questions of Indian administration and finance. Professor Gokhale is also a member of the Bombay Presidency Association, and was for four years one of the secretaries of the Bombay Provincial Conference. He was a secretary of the 11th Indian National Congress, which met at Poona in 1895. For four years he was one of the editors of the *Sudharak* or *Reformer*—an Anglo-Marathi weekly published at Poona. Mr. Gokhale is Professor of History and Political Economy in Fergusson College, being one of a body of young Indians—sometimes called "the Indian Jesuits"—who, in view of the Government's neglect of higher education, took a vow of poverty, and pledged twenty years of their life to educational work.

With reference to the proposed meetings, in which it is hoped that Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee, Mr. D. E. Wacha, Professor Gokhale and others will take part, the following circular, signed by Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., has been issued to various political associations in England and Scotland by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress:—

In view of the present prominence of Indian questions, it occurs to us that you might be disposed to hold a meeting in your district for the discussion of the financial and economic problems which the occurrence and the appalling severity of famine in India have forced upon public notice.

It happens that there are now in London several Indian gentlemen of distinction and experience, who have been deputed from India as witnesses at the request of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, and who are well qualified to place before an audience at first hand the facts of Indian administration as they appear to Indians themselves. During the next few weeks we expect other Indian gentlemen to arrive in London in order to give evidence before the Royal

Commission, and their services will also be available for public meetings.

If, as we hope, you are disposed to make arrangements for a meeting in your district—whether it be a small meeting in your own club premises, or a public meeting in a large hall hired for the purpose—we shall be happy to co-operate with you. As regards any expense that might be incurred, we should be glad to know what your views are, and to arrive at a friendly arrangement.

So far as our Indian friends are concerned, a meeting might be arranged at your early convenience. On the other hand, it is not probable that these gentlemen will be in England later than the end of June, and, as they hope to speak in various parts of the country, we shall be glad to receive your reply as early as may be. Applications for speakers will of course be dealt with in the order in which they are received.

The evidence given by Lord Ripon before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure has naturally a special interest for Indians. Lord Ripon's administration is remembered in India with gratitude and affection as a period of "peace, retrenchment and reform." Yet, for that very reason, it will be found that in his evidence before Lord Welby's Commission he was not able to give strong support to some of the proposals for modifying the existing financial machinery, because he did not appreciate their necessity. "It so happens," said Lord Ripon, "that I had no difference of opinion upon questions of economy with any of the gentlemen who were Finance Members of Council in my time." And again: "I think that the gravity of the financial question was undoubtedly appreciated by the Government of which I was the head; and I am quite sure that all the representations of the Finance Member received the utmost attention from the Council of the Governor-General. I claim for the Government with which I was connected that we were an economical Government. We reduced expenditure and we reduced taxation." Precisely, but unfortunately—*tempora mutantur*.

As regards financial anxiety in India, Lord Ripon said:—

"You must be always anxious about finance in India, partly for the reason that the revenue in India increases very slowly, and a considerable portion of it (that, for instance, derived from opium) is very uncertain; and, besides that, we had already beginning in my time those difficulties brought about by the state of exchange which has become latterly so great a financial evil in India; and, as I have said, the difficulty of finding new sources of taxation, without resorting to measures that might be oppressive, is always present. The finances of India are inelastic, and you have little to look to in the way of increase from ordinary taxation."

"No doubt," added Lord Ripon, "there has been a more forward policy since 1885 than there was before. Personally, I have never been in favour of a forward policy; and while I was connected with the Government of India there was no forward policy. For various reasons which I do not want to enter into, because I am not the person to speak to them, the military expenditure in India has increased since my time." Later, Lord Ripon said, significantly enough:—

"You know there are always persons who are urging frontier expeditions, and it is sometimes by no means easy for the Government to resist that pressure. But if the Government were determined to resist frontier expeditions unless they were absolutely necessary, I think you would find that the number of them would very greatly decrease."

On the question of apportionment, Lord Ripon said

that he did not think the analogy of partners was quite suitable. "There are forcible grounds for favourable consideration towards India in regard to the charges which are to be divided between the two Governments."

"Two partners have, as I understand it, the same kind of interest in the undertaking. In all probability they are conducting one undertaking in which they have both a common interest. Now, there are points—in regard to military expenditure, for instance, or in regard to the amount that is to be charged to India for any particular expeditions outside India—in which the interest of the two partners, as you propose to call them, would be not the same but different."

Lord Ripon made an interesting and important suggestion with regard to the proposals which have been put forward with the view of enabling Parliament to deal more effectively with Indian finance:—

"I fully recognise the unsatisfactory nature of the discussions that take place on the Indian Budget in these days under the present system. I think that that is very unsatisfactory, and I should like to see it amended. I have no particular objection to the appointment of a Select Committee, though whether it would have the desired effect or not, I do not know. . . . I should like to make one remark. Under the old system of the East India Company it came about that, as their charters were granted for limited periods, when that limited period was nearly run out, Parliament was in the habit of appointing a very important committee, upon which it generally put, if I am not mistaken, some of the foremost men in the House of Commons, to look into the whole question of the Indian Government during the period of the expiring charter, and to make a full report upon the whole subject. Now, it has often struck me that by the abolition of the East India Company, and the fact that there are no limited charters now running out, that solemn (if I may say so) enquiry by the principal men in Parliament does not take place; and I have thought that it might now be a very good thing to have such an enquiry regularly fixed, not yearly, because that is a great deal too short an interval, but at considerable intervals, so that at the expiration of a certain period of years a Committee of the kind I have mentioned should be appointed to look into the state of the Indian Government. I think you would deal with policy more thoroughly in that way than you would with your annual Committee examining the Budget."

Lord Ripon, replying to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, said that in his judgment the government of India, speaking broadly, must be paid for by India herself. "The advantage which England derives from the possession of India is a very large question upon which a great deal might be said both ways."

We understand that an article by Mr. Alfred Webb (formerly President of the Indian National Congress), upon the grievances of British Indian subjects in South Africa, will shortly appear in the *New York Nation*.

The Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of Sir James Lyle Mackay, K.C.I.E., to be a Member of the Council of India in succession to Mr. Robert Hardie, whose tenure of office has expired.

The Lord Mayor's Fund at the Mansion House for the relief of the sufferers by the famine in India reached and exceeded on April 23rd the sum of £500,000. The fund was opened on the 9th of January, and this sum has been raised in fifteen weeks. The amount, however, does not yet beat the 1877 record, when for the Indian Famine Fund £515,200 was raised; but there is said to be no doubt that this total will be exceeded before the present fund is closed, as various remittances known to be on their way from the C.

BRITISH INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

IMPORTANT LETTER FROM MR. P. M. MEHTA.

The following is the text of the communication addressed to the Secretary of State for India, Lord George Hamilton, M.P., by the Hon. Pherozeshah M. Mehta, C.I.E., as Chairman of a public meeting recently held at Bombay:—

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR,

The following Resolution was unanimously adopted at a Public Meeting of the citizens of Bombay, held under the auspices of the Bombay Presidency Association, in the Framjee Cowasjee Institute, on the 26th day of September, 1896:—

"This Meeting resolves that the Chairman be authorised to address Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, soliciting his attention to the hardships and disabilities under which Her Majesty's Indian subjects in South Africa are at present suffering, as set forth in the various Memorials presented on their behalf, and imploring him to take suitable measures for their redress."

In accordance with the above Resolution, I beg respectfully to submit the following for your consideration.

From the various Memorials and Pamphlets distributed and the Address delivered at the meeting, it appears that throughout South Africa the Indian British subjects of Her Majesty labour under grievances of two kinds, viz.: (a) those due to the ill-feeling exhibited by the European Colonists towards the Indians, and (b) those due to law.

Owing to the grievances of the first kind, it seems that the Indians cannot travel on the railways or tramways without frequent molestation throughout South Africa, and the South African Republic has even passed a law making it illegal for any coloured person to travel 1st or 2nd class in the Netherlands carriages. The instances cited in one of the pamphlets distributed at the meeting, copy of which I have the honour to enclose for your perusal (Enclosure A), if true, certainly disclose a very regrettable state of things in South Africa. They may be pushed off the foot-paths, and they cannot use the public baths. The Government Schools, according to the speaker at the meeting, are not open to the Indians. Altogether, the Indian is a hated being throughout South Africa; he is shunned as a pariah. Every Indian is a coolie without distinction.

A perusal of the Address, copy of which is also herewith enclosed (Enclosure B) and the pamphlets, in my humble opinion, makes out a very good *prima facie* case for a State inquiry. It is, of course, true that the intervention of Her Majesty's Government with respect to such grievances can only be indirect and slow. But an expression of an emphatic opinion may do much to allay the unreasonably strong feeling that seems undoubtedly to exist in South Africa towards the Indians.

I beg to take the liberty to quote a very apt suggestion made by the London *Times* in a leading article, dated the 31st August, 1895, which, after expressing its sympathy towards the Indians in South Africa, thus concludes:—

"The rapid growth of the population of India is such that the movement is inevitable and it is a movement

that will increase. It is very desirable that our white fellow-subjects in Africa should understand that there will in all probability be this current flowing from India, that it is perfectly within the right of the British Indian to seek his subsistence at the Cape, and that he ought, in the common interests of the Empire, to be well treated when he comes there. It is, indeed, to be feared that the ordinary colonist wherever settled thinks much more of his immediate interests than of those of the great Empire which protects him, and he has some difficulty in recognising a fellow-subject in the Hindu or the Parsee. The duty of the Colonial Office is to enlighten him and to see that fair treatment is extended to British subjects of whatever colour."

Before quitting this portion of my letter, I beg to quote a few extracts from the *Times of India* which seem to corroborate the story of the grievances unfolded in the Address and the pamphlets referred to above.

In the course of a leading article on the Indian question in Africa, dated the 27th August, 1894, that journal observes:—

"It will strike most people in this country and at home, too, we hope, as a singularly narrow-minded and unconstitutional act of policy on the part of the legislature of Natal to lend—for that is what it practically comes to—their countenance and sympathy to the European Colonists there in their cruel and persistent persecution of the large body of Natives of India. They have been wantonly assaulted in the streets and been unable to obtain redress from the courts. They have been robbed and outraged and reviled for presuming to exist at all . . . and they have been persistently denied the status of citizens."

The following occurs in a contribution from the *Times'* own correspondent in its weekly issue, dated the 19th September, 1896:—

"The European population of Durban numbers some 16,000, being exactly equal to the black population, of whom the majority are Indians, called here without distinction 'coolies,' and hence giving great offence to the better classes of Memon and Khojah Traders of Bombay. The colonial distinction between black and white runs in Natal to a great height, and grievous and sore are the consequences therefrom to the weaker party—the blacks, or, rather, the Indians. . . . I am told that a coolie may be kicked or flogged. . . ."

The various States in South Africa in one way or another have countenanced and encouraged this bitter feeling by passing legislative enactments to suit the fancy of the European Colonists.

Natal has been the most active of late in passing such legislation. The Indian Memorial (Enclosure C) with respect to the Franchise Act of 1896 of the Natal Parliament is, it appears, still under consideration by Her Majesty's Government. The Memorial against the first Franchise Bill, now happily repealed, owing to the firm attitude taken up by Her Majesty's Government, and the Memorial just now referred to, seem conclusively to establish that the real object of such legislation is not to protect against future preponderance of the Indian over the European vote, but to degrade the Indians, so that it may not be worth the while of a respectable Indian trader to seek his livelihood in Natal. Under the circumstances, and in view of the fact that the present Bill is also a piece of class legislation, it is difficult to understand what induced the Right Honourable Mr. Chamberlain to approve of the terms of the Bill which, it appears from the papers published in the Natal *Government Gazette*, was submitted to him for approval by the Ministers of Natal before being introduced into the Local

Parliament. The arguments and facts brought forward in the Indian Memorial, I venture to trust, will enable the right honourable gentleman to reconsider his views, and save the Indian community in Natal from much future trouble and vexation. It cannot, I humbly think, be disputed that the Bill has been made purposely ambiguous, and leaves loopholes for endless litigation and agitation—a thing to be discountenanced in the interests of all the communities residing in Natal. The contention of the Memorial, that if it is at all desirable to restrict the Indian Franchise, the object can be gained without resort to class legislation of so doubtful a nature as the present Bill, by imposing a reasonable educational test or increasing the property qualification with respect to all classes of voters, seems to be very just, and I beg to commend it to your earnest consideration. The opinion of the *Natal Mercury*, the Government organ in Natal, cited to establish the justness of the prayer, should not a little influence the decision of Her Majesty's Government in the matter. Looked at from the stand-point of the Indians in Natal, there cannot, I venture to think, be two opinions as to the fate of the measure.

I regret very much to notice from the Natal papers that the Natal Immigration Law Amendment Bill has received the royal sanction, and that it came into force as from the 18th day of August, 1896. The decision on that question is a sad blow to Indian enterprise, and an encouragement to the Colonists to still further prosecute their war of opposition against the Indians. It is wholly unexpected, in that Natal is the first colony to receive such favourable terms in spite of strenuous opposition on behalf of the Indians concerned. It is difficult to conceive any reason to justify a measure which, according to the extracts given in the Indian petition, was only ten years ago universally condemned by the most eminent Natalians, including the present Attorney-General of Natal. The reasons publicly given to justify the measure are too selfish to deserve consideration.

It is difficult not to sympathise with the statement of the Indian Memorialists that the Immigration Law Amendment will frustrate the very object of emigration. A state which in the words of the *London Times* (13th September, 1896) "comes perilously near to slavery," viz., perpetual indenture, cannot but degrade those labouring under that state.

Many of the eminent Natalians whom the Memorialists quote seem to have agreed that it is better to stop further immigration than to pass a measure which to them seemed so utterly iniquitous. (Enclosure D.) And I feel constrained respectfully to urge that view for your serious consideration. The terms of indenture under the new Act are such that they will in no wise benefit the Indians, whether those serving under such a contract or whether those of their brethren in India relieved by them. I submit that the Indian Government are in no way bound to oblige the Colonists of Natal without any corresponding advantage.

"The whole system of Indian immigration," says the *London Times* "under indentured service for periods of years is regulated by legislative precau-

tions. Those precautions are based partly on the ground that the indentured labourer, notwithstanding explanations, often does not really apprehend the ultimate consequences of his contract, and partly with a view to prevent his contracted service being used as a preliminary for his permanent enslavement in a distant country." The objects to be secured by such precautions are evidently frustrated by the amending Act. "The Government of India," continues the *Times*, "has one simple remedy. It can suspend emigration to South Africa, as it has on previous occasions suspended such emigration to foreign possessions, until it obtains the necessary guarantees for the present well-being and future status of the immigrants. The Government of India may well shrink from inflicting such inconvenience and loss upon a friendly British possession. It is eminently a case for sensible and conciliatory action on both sides. But the Indian Government may be forced to adopt measures in connection with the wider claim which is now being urged by every section of the Indian community, which has been explicitly acknowledged by Her Majesty's Government at home—namely, the claim of the Indian races to trade and labour with the full status of British subjects throughout the British Empire and allied States."

The system of passes and what is known as the 9 o'clock rule, whereby coloured people are required to produce passes if out after 9 p.m., are alluded to in the memorials and discussed at length in the pamphlets. They show a lamentable want of respect for the feeling of the Indian population, and the working of the law with regard thereto, if the facts quoted in the pamphlet (Enclosure A) be true, is far from satisfactory. I venture to feel sure that those disabilities are so serious that they will receive your very great consideration, which they deserve.

The Crown Colony of Zululand has gone further even than the self-governing Colony of Natal in that the regulations for the Townships of Eshowe and Nondweni prevent the Indians from owning or acquiring property. The Memorial about those disabilities is, I understand, still engaging attention, and I trust I need not doubt that in this case full justice will be speedily done to the Indians by the abrogation of the rules, so far as they impose restrictions on the freedom of the Indians to buy property. (Enclosure A.) I venture to submit that their existence on the Statute book constitutes a blot on British justice and name, and they are there only because they were not brought to the notice of Her Majesty's Government earlier. I am now referring to the Eshowe regulations, which were passed some years ago.

While the Indians do not get everything they want or that might have been given them in the South African Republic, the very sympathetic Despatch from the Right Honourable Mr. Chamberlain leaves nothing to be desired. I would, however, venture to remind Her Majesty's Government of the promise made to make friendly representations to the Transvaal Government, and beseech that they may be of such a character as to gain their object. This is all the more necessary, in view of the fact that a departure from the strict mea-

London Convention was assented to without the knowledge of the Indian Government and without the Indians affected thereby having a say in the matter.

There are other matters in reference to the Transvaal not covered by the despatch. The pass and the 9 o'clock rules, it appears, exist in the Transvaal. The Indians there are by law prevented from travelling 1st or 2nd class on the railways. These disabilities might be easily removed by a strong representation from Her Majesty's Government. I venture to hope that the restriction of the meaning of the phrase "the British subjects" occurring in the commando treaty which has been made the subject of an Indian Memorial (Enclosure F) will not be assented to by Her Majesty's Government. A foot-path bye-law in Johannesburg, it seems, prevents Indians from walking on the foot-paths!

The Orange Free State has made the "British Indian" an impossibility, and, according to the pamphlet hereinbefore referred to (Enclosure A), has driven away Indian traders without any compensation, causing to them a loss of nearly £9,000, and has passed laws preventing the Indians from settling in that Republic except under certain degrading conditions, and in any case making it illegal for an Indian to acquire landed property, to trade or farm. While it is true that Her Majesty's Government cannot interfere with the acts of the Free State Volksraad, it is, I submit, a question whether a friendly and allied State can shut its doors against any portion of Her Majesty's subjects without just and good reasons.

The speaker at the meeting also drew attention to the East London Municipality Act recently passed by the Cape Parliament. It was not made clear whether the Act has received the Royal assent. It gives power to the East London Municipality to frame bye-laws preventing Indians and other coloured people from walking on the foot-paths and living anywhere else except in specified localities.

All such legislation suggests one question—viz., the question of the status of the British Indians outside British India. Her Majesty's Gracious Proclamation of 1858 guarantees to the Indians equal rights with all other British subjects, and a despatch from His Excellency the Right Honourable the Marquis of Ripon, while Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies, recognizes that principle specially with regard to the Indians in Natal. It is evident that all the laws passed by the Colonial Legislatures and referred to above are in direct violation of the Proclamation and the terms of the said despatch.

This, I submit, is pre-eminently an Imperial question. The British subject theory would be a mockery if Her Majesty's Indian subjects cannot enjoy the ordinary rights of citizenship in Her Majesty's dominions outside India or in allied States. If the Indian can be treated as he is being treated in South Africa, he ceases to be a British subject except in name. I appeal to Her Majesty's Government to do away with such a glaring anomaly by once for all declaring class legislation of the description above-mentioned illegal, so far as the Colonies are concerned.

I have not examined the causes that have led the various States to restrict the freedom of the Indians, as the official reasons put forward by the other States are more or less the same as those advanced by the South African Republic, and as the Right Honourable Mr. Chamberlain's Despatch alluded to above does not attach any weight to those reasons, and practically accepts the statement made by the Indian Memorialists that trade jealousy is the root of all the evil.

The London *Times* has eloquently pleaded the cause of the British Indians in South Africa, and I shall venture to close this somewhat long letter by quoting a few extracts from the various articles devoted by that influential journal to the Indian question in South Africa.

Dealing generally with the question, it says in a leading article, dated the 31st August, 1895:

"The incident is one of those which suggests wider questions than any that directly offer themselves for official replies; we are at the centre of a world-wide empire at a period when locomotion is easy and every day becoming easier both in time and cost; some portions of the empire are crowded, others are comparatively empty, and the flow from the congested to the under-peopled districts is continuous. What is to happen when subjects different in colour, religion and habits from ourselves or from the natives of a particular spot emigrate to that spot for their living. How are race prejudices and antipathies, the jealousies of trade, the fear of competition to be controlled? The answer, of course, must be by an intelligent policy at the Colonial Office."

Again, in another article, dated the 6th September, 1895, the same journal proceeds:

"The question with which Mr. Chamberlain was called upon to deal cannot be so easily reduced to concrete terms. On the one hand, he clearly laid down the principle of the equal rights and equal privileges of all British subjects in regard to redress from foreign States. It would, indeed, have been impossible to deny that principle. Our Indian subjects have been fighting the battles of Great Britain over half the old world with a loyalty and courage which have won the admiration of all British men. The fighting reserve which Great Britain has in the Indian races adds greatly to her political influence and prestige, and it would be a violation of the British sense of justice to use the blood and the valour of these races in war, and yet to deny them the protection of the British name in the enterprises of peace. The Indian labourers and traders are slowly spreading across the earth from Central Asia to the Australian Colonies, and from the Straits Settlements to the Canary Islands. Wherever the Indian goes he is the same useful, well-doing man, law-abiding under whatever form of Government he may find himself, frugal in his wants and industrious in his habits. But these very virtues make him a formidable competitor in the labour markets to which he resorts. Although numbering in the aggregate some hundreds of thousands, the emigrant Indian labourers and small dealers have only recently appeared in foreign countries or British Colonies in numbers sufficient to arouse jealousy and to expose them to political injustice. But the facts which we brought to notice in June, and which were urged on Mr. Chamberlain by a deputation of Indians last week, show that the necessity has now arisen for protecting the Indian labourer from such jealousy and for securing to him the same rights as other British subjects enjoy."

Commenting upon our remarks in the last number of *INDIA*, the *Bradford Observer* wrote (leading article, April 3rd): The course of affairs in South Africa has thrown into very striking relief a question which is of considerable present moment, and likely to be of increasing Imperial importance as the years go by—the question of the treatment of British Indian subjects in British colonies other than India. Just now there is a loud-throated profession, both at South Africa and at home, of the sense of obligation to native races under our rule. Mr. Chamberlain formulates the principle; and the South African

Imperialist asserts the necessity which is laid upon him to see that it is practised—by the Boers. That the Boers should regard the blacks as anything less than men and brothers appeals to the Cape Imperialist as the very height of man's inhumanity to man; and his indignation at the decoration and degradation of the Cape boy by a compulsory badge as soon as he crosses the Transvaal border, knows no bounds. He sheds tears over the indignities suffered by his black coachman, and founds upon them frantic appeals to Mr. Chamberlain to bring the Boer to a sense of his duty by supplementing protest with artillery. In these evidences of a tender and sympathetic interest in the natives of South Africa philanthropy might well find a new hope for the regeneration of the world, if it were not for the fact that, side by side and in startling contrast with this sham protest, runs a record of racial arrogance and injustice more contemptible than any that the Boer can show. Most newspaper readers will readily recall more than one recent story of the invincible hostility of British colonists in Natal and elsewhere to British Indian emigrants, and the situation is excellently summed up in a brief statement in the current number of INDIA—a record and review of Indian affairs which every Englishman with the due sense of "obligation" would do well to study. The summary is based in part upon a memorial drawn up a few months since by Mr. Pheroze Shah Mehta and presented to Lord George Hamilton, but the facts are too notorious to be in doubt or dispute. "Throughout South Africa British Indian subjects of the Crown are not only subjected to the most humiliating indignities by European colonists, but they are harassed by legal disabilities of the most vexatious and injurious kind. Indians, for example, cannot travel on the railways or tramways without frequent molestation. In some parts of South Africa they are prohibited by law from travelling in any class but the third class. They are pushed off footpaths, and excluded from the public baths and Government schools. 'Altogether,' as Mr. Mehta says, 'the Indian is a hated being throughout South Africa; he is shunned as a pariah. Every Indian is a coolie without distinction.'" By the new Franchise Law Amendment Act in Natal British Indian subjects are excluded from civic rights—the motive being not so much one of fear that in some remote future the Indian vote may preponderate, as one of hostility to the presence at all in the colony of any respectable Indian trader. It is of a piece with the recent violent demonstrations against Indian labour, and part of what has come to be persistent persecution of those to whom, in common with other British subjects, the Queen's proclamation of 1858 guaranteed equal rights. These Indian Uitlanders of the British South African Colonies raise no objection to any reasonable educational test—a fair number of them at least are better educated, better men, better gentlemen, and more loyal subjects of the Queen than a considerable proportion of their white "fellow-subjects;" they raise no objection to a high property qualification. But the British Boer, who is every whit as narrow and prejudiced in his own way as his neighbour of the Transvaal, will hear nothing of any plea for justice in this matter. Black to him is black, whether Indian or Cape boy; and white is white, whether millionaire adventurer, or the outcast scum of the mother country; and to the Indian trader he will deny for his colour the civic rights he accords to the man whose proper place would be an English gaol. For the white Uitlander of the Transvaal nothing is good enough; but the black Uitlander of Natal is only so much dirt, to be shovelled out of place as quickly as may be. It is, as Mr. Gordon Hewart urges, "a grim commentary upon Mr. Chamberlain's menaces to President Kruger with reference to the grievances of the Uitlanders in the Transvaal" that the related grievances of these British subjects in British Colonies should remain unredressed and unheeded. For two years their protest has been urged upon Mr. Chamberlain's attention—urged not unreasonably, but merely with intent to elicit "an expression of emphatic opinion," which it is believed might "do much to allay the strong feeling that seems to exist in South Africa towards the Indians." Mr. Chamberlain, however, has apparently used up all his emphasis in addresses to the South African Republic, and has none left to give practical force to his ideals of kinship and obligation as between British subjects of different races. None the less, the matter is a crying scandal to English rule, and the mischiefs to which it is laying the train are graver than most Englishmen seem to recognise.

The *Newcastle Leader* wrote: The current number of INDIA contains a timely criticism of Mr. Chamberlain's attitude towards the Boer Republic. Our contemporary refers to an inconsistency to which we drew attention a few days ago—the treatment of our Indian subjects in Natal. The policy of the Colonial Secretary in this matter forms a curious comment upon his sympathy for the Uitlanders. British Indian subjects in our South African colonies are denied civil rights. We are told that "Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has been for two years, and still is, in communication with Mr. Chamberlain on this subject, but so far, it would appear, with very little practical result." Notwithstanding protests from both India and South Africa, no effort has been made to remove the disabilities from which the Hindoo population in Natal suffer. The Colonial Secretary has "declined to disallow the new Franchise Law Amendment Act in Natal," which ignores the claim of our Indian fellow subjects to civic rights. The attention of Lord George Hamilton was also drawn to the matter in December last, but nothing whatever has been done or is likely to be done. When we consider that Mr. Chamberlain's sympathy with the hard case of the Uitlanders is endangering the peace of South Africa, these facts are exceedingly suggestive, and throw a curious light upon the present policy of the Colonial Office.

The *Star* wrote: We have from time to time called attention to the grave disabilities and indignities under which British Indians suffer in South Africa, and we are glad to see that the London Indian Society—a vigorous and useful organisation of Indian gentlemen resident here—is once more pressing the matter upon Mr. Chamberlain's notice. So far as argument is concerned, the London Indian Society ought to have no difficulty at all. It has only to take Mr. Chamberlain's references to the grievances of Uitlanders in the Transvaal and apply them *a fortiori* to the grievances of British Indians in our own South African colonies. The grievances of our Indian fellow subjects, it is true, extend throughout South Africa. But it is our business to set our own house in order first—and a beginning should be made in Natal and Cape Colony. The Indians, who are among the most loyal subjects of the Queen, and who have been repeatedly guaranteed the equal rights of British citizenship without distinction of caste, colour, or creed, are treated by Englishmen in South Africa as pariahs or lepers. That they are excluded from the franchise is but one matter. They are also subjected to the most odious indignities—pushed off footpaths, restricted as regards tramways and railways, and treated indiscriminately as "coolies," whatever their intelligence, rank, or position may be. The thing is a scandal and a disgrace to the British Empire, and so long as Mr. Chamberlain permits it he is stultifying everything he says with regard to the Transvaal. The Indians have no objection to reasonable restrictions—say, a high property qualification, or some intellectual test, for the franchise. What they detest and cry out against is the offensive "colour line," which has been expressly provided against in the Queen's Proclamation, and which Mr. Chamberlain ought once and for all to prohibit.

LORD WELBY'S COMMISSION.

EVIDENCE OF MR. D. E. WACHA AND PROFESSOR G. K. GOKHALE.

We print below a brief abstract of the evidence given by Mr. D. E. Wacha before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure on April 5th and 8th, and some of the most important passages from the first portion of the evidence given by Professor G. K. Gokhale on April 12th and 13th. Of course, impossible within our limits to attempt a full report of the evidence to these witnesses, but it is hoped that the account may convey some useful ideas on points which were raised:—

Mr. Wacha said that, bearing in mind the alien

the administration in India, and the absence of any effective popular voice from the Councils of the Empire, it was essential that the finances of the country should be closely watched and controlled. Sir David Barbour and Sir Auckland Colvin had pointed out the weak spots in the financial machinery of the administration. He agreed with these two distinguished ex-finance ministers, as the sentiments to which they gave expression before the Royal Commission were wholly in accord with those of the Indians. Their experience of viceroys and military members of the Council was very different from that of Sir Evelyn Baring, now Lord Cromer. The last-named had a strong viceroy in Lord Ripon, whose economic instincts were a great source of strength. Costly frontier wars were not the principal features of Lord Ripon's administration. Domestic reforms of an ennobling and far-reaching character occupied his attention. It was not so with the three viceroys who had succeeded him. The joint minute of Sir A. Colvin and Sir C. P. Ilbert on the cost of the additional troops was proof positive that the finance minister was not consulted at the initial stage, and, so far, he could not act as the "watch-dog" of the Indian treasury. A viceroy with military instincts was sure to support the military party in the viceregal council, the net practical result of which was to increase the burdens of the taxpayer.

WANTED: POPULAR REPRESENTATIVES.

Under the circumstances the only effectual remedy was to give greater powers to the popular representatives in the various councils, including the Imperial Council. The best way to keep a check upon public expenditure was to concede unofficial members the privilege of voting on the Budget. Amendments could be brought forward which would tend to reduce expenditure, where expenditure was reasonably susceptible of curtailment. There was no fear whatever of the Government being "swamped," as alleged in certain quarters. Under the constitution of the expanded councils the Government would always have a majority; and if ever a defeat of the Government occurred, it would simply indicate how far the Government was in opposition to popular sentiments and views. Mr. Wacha referred to the innovation introduced by Lord Elgin as to the presentation of public addresses, complaining that recognised public institutions like the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha and the Mahajana Sabha of Madras were asked to delete certain matter from their respective addresses which related to Imperial questions. Mr. Wacha further complained that the civil and military estimates were not made available to members of the viceregal council and recognised public bodies like chambers of commerce and leading political associations. A great deal of unformed or ignorant criticism might be avoided if the Government made such estimates accessible, say, a fortnight before the publication of the Budget, as the Bombay Legislative Council did. The military estimates were never made public, while the civil estimates were published a year after the date of the Budget to which they referred.

THE "EXCHANGE" BOGEY.

Lastly, in connexion with financial machinery, Mr. Wacha observed that it would be better if a separate account, to be called "Exchange equalisation" or "Reserve," were opened. Whenever exchange realised a better rate than that taken in the Budget, the surplus or the difference should be credited to this account and not hastily utilised in the Budget of the succeeding year as was done by the finance minister in 1896-97. Sir J. Westland disposed of the surplus of over a crore, arising from "improvement" in exchange, by gifting away half a crore to Manchester, by way of reduction of $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the import duty on cotton goods, and allowing half a crore to the military department for "mobilisation" rendered necessary by the new and burdensome acquisition of Chitral. Exchange was the "lodging-house cat," as Sir A. Colvin said, which all the financial disturbances of a given year frequented. The opening of such an account as Mr. Wacha suggested would, in his opinion, go a great way to saving the Budget, the vote of exchange being limited at the lowest minimum, say 13d. to 14d. It was suggested that for better control of the finances there should be in the House of Commons a committee of the kind proposed by Sir W. Wedderburn; such a committee

could take up questions of expenditure brought by non-official members in the viceregal council and defeated there. In this way the public spirit and energy of such members might be greatly stimulated.

PROVINCIAL ALLOTMENTS.

With reference to Provincial allotments, Mr. Wacha refrained from entering into a historical review of the question, as it was already before the Commission, and the Indian public was fully cognisant of the merits of the case. Mr. Wacha, however, explained the suggestions which he had put forward in his speech in May last before the Karachi Provincial Conference. Revenue, he said, was collected in order to be expended, and it was best to give the Provincials a fixed percentage of expenditure—a percentage which might from time to time be revised. At present the Imperialists absorb too much of the Provincial revenues. The system should be radically altered. The Provincials should contribute a portion of their revenues according to this fixed percentage. The Imperial Government could then cut its coat according to its cloth, and not fritter away a large portion of the revenue, as it did now, on "frontier fireworks" and so forth, leaving the Provincials to starve and shiver. At present there was none to check and control the appropriation of Provincial balances. It was the old question of who should check the custodian. The scheme suggested provided a sort of automatic check on the Imperial Government, while it left the Provincials to work out their own financial independence unfettered. The cardinal idea should be to make every province financially independent like any self-governing country. It was the only way towards progress.

MILITARY EXPENDITURE.

As to the growth of expenditure, Mr. Wacha dealt at length with the details of the matter, observing that both civil and military expenditure had increased greatly since 1885, though the increases really began in 1875. Civil expenditure, though overgrown, was not so bitterly complained of by Indians as military expenditure. Greater expenditure on education, law and justice and so forth, leading to greater moral progress and administrative efficiency, would be reproductive. Useful expenditure on civil works was much to be desired. Military expenditure afforded the chief ground of complaint. During the last 10 years, exclusive of exchange, nearly 40 crores had been spent in this way. But for this expenditure, the revenues could have easily borne the burden of exchange, and that without increased taxation. The yield of the enhanced salt duty, income tax, etc., came, up to 1894, to something like 29 crores of rupees. As matters stood, the financial deterioration between 1885 and 1895 was deplorable. If the frequent suspension of famine grants and the extra benevolences forced from the Provincial Governments were taken into account, instead of there being an insignificant surplus of half a crore in the decade, there was really a deficit of 30 crores. On the other hand, had there not been the extra military expenditure referred to, the position would have been a surplus of over 8 crores and that without taxation, new and increased. As Mr. Morgan Browne had examined the charges of military expenditure, Mr. Wacha refrained from travelling over the same ground. He laid great stress on the inexpediency of increasing the sterling debt which had already grown 70 per cent since 1885. He deprecated the development of railways, which were not quite unmixed blessings. Railways were still a great loss to the State. Since 1848 there had been a loss, under this head, of 51 crores of rupees. The military railways were a source of additional loss. The North-Western railways were a losing concern, and the annual loss therefrom should be debited to military expenditure, and not to railways. Irrigation works were somewhat better, though in the past improvident blunders on a colossal scale were made by taking up insolvent private companies, concerns (like the Orissa Canal Company), entailing a burden of over 2 crores on the taxpayers. Like railways, many of the irrigation canals were of a non-paying character. On the whole, however, the irrigation works were fairly satisfactory. What was wanted now was not railways, but extensive irrigation by wells. If wells were constructed where there was a general liability to drought, the loss would not be so great, while in a few years they might change the whole face of the soil changed in India. There would be greater verdure and increased cultivation. Even protective railways were useless when there was no grain to carry from the province where there was a surplus to another where it

was needed. At present India does not grow sufficient for the entire population. Something like 29 million tons were wanting to feed it.

THE "SIMLA EXODUS."

After referring to other civil charges, Mr. Wacha mentioned the expenses of the "Simla exodus." He said that even now there was a bitter cry against it. He did not know why the Viceregal party could not make a short stay of two months, instead of seven or eight months. If judges worked hard in the sultry heat of Calcutta during the hottest parts of the year, what was there to prevent the Viceroy and his staff from following their excellent example? It was observed that all the warlike expeditions were hatched at Simla. Being far away from the plains, the Government was not in touch with the country. Sometimes important pieces of legislation, of a far-reaching character, were enacted at Simla, while popular representatives were not summoned. For instance, the Amended Currency Act was passed in June, 1893, at Simla, a measure against which almost the entire mercantile classes of the country protested. No representative of these was at Simla at the time save Sir John Mackay, who was well known as a staunch supporter of the official measure.

Mr. Wacha condemned the exchange compensation allowances. It was, he said, false generosity to the civilians at the expense of the taxpayers. The heinousness of this crime lay in the fact that the import duty was specially imposed in order that these tax-eaters might have their exchange cake and that too, when the taxpayers were themselves suffering acutely from the evils of the currency. Mr. Wacha dwelt upon the need for the separation of judicial from executive functions, and referred to the scheme propounded by the Hon. Mr. P. M. Mehta in the Bombay Legislative Council. Mr. Wacha paid, in the earlier part of his evidence, a tribute to Mr. Mehta, saying that he acquitted himself most creditably in the Imperial Council, though the Finance Minister resented his outspoken speech, as, in fact, the Government resented anything emanating from non-official individuals or bodies. Mr. Wacha summed up his evidence upon the growth of expenditure by emphasising the fact that military expenditure was at the root of the financial embarrassments of the Government. All that the Bombay Presidency Association had stated in its three memorials (from 1885 to 1895), which were put in, had been confirmed by the events that had taken place. He agreed with Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji that, unless the "foreign agency" which was at the root of the present deteriorated condition of Indian finance was gradually exchanged for native agency, there was no hope of financial reform. Looking from any point of view they came round to this radical evil. There was now a monopoly of all the higher offices of State in the hands of foreign agency. As to the apportionment of the home charges, and the English charges which had for years been foisted on India, there was not much to be said after the volume of evidence already recorded by every viceroy and every other authority who had paid attention to those charges. Mr. Wacha made some useful suggestions in this connexion.

PROFESSOR G. K. GOKHALE.

As regards Mr. Gokhale's evidence, we reproduce here some of the chief passages relating to financial machinery. His evidence on the two remaining portions of the Commission's subject-matter—namely, the progress of expenditure and the apportionment of charges between the United Kingdom and India—is reserved for future issues.

FINANCIAL CONTROL: DEFECTS OF THE PRESENT SYSTEM.

After examining the existing machinery of financial control at some length, Mr. Gokhale thus summed up the defects of the present system:

The whole position may thus be summed up:—

(1) The buffer of the Company's Government which fairly protected Indian interests is gone, and there is no effectual substitute.

(2) We have no effective constitutional safeguards against the misapplication of our revenues for extra-Indian requirements.

(3) The control vested in the Council of the Secretary of State under the Statute of 1858 is rendered almost nugatory by the alteration of its status under recent amending Acts. Further, the mode of recruiting this Council is radically faulty.

(4) The control of Parliament, as against the Secretary of State, has become entirely nominal, owing to the latter being a member of the Imperial executive, with a standing majority behind them. The old periodical enquiry by Parliament and its jealous watchfulness are gone. In fact, we have at present all the disadvantages of Parliamentary Government without its advantages. In the case of all Departments except the Indian, ex-ministers think it their duty, and also feel it to be their interest, to exercise the closest watch on the proceedings of their successors with a view to passing the most adverse criticism that may be possible. In regard to India alone, ex-ministers vie with, and sometimes even go beyond, their successors in extolling all that exists and all that is done. The responsible Opposition in this country thus abdicates its functions in the case of India only.

(5) The Government of India, as at present constituted, cannot be much interested in economy. Almost all internal administration having been made over to Local Governments under the Decentralization Scheme, questions of foreign policy, large public works and military questions absorb almost the whole attention of the Government of India. Further, the Finance Minister excepted, every other member of Council, including, since 1885, the Viceroy, has a direct interest in the increase of expenditure.

(6) Neither in England nor in India is there the salutary check of public opinion on the financial administration. Parliament is ill-informed and even indifferent. And the Supreme and Local Legislative Councils are simply powerless to control expenditure, since the budgets have not to be passed and no resolutions in reference to them can be moved.

PROPOSED REMEDIES.

Coming to the question of remedies, I think it is, in the first place, absolutely necessary that the Indian Budget should be passed item by item in the Viceregal Legislative Council. Government may retain their standing majority as at present, and that means an absolute guarantee that no adverse vote will ever be carried against them. We have no wish to see the Government of India defeated on any point in the Supreme Legislative Council, but the moral effect of recording and, so to say, focussing, by means of divisions, non-official disapproval of certain items of expenditure will, I expect, be very great. It must be remembered that, while large questions of policy can be discussed and settled with advantage only in this country, the details of Indian expenditure can be criticized effectively and with the necessary amount of knowledge only in India. I would also provide that when a certain proportion of the non-official members of the Supreme Legislative Council—say, more than half—are of opinion that the voting of a particular sum by the Council is prejudicial to Indian interests, they may, if they please, draw up a statement of their case and submit it through the Government of India to a Committee of Control, which I venture to suggest, should be created in this country.

The creation of such a Committee of Control is a matter of the most vital importance. A Standing Committee of the House of Commons has been suggested, and would, I think, do very well. Or the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council might be entrusted with the work. Or even the Arbitration Committee which now seems likely to be created might do for this purpose, and the duty of reporting to Parliament from time to time on matters of Indian finance may be assigned to it. But, whatever the form, the Committee should have absolutely no powers of initiating expenditure, else like the old so-called Board of Control, it will do more harm than good. The Committee should take cognizance of all appeals addressed to it by the non-official members of the Viceroy's Council, and may also call for papers of its own accord, and exercise general control over the administration of Indian expenditure. The proceedings should be reported to Parliament from time to time. If some such body were called into existence, the mere fact that non-official members will be in a position to appeal to it, thereby putting

the Government of India and the Secretary of State on their defence will have a tremendous moral effect, which will make for economy and sound finance in a very striking manner. There is nothing in this which will in any way affect the directive and executive powers of the Secretary of State or the Government of India. The plan provides only for a reasonable amount of control, and will enable the representatives of Indian taxpayers, who have no powers of controlling expenditure, to make a complaint in a responsible and constitutional manner.

Further, I would suggest that section 55 of the Government of India Act of 1858 be amended. This section, as it stands at present, enacts that "except for preventing or repelling actual invasion of Her Majesty's Indian possessions, or under other sudden and urgent necessity, the revenues of India shall not, without the consent of both Houses of Parliament, be applicable to defray the expenses of any military operation carried on beyond the external possessions of such frontiers by Her Majesty's forces charged upon such revenues." Now, this only safeguards the controlling powers of Parliament, and does not provide, as is commonly believed, against the diversion of our monies from their legitimate use, the only thing secured being that the sanction of Parliament shall be obtained for such diversion—a sanction that can be obtained without any difficulty. Now, this is not sufficient; and has been of little use in practice, and I would press for an express and absolute statutory provision, giving us a complete guarantee against the misappropriation of our revenues for purposes unconnected with our interests. I therefore beg to suggest that section 55 of the Government of India Act of 1858 be so amended as to provide that, except in case of actual or threatened invasion, the revenues of India shall not be used for military operations beyond the natural frontiers of India, unless, at any rate, a reasonable portion of such expenditure is put on the English Estimates. I would further suggest that the frontiers of India should be definitely declared by Parliamentary statute, and that no extension or alteration of them should be permitted without statutory sanction.

Further, I would urge that the elected members of the Legislative Councils of Madras, Bombay, Bengal, N.-W. Provinces, and now Punjab and Burmah, be invested with the power of returning to the Imperial Parliament one member for each Province. Six men in a House of 670 would introduce no disturbing factor, while the House will be in a position to ascertain Indian public opinion on the various questions coming up before it in a constitutional manner. I may mention that the small French and Portuguese settlements in India already enjoy a similar privilege. Here, again, I rely more upon the moral effect of the course proposed than upon any actual results likely to be directly achieved.

The last suggestion that I have to make on this subject is that, as far as possible, Indian Viceroy should be selected from among men who have earned a distinct position for themselves for their grasp of intricate problems of finance. Among the First Ministers of England, no greater names can be mentioned than those of Walpole, Pitt, Peel, Disraeli, and Gladstone. And all these men were great finance ministers. I know men in the very front rank of English politics do not care to go to India; but, all the same, if men noted for their knowledge of finance, like Mr. Goschen, for instance, were induced to accept the Viceroyalty of India, the arrangements would produce decidedly beneficial results. It would be a great advantage to all if the Viceroy, instead of being his own Minister for Foreign Affairs, were to be his own Finance Minister. At any rate, his immediate connexion with the Foreign Department should cease, the Department being placed, like other departments, in charge of a separate member of the Executive Council.

PROVINCIAL FINANCE.

I now come to the very interesting and important subject of Provincial Finance. While gratefully acknowledging that the decentralisation policy has done a great deal of good, even as far as it has gone, I think the time has come when an important further step ought to be taken. It is now fifteen years since this policy was carried to the point at which it now stands by the Government of Lord Ripon. The fact that

nearly the whole internal administration of the country is in the hands of the Provincial Governments explains why the people of India are so anxious to see the position of Provincial Governments, in the matter of finance, strengthened much more than what it is at present. The expenditure administered by the Provincial Governments is principally devoted to objects which are intimately connected with the well-being of the people, and the larger, therefore, this expenditure, the better for them. The chief defects of the existing arrangements are the following:—

1. The "so-called provincial contracts"—to use Sir James Westland's expression—are really only one-sided arrangements practically forced on the weak Provincial Governments by the Government of India, which is all-powerful in the matter. The contracting parties not being on a footing of equality, the Government of India virtually gives the Provincial Governments such terms as secure the maximum advantage to itself, and the power which it possesses of disturbing the contracts, even during the period of their currency, leaves the Provincial Governments in a state of helplessness and insecurity, and all this is very prejudicial to the interests of the internal administration of the country. A reference to the tables given on pages 47 and 48 of Appendix, Section I, of the evidence recorded by this Commission will at once show how, at each successive revision, the Government of India, while keeping to itself all the growth of revenue which had accrued to it as its share of the normal expansion, has in addition resumed a large portion of the share of growth that had accrued to the Provincial Governments, compelling them thereby to cut down their expenditure in the first year or two of each new contract. Thus, taking Bombay as an illustration, we find that in 1886-87, the last year of the Contract of 1882, its expenditure was Rs. 3,998,912. This expenditure had, however, to be reduced to Rs. 3,814,500 in 1887-88, the first year of the next contract, and it was not till 1891-92 that the level of 1886-87 was again reached, when, at the next revision, it was again put back. The same was the case with almost every other Province. How sore is the feeling of Provincial Governments on this subject may best be seen from the following remarks which the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal thought it his duty to make in the matter in the Supreme Legislative Council last year: "I must say I deprecate the way in which these quinquennial revisions have too frequently been carried out. The Provincial sheep is summarily thrown on its back, close clipped and shorn of its wool, and turned out to shiver till its fleece grows again. The normal history of a Provincial contract is this—two years of screwing and saving and postponement of works, two years of resumed energy, on a normal scale, and one year of dissipation of balances in the fear that, if not spent, they will be annexed by the Supreme Government, directly or indirectly, at the time of revision. Now all this is wrong, not to say demoralising. I say the Supreme Government ought not to shear too closely each quinquennium. It is as much interested in the continuity of work as the Local Governments; and ought to endeavour to secure this and avoid extreme bouleversements of the Provincial finances. . . . It would be an immense gain to local administrations if the Government of India could see its way to renewing the contracts with as little change as practicable on each occasion. It is only in this way that the element of fiscal certainty, which was put forward in 1870 as one of the main objects of decentralization can be secured. Hitherto we have had but little of certainty. A similar protest was made last year by the Lieutenant-Governor of the N.-W. Provinces from his place in the Legislative Council of that Province, and this year the Government of Madras has addressed a very strong remonstrance against the surrender of an additional 24 lakhs of rupees a year demanded by the Supreme Government.

2. There is no fixed or intelligible principle on which these contracts are based, no uniformity in their plan, no equality in the burdens which they impose on the different provinces. The share of Imperial expenditure which the different Provinces have to bear is not determined by any tests of population or revenue. A calculation made by Sir James Westland, and printed on page 400 of the 2nd volume of the Finance Committee's Report, gives the following results.

The proportions or percentages of revenue surrendered

by each Province to the Supreme Government are as follows :—

	Per Cent.
India Districts (General)	26
Central Provinces	56
Burmah	58
Assam	51
Bengal	68
N.-W. Provinces	76
Punjab	45
Madras	52
Bombay	46

The contribution of each Province per 100 of the population is as follows :—

	Rupees.
Central Provinces	71
Burmah	312
Assam	97
Bengal	107
N.-W. Provinces	177
Punjab	82
Madras	123
Bombay	155

These figures are sufficient to show the totally arbitrary character of the present contracts. The fact is that these irregularities are a legacy of the pre-decentralization period, when the expenditure of the different Provinces was determined—as men like Sir Charles Trevelyan, Sir John Strachey, General Chesney, and others have put it—not by the resources or requirements of those Provinces, but by the attention that their Governments succeeded in securing from the Central Government—*i.e.*, by the clamour that they made. And when the first step was taken in 1870 in the matter of decentralization, the level of expenditure that had been reached in the different Provinces was taken as the basis on which the contracts were made, and the inequalities that then existed were, so to say, stereotyped. I think it is high time that an effort was made gradually to rectify these inequalities.

3. The third defect of the existing scheme is that, while it operates as a check on the growth of Provincial expenditure, it imposes no similar restraint upon the spending propensities of the Government of India.

The only way by which these defects could be remedied was clearly pointed out by four members of Lord Dufferin's Finance Committee. They were the President, Sir Charles Elliott, late Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, Sir W. W. Hunter, Mr. Justice Cunningham, and Mr. Justice Ranade. In a note which they submitted to the Government of India on the subject, they made the following four proposals, and urged that their adoption would be attended by very beneficial results: (1) That there be no divided departments, but that those departments of receipts and expenditure which are now wholly or almost wholly Imperial, or which it may be found convenient to make Imperial, should be set on one side for Imperial purposes and that the receipts and expenditure of the Provincialized departments should be entirely Provincial. (2) That, whatever the sum be by which the Imperial expenditure exceeds the income from those sources of revenue which are not Provincialized, that sum should be declared the first charge on the Provincial revenues. (3) That the Provincial surplus which arises from the excess of receipts over expenditure should be the fund from which, in the first place, all Imperial necessities should be met, before any increase can take place in Provincial expenditure. (4) And that as regards the future growth of revenue it should, as far as possible, be divided equally between Provincial and Imperial, subject to the condition that if the Imperial exigencies ever required a larger share, the Imperial share should be increased.

Taking the Accounts of 1884-85, Sir Charles Elliott and the other members thus illustrated the working of their scheme. They proposed that opium, salt, customs, tributes, post office, telegraph, mint, interest on debt, superannuation receipts and charges, the East Indian, Eastern Bengal, Guaranteed and Southern Maratta railways, military works, army, exchange and home charges should be wholly Imperial, and that the Government of India should also bear the charges and receive the revenues of the Imperial Districts, *i.e.*, the parts of India which are not included in the Provinces. On the other hand, they proposed that land revenue, stamps, excise, assessed taxes, forests, registration and the civil departments should be wholly

Provincial, such heads as stationery, printing, miscellaneous and railways, canals and other public works as were already Provincial continuing to remain so. The Accounts of 1884-85, exclusive of Provincial rates, were as follows :—

	Imperial.	Provincial.	Total.
	(In Thousands of Rupees.)		
Revenue ..	503,569	175,537	679,106
Expenditure ..	505,066	174,854	679,920

These accounts, on the basis of readjustment suggested above, would have stood thus :—

	Revenue.	Expenditure.	Surplus. or Deficit.
	(In Thousands of Rupees.)		
Imperial ..	326,799	505,365	—178,566
Provincial ..	354,307	176,559	+177,748

This means that, on the basis of division proposed, the Provinces would have had to pay about 17½ crores, *i.e.*, about 50 per cent. of the revenues made over to them, to the Imperial Government, to enable the revenue of the latter to come up to its expenditure.

This scheme, if adopted, would have the following advantages over the existing arrangements :—

(a) It would remove all irritation at present felt by the Local Governments, and will secure to them, under ordinary circumstances, half the normal growth of revenues in their Provinces, enabling them thereby to make steady efforts towards the progressive improvement of the internal administration of the country.

(b) It is, of course, not possible to secure at once a complete equality in the burdens which the Imperial expenditure imposes upon the different Provinces. Provinces that contribute less than half their revenues to the Imperial Exchequer cannot be suddenly called upon to reduce their own expenditure and pay their full share with a view to reducing the share of those that at present contribute more than half. Existing facts, after all, must be respected, and the present level of expenditure in the different Provinces must be left untouched. But the effect of contributing to the Imperial Exchequer an equal portion of all future increase in revenue (*viz.*, 50 per cent.) will be that year by year the relation which the contribution of a Province bears to its revenue will tend more and more towards equalization. Thus the Provinces which now pay, say, 60 per cent. of their revenue will, after paying only 50 per cent. of their increase for some years, be found to have dropped down to a ratio of 58 or 57 per cent. And, similarly, in the Provinces which pay less than 50 per cent. at present, the ratio will constantly work itself up to 50 per cent.

(c) The proposed scheme, while making ample provision for the necessities of the Central Government, imposes at the same time something like a check on its spending propensities. It secures to that Government the entire normal growth of the Imperialized items of revenue, and also half that of the Provincialized items, and leaves to it besides the power to demand more than half in times of need. But it is expected that in ordinary years more than half the normal growth of Provincial revenues will not be devoted to non-Provincial purposes.

(d) The adoption of the scheme will place the financial system of India once for all on a sound basis, and will bring it more in a line with the federal systems of finance in other countries, such as Germany, Switzerland, and even Canada and the United States. In these countries, so far as I have been able to gather, the Central and Constituent Governments have their separate resources, but the latter are called upon, in Germany and Switzerland, to make special contributions on extraordinary occasions.

I would add one condition to the foregoing scheme. Even in extreme cases, when the Government of India wishes to take more than 50 per cent. of the growth of Provincial revenues, it should do so only with the previous sanction of the Government of India, and that a formal declaration of the reasons necessitating such a step should be drawn up and sent to the Secretary of State to be placed by him before Parliament.

I am confident that the Provincial Governments in India will welcome such a settlement of the question. Before concluding this portion of my evidence, I may be permitted to remark that it would have been a matter of general advantage if representatives of Local Governments had come here to give evidence on this subject before the Commission.

“COUNSELLORS OF THE EMPRESS.”

[FROM A CORRESPONDENT.]

The appended document is known to some few of those present on the occasion of Her Imperial Majesty, the Queen-Empress's Proclamation on the plains of Delhi at the New Year, 1877; but it has been forgotten by many who only indirectly heard of the institution inaugurated by the issue of this royal missive. It is not clear whether the “Counsellors of the Empress” then appointed, or their successors, have been called together, either collectively or in groups, for their “counsel and advice;” but this is not material to my present purpose. That is twofold: first, to invite attention to the essentially Imperial quality of the project, and the gracious terms of her Majesty's spontaneous invitation; second, to refer to this duly constituted council of the British Indian Empire as one form of “a tribunal independent of the Government of India,” which, in various shapes, has been proposed or designed at different times since it was first suggested (as I believe) by that wise and excellent Anglo-Indian, long time member for Aberdeen, Colonel Sykes, the last Chairman of the East India Company.

This design of the council as described and constituted at Delhi, is, as will be observed, mainly consultative, also, presumably, for ceremonial purposes. This, it may be taken, is applicable to the higher and more formal functions of such Imperial tribunal; while the more practical form of the institution would include some special judicial procedure quite apart from the High Courts or Judicial Committee—to deal with exigencies such as those in the recent case of the Rájá of Jhalawar, or with disputed successions, as that of Manipur, which, through failure in the ordinary secret executive action by the political department resulted so disastrously. Colonel Sykes's tentative proposal, afterwards expanded by Mr. Prichard, occupies a position between these two extreme functions of the council. The chief object of that sage Director was to obtain some important disinterested authoritative body “to decide between the paramount power and the feudatory.”

These remarks serve to remind one how many details of this comprehensive subject remain to be filled up; but, if it be approached from the top, nothing could be better suited for beginning with than the Queen-Empress's graciously proffered initial plan, which describes Her Majesty as “being desirous of seeking from time to time, on matters of importance, the counsel and advice of the Princes and Chiefs of India.” That Delhi decree in 1877 reads like a recognition of such an aspiration as that expressed by General Sir Le Grand Jacob on the occasion of Mr. Prichard's paper being read in 1870, namely, that there should be some instrument giving practical effect, as he said, to “the noble Proclamation of the Queen, on assuming the direct administration of India.” As to the more special objects and reasons for the definitive organisation of an Imperial Council for India, there are abundant materials to proceed upon when some rising jurist, student of

political science, or, haply, some statesman shall set himself to the task:—

“No. 4. D.C.P.—Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom and Empress of India, being desirous of seeking from time to time, in matters of importance, the counsel and advice of the Princes and Chiefs of India, and of thus associating them with the Paramount Power in a manner honourable to themselves and advantageous to the general interests of the Empire, has authorised me, through Her Principal Secretary of State for India, to confer, and I do hereby confer, in Her name, and on Her behalf, upon the undermentioned Chiefs and High Officers of Government the most honourable title of “Counsellor of the Empress”:

Arbuthnot, the Hon. Sir A. J., K.C.S.I., Member of the Council of the Governor-General (*ex-officio*).
 Bayley, the Hon. E. C., C.S.I., Member of the Council of the Governor-General (*ex-officio*).
 Bundi, His Highness Ram Singh, Maharao Rájá of.
 Buckingham and Chandos, His Excellency the Most Noble Richard Plantagenet Campbell, G.C.S.I., Duke of, Governor of Madras (*ex-officio*).
 Cashmere, His Highness Ranbir Singh, G.C.S.I., Maharája of Jammu, and
 Clarke, the Hon. Colonel Sir A., K.C.M.G., C.B., Member of the Council of the Governor-General.
 Couper, the Hon. Sir George, Bart., C.B., Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces (*ex-officio*).
 Davies, the Hon. Sir Robert Henry, K.C.S.I., Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab (*ex-officio*).
 Gwalior, His Highness Jayaji Rao Sindhia, G.C.S.I., Maharája of.
 Haines, His Excellency Sir F. P., K.C.B., Commander-in-Chief in India (*ex-officio*).
 Hobhouse, the Hon. A., Q.C., Member of the Council of the Governor-General (*ex-officio*).
 Indore, His Highness Tukoji Rao Holkar, G.C.S.I., Maharája of.
 Jaipur, His Highness Ram Singh, G.C.S.I., Maharája of.
 Jhind, His Highness Raghubir Singh, G.C.S.I., Rájá of.
 Norman, the Hon. Major-General Sir H. W., K.C.B., Member of the Council of the Governor-General (*ex-officio*).
 Rampur, His Highness Kalab Ali Khan, G.C.S.I., Nawab of.
 Strachey, the Hon. Sir J., K.C.S.I., Member of the Council of the Governor-General (*ex-officio*).
 Temple, the Hon. Sir R., Bart., K.C.S.I., Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal (*ex-officio*).
 Travancore, H.H., Rama Varma, G.C.S.I., Maharája of.
 Wodehouse, His Excellency Sir P. E., G.C.S.I., K.C.B., Governor of Bombay (*ex-officio*).

LYTTON,
 Viceroy and Governor-General.

Review.

THE STORY OF INDIA.

British India: The Story of the Nations Series. By R. W. FRAZER, LL.B., I.C.S. (retired), Lecturer in Telegu and Tamil, University College and Imperial Institute, etc. (London: T. Fisher Unwin).

For the purposes of the Series, there need be no quarrel with the inclusion of India, notwithstanding the diversity of its teeming populations. Neither need there be any quarrel over the restricted title, though the story goes back to a period long antecedent to the connection of the British with the country. There the British are, and there they are likely to remain; above all, there they have made history in a very remarkable way; and it is now of

extreme importance that the course and the causes of that history should be known as widely as possible, and that the deductions should be drawn with due care and appreciation. Mr. Frazer's task, in spite of its picturesque elements, has been a very difficult one; for the facts are most complicated, and often scattered so as almost to defy welding, while the available space is severely limited. Hence, "throughout the Story attention has been centred more on the main factors which led to the foundation and expansion of British Empire in India than to mere details of military operations or of administration." A general view is no doubt effectively presented, and perhaps with that we ought to be content. Still, with stronger literary power, Mr. Frazer would have been able to weld his matter together more compactly, and to give greater force to particular episodes. In some important points, too, causes and tendencies might probably have been set forth with much larger advantage. The obligation of impartiality in the criticism of policy seems to have been taken to heart with a strictness that tends to diminish the real value of the lessons that the Story might have fairly been used to inculcate. Yet, with all such deductions, the volume still forms a good average member of an admirable and most useful Series.

In a single chapter, Mr. Frazer disposes of everything antecedent to the rise of the East India Company, describing mainly the course of early Indian commerce, but also indicating rather than tracing some leading channels of the interchange of ideas between the East and the West, "the wide-spreading influence of which," he justly remarks, "is even at present but little realised and but seldom acknowledged." To this period belongs the century of Portuguese primacy, and the awakening of English interest to the possibilities of Eastern trading. The second chapter, covering the seventeenth century, sketches the successful rivalry of the English with the Dutch and the French for the monopoly of Eastern commerce, and enforces the supreme importance of the command of the sea. In 1702, the East India Company was reconstituted in the form it maintained down to its supersession by the Crown in 1858. The reader should now have gained "a clear insight into the primary factors underlying British Dominion in India." Secondary causes of but little less influence in fact, though not fundamental, next fall to be explained. The Mughal Empire was falling to pieces; "the people, separated from each other by differences of race, religion, language, customs, and local tradition, lacked the essential elements wherewith to combine in a national sentiment of opposition to the invasion of a foreign power whose resources and strength were secured on the seas." After some account of the Aryan invasion, and of the predecessors of the Aryans, Mr. Frazer concisely pictures the Great Moguls, and suggestively points to "the inevitable law of India, with its enervating climate—that the land can never be long held or firmly governed by a race which does not periodically renew its strength and manhood by fresh recruits drawn from northern or temperate climes." One cannot but feel, however, that there are counter-elements in the problem, and

that these are receiving steady if slow development under the teachings of English rule. As for the final spasmodic efforts of France, or rather of the ill-fated Dupleix, La Bourdonnais, and Lally, Mr. Frazer rightly sets them down as "merely interesting as historical facts, for without a command of the seas France was powerless to compete with England in the East."

In his important chapters on Clive and Warren Hastings, Mr. Frazer ably summarises the results of recent investigations into the main points of controversy, political and personal. Hastings, in particular, has undoubtedly been cleared "from many wildly reckless and even false charges." Without shutting one's eyes to much that must be regrettable to the judgment of history, one can readily understand how Clive impenitently stood "astonished at his own moderation," and how Hastings could honestly vindicate himself in terms of the bitterest and most contemptuous reproach. With regard to Hastings, whose cause Mr. Frazer seems inclined to champion more boldly than he specifically does, he writes on the general question as follows:

As to the essential morality of these colossal intrigues of Hastings, neither his age nor our age, in a compulsory struggle for existence, can judge. The same problem, differing in none of its essential details, lies before us to-day in our determination to hold our possessions in Africa as a field for the outlet of our productions, as well as in the consistent efforts of Russia to gain seaports in the Mediterranean or in the North Pacific, so as to establish a commercial prosperity for herself in the future, by means which are inevitably destined to end in success. All we are concerned with is the fact that Hastings in his dealings with the native powers had but one main ideal before him—that of serving the interests of the East India Company, and establishing on a secure basis the foundation of the British Empire in India, so that the commercial enterprise of the London merchants should have its necessary development. If in this there be discovered any taint of turpitude, not by Hastings alone but by the nation at large must the blame be borne.

Still, however much truth there may be in this argument, it does no more than shift the responsibility; the turpitude, if any, yet remains. Hastings, indeed, might fairly be credited with excuses that are not open to us or to Russia—certainly not to us. For example, Hastings had situations of the utmost difficulty and peril thrust upon him by a policy that he neither initiated nor approved, and he had to save himself and his charge at all hazards. But the general thesis opens up wide vistas of discussion, which will always be peremptorily closed by the supposed requirements of the extension or maintenance of commercial supremacy. In a nation of shopkeepers, morality is inevitably bent to the assumed interests of the shop, or temporarily put aside till a more convenient season. At the same time, there remains much to be done for the adequate exposition of the real bases and conditions of the official conduct of the greatest of our Pro-consuls, though Mr. Frazer has gone as far as he legitimately could on the present occasion. The case of Nanda Kumar must be taken to be conclusively settled by Sir James Fitzjames Stephen in favour of Hastings, and that is one remarkable vindication.

The policy inaugurated by Clive and Hastings found its natural development in the subsequent conquests and annexations that constitute the

popular landmarks of later Indian history. Mr. Frazer gives a fair account of the disastrous Permanent Settlement under Lord Cornwallis—disastrous immediately and permanently—though he somewhat weakly characterises it as not “particularly successful.” He shows how “the insanely vaunting Sultan of Mysore, the proud Nizam of Haidarabad, the puppet Nawab Wazir of Oudh, the fierce Maratha chiefs Sindhia, Holkar, the Bhonsla, the Gaekwar, and the Peshwa, were one and all forced to bow their heads before the imperious dictates” of the iron Wellesley. Though the wars against the Pindaris, the Ghurkas, the Pathans, and the Mahrattas require just notice, yet Mr. Frazer might have been expected to make room for some more adequate indication of the works of peace during the administration of the Marquess of Hastings. What may be called the modern history of British Administration in India commenced under Lord William Bentinck, whose work opened with an operation now ominously familiar—the restoration of financial equilibrium after a war, the Burmese war of Lord Amherst. The abolition of Sati, and the suppression of the Thags are prominently mentioned; but it is unjust to Colonel Sleeman to say no more than that his and Colonel Meadows Taylor’s writings effectively “drew public attention” to the latter subject. With Lord Auckland, Afghanistan comes unpleasantly into the story, and that “very advantageous, useful, and humane piece of rascality,” the annexation of Sind. Under Lord Hardinge, we have the marvellous history of Rangit Singh, and the first Sikh war; and under Lord Dalhousie, a strong course of annexation, beginning with the Punjab. The Mutiny is generally well narrated, though the various causes might be more definitely valued, and the essential points of the various critical emergencies might be more precisely touched. The later summary calls for no particular remark, except that it is crushingly abbreviated.

The final chapter also suffers seriously from inevitable compression. It sets out the main heads of the moral and material progress of the country under British rule. Without putting it strongly, Mr. Frazer yet points out that there “may be limits” to military operations and provisions “beyond which no Government, with a due regard to financial considerations, can prudently advance.” He further says, quite justly and properly, that “the revenues of India, from which these increasing expenses of the army, military defences, civil administration, and loss by exchange have to be met, are raised for the greater part from that portion of the population least able to bear any increase of taxation.” He speaks plainly enough about the “grave danger” of the steady ousting of the peasantry by law in favour of the usurer—a danger recently emphasised in these columns by Sir William Wedderburn, and in the Governor-General’s Council by Sir Griffith Evans. In conclusion, he quotes Sir Alfred Lyall’s statement of “England’s prime function in India at present”: “to superintend the tranquil elevation of the whole moral and intellectual standard.” The general proposition, however, does not take us far: it does not exempt us from vigilant

examination of the practical operations of detail, from time to time proposed. We trust, however, that Mr. Frazer’s book will be widely read, and that it will do something for the popularisation of serious interest in the government of our Indian fellow-subjects.

AS OTHERS SEE US.

“Our able and energetic contemporary.”—*The New Saturday*.

“The best source of current information on the controversies of our great dependency published in England.”—*The Speaker*.

“A record and review of Indian affairs, which every Englishman with the due sense of ‘obligation’ would do well to study.”—*Bradford Observer*.

Reviewing our seventh volume (1896), the *Westminster Gazette* described it as “a well arranged file of carefully prepared articles and statistics on Indian matters which must prove of considerable value to politicians and journalists, and others. Our Eastern dependency is a topic on which there is not only much indifference but ignorance in this country. This a course of study of the columns of INDIA might do something to dissipate.”

“All who are in sympathy with popular native aspirations will be delighted to see the manner in which the political, social and intellectual activities of the Indian movement are reflected in its pages.”—*The Leeds Mercury*.

“The volume of INDIA for 1896 has reached us, and will be found invaluable by students of Indian affairs who sympathise with the development of the native.”—*The Star*.

“Brimming over with interest . . . an excellent periodical.”—*The Western Mercury* (Plymouth).

“The new number of INDIA contains much instructive matter.”—*The Newcastle Leader*.

“Our esteemed contemporary INDIA.”—*The Englishman* (Calcutta).

“INDIA, in the hands of a new editor, seems really in a way to perform the difficult feat of making a publication entirely devoted to Indian affairs pay its way in England. Its pages may be looked to for some exposition of most subjects that are before the Indian Government and public.”—*The Pioneer* (Allahabad).

“Anyone who is desirous of getting to know what is the real sentiment of India on the main questions which concern her welfare, could not do better than read INDIA, which seems to us to place fairly and justly before its readers views which the most enlightened of the Hindus entertain of our rule, and to give a sensible and sound exposition of the policy best suited to the interests of the Hindus and of ourselves.”—*The Huddersfield Examiner*.

“A most useful and admirable publication.”—*The Somerset Express*.

“Although we differ from many of the views expressed in this periodical, we are bound to admit the talent and enterprise with which it is conducted.”—*Indian and Eastern Engineer*.

“A sober and serious magazine . . . with its excellent supplement, which gives a *verbatim* report of Indian debates in the House of Commons during the month.”—*The Army and Navy Gazette* (London).

“An enlightening monthly serial.”—*The Eastern Morning News* (Hull).

“An unread newspaper.”—*The St. James’s Gazette*.