

discussion, and that it is, that the passing of the Bill to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1882, against the will of the British in India, will be oppression rather than law. Of course I am aware that Lord Ripon is not bound by the opinion of Pericles, but I am sure he will pay due respect to it, as the opinion of the greatest of Athenian statesmen.

Dr. Hunter next refers to the Black Bill of 1849, with which Mr. Drinkwater Bethune tried to put us, our wives and daughters, under the clumsy shoe of the Aryan. He failed, and, if Dr. Hunter will refer to the file of the *Englishman* of that year, I think he will find further reasons for the failure beyond those stated by him; for the *Englishman* was as true to its name then, as it is now. Yes, the Brown Bills of England (metaphorically of course) were as victorious against the Black Bill of 1849, as I trust they will be against the Black Bill of 1883.

I again ask why is Lord Ripon so angry with us? Can he not see that the opposition to the Bill is unanimous among those whom it will injuriously affect? Can he not hear our young men cry out like Neocles, when his father Themistocles, in Metastasio's Drama of that name, after restraining his ardour to resent the insult put upon his father by Xerxes, says: "*Va ; taci e spera.*"

Neocle.—"Ch'io spero? Ah padre-amato,

E come ho da sperar?

Qual astro ha da guidar

La mia speranza?

Mi fa tremar del fato

L'ingiusta crudeltà;

Ma più tremar mi fa

La tua costanza."

BRITANNICUS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—The Hon'ble W. Hunter continues his apology for the Bill thus:—"By a narrow majority the Legislature" (in 1872) "abstained from giving these powers" (to try, fine and imprison British men and women) "to the native Members of the Covenanted Civil Service." If he means a narrow majority in numbers, we agree with him, provided the leading representatives of the non-official European population, who, Sir Fitzjames Stephen tells us, in his letter to the *Times*, were consulted, be not taken into account; but, if the majority be gauged by

the intellect arrayed on each side, it was overwhelming; for Sir Fitzjames Stephen was one of the majority, and he was a giant in intellect to the pigmies who supported the measure, even though the Hon'ble Mr. James Gibbs, as he tells us, supported it by a minute. Sir Fitzjames Stephen, as he tells us in his letter to the *Times*, is as strongly opposed to the measure in 1883 as he was in 1872, notwithstanding the alleged altered circumstances of which Dr. Hunter attempts to make so much.

Sir Fitzjames Stephen says:—"Why it should be considered necessary to amend in 1883 a Bill which had been carefully considered and re-enacted in 1882, I am at a loss to imagine." Is it wonderful then that we, who are pigmies in intellect to him, have also failed to imagine the reason? And yet Lord Ripon is angry with us for that failure! Sir Fitzjames Stephen continues:—"This in itself seems to show that there can be no solid reason for the change proposed to be made." The reason why the change was not made in 1872 is obvious. "There were giants in those days."

What are the altered circumstances to which Dr. Hunter alludes? They are:—1. New enterprises have since then (1872) brought an influx of Englishmen into the interior and created independent public opinion in the districts. 2. Telegrams have poured into the *Englishman*, which show that our non-official countrymen are everywhere opposed to the Bill, and that Englishmen in the interior have now the means of expressing the public opinion of their class. 3. Since 1872 the length of railways open in India has increased from about 5,000 to about 10,000 miles. 4. The number of private telegrams has increased from 600,000 to 1,337,526. 5. The number of Post offices and letter-boxes has increased from about 5,000 to about 11,000, and the number of letters from 89 millions to 158 millions. 6. Districts formerly isolated have now speedy and constant communication with the capital. Really, if I knew nothing of the subject but what is contained in this part of the speech, I should have thought that Dr. Hunter was arguing for a restoration of the *statu quo ante*, 1872; for the principal reason for empowering European Magistrates and Judges in the Mofussil to try European British subjects for minor offences, was the difficulty and expense of bringing the accused and witnesses to the Presidency Towns where the High Courts were located; and Dr. Hunter's argument shows that that difficulty has disappeared. How that can be a reason, or even a sufficient apology for giving native Magistrates power to try Europeans, their wives and daughters, I am utterly at a loss to imagine. If Dr. Hunter mean that, because there is a larger amount of independent English opinion in the Mofussil, therefore native Magistrates will

not be able to do injustice to Europeans, I reply there is not so much as there is in Calcutta, and yet the independent British opinion in Calcutta, aided by the eloquence and forensic talent of that able lawyer Mr. Branson, did not deter Mr. Gupta and his native colleague from inflicting upon a European a fine of Rs. 1,000 for an offence, for which the High Court thought Rs. 50 would have been an adequate punishment. I submit therefore that that portion of the Apology is also insufficient.

I have already shown the worthlessness (with all due respect I say it) of the opinions of the Local Governments in support of the Bill. I therefore submit that the "overwhelming preponderance of opinion" alleged by Dr. Hunter has no real existence.

Dr. Hunter next begs the question by assuming that "we have guaranteed to them" (native Civilians) "equal rights with their English brethren." But whether the proposition is true or not, it does not affect the question, since no man has a right to sit in judgment on another. And here let me remind him that Montesquieu says. "In Governments where there are necessary distinctions of persons, there must likewise be privileges; and "One of the privileges least burdensome to society, and especially to him who confers it, is that of pleading in one Court preferably to another," and not, as he seems to think, that of sitting in judgment upon the dominant race. Of course, if Dr. Hunter can show that necessary distinctions do not exist, that argument falls to the ground; but I think he will hardly attempt to do that in the face of the necessary distinctions created by Hinduism and conquest, and of the distinctions which the Government, of which he is a member, has declared to be necessary, by excluding Englishmen from the new Civil Service, the Uncovenanted Civil Service, and the Roorkee College.

Now I really have great respect for Dr. Hunter, and therefore I would not willingly treat lightly anything he says. You can, then, imagine how ludicrous his allusion to the Queen's Proclamation appeared to me, when I tell you that I could not repress a smile on reading it. What hope is there for these men, I thought, when even one of the most talented of their number is so absorbed in the contemplation of one side of the shield, that he forgets there is another? He actually does not see that, in quoting the Queen's Proclamation in favour of natives, he is condemning the policy of the Government of which he is a member. "In that Proclamation," he says, "she commanded that her subjects of whatever race or creed be freely and impartially admitted to office in [her] service" &c., and the way in which his Government obeys that command is by opening wide the

door of Her Majesty's service to heathen natives, and shutting it closely against Christian Britons!!!

The rest of Dr. Hunter's apology for the Bill, when carefully added up, amounts to this—

Pity the sorrows of a poor old Gup,
Whose whine for pow'r is-sounding at our door,
Pray give him all you can, and shut him up,
And when he gets it, let him howl for more.

The remainder of Dr. Hunter's speech has been so fully answered by you and your able correspondents, as well as by Sir Fitzjames Stephen in his letter to the *Times*, that it would be an impertinence on my part to attempt to add anything to what my superiors in argument have said upon the subject.

BRITANNICUS.

March 30, 1883.

THE HON'BLE SIR STEWART BAYLEY'S SPEECH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—Aristotle informs us that the ancient Cretans had a peculiar method of preventing their Chief Magistrates, or Rulers, from abusing their power. They got up an insurrection, rose up in arms, put their Chief Magistrates to flight, and compelled them to return to private life. This was supposed to be done in accordance with the law. Montesquieu refers to this custom, and wonders that it did not subvert the republic of Crete, for it did not, since after the insurrection everything went on smoothly. The Americans, when their Chief Magistrate, George III, abused his power, adopted the same plan. The difference, however, was that the Cretans lost nothing, but the British lost America. When our Chief Magistrates abused their power, by announcing the Criminal Amendment, we, being Britons, and not Cretans or Americans, adopted a more dignified, if less effective method. We got up, not an insurrection, but a grand public meeting, at which our eloquent orators expressed our sentiments and our young men shouted their indignation at the insult offered to themselves, their mothers and sisters, and—well, yes,—their sweet hearts also; Sir Stewart Bayley calls that “spread-eagleism,” a description which would have been correct only if, like the ancient Cretans and modern Americans, we had swooped down upon our Chief Magistrates and put them to flight. As it was, we only shouted, and therefore a better description of what occurred would have been, “The British lion roared.”

We, however, forgive Sir Stewart Bayley the misdescription on account of the kindness he feels for us and especially for that noble body of men our Indigo Planters. If he had known our Tea Planters as well as he knows our Indigo Planters, he would doubtless have expressed himself as kindly towards them. He is evidently one of the Civilians of the pre-competition era, of whom Sir Fitzjames Stephen has been imbued with the incorrect idea, that they looked upon the Supreme Courts as intruders. This may have been the case on the first institution of those Courts, but it was not so for many years before they merged into the High Courts, for the Civilians of those days were men whose hearts were too full of honourable and kindly feelings for petty jealousy of the Supreme Courts, or of any other person or thing to find room therein. There may have been Philistines among them, who looked upon all Europeans in India out of the Civil Service as "white trash," and upon the Supreme Courts as intruders, for Philistines intrude everywhere, but these snots on their honourable shield were few and far between.

We are thankful to Sir Stewart Bayley for so clearly pointing out in his speech some of the dangers to which we shall be exposed if the Bill becomes law, even though he did not absolutely oppose it. We are surprised, however, at so clear-sighted an officer of Government having failed to foresee either "the extent or the depth of feeling which the measure has aroused among the European population."

Some supporters of the Bill laid great stress upon one argument, the fallacy of which ought to be exposed. The British in India, they say, strenuously opposed the passing of the law which subjected them to the jurisdiction of native Judges in civil matters, yet the result has proved that their fear of injustice was ill-founded. Ergo their fear of injustice at the hands of native Judges in criminal matters is unfounded also. The fallacy consists in assuming that the decisions of native Judges in civil suits between Europeans and natives have been just and satisfactory, the contrary, as a rule, being the fact. The incorrect assumption is probably based upon the fact that no complaints have been made to Government against those decisions. The fact is that the British being a law-abiding race, when the Bill became law they submitted to it under protest, and when injustice was done by means of it, their school training in England prevented them from running with tales about it to the Master, the Governor-General, on every occasion, even if they had had time to do so. They therefore either submitted quietly or got the injustice set aside on appeal when they could, though native Judges often cast such a glamour over their decisions, and make their reasons appear so plausible, that it was often

difficult to do so. The danger of assuming that the people are satisfied because their Ruler does not take the trouble to ascertain the truth, and his counsellors neglect their duty, has been too often practically proved to require further proof from me. Louis XVI heard no complaints about *corvées*, and his counsellors failed to tell him the truth, he therefore concluded that there were none. He lost his head. I do not mean to hint that Lord Ripon will lose his head in a similar way, but merely to show him, that it does not follow that unwise and illogical counsellors are correct, when they tell him that the decisions of native tribunals, in civil suits between Europeans and natives, are either just or satisfactory, because no complaints against them have reached his ears. A very clever and talented Civil and Sessions Judge, with whom I was intimate, told me that the decisions of the Principal Sudder Ameen, at the Sudder Station of his district, were very unsatisfactory in suits between Indigo Planters and natives, and that he was morally certain that native Judge received bribes from native litigants, but, as the bribes were always paid to his brother, who was living with him, but was not a Government officer, he could not obtain legal proof against him. If Lord Ripon will take the trouble to read the decision of Moonsiff Babu Mohendro Lall Gossain of Shibgunge in suit No. 90 of 1882, and the remarks made thereon by the Judge, Mr. J. G. Charles, on appeal, he will be able to form some idea of that which some of his counsellors call the satisfactory nature of the decisions of native Judges in suits between Europeans and natives in civil suits, and he will be able to form some faint idea of the indignities to which we, our wives, and daughters, will be subjected, if the Bill under discussion becomes law. If Lord Ripon will then take the trouble to read the decision of Kheter Mohun Mookerjee, Officiating Deputy Magistrate, dated the 21st March 1877, on the complaint of Ramdharising Jowardar of the Bhagavanpore Indigo Factory against Nijib Mandal and others, he will also learn how wise and just native Magistrates can be.

One would imagine, by the Queen's Proclamation being quoted so often, that the natives had not a fair share of offices under Government before it was made. A reference to the number of European and native uncovenanted officers at that time will prove the contrary to be the fact.

We regret as much as any one the present state of affairs, but we hope it will not subside until the British in India obtain all their rights, one of which is that the Government of India shall cease to disobey their sovereign's command, contained in the Queen's Proclamation, issued when Her Majesty assumed the Government of India, that

her subjects, "of whatever race or creed, be freely and impartially admitted to offices in her service, the duties of which they may be qualified by their education, ability and integrity duly to discharge," and shall forthwith obey that command by reopening the Uncovenanted Civil Service and the Boorkee College to European British subjects in India, and by giving at least half the appointments in the new native Civil Service to European British subjects.

BRITANNICUS.

March 31, 1883.

THE HON'BLE MR. JAMES GIBBS' SPEECH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—Whenever any one was brought to the notice of the great Napoleon, the first question he asked was, "What has he done?" If he were alive now, and were to make that inquiry about the Hon'ble Mr. James Gibbs, the answer would be, "He wrote a minute." That is the most prominent fact in his speech. He wrote a minute. This, he tells us, was in 1870, when he adorned the Bench of the High Court of Bombay. He fails to inform us, however, whether, the late Chief Justice Sir M. R. Westropp, the present Chief Justice Sir C. Sargent, and, we trust the future Chief Justice, the Hon'ble Mr. Justice Bayley, who, we are informed, were his learned colleagues in that year, also wrote minutes, and whether their minutes agreed with his, or differed from it. Was this kind to them or himself? If their minutes agreed with his, what lustre would be added to their honourable names, by the mention of the fact! If they differed from his, in what bold relief would the mention of the fact cause his to stand forth! And with what bright effulgence would his minute shine, when contrasted with the darkness of theirs! Nevertheless this fact stands prominently forth, that he wrote a minute. He then proceeds to tell us the contents of that minute. I need scarcely say that I entertain the highest respect for the learned ex-Judge. But I cannot help lamenting that his zeal to lighten our darkness has led him into a violation of a general rule of law, namely, "The contents of a written instrument, which is capable of being produced, must be proved by the instrument itself, and not by parole evidence." I need hardly tell one who has eaten his dinners at an Inn of Court, and had sat upon the Bench of the High Court of Bombay, that this rule is as old as any part of the Common Law of England, has ever been regarded with favour, and maintained with approbation by the Judges." How then could he permit himself to violate it, especially when he was seeking to use the

document against us? If he could not produce the original, why did he not produce a certified copy? For, being a public document, he knows that, under the Evidence Act, a certified copy is admissible as evidence. We are the more grieved at his forgetfulness of this general rule of law, because we feel sure that his modesty has prevented him from doing himself that full justice which the production of the document, or of a certified copy thereof, would have done; as well as because, in conformity with that general rule of law we are compelled, much against our will, to reject his parole evidence of its contents; so that the information we have upon the subject is reduced to the bold statement, that he wrote a minute. That fact may make him famous, but it leaves us unenlightened. The non-production of the minute also debars us from applying to him the legal maxim, "*Verba chartarum fortius accipiuntur contra proferentem*," the words of an instrument shall be taken most strongly against the party employing them. This is an act of injustice towards us, of which an ex-Judge ought not to have been guilty, especially in his own cause. There is another point on which we regret he did not enlighten us. Was the minute he wrote published in Bombay? I fancy not, or we should have heard something about it from Mr. Maclean of the *Bombay Gazette*, who would have been delighted to do honour to the author with his facile pen. Moreover, the publication of the minute, with Mr. Maclean's comments thereon, would have greatly assisted Mr. Gibbs in his sedulous search for popularity among the people of Bombay, especially the natives. They would, whenever they saw him, have said: "He wrote a minute." Let us do the same, and whenever we see him, say, "He wrote a minute."

The next prominent point in Mr. Gibbs' speech is his statement that he is "of a somewhat unsentimental disposition." What a pity it is that one naturally so amiable should have so schooled himself to repress his feelings, as no longer to possess any! Has he read "*Real-mah*? It is by a well known author. There is a sentence in that book which he will do well to ponder in his heart. It is this: "If you constantly repress the expression of feelings, you will gradually cease to have those feelings." It is since he became a member of the Viceroy's Council that he has thought it statesmanlike to divest himself of the feelings which made him sympathetic when he was courting popularity in Bombay? If so, he is wrong, for a man without feeling is incapable of feeling the pulse of the people, or of sympathising with them. And a statesman, who cannot do either of those things, is incapable of ruling either well or wisely. The best and most successful statesmen have not been those who have had the procrustean proclivities which

prompted the preparation of the present Bill, but those who have had large hearts and have been wisely sympathetic.

The next idea with which his speech impresses us is that he leads an easy and happy life. In seeking for the reasons why his speech so impressed us, we found it was because we gathered from it that he neither indulges in ideas nor believes much in anything or any body and on referring to "Realma" again, we found the following passage, which solved the riddle:—"It is not so much the stupid man, as the limited man, the man of routine, the man who does not indulge in ideas, who does not believe much in anything or any body, who will have an easy and happy life." This reminds us of another passage in the same book:—"I think, to put the matter briefly and frankly, that there is not sufficient intellect brought to bear upon the affairs of Government." Recent events have proved that sentence to be peculiarly applicable to the Government of India.

On returning to the speech we made a discovery. It was not Lord Ripon or Mr. Ilbert who was the prime mover of this measure. It was Mr. Gibbs. He tells us that, as the member of Council in charge of the Home Department, he is intimately connected with the general administration of justice in the empire. He also tells us that he wrote a minute. When we put these two facts together, it appears to us that nothing is more likely than that he is the prime mover in the matter of the Bill. Now prime movers, as every mill-owner knows, are very dangerous things, if not well looked after. They are apt to be the cause of explosions. Here is a case in point. The prime mover, Mr. Gibbs, though not having been properly looked after, has caused the entire British population of India to explode with indignation at his Bill, and with laughter at his speech in support of it. Does not this prove that some one ought to look after him? We recommend him to the care of the Defence Association.

But why did Mr. Gibbs, who objects to inuendos, not speak out? Why did he not tell us distinctly that he is the prime mover of this Bill? Why throw the blame upon an absent man, poor Sir Ashley Eden? Why say, like the little sneak at school, "Please, Sir, it wasn't I, it was Ashley Eden did it?" His minute was written twelve years before Sir Ashley Eden's letter. Why then did he not take to himself all the honour of being the prime mover of the measure? Was it because he thought the honour doubtful? Who knows? Or was it because, like Sir Walter Scott, he wished to see how the British public received his works before he owned them? If the latter be the case, with what amusement he must have sung to himself, "*Sic vos non vobis*," &c., when the public attributed the authorship

of his work to others! How he must have wondered at the obtuseness of the British people in not at once divining that the great work was the great man's! But why was he not frank with us in his speech? Why did he not tell us plainly that he was the author, instead of leaving us to infer it from the facts abovementioned? Why, in short, did he not finish his song of "*Sic vos non vobis*," &c, with a quotation from the *Ingoldsby Legends* slightly altered? Thus:—

"Hos ego versiculos feci, tulit alter honores,

This Bill is mine. Who says it's Ilbert's he tells stories."

Having already trespassed too much upon your valuable space, I will conclude to-day. and, with your permission, resume the subject to-morrow.

BRITANNICUS.

April 2, 1883.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—Your able correspondent *Whincop* has so fully answered Mr. Gibbs' speech that he has left me very little to add. He has pointed out that the "large railway works" in the neighbourhood of Carwar which the speaker said were being commenced have no existence. The fact is, the Government, of which he is a member, with its usual unwisdom, sanctioned the Marmagaon-Hubli Railway to benefit a foreign port that of Goa, in preference to a railway into the interior from Carwar. It is probably the Marmagaon-Hubli Railway that was in Mr. Gibbs' mind whilst he was speaking, but as its terminus, at the coast end of the line, is in foreign territory, it would not help him in his argument, so, by a mental process peculiar to himself, he transported it to Carwar. But even supposing there were large railway works at Carwar, and it was necessary to try some British employé on a criminal charge, and there was no British Magistrate and Justice of the Peace at that station, there would be no need to incur the "inconvenience, danger, expense, and delay" of sending him to Belgaum or Dharwar, for any of the steamers which constantly touch at Carwar could convey him to Bombay, from which, if necessary, he could be sent on to the Magistrate at Tenna, only 21 miles further, by rail. Mr. Gibbs was fully aware of this when he was making his speech, but it suited him to throw the Belgaum and Dharwar dust in the eyes of his hearers, and so he ignored it. Was this dodge worthy of a Councillor of the Indian Empire? This is a specimen of the fallacious arguments to which the Government of India are reduced in attempting to support their notoriously indefensible Bill.

Strangers will doubtless feel highly flattered at the amount of stupidity with which Mr. Gibbs credited them when he said, "From

the extraordinary excitement which has been raised, a stranger would be led to suppose that the majority of Europeans were constantly before the Criminal Courts in serious and intricate cases, whereas, as far as my experience goes, there are very few cases in which Europeans come before them, and those of a simple nature, petty thefts or assaults." His mental vision must be very dim since it does not enable him to see that it is to keep those cases few, and prevent the Government, of which he is a member, from increasing their number indefinitely by means of their Criminal Amendment, that we are striving with all our might. No, he cannot understand this, and he will blindly go on with his Bill, without being able to see many other things, for as Schiller truly says, "Against stupidity the gods themselves are powerless."

Mr. Gibbs, in support of his argument, if anything he said is worthy of the name, stated that foreigners are liable to the jurisdiction of native Magistrates in the Mofussil. *Whincop* has fully answered that part of his speech, and has clearly shown that it has nothing to do with the question at issue. I therefore refer to it only to exhort foreigners to agitate through their own Governments and the Defence Association to get themselves relieved from that unmerited degradation.

If we may judge from the number of times the word "inconvenience" is repeated it would seem as if that was the argument upon which Mr. Gibbs mainly relied. His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal has clearly shown that it does not exist in his Province. *Whincop* and I have shown that it does not exist in the Province of Bombay, and it is not alleged to exist in Madras or elsewhere. Hence that which Mr. Gibbs styles the "inconvenience argument" turns out to be only *inconvenant*, for it is highly unbecoming in a Councilor of the Indian Empire to advance as an argument that which has no foundation in fact.

Mr. Gibbs expresses his "inability to understand why all this commotion should have arisen about this measure;" much less can he understand why Lord Ripon "should be looked upon as the leader of an anomalous, unconstitutional, and illegal confiscation of chartered rights;" nor can he understand why the European gentry of Calcutta should now rise to protect their country-men and country-women in the Mofussil from being subjected to the jurisdiction of native Magistrates and Judges. He is unable to understand any of these things, although Messrs. Miller, Evans and Thomas had only shortly before fully explained the reasons to him. He then says he is not sure that the great bulk of the European and Eurasian population of Bengal know the meaning of the term "European British subject," and then this gentleman, who has eaten his dinners at an Inn of Court, has sat on the bench of a High Court, and claims to be a leader of men as a

member of the Viceroy's Council, practically explains why he is unable to understand so many things, by wrongly interpreting a simple point of law, which it was his peculiar duty to understand thoroughly. His indeed must be one of those peculiar minds so well described by Philip von Artevelde in the following lines :—

“ A mind it is

Accessible to reason's subtlest rays,

And many enter there, but none converge.”

Mr. Gibbs is the member of Council in charge of the Home Department. One of the duties of that Department is to admit qualified candidates into Her Majesty's Uncovenanted Civil Service. Her Majesty has commanded that her subjects, of whatever race or creed, shall be freely and impartially admitted to offices in her service. A member of Council in charge of the Home Department who wilfully and systematically excludes Her Majesty's Christian British subjects from her service wilfully and systematically disobeys Her Majesty's commands. A subject who wilfully and systematically disobeys his sovereign's command is a rebel. If, then, Mr. Gibbs wilfully and systematically disobeys his sovereign's command by excluding her Christian British subjects from her service, he is a rebel.

If Mr. Gibbs is a rebel, he can no longer deserve or possess the confidence of his sovereign. In that case it will be neither unconstitutional nor inequitable for the British in India to petition Her Majesty to inform him that his services are no longer required.

BRITANNICUS.

April 3, 1888.

THE “ AMRITA BAZAR PATRIKA.”

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—A friend of mine has sent me a copy of an editorial which appeared in the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* of the 23rd ultimo. I am sorry to see that your kindness in publishing my letters has subjected you to the censure of one so able to teach you your duties as the editor of that invaluable paper. At the same time allow me to thank him for his favourable notice of myself. After reading his article I felt as if I had grown several inches in stature, for I saw at once that the fact of my having received special notice from the pen of so famous an editor would cause my name to be handed down to posterity brightened by the halo with which he has so kindly surrounded it. That my letters have wounded his susceptibilities I regret. He must, however, excuse my inclining to enter the lists with one so powerful in argument as himself

upon the minor points raised by him, my object being to deal with facts and to leave others to argue upon them.

I am deeply grateful to him on account of the intense desire he so kindly expresses to know my name, but I may be the No. 1, for whom the Dublin Police are making such anxious inquiries, and, though there is no danger in entrusting my name to an *Englishman*, it would not be safe to tell it to one who, Dr. Hunter informs me, is more English than an *Englishman*; for his intensified sense of honour might give lasting pain to his intensified kindly feelings, by constraining him to inform the Native Police of my identity, in which case, although I know I should be treated by them with that kindness and gentleness for which they are famous, especially when they have a European in their power, yet that kindness, great as I know it would be, would not console me for the loss of my liberty.

BRITANNICUS.

April 4, 1883.

H. E. THE COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF'S SPEECH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—I deeply regret that any one should have attributed selfish motives to H. E. the Commander-in-Chief for giving his adhesion to the notorious Bill. My theory is that he had not given the matter sufficient thought when he spoke, and that he had been led away by the specious arguments of some one inferior in intellect to himself. The unselfish way in which he denuded himself of the flower of his army to enable that gallant General, Sir Frederick Roberts, to distinguish himself by making his rapid and successful march from Kabul to Kandahar, is alone sufficient to prove him to be incapable of so mean a feeling as selfishness. That he attended to the interests of the gallant soldiers under his command, or thought he was doing so in what he did, goes without saying, for it was his duty to do so. That he failed in his attempt to protect their interests was not his fault, but the fault of those who persuaded him that by restricting the office of Cantonment Magistrate to British officers, and making them Justices of the Peace, his soldiers (which of course includes officers) would be saved from the jurisdiction of native Magistrates. That the panacea proposed was no panacea at all, the following case will show.

If, on a shooting excursion beyond the limits of cantonments, and within the district of a native District Magistrate and Justice of the Peace, one of his soldiers accidentally hurts a native, without killing him, he may be charged with an offence under Section 336 of the Indian

Penal Code, and since, by a section of the Code of Criminal Procedure, "every offence shall be inquired into, and, if tried by a Magistrate, shall be tried in the district in which it was committed," the soldier would be tried by the native District Magistrate and Justice of the Peace. Any lawyer will tell His Excellency what a fearful amount of discretionary power Section 336, above referred to, gives to a Magistrate. There may really have been no rashness, and no negligence, on the part of the accused; the infliction of the hurt may have been perfectly accidental, and the soldier may be as deeply grieved at the accident as it is possible for a kind-hearted man, be he officer or private, to be. The native Magistrate, however, happening to have a grudge against His Excellency's soldiers on account of their being fellow-countrymen of those who so strenuously opposed the Bill, or for some other cause, uses the fearful amount of discretion the law gives him against the accused, and sentences him to three months' imprisonment and a fine of Rs. 250. Does His Excellency think that such a state of affairs will lessen the difficulty at present experienced of obtaining recruits for regiments which must come to India in their turn? Does he think it will conduce to the honour of an officer or private to be unjustly sentenced to imprisonment by a spiteful native Magistrate? Does he think it will improve the morale, prestige, or discipline of his army?

Let His Excellency then contemplate the possible fate of an officer's wife on her way to join her husband on his return from one of our great or little Indian wars, in which he has been distinguished for his bravery. The lady, whilst passing through the district of a native District Magistrate and Justice of the Peace, is falsely charged with some offence by a wicked native. The native Magistrate in his discretion (a most dangerous weapon in the hands of a Magistrate determined to convict), finds her guilty, and sentences her to three months' imprisonment and a fine of Rs. 1,000. Does His Excellency think that will be a fitting reward for the husband's gallantry? Will the chivalry of our gallant Commander-in-Chief allow him to aid in passing a Bill, which will permit even the possibility of the wife of one of his gallant officers being treated with such indignity, or ever permit the possibility of the wife or daughter of any officer, non-commissioned officer or private being compelled to appear, as a prisoner, before a native Magistrate, whose hereditary qualities and early education render it impossible for him to have that respect and tenderness for the dignity of womanhood which are innate in a Briton? It is true that the wives and daughters of our gallant soldiers (which word, as I said before, includes officers) are not soldiers, though Anacreon tells us, in

his Ode commencing "*Phusis kerata taurois*," that nature has given them a weapon, *kallos* (beauty), superior to any his soldiers possess, with which it is no disparagement of his gallant army to say that the ladies are able to vanquish the bravest of their number. But though they are not soldiers, I think His Excellency will admit that they are as much entitled to protection at his hands as their husbands and fathers themselves.

If His Excellency agrees with me so far (and who can doubt it?) surely his gallant and chivalrous nature will constrain him to oppose a Bill, which will subject any of his countrywomen, albeit neither wives nor daughters of soldiers, to such indignity and danger as that above referred to.

We trust, therefore, that His Excellency will ponder well the arguments against the Bill, so that when it comes before the Council again he will be able to oppose it with all his might.

With reference to the experiment argument, with which he has been impressed by some one, I would remind him that we are not eels, and so are not likely to get used to skinning, and that vivisection experiments are illegal.

BRITANNICUS.

April 4, 1883.

INDIA FOR THE INDIANS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR.—Allow me to thank your able correspondent, "Memnon," for that part of his letter which favourably criticises mine. With regard to the portion which is adverse, I beg to ask, as we both arrive at the same goal, a determination to strive for the destruction of the notorious Bill, what benefit would accrue, at present, from an argument as to whose road is the better? Rather than be even the remote cause of a split in the camp, I would, like a true Conservative, make any reasonable concession, at present to my Liberal opponent. After the battle is won, if there is a field open to us, I shall be delighted to have a friendly joust with so courteous and knightly an adversary. In the meantime, permit me to say that, not being in possession of a pair of the rose-coloured spectacles used by the Liberals, instead of seeing a Utopia when England retires from India, I see nothing but chaos being reduced to order by the Russian knout.

BRITANNICUS.

April 6, 1883.

H. E. THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH.

—
 *TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—Having learnt from unquestionable authority, the authority of a Bengali contemporary of yours, the editor of which belongs to a race whose veracity has passed into a proverb, that the Government of India is powerfully supported by “the naked black arms of 250 armless black-skinned millions,” I naturally approach the speech of the head of that Government with fear and trembling, albeit he is an Englishman, and therefore, according to the same veracious authority, “not a very intelligent creature.”

Here allow me to remark that, since, according to your veracious contemporary, “an Englishman is not a very intelligent creature,” and according to Dr. Hunter a Bengali Covenanted Civilian is “more English than an Englishman,” a Bengali Covenanted Civilian must be “not a very intelligent creature” in a greater degree, that is, a less intelligent creature than an Englishman; therefore he is not equal to, or the peer of, an Englishman. Now since Lord Ripon calls the Bengali Covenanted Civilian “the cream,” how far inferior to Englishmen must be the skimmed milk, that is, the educated Bengalis who have not been to England! How thankful we ought to be to Dr. Hunter and your veracious contemporary for solving, by their joint labours, this much vexed question.

There are two things which stand forth prominently at the commencement of the speech of H. E. the President. They are his explanation of the action of Government in neglecting to consult the Government of Bengal when it consulted the other Local Governments, and the reason he assigns for the intention of Government to press the Bill forward to the second reading, so nobly frustrated by the Hon'ble Mr. Evans. In both of these cases the policy of Government was not so straightforward as we should have liked it to be. For my part, I entirely acquit Lord Ripon of want of straightforwardness or of any fault in these two matters, but that of alleging himself to be led into these two errors by some one not so straightforward as himself; and I do so notwithstanding his having, in his speech, generously adopted the faulty policy as his own, in order to screen his impolitic adviser. For the purpose of discovering who that adviser is, it is necessary briefly to recapitulate the impression made upon one by a careful perusal of every speech in support of the Bill.

The Hon'ble Mr. Ilbert's speech is explanatory. It is just such a speech as might be expected from the Legal Member, who had drawn the Bill upon lines settled before he joined the Government.

The Hon'ble Mr. Quinton's is the speech of one groping in the dark for reasons, and falling into a quagmire of absurdities of his own creation.

The Hon'ble Messrs Kristo Dass Pal's and Durga Churn Laha's speeches are those of men who know the Bill is indefensible, but who, by compliments and flatteries, encourage the Government to pass it, because it panders to Bengali lust for power.

Raja Shiva Prosad's speech is that of a kind-hearted Hindu gentleman of the old school, who, though urged to support his co-religionists by false statements, is constrained to tell bitter truths about them.

The Hon'ble Sayad Ahmad Khan makes no speech at all, for the written speech, read as his, is the elegant composition of some one who puts into it sentiments which, being opposed to the teaching of the Koran and the tenets of Islam, it is impossible for a Sayad, that is, a descendant of the Prophet, to think or utter.

The Hon'ble W. W. Hunter's speech is a learned apology for the Bill, which, though insufficient, does equal honour to his head and heart.

Sir Stewart Bayley's speech is that of a cautious and kind-hearted gentleman, who sees some of the dangers of the Bill, and is too honest to conceal them; but, since he does not see all the dangers, though he deprecates, he does not oppose, the Bill.

H. E. the Commander-in-Chief's speech is that of a gallant soldier, persuaded by the specious arguments of some one to give qualified support to the Bill under the erroneous impression that the appointment of British officers to the office of Cantonment Magistrate will prevent the possibility of the soldiers under his command from being affected by it.

The Hon'ble Mr. James Gibbs' speech is that of a self-sufficient, supercilious prime mover of the Bill, determined to use every artifice in his power to get the Bill passed without caring who is injured by it.

The last mentioned speech, that of Mr. Gibbs, appearing to us to be the least straightforward of any, for the reasons given in a former letter, we are inclined to believe that it is through his counsels that the two errors we are discussing were committed.

My theory is that Mr. Gibbs "the member," as L. tells us, "in charge of the Home Department," and therefore intimately connected with the general administration of justice in the empire, having written a minute in favour of such a measure, was most anxious to distinguish himself by getting it passed. He therefore went cautiously to work, and before any action was taken upon Sir Ashley Eden's

letter, he ascertained that Sir Ashley Eden's successor and the Judges of the High Court of Bengal would not be favourable to such a measure. In order, therefore, to avoid the obstacle which the record of the unfavourable opinion of the Government of Bengal would place in the way of the measure, Mr. Gibbs advised Lord Ripon that the Government had better take Sir Ashley Eden's letter as a letter from the Government of Bengal proposing legislation in this direction, in which case there would be no need to consult the Government of Bengal, when the other Local Governments were consulted, and Lord Ripon, trusting in the *bona fides* of Mr. Gibbs, adopted his suggestion. We also believe that Mr. Gibbs, fearing for the fate of his Bill, attempted to get it pushed on quickly to the second reading stage.

This is my theory. If I am wrong I apologise to Mr. Gibbs. If I am right, let him apologise to the British in India for placing their Sovereign's Viceroy in so invidious a position.

BRITANNICUS.

April 6, 1883.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—In his generous attempt to screen from blame his impolitic adviser, or the member, whoever he may be, who had the nursing of the infant measure before the arrival of its legitimate nurse, Mr. Ilbert, H. E. the President rather overshoots the mark. He says: "There is not a word in Mr. Cockerell's letter, from which I have quoted, which indicated any probability that a proposal of that kind would be received, I will not say with resentment, but even with disapproval by any portion of the community;" and a little further on in connexion with the silence referred to, he says that Sir Ashley Eden "was a man of large experience, intimately acquainted with the feelings of the European population, and certainly there was ample proof that he had their respect and confidence in the remarkable ovations which he received just before he left the country. Sir Ashley Eden did not accompany that letter by any other communications upon the subject." What does His Excellency intend^{ed} us to understand from this? He surely does not mean to say that Sir Ashley Eden's silence regarding any probability that the measure would be received with disapproval by the British community, coupled with his intimate knowledge of their feelings, and with the ovations they were giving him convinced him (His Excellency) that Sir Ashley Eden had communicated to them the contents of his letter recommending the Government of India to subject them, their wives and daughters to the Criminal Jurisdiction of native Magistrates, and that they

were so overjoyed at his fatherly care of them, that they were giving him remarkable ovations!!! But that is the only logical inference to be drawn from his words. I think, if we read between the lines, we shall find that what he meant to say was this, that, When he found that the measure was received with resentment by the British community, he asked the member who had been in charge of the infant measure, before it was handed over to Mr. Ilbert, why he had not given him warning of the indignation with which it would probably be received by the British community, and that member's reply was in substance the same as is stated in the above logical inference. His Excellency, however, saw the absurdity of adopting the excuse *totidem verbis*, and so he made a statement, from which nothing but that excuse could be inferred.

It is greatly to be deplored that His Excellency intrusted the nursing of so important a measure to any one, for, if he had attended to it himself, he must have seen that the very reason assigned for believing that the British community would not receive the measure with disapproval proved that, on the contrary, they had not been taken into Sir Ashley Eden's confidence in the matter. For, firstly, if Sir Ashley Eden had by the dulcet tones of his voice succeeded in charming away the spirit of opposition with which similar measures had been received in 1849, 1857, and 1872, he would, instead of being silent on the subject most undoubtedly have taken credit to himself in his letter for the success of his arts of sweet persuasion. Secondly, Sir Ashley Eden's intimate acquaintance with the feelings of the European population, coupled with his silence upon the subject of his letter during the remarkable ovations, ought to have convinced His Excellency that he had refrained from mentioning the matter during the ovations, for fear of disturbing their harmony, from which His Excellency would naturally have inferred that Sir Ashley Eden's intimate acquaintance with the feelings of the European population had caused him to feel certain that the measure would be received with indignation by the British community. Whether Sir Ashley Eden was justified in withholding all information on the subject from the British community, whose ovations he was receiving, is beside the question. I hold that he was not. I hold, moreover, that after writing the letter in question, or even after having decided upon writing it, he had no right to accept the ovations, for they were given to him for his good government of the Province, and that letter undid all the good he had done. And thirdly, the remarkable ovations Sir Ashley Eden was receiving from the British community, coupled with His Excellency's knowledge of the resentment with which they had always received the proposal of similar measures, ought

to have convinced His Excellency, that, so far from not disapproving of the measure, they had not even been informed of it.

His Excellency would also have seen from the tenor of Sir Ashley Eden's letter that he had not only not consulted the persons whom it is usual for Local Governments to consult, but that he had not even consulted the Judges of the High Court, whom it was incumbent upon the Government of Bengal to consult before proposing a measure affecting the jurisdiction of Magistrates under their supervision. His Excellency would then have perceived that the letter could be accepted only as containing the individual opinion of Sir Ashley Eden, and that no one would accept it as containing the opinion of the Government of Bengal, unless he wished, by a quibble unworthy of the Government of India, to use it as such.

It was a graceful act on the part of Sir Stewart Bayley to take blame to himself for neglecting to warn His Excellency "of the spirit the proposal would arouse." But what shall we say of His Excellency's adviser, the member in charge of the infant measure, whoever he may be, who by his shifty policy in the matter destroyed the confidence of the British community in the integrity of the Government, and then allowed his Sovereign's Viceroy generously to screen him by bearing all the odium of his unjustifiable acts?

Of course the member in charge of the infant measure could not know what opinions any of the other Local Governments would send unless he had visited them, but, by eliminating Bengal, by means the quibble above referred to, from the Governments to be consulted, one dissentient voice was got rid of, whilst, by the same quibble, the Government of Bengal, the Government which really opposed the measure more strongly than any other, and which really was the only Government at present interested in the matter, was added to the list of approving voices. By these means the supporters of the Bill were enabled to cry, with the outward semblance, but without the substance of truth, that every Local Government but Coorg is in favour of the measure. All honour to Coorg! At the same time, I do not see why poor Bangala should be falsely accused of having accepted Lord Ripon's ugly *protégé* "Administrative inconvenience."

One of the supporters of the Bill was very glib with his charges against us of using invective, assertions, insinuations, &c., as if he felt more aggrieved than any one else at the invective and assertions. I can only say I am sorry for him. It is true that Cæsar's wife ought not even to be suspected, but it is equally true that she ought not to do anything likely to arouse just suspicion.

April 7, 1883.

BRITANNICUS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—If anything were needed to show the straits to which the supporters of the Bill are reduced, the contradictory nature of their arguments, and the pitfalls of their own digging into which they fall, one part of Lord Ripon's speech would supply it in a remarkable manner. His Excellency, after arguing as strongly as he could in favour of the institution of a Covenanted Civil Service, to which natives are admitted, to the exclusion of Europeans, without going to England to compete for admission in the usual way, as well as in favour of the admission of natives to the Uncovenanted Civil Service also to the exclusion of Europeans, and after citing the opinions of several eminent men in favour of that policy—that is to say, after arguing as strongly as he could in favour of the policy of race distinctions in the matter of admission to Her Majesty's Covenanted and Uncovenanted Services in India—His Excellency flatly contradicts himself by saying that with those who are in favour of retaining race distinctions, he has “no sympathy whatever.” He may say, perhaps, that he meant that he had no sympathy with the retention of race distinctions which would be an obstacle to the passing of the Bill. In that case his policy is clear. It is this. Race distinctions, whenever they are unfavourable to natives and favourable to Europeans, shall be abolished; but, whenever they are favourable to natives and unfavourable to Europeans, they shall be retained. That is the policy most distinctly declared in Lord Ripon's speech. I recommend it to the careful attention of the Defence Association. Let it be proclaimed from the housetops. Let it be printed in letters of gold over every gateway of the Viceregal palace and over the entrance to every gubernatorial palace but those of Bengal and Coorg. Let it be loudly proclaimed in every city and town in the United Kingdom, and let it be proclaimed by the stentorian voice of a powerful orator in a full House of Commons, and not in the hole and corner way in which Indian affairs are usually discussed, with just enough members to prevent the House from being counted out.

Again, if anything were needed to show the ignorance of Indian affairs, not only of our non-official countrymen at home, but also of Secretaries of State for India, H. E. the President's speech would abundantly supply it; for he cites the names of the following statesmen in favour of admitting natives to Her Majesty's Indian Service to the exclusion of Europeans—Lord Cranbrook, Lord Halifax, Lord Salisbury, the Duke of Argyll, and Sir Stafford Northcote. Is it possible that these statesmen were aware that there were any British Colonists in India? Is it possible that they knew that among these

Colonists there were, as there are still, well-educated and honourable young men whose fathers had served the State well in Her Majesty's Covenanted and Uncovenanted Services? Is it possible that they were aware that there were, as there are still, among those Colonists well-educated and honourable young men, the sons of gallant officers, who had shed their life's blood in defence of the State? Is it possible that they were aware that there were, as there are still, among those Colonists well-educated and honourable young men, the sons of Merchants, Lawyers, Planters, Civil and Mechanical Engineers and Tradesmen, who, if they had not served the State directly, had served it well indirectly, by developing the resources of the country, by attracting wealth to it and by their civilising influence? Is it possible that they knew that they, in whose favour they were excluding the above mentioned well-educated and honourable young men, were the sons of men who had done nothing good for the State, the sons of men who, as rebels, had done harm to the State, and the sons of men who, as well as their sons, were injuring the State by retarding the march of civilisation by means of their absurd and finical caste rules? No, it is not possible that they were aware of these things, and yet they are facts. The fact is that those statesmen have been kept in ignorance of the truth. And why? Because the Viceroys and Governors whose duty it has been to instruct them have been surrounded by those who, with rare exceptions, have been men whose antecedents and proclivities have unfitted them to be sound counsellors, inasmuch as they themselves have, ever since their arrival in this country, been surrounded by sycophantic natives whose flattery and subservience have blinded their sight, which was never strong or clear; and because those Viceroys and Governors have never seen or heard anything themselves but what they have seen and heard when fulsomely flattering addresses have been presented to them by sycophantic natives, during their Viceregal and Gubernatorial progresses. On such occasions my advice to my countrymen is, "Britons be silent. If etiquette prevents you from expressing your true sentiments, do not, out of compliment, say what you do not feel."

The Viceroy and his Councillors, instead of being ashamed, actually boast of their oppression of their countrymen in India. They gloat over their Act XI of 1836, whereby they subjected us to the injustice of native Judges in civil suits! They boast of excluding from Her Majesty's service the loyal sons of loyal men who have served the State well, and shed their blood in its defence! And they glory in throwing open that service exclusively to the sons of rebels, and of those who have never served the State, all of whom do all they can to retard the

march of civilisation by their absurd and finical caste rules ! In short, they boast of having thrown down the stalwart props of the Empire, and of supporting it with rotten reeds ! And, not content with this, they are now violently striving to force down the delicate and lovely heads of their countrywomen beneath the clumsy shoe of the heathen and woman-despising Aryan !!! Oh ! were it not that, as Marcius Porcius Cato said more than 1,900 years ago, "*Jampridem equidem nos vera vocabula rerum amisimus*" (for some time past indeed we have lost the true names of things), I could describe these tyrants and their deeds in such true and glowing words, as might, perhaps, with justice be styled "assertion and invective," but not "insinuation." But I must stop, for I feel the *vera vocabula rerum* violently trying to force themselves off the nib of my pen on to the paper before me.

Let me conclude, however, by quoting, with a slight alteration, the complete passage of the speech of M. P. Cato, of which I have quoted a part, for it is peculiarly applicable to the Government of India at the present juncture, "*Jampridem equidem nos vera vocabula rerum amisimus, quia omnia jura publica obrumpere, liberalitas, malorum rerum audacia, fortitudo vocatur : eo respublica in extremo sita est,*" which may be rendered thus. "For some time past, indeed, we have lost the true names of things, for to violate all public rights is called liberality, and audacity in wickedness is called firmness: thus the State is placed in the greatest danger."

BRITANNICUS.

April 9, 1883.

SUICIDAL POLICY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—We ought to be very thankful to Lord Ripon for declaring the fixed policy of the Government of India so distinctly, as I showed in my last letter that he had declared it. Hitherto we have had nothing tangible to fight against. One man felt the injurious effect of the policy in one way, another man in another. One man felt it in the injustice of native tribunals in civil suits, and in the studied insolence of natives when he was compelled to attend those courts to prosecute or defend an action; another man felt it in the encouragement it gave to natives to repudiate their business engagements; a third felt it in the difficulty or impossibility of getting employment for his son in the service of Government, and so forth. Each man thought much of his own grievance, and little of his neighbour's, for none perceived that the grievances of all were the outcome of the

same policy. This prevented combination. Now, however, thanks to Lord Ripon, we see it plainly, and we know what his policy is. Pardon my repeating it. It cannot be repeated too often, for its enunciation by Lord Ripon gives us something tangible and definite to fight against, and enables us to combine as one man to throw off the incubus which has so long paralysed our exertions, and annoyed us at every turn. It is this: "Race distinctions, whenever they are unfavourable to natives and favourable to Europeans, shall be abolished, but whenever they are favourable to natives and unfavourable to Europeans they shall be retained."

The notorious Bill has been the immediate cause of our combining, and it, of course, must be the first act of Government which we must most strenuously oppose. But we must oppose it as one of the natural results of the policy of Government, now for the first time distinctly declared. In order to obtain the full sympathy of our brethren at home we must make it clearly understood that we oppose the Bill not only for its own sake, but also as the natural outcome of the above-mentioned suicidal policy. It is, in fact, the policy itself which we must attack. And we must make our countrymen at home thoroughly understand that that is the policy, the declared policy of the Government of India. We must make them clearly understand, too, that that suicidal policy, if persevered in, will first relax the grasp of England upon India, and eventually cause her to lose it altogether. Liberal politicians and natives, however, must not imagine that England's loss will be natives' gain. Far from it, for all that the natives will gain will be new and harder masters. They will get king Stork instead of king Log. They will have Russian instead of English masters. There will be no competition-wallahs then, for the Russians wisely object to conquered races competing with them. There will be no native Covenanted or Uncovenanted Civil Service, and no native Magistrates or Judges to exercise jurisdiction over any one in civil or criminal matters, because that means power, and the Russians know too well the value of power to waste it by placing it in the hands of conquered races. There will not be many race distinctions. There will be but one, the race distinction between the Russian and the native, and that distinction will be very well defined. There will be no pandering to caste prejudices, or native lust for power. There will be the knot for minor offenders, and the bayonet and the bullet for the more refractory. When Russia deposes a native prince or chief for any cause, she will not go into the highways and byways, the ploughed fields or the meadows, to look for a beggar, a plough-boy, or a herdsman, whose pedigree she will be able to torture into that of the rightful heir, and then pose for applause for

her magnanimity in placing him upon the throne, because she is wise enough to know that the only applause she would get in such a case would be the ironical cheers which the Government of India received on a similar occasion from the nations of the earth, especially the Asiatic. For the effete policy of the Government of India of creating great vassals in Mysore, or elsewhere, will be substituted the stern policy of Louis XI of France—the total abolition of all that exist. The Russians are too wise to brook any *imperia* in their *imperio*. There will be no native engine drivers, or other railway employes, because Russia knows too well the value of railways and rolling-stock in time of war, or rebellion to place them in the power of possible enemies. There will be no Legislative Council to abolish anomalies and create administrative inconveniences. There will, in fact, be no law but that of the drum-head court-martial. There will be no Parliament to appeal to. The autocrat of all the Russias is a despot, and from the orders of his Viceroy there will be no appeal. He knows too well the value of order in conquered provinces to foster sedition by listening to appeals from conquered races. For the same reason there will be no native newspapers to stir up sedition. “But,” cries a brave Bengali editor, “Russia will make promises before we will receive her.” “Oh, yes, she will make promises and keep them, too, until she has got a firm grip of the country.” “And then?” “Well, and then she will forget them.” “But,” replies the gallant Bengali, “we will remind her of them.” “Of course you will, but Russian is a difficult language to speak, and probably you would not express yourself well in it. In that case you will be sent to study Russian gratis in her Siberian colleges, or, if you object to the journey on the score of caste, you will most likely be put in a fair way of proving the truth of your religion, by transmigrating into the animal you will be if you remind Russia of promises she wishes to forget. That will be the kind of Utopia which the policy of the Government of India, declared by Lord Ripon, will produce. What a glorious Utopia it will be! Do the natives like the picture?”

Every mail brings out some proof of the need our countrymen at home have of instruction in Indian affairs. Even the *Saturday Review*, in its otherwise most able article, headed “Sentimental Legislation for India,” falls into the error of thinking that the present difference between us and the Government is “a schism on the subject between Englishmen in office and Englishmen out of office, the fact being that it is a dispute between Englishmen, both in and out of office, and a majority only of the members of Council who constitute the Government of India. Again Mr. Onslow showed by his

question to the Prime Minister in Parliament that he did not understand the question, for he treated the seditious articles in native newspapers as an indication of rebellion among the natives of India, thus giving infinitely greater weight to those articles than they deserve. He did not see the real danger of the Bill, nor that it is the natural outcome of a policy far more dangerous to our hold on India than all the articles, however seditious, of every native newspaper in the land.

Lord Ripon has no sympathy with race distinctions, and wishes by some decided act of his Government to mark his abhorrence of them. Then why does he not abolish the race distinction between the Brahman and Sudra? Why does he allow the Brahman to oppress the Sudra by means of race distinctions. If any Liberal suggests that is a religious matter, I say it is not. Raja Shiva Prosad has distinctly and truly told us that it is nothing but a race distinction. The Brahman is of the Aryan race, the Sudra of the race of aborigines of India. There is no community of religion between them. There is only a race distinction, but it is one on account of which the Brahman practised such inhuman cruelty upon the Sudra in former days, that it has caused the Sudra to have a hereditary dread of the frown of a Brahman. Let Lord Ripon begin by abolishing that unnatural race distinction. After he has accomplished that task, I will find him many more unnatural race distinctions to practise his hand upon, before he turned his attention to the abolition of the natural race distinction between the Briton and the Aryan.

BRITANNICUS.

April 11, 1883.

THE FIRST UNCONSTITUTIONAL BLOW.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—Mr. Elliott, the Chief Commissioner of Assam, and, as such, Lord Ripon's lieutenant in that Province, has struck the first unconstitutional blow in this dispute between us and the Government of India. The reason why he has so acted is, because he is deficient in knowledge of history. The greatest act of kindness, therefore, which Lord Ripon can do to his over-zealous lieutenant, is to relieve him of the onerous duty of governing a Province, and relegate him to some quiet station, "far from the noise and turmoil of the world," where he will have ample leisure to perfect himself in that knowledge of history so essentially necessary to one aspiring to be a successful ruler of men. If Lord Ripon does this, I recommend Mr. Elliott to

commence with the study of Lord Nugent's "Memorials of John Hampden, his party, and his times," and to note particularly the following passage in Macaulay's Essay on that excellent work:—"A great and terrible crisis came. A direct attack was made by an arbitrary Government on a sacred right of Englishmen, on a right which was the chief security for all their other rights. The nation looked round for a defender. Calmly and unostentatiously the plain Buckinghamshire Esquire placed himself at the head of his countrymen, and right before the face and across the path of tyranny." After Mr. Elliott has perfected himself in that lesson, I recommend him to study a history of the American War of Independence, and to note particularly the origin thereof.

Was Mr. Elliott aware that, in uttering a threat for the purpose of coercing the Lakhimpur planters into ceasing to oppose the Criminal Amendment Bill in a constitutional manner within their right, he was striking at the entire British population of India an unconstitutional blow to deter them from defending themselves from an attack made by an arbitrary Government on a sacred right of Englishmen, on a right which is the chief security for all their other rights? It is so, whether he is aware of it or not : and I call Lord Ripon to witness should anything hereafter happen which we should all deplore, that the first unconstitutional blow which has been struck in this dispute between us and his Government has been struck by his own Assam Lieutenant.

Has it never occurred to Lord Ripon that history occasionally repeats itself, and that it is within the range of possibility for his acts and those of his Assam lieutenant to bring forth another Hampden calmly and unostentatiously to place himself at the head of his countrymen, and right before the face and across the path of tyranny? Has it never occurred to Lord Ripon that the present state of affairs is very similar to that which called forth the first Hampden? The following is Macaulay's description of the state of affairs at that time:—"It would be absurd to deny that he" (Charles I) "was a scholar and a gentleman, a man of exquisite taste in the fine arts a man of strict morals in private life. His talents for business were respectable ; his demeanour was kingly. But he was false, imperious, obstinate, narrow-minded, ignorant of the temper of his people, unobservant of the signs of his times. The whole principle of his Government was resistance to public opinion ; nor did he make any real concession to that opinion till it mattered not whether he resisted or conceded ; till the nation, which had long ceased to love him or to trust him, had at last ceased to fear him." It appears to me that the only thing needed to make a

picture of the present time in India a *fac simile* of the time described by Macaulay in the above quotation is a second Hampden. May God grant him to us!

The obnoxious Bill is an experiment forsooth! Threats to deter us from opposing it are also experiments, I presume. That being the way the promoters of the Bill treat us before it is passed, what may we not expect from their *protégés* after it is passed? But we are told they are to be watched. That suggests the following questions. Why? Because they are not trustworthy? By whom? And "*Quis custodiet hos custodes?*" Are we to be experimentalised upon until one of our pure and delicate countrywomen is tried after the manner of Alice Lisle by a Hindu Jefferies? God forbid!

To the Lakhimpur Planters I say, "Stand firm. If you are made the proto-martyrs, glory in your martyrdom, for it is in a righteous cause, the cause of a Briton's rights. Remember that we all sympathise with you, and are all ready to pass through any purgatory Lord Ripon and his lieutenants may prepare in order to arrive at the heaven of our liberty."

BRITANNICUS.

April 14, 1883.

ARYAN MORALITY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—At the present crisis it may not be deemed out of place to consider the morality of the heathen race, whom the Government of India has declared it to be its fixed determination to raise, not to an equality only, but above Her Majesty's Christian British subjects. I say "above" advisedly, for in the eyes of the natives of this country the only aristocracy is the aristocracy of power; and, since power is manifest to them only in the members of the Covenanted and Uncovenanted Civil Services, it naturally follows that, in their eyes, the members of those services are the aristocracy of the country, the Covenanted Civil Servants being looked upon by them as the nobility; on account of their greater power and higher salaries, and the Uncovenanted as the gentry. Consequently, by admitting natives to the Civil Services to the exclusion of Europeans, the Government of India places them; in the estimation of the native population of India, in a rank above that of Her Majesty's non-official Christian British subjects, and by admitting natives to the Covenanted Civil Service through a private entrance, not open to Europeans, it places them, in the same estimation, in a rank above even that of the Christian British

members of the Covenanted Civil Service, on the ground that the latter have obtained admission only through the public entrance of competition.

The Brahmins, who claim to be the cream of the Aryan race, who again claim to be the cream of the world, perform many austerities in order to obtain eternal bliss. It is not obligatory upon them, however, to practise morality whilst inflicting those austerities upon themselves, for it is a tenet of the Aryan religion, that, although a Hindu has habitually committed every sin but the five unpardonable sins hereinafter mentioned, yet, if he repeats the name of God with his dying lips, he is sure of eternal happiness. This is corroborated by Mr. Ward in his *View of the Hindus*. He says:—"A Hindu shop-keeper one day declared to the author that he should live in the practice of adultery, lying, &c., till at the point of death, and then by repeating the name of God he should without difficulty ascend to heaven.

The five unpardonable sins, which a Brahman may not commit without rendering his punishment certain hereafter, are the following: 1. He must not divulge the Brahmanical mysteries. 2. He must not commit the sin of incest. 3. He must not kill a Brahman, or rob him of gold or other property, but rather relieve him if he is in need. 4. He must not be habitually intemperate in eating or drinking. 5. He must not associate with any one who has committed any of the above sins. He is at liberty to commit every other sin without imperilling his future happiness; provided he utters the name of God with his dying lips. Thus he may do gross injury and injustice to any man who is not a Brahman, and to any woman not related to a Brahman. He may murder any man or woman who is not of the Brahman caste, or rob him or her of gold or any other property. He may lie, cheat, steal, and commit perjury and adultery so long as it is not a Brahman whom he injures by committing those sins. And all this he is taught in his youth, he may do without fear of punishment in the future state if he only pronounces the name of God with his dying lips. The same morality pervades the other castes, for the morality good enough for a Brahman is, of course, good enough for every other caste. How admirably this morality qualifies the Aryans for an impartial Judge or Magistrate, especially in criminal trials in which a Brahman is prosecutor or prisoner and the other side a European!

Let us now see what kind of morality he is taught in his grand temple of Jaganath, where what Macaulay calls the "hideous idol of Orissa" reigns supreme. This is what Dr. Buchanan, in his *Researches in Asia*, tells us. This temple "is a stupendous fabric, and truly

commensurate with the extensive sway of Moloch, horrid king. As other temples are usually adorned with figures emblematical of their religion, so Jaganath has representations, numerous and various, of that vice which constitutes the essence of his worship. The walls and gates are covered with indecent emblems in massive and durable sculpture." Again, in another place Dr. Buchanan says,—“The tower of Jaganath is covered with indecent emblems, which are newly painted, when it is exhibited in public, and are objects of sensual gaze by both sexes.”

This is the morality of the heathen race whom the Government of India by its words and deeds holds forth to the world as, not the equal only, but the superior of the Christian Briton! This is the morality inculcated in the youthful Hindu to whom the Government of India has entrusted the power of deciding civil suits between a Briton and a Brahman, against the latter of whom it is an unpardonable sin to give judgment! This is the morality of the heathen race, whom it is the declared policy of the Government of India to admit to Her Majesty's Indian Civil Services to the exclusion of Her Majesty's Christian British subjects! This is the morality of the heathen race whom the Government of India is now seeking to intrust with criminal jurisdiction over Christian Britons and their pure-minded sisters. Can iniquity further go? Well may the notoriously obnoxious Bill be said to give criminal jurisdiction to Hindus over British women and British men!

I have seen several natives, who have resided in England from one to four years. Some, on their return to India, went back to their native ways. They were the best. Others assumed what they thought English airs, and—well, I must apologise to Dr. Hunter for smiling at his saying they are more English than Englishmen, for they are so,—they are caricatures of Englishmen. As for their thought and feeling, unless Dr. Hunter is Cagliostro or Zanon, he must excuse our doubting his ability to judge from their speech what they are. If words revealed the native mind, then the noble words of the notorious Nana Sahib, before the rebellion which it has been the fashion euphemistically to call the mutiny, proved him to be what Dr. Hunter delights to call “more English in thought and feeling than Englishmen.” The Cawnpore massacre proved how much a native's thought and feeling are in accord with his words.

Lord Ripon and the members of his Government had much better allow themselves to be guided in their dealings with natives by the Brahman of the Pancha Tantra, for he knows his own race much better than they are ever likely to know it. The following is a translation of

some of his advice :—" When there is enmity in the nature of one race towards another" (as the native papers all over India have long proved it to be in the nature of the native towards the Briton), " although there may be apparent friendship between them, yet no reliance can be placed upon it, and strict watchfulness and observation of the most trifling circumstances cannot be dispensed with, for the dangers of such friendship are many, and the result thereof is injurious."

If the Government of India passes this Bill, it will have only one more step to take in its *facilis descensus Averni*. That step will be to proclaim to the world its belief in the Hindu religion, and, as a necessary consequence, to admit the Brahman to be the cream of creation, and declare the British, not omitting themselves of course, to hold the place in creation which the Brahman assigns to them, that of the lowest and vilest of outcasts. This will necessitate the re-enactment of the laws of Manu and a direction to the Hindu Magistrates and Judges to *pour boiling oil into the mouth of every European who speaks or teaches Sanskrit*, and to hang every European who slanders a Brahman, but if a Brahman kills a European, to allow him to atone for the offence by the same penance as he would have to perform for killing a cat, a weasel, a peacock, a frog, a dog, a lizard, an owl, or a crow.

BRITANNICUS.

April 16, 1883.

SUBTERFUGES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—Mr. Ilbert tells us in his speech that the obnoxious Bill " originated with a proposal for legislation which was made by the Government of Bengal to the Government of India in the month of March 1882." Lord Ripon says in his speech that it originated with a proposal made by Maharajah Jotindro Mohun Tagore, but " before we had taken any steps whatever to fulfil that pledge we received from Sir Ashley Eden a letter upon which the Government of India acted. That is a discrepancy caused by the member in charge of the measure in its infancy failing to give Mr. Ilbert correct information of what had occurred before he joined the Government, whereby he led Mr. Ilbert to stamp with his own authority the statement that Sir Ashley Eden's letter was a letter from the Government of Bengal. That was a subterfuge.

The Government of India did not, however, treat the said letter as the individual opinion of Sir Ashley Eden, which, I submit, I have proved it to be, but as a proposal for legislation made by the Govern-

ment of Bengal. This was done to evade the necessity of submitting the measure to the Government of Bengal for its opinion, which was known to be adverse, when it was submitted to the other Local Governments. This was also a subterfuge.

We are accused of misunderstanding the scope of the measure. Mr. Ilbert says, "The scope and effect of the Bill have been much misunderstood or misrepresented." I think he rather overstepped the bounds of courtesy when he said "or misrepresented." One may honestly misunderstand, but one cannot honestly misrepresent. However, let that pass. What we understood was neither more nor less than what he himself told us on the 30th January last, in his "Statement of Objects and Reasons." This is what he says. "The Government of India has accordingly decided to settle the question of jurisdiction over European British subjects in such a way as to remove from the Code, at once and completely, every judicial disqualification which is based merely on race distinctions. With this object the present Bill has been prepared." In accordance with this statement we understood, that, however limited may be the number of natives to whom it is proposed by the present Bill to give criminal jurisdiction over us, the Bill had been prepared with the object of removing from the Code, at once and completely, every judicial disqualification based on race distinctions, so that it would be easy afterwards by another short Bill to extend that criminal jurisdiction to native Magistrates of every grade. The Bill itself then is a subterfuge, whereby the Government of India sought, by means of a measure limited in appearance, eventually to subject its European British subjects to the criminal jurisdiction of every grade of native Magistrate.

Lord Ripon and Dr. Hunter make much of the Tagore argument. Whence they obtain it is plain. It is from Mr. Gibbs. He, being an ex-Judge of the High Court of Bombay, and an ex-Councillor of the Government of Bombay, was looked upon as an authority on Bombay affairs. Let us see what his wisdom evolved out of them. Being aware that the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal would demolish the inconvenience argument as regards his Province, Mr. Gibbs went to Bombay for one. He says, "Let me explain more fully what I mean by the 'inconvenience' argument. Take Carwar for example, where Mr. Tagore is Sessions Judge, in the neighbourhood of which large railway works are being commenced. If a European commits a crime which requires more punishment than the District Magistrate can award, and which is three months and a fine of Rs. 1,000, he must be committed to the Sessions Court, whose powers extend to one year's im-

prisonment and fine; but the Sessions Judge there could not try him, and an application would have to be made to the High Court to order his commitment elsewhere." Then the cruel man throws the Belgaum and Dharwar dust into the eyes of his hearers. After that he himself demolishes his own Tagore argument as ruthlessly as a little child knocks down a card house he has built up, by telling us that Europeans do not commit crimes which require more punishment than a District Magistrate and Justice of the Peace can award. These are his words, "So far as my experience goes, there are very few cases in which Europeans come before them" (the criminal courts) "and those of a simple nature, petty thefts and assaults." It is clear then that his Tagore argument is a subterfuge, which he himself, close reasoner that he is, naively exposes.

With reference to the District Magistracy Mr. Gibbs says that the present arrangements "are to some extent subversive of discipline; by putting a junior officer, by reason of his birth only, for one particular purpose, over the head of his superior in all other matters." The present arrangements are for Joint Magistrates to try all important cases, the District Magistrate's time being fully occupied with other onerous duties. We have never before heard that that arrangement has caused Joint Magistrates to be insubordinate towards District Magistrates, but of course we must bow to the authority of the member "intimately connected with the general administration of justice in the Empire," upon that subject. Our only wonder is that the Joint Magistrates have not been publicly and severely reprimanded for their habitual insubordination in the *Gazette* of the Government of India. We fail to see, however, how empowering a Joint Magistrate to try a particular class of cases, which his District Magistrate is not empowered to try, places the former over the head of the latter. This argument therefore is also a subterfuge.

The action of Government in obtaining the sanction of the Secretary of State for India beforehand for the Bill was most unusual. Such a course is intelligible only on the supposition that Government expected the Bill to be strongly opposed by the British population of India, and wished to take us by surprise by rushing it quickly through the Legislative Council, before we could organise our opposition to it, and then tell us that it was too late to object to the Bill, as it had been already sanctioned by the Secretary of State. That was another subterfuge.

After the discussion of the Bill in the Legislative Council on the 9th ultimo Lord Ripon telegraphed to England, at the public expense, a full report of the speeches of those members who had spoken in

favour of the Bill, and suppressed, with a brief notice, the speeches of all the members who had spoken against it. This was an *ad captandum* mode of proceeding whereby Lord Ripon unfairly attempted to get a favourable first hearing at home for his pet measure, not at his own expense however, but at the expense of the opposing tax-payers. This is what M. P. Cato says in the words for which I substituted "*omnia jura publica obrumpere*," is called *liberalitas*. His words are, *quia bona aliena largiri liberalitas * * * vocatur*," which may be rendered "for to squander the money of others is called a Liberal measure" This was also a subterfuge.

Other subterfuges could also be pointed out, but I submit that, I have sufficiently proved that the conduct of the Government of India, in the matter of this obnoxious Bill, has been worthy of such a measure, for it has been from first to last a succession of subterfuges. Allow me then to conclude in the words of that eloquent orator, Mr. Gibbs, with the alteration of one word only, that is by substituting "subterfuges" for "invective." "When a cause appears supported" (as this Bill does) "mainly by subterfuges instead of calm and dignified reasoning, its importance diminishes and its significance fades."

BRITANNICUS.

April 18, 1883.

CRUSHERS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—The *Echo* advises Lord Ripon to crush us. A friend of mine, who has recently arrived from England, writes to me thus:—"The *Echo* is an evening paper published daily in London, price one half-penny. It is better known under the name of the half-penny rag. It has about the same standing as the 'voracious contemporary' referred to by you. The latter paper is edited by a baboo. The editor of the *Echo* is something more than a baboo. Let *n* represent the unknown quantity 'something more.' Then Baboo + *N* = Editor of the *Echo*. Further more it is well-named the *Echo*, for it is '*vox et præterea nihil*.'" I congratulate the noble Lord on his ignoble adviser. He is indeed a counsellor worthy of a measure defended by fallacy and supported by subterfuge. But how is the operation of crushing to be performed? Will his lordship assign that duty to the "worm-crushers" as the cavalry chaffingly call our gallant British infantry? If he does, he will make a mistake; for, in the first place, we are not worms; and, in the second place, though I feel as confident as His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief that his gallant army knows its duty, and that it is

thoroughly loyal to its Sovereign, yet it is for that very reason, its loyalty to Sovereign, that I am convinced that it would be a dangerous experiment to ask the soldiers of that gallant army to assist in crushing us, whom they know to be as loyal to their and our beloved Queen as themselves, simply because we are defending a scared right handed down to us by their and our common ancestors. If, however, the worst were to happen, I for one would ten thousand times rather be shot by a soldier of that gallant army than be hanged by a Bengali baboo. I think therefore we may answer the "crushing" threat as Petruchio answered Gremio,—“Tush! tush! fear boys with bugs.”

The *Pioneer* has the questionable honour of having been the first to begin the crushing work. He commenced with the ladies. O brave *Pioneer*! by whom is he inspired? Is he in telephonic communication with Olympus? and has he heard a whisper from cloud compelling Zeus? or has he received a message from the brothers, the mysterious Hoo-Haw-Hums of the Theosophists through a clock-shade? Is that why he says he does not think it meet for the ladies to petition Her Majesty against the Bill? Herein he differs from Mr. Gibbs. That wise councillor said “No one respects more than I do the right of any person, or class of persons, to bring forward their grievances and demand redress.” That is all the ladies have done, and surely they are a class of persons, and a very superior class too. Such being the case, the *Pioneer* would have acted better if he had imitated Mr. Gibbs in respecting their rights. The only answer any lady need give to the impertinent and uncalled for statement of the *Pioneer* is the following quotation from the answer given by Constance to Salisbury in King John,—

“It cannot be; thou dost but say, 'tis so;
I trust I may not trust thee: for thy word
Is but the vain breath of a common man:
Believe me, I do not believe thee, man.”

BRITANNICUS.

April 20, 1883.

HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—History repeats itself. Let us see whether it is repeating itself in India at the present time, and if it is, let us reflect whether the events which are now taking place render it probable that it will continue to repeat itself. For this purpose let us compare India of the present day with Ireland under James II, as described by Macaulay.

The British Colonists in Ireland were vastly inferior in numbers to the Irish natives; but, Macaulay says. "The great preponderance of numbers on one side was more than compensated by a great superiority of intelligence, vigour and organization on the other. The English seem to have been in knowledge, energy and perseverance, rather above than below the average level of the population of the mother country." James was a Roman Catholic King. "Unhappily James, instead of becoming a mediator" between the hostile races of British colonists and Irish natives, "became the fiercest of partisans. Instead of allaying the animosity of the two populations, he inflamed it to a height before unknown. He determined to reverse their relative position, and to put the Protestant Colonists under the feet of the Popish Celts." If in this passage we substitute Lord Ripon for James, Viceroy for King, Indian for Irish, British for Protestant, and natives of India for Popish Celts, the passage becomes a true description of Indian affairs at the present time.

So far history has repeated itself. What is in the future? As I do not pretend to be a prophet I shall merely narrate what Macaulay says did occur in Ireland. Having acknowledged my authority I shall not use inverted commas; but I shall quote Macaulay's words with the necessary verbal substitutions. The passages I am about to quote narrate events which occurred at different times, those which are adverse to the British having occurred whilst Tyrconnel was in power. I use them, however, to depict two possible futures of the British in India.

First, if we are supported in our opposition to Lord Ripon's suicidal policy by the mother country, and Lord Ripon is supported by the educated natives, the following events will happen, if history continues to repeat itself, and they will be thus narrated by a future historian:—The event was such as might have been foreseen. The colonists turned to bay with the stubborn hardihood of their race. The mother country justly regarded their cause as her own. Then came a desperate struggle for a tremendous stake. Everything dear to nations was wagered on both sides. The contest was terrible and short. The Hindu being the weaker went down. The effect of Lord Ripon's insane attempt to subjugate the British by means of educated natives was that the latter became hewers of wood and drawers of water to the former.

If, however, the mother country supports Lord Ripon, and the obnoxious Bill is passed, a future historian will, if history repeats itself, narrate the events which will happen as follows:—Panic spread fast among the British when they found that the Viceroy, their fellow-countryman, was unwilling to extend to them the protection which

they had expected from him. They began to know by bitter experience what it is to be a subject race. Even they who had supported the Bill were not free from persecution. They, in common with those who had opposed it, were harassed by the natives with false accusations, and the evidence of the most infamous of mankind was ready to substantiate every charge. Landowners hastened to sell their estates for whatever could be got, and to remit the purchase money to England. Traders began to call in their debts and to make preparations for retiring from business. The alarm soon affected the revenue. Lord Ripon appears not to have recollected that there had once been a plot to ruin the fame of a fellow-countrywoman, and that in that plot a Bengali Babu had borne a chief part. This is not exactly one of the injuries which high-spirited men most readily pardon. But in the wicked court where the Guptas had long been pushing their fortunes such injuries were easily forgiven and forgotten, not from magnanimity or Christian charity, but from mere baseness and want of moral sensibility. Fifteen hundred British families emigrated in a few days. The panic was not unreasonable. The work of putting the British colonists, their wives and daughters, mothers and sisters down under the feet of the natives went rapidly on. Those who had lately been the lords of the peninsula now cried out, in the bitterness of their souls, that they had become a prey and a laughing stock to their own serfs and menials; that houses were burnt and cattle stolen with impunity; that their wives and daughters were arrested and imprisoned on false charges; that to appeal to the law was vain; that native Magistrates, Judges, Juries, and witnesses were all in a league to save native criminals.

Which way will history repeat itself in our case? That is a momentous question. Can we do nothing to avert the latter fate? Will our mother country help us to avert it? If not, are we prepared to sit down quietly and endure it? That is another momentous question? At the present crisis momentous questions seem to start up all around us. The State appears to be in danger. Is it not, then, the duty of every Briton and Eurasian able to bear arms to enrol himself in some Volunteer Corps with the loyal intent of defending the State? That is a third momentous question. I hope my countrymen will solve these momentous questions wisely.

BRITANNICUS.

April 20, 1883.

THE DESPATCH TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—Your correspondent, in his "Notes from London," says of the Criminal Amendment Bill: "Openly, I believe, your Government professes that this is a trifling item of adjustment; just the utilising of one or two judicial officers. But I have reason to believe that, in the despatch sent home, the extension of jurisdiction is dealt with as a tentative measure, which, if successful, may go much further. A time is even seriously contemplated when, partly as a measure of economy, partly as a Liberal step, Indian officials, Judges and Magistrates particularly, will be mostly Hindus and Muhammadans. As soon as the Bill becomes law it will form a part of a scheme of policy for India which it will be useless to oppose."

The above quotation fully bears out what I said in my letter of the 19th instant headed "Crushers," namely, that from Mr. Ilbert's Statement of Objects and Reasons "we understood that, however limited may be the number of natives to whom it is proposed by the present Bill to give criminal jurisdiction over us, the Bill had been prepared with the object of removing from the Code at once and completely every judicial disqualification based on race distinctions, so that it would be easy afterwards by another short Bill to extend the criminal jurisdiction to native Magistrates of every grade."

Lord Ripon, in his speech on the 9th ultimo, said that the despatch, referred to by your correspondent, was sent to the Secretary of State, Lord Hartington, in September last. I do not find a copy of that despatch in the Report of Official Proceedings published by you. I therefore conclude that no such copy has been furnished to the Indian Press. Lord Ripon said in his speech, "I observe that the opponents of this Bill speak of appealing to the House of Commons. I am the last man in the world to object to such a course being taken." The despatch above referred to is a most important document in such an appeal. I therefore suggest that the Defence Association should respectfully request H. E. the Viceroy to supply them and the Press of India with a copy of that despatch. There are two reasons, which, I submit, are unanswerable, why a copy of that despatch ought to be granted to us. First, because it forms a part of the action of Government against which we propose to appeal, and a copy of the document is therefore necessary in order to make our appeal to Parliament complete. Second, because it will put us in full possession of the policy which the Government of India proposed to the Secretary of State as the correct policy to be pursued towards us, a piece

of information to which we are clearly entitled, as it nearly concerns us, and which it will be unfair to withhold from us, inasmuch as, in that case, the document will be used against us in the appeal without our having had any opportunity of answering the statements and arguments contained in it. I therefore submit that the Government of India cannot, with any show of justice, refuse us a copy of a document so important to us in every sense of the word, and that if it does so, it will indelibly stamp itself with the stain of unfair dealing.

Whether your correspondent is right or wrong in his belief regarding the contents of that despatch one thing is certain, namely, that the only essential part of the Bill, its substantive principle in fact, is the immediate and complete removal from the Code of Criminal Procedure of every judicial disqualification based on race distinctions. The restrictive clause defining the persons to whom it is at present intended to give criminal jurisdiction over British men and women, is a mere adjunct. If the Bill is passed, the propriety of giving native Magistrates, without restriction, criminal jurisdiction over us will be affirmed, for that is the substantive principle of the Bill. That, indeed, is admitted by H. E. the Commander-in-Chief, the only supporter of the Bill who gives anything like an honest description of it. He says:—"Though the principle involved is, no doubt, a large one and of considerable importance, yet it must be patent to any one that its practical application must for a considerable time be small. I looked upon the change as a very tentative measure," &c. He has evidently been misled into believing that "its practical application must for a considerable time be small." The period of its smallness will depend entirely upon the idiosyncrasies of the people in power, and it will come to an end as soon as they decide that "the time has come" for its practical application to be increased. Here let me remark that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief's description of the Bill lends colour to your correspondent's belief as to the contents of the despatch, whilst the description given by the other supporters tallies with what he says our Government openly professes.

At any time after the Bill is passed it will be open to any anomaly-monger to propose a short Bill to abolish the anomaly of one class of native Magistrates having power to try European British subjects, and another not, and, the disqualification based on the race distinctions having been abolished, it will be open to him to use the Gupta argument, namely, that a slur is cast upon the native Magistrates of every grade from whom jurisdiction over European British subjects is withheld. He could also use Mr. Gibbs' "inconvenience argument" with

great force and say, should an offence be committed by a European British subject at a place where there was a resident native Deputy or Sub-Deputy Magistrate, if the latter could not try him, the accused would have to be sent to the District Magistrate at the Suddar Station, thirty or forty miles off, a "troublesome journey," as Mr. Gibbs says, "at any time, but, for some months of the year, one generally dangerous to the health of all parties, Europeans especially."

Let us then respectfully request H. E. the Viceroy to grant us a copy of the despatch sent by the Government of India to the Secretary of State, Lord Hartington, in September last.

BRITANNICUS.

April 30, 1883.

H. E. THE COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF'S COMPROMISE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—I am informed that my letter of the 4th ultimo caused some disquiet in the mind of H. E. the Commander-in-Chief, but that some one has reassured him by telling him, that a High Court must, on his simple application, transfer any charge made against one of his soldiers from the Court of the native District Magistrate, within whose jurisdiction the offence is alleged to have been committed, to that of a Cantonment Magistrate. If my information is correct, His Excellency has been again deceived, for there is no "must" in the matter, and if there were, it would not apply to the wives and daughters of his gallant soldiers. It is true that a High Court has the power of transferring a case from the Court of one Magistrate to that of another with competent jurisdiction, but it never exercises that power unless good cause be shown. On what grounds then will His Excellency make the application. On the ground that the Commander-in-Chief wishes it? High Courts are usually too impartial to be respectors of persons, and will pay as little attention to the wishes of a Commander-in-Chief as to those of a Mr. Dash, when no good cause is shown. Will the application be made on the ground that the District Magistrate is a native? That is untenable, because the Bill abolishes all judicial disqualifications based merely on race distinctions. Moreover, as Mr. Ilbert informs us in his Statement of Objects and Reasons it would be anomalous that a native Magistrate, held competent to try a British Commissioner, should not be deemed competent to try a private soldier, or even a Commander-in-Chief. Will the application be made on the ground that it is feared that the native Magistrate will not effectually and impartially administer justice in the case? That is also untenable,

because, as Mr. Ilbert said in his speech on the 2nd February last, it was simply to secure the effectual and impartial administration of justice that it was proposed to give native Magistrates criminal jurisdiction over European British subjects. Will the application be made on the ground that the case is exceptionally troublesome and difficult? That is also untenable, because, as Mr. Ilbert said in his speech above referred to, it was for that very reason that criminal jurisdiction over European British subjects is restricted by the Bill to the class of native Magistrates of whom the native District Magistrate is one. Will the application be made on the ground that it is feared that the native District Magistrate will not use his powers with proper discretion? That is likewise untenable, because, as Mr. Ilbert stated in his said speech, native Magistrates will not be empowered to try European British subjects until they have convinced the superior authorities that they will be likely to use that power with proper discretion. Upon what ground then will His Excellency apply? Upon none, as far as I can see, which will not be a good argument against the passing of the Bill.

Granting, however, for the sake of argument that High Courts, as at present constituted, will be complaisant enough to grant His Excellency's application without any cause being shown, will the High Courts of the future, when Lord Ripon's programme is fully carried out and there are none but natives on the Benches of those Courts, be equally complaisant? I know not. I rather incline to the opinion that, if any Commander-in-Chief makes such an application to a High Court so constituted, he will be most severely rebuked for so grossly insulting the native Magistrate. In addition to that, the native Magistrate will most probably sue him in the same High Court for the libel, and will obtain a decree for heavy damages and costs. I think then that the sooner His Excellency awakes from the delightful dream caused by the opiate administered by his soothing adviser, the better, for when he is awake, he will find that the Cantonment Magistrate dodge will not answer under any circumstances.

But, even if the Cantonment Magistrate trick were sufficient to protect his gallant soldiers from the indignity of being tried by a native Magistrate, it will not protect their wives and daughters from that indignity. Is it possible that His Excellency has abandoned them to the tender mercies of native Magistrates? I repeat that I feel as confident as His Excellency that the gallant army under his command knows its duty, and is thoroughly loyal to its Sovereign, but I cannot too strongly deprecate the attempt to put its loyalty to the Government of India to so severe a test as that to which it will be put if the wives

and daughters of its officers and soldiers are subjected to the criminal jurisdiction of a native Magistrate. The attempt indeed is both cruel and wicked, for we all know what dangerous feelings are caused in the minds of Britons, be they soldiers or civilians, when any indignity is offered to the female members of their families. Is it fair then wantonly to arouse such feelings in the minds of men with arms in their hands, whose profession it is to use them? Will the insult offered to their wives and daughters by subjecting them to the criminal jurisdiction of native Magistrates be likely to increase their loyalty to the Government of India? Will it increase the morale or discipline of the army? And when the news of that insult is widely spread over the United Kingdom by the time-expired men, who are shortly going home in large numbers, because they will not stay to be subjected to the criminal jurisdiction of native Magistrates, will the difficulty at present experienced, of obtaining recruits for regiments which must come to India in their turn, be decreased by that news? Certainly not. Let me then exhort His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief to oppose this obnoxious Bill with all his might, for it is fraught with far more danger, in every sense of the word, than he seems to be aware of.

Again I reiterate that I am as confident as His Excellency that the gallant British army under his command knows its duty and is thoroughly loyal to its Sovereign. But has His Excellency so mean an opinion of the spirit of the officers and soldiers who compose it as to think that they will act the cowardly part of abandoning their wives and daughters to the indignity of being subjected to the criminal jurisdiction of native Magistrates, whilst sheltering themselves from that indignity behind the ægis of Cantonment Magistrates? Why even the ladies have refused an exemption not accorded to their husbands! Does His Excellency think his soldiers less courageous than women? If they were so they would be an anomaly indeed, for they would at the same time be both worthless and expensive, and they would afford Lord Ripon a splendid opportunity of abolishing an anomaly by abolishing them. If His Excellency has not so mean an opinion of his army, why does he insult it by listening to those who suggest means of protecting his soldiers from indignity, from the operation of which means their wives and daughters are excluded? This native-worship must be a most dangerous thing, if it has so dulled His Excellency's chivalrous feelings that he cannot perceive that his acceptance of such a compromise is the greatest insult he can offer to the gallant and loyal British army under his command.

BRITANNICUS.

May 4, 1883.

NATIVE CALUMNY.

—
TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—It is not usual to take any notice of attacks made upon us by native papers, for, though those attacks are full of spite and venom, they are generally so puerile as to be beneath contempt. But the *Ananda Bazar Patrika*, in the extract given by you in your issue of the 2nd instant, has brought a distinct charge of corruption, of the very worst description, against all the British members of the Covenanted and Uncovenanted Services in India, empowered to try European British subjects in criminal cases. This attack, being general, is made upon the British members of the Covenanted and Uncovenanted Services, not of Bengal only, but also of every Regulation and non-Regulation Province in India, and embraces not only those who are at present exercising judicial and magisterial powers, but also those who, after having exercised them, have either passed into the higher grades of the service, or have gone home. It therefore includes the immaculate Sir Ashley Eden, as well as Sir George Campbell, Sir Stewart Bayley and Messrs. Gibbs, Hope, Reynolds and Quinton, all of whom at some period of their career, have sat as Judges or Magistrates with criminal jurisdiction over European British subjects. Are those gentlemen prepared to sit down quietly under so grave a charge? Will they allow themselves to be stigmatised with impunity as libertines of the vilest type, not libertines carried away by their passions, but cold calculating villains, who, for a bribe of the vilest description, have perpetrated the grossest injustice towards the natives of India? And, if they are willing to do so, will Lord Ripon permit it? Will he allow such a charge to be made with impunity, a charge which stigmatises his colleagues in the Government of India as villains of the vilest type? In considering this matter His Lordship must remember that, although we in India know how false such charges are, they will go home, where there is a class of newspapers so un-English as to accept them as true, and to laud the foul slanderer for his false and libellous attacks upon His Lordship's fellow-countrymen, as they have already done in the case of another of the same tribe of foul-mouthed slanderers.

After this will Lord Ripon, by persisting in closing the mouths of the British members of the Covenanted and Uncovenanted Services, compel them to be silent when so foully assailed? Or will he permit, not a selected few, as has been done in Madras, chosen because they are known to agree with him in opinion, but all the members of those services, without exception, publicly to speak their minds, not upon this subject only, but also upon the whole question, including the Bill,

the agitation of which has caused abuse of the vilest kind to be heaped upon them and their non-official fellow-countrymen by writers in native newspapers whose venom is equalled only by their untruthfulness? If this permission be given, it must, to be of any use, be given at once, so that the refutation may be read at home at the same time as the slander. It is most urgently necessary that His Lordship should give this permission, for, if he does not, the words of Mr. Ilbert, endorsed by him, will seem to confirm the foul slanders above alluded to; since, if there were any truth in them, Mr. Ilbert would have been fully justified in saying, "it has become abundantly clear that the existing law cannot be maintained," and therefore it must be altered with the object of obtaining the "effectual and impartial administration of justice" by transferring to native Magistrates and Judges the power to try European British subjects, which, as has been pointed out by the *Anunda Bazar Patrika*, British Magistrates and Judges have so grossly abused.

The charge of placing native troops in front and keeping well out of danger themselves, is clearly levelled at H. E. the Commander-in-Chief, Sir Frederick Roberts, and Lord Wolseley, the only generals commanding armies in the late Afghan and Egyptian campaigns. Since they are supporters of the Bill, which the native Editor advocates, they must be friends of his, and, as I have a great objection to interfere between friends, I shall leave them to exculpate themselves, as best they may, from the charge brought against them by the native Editor.

BRITANNICUS.

May 5, 1883.

A PENNY-A-LINER'S VERACITY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—The school-master is abroad. This time he is that veracious penny-a-liner euphemistically styled the *Times of India's* Calcutta correspondent. His motto seems to be similar to the advice given by Sam Slick, to his son, "Write lines, truly if you can, but write lines, for at a penny a line the more lines he writes the more grist is brought to his mill. His truthfulness is equalled only by the *Bengalee*, the *Anunda Bazar Patrika*, and the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*. I congratulate the *Times of India* on its veracious Calcutta penny-a-liner. Here is a specimen of his veracity, "When his energy" (that of "Britannicus") "flagged but for a moment, the wife of 'Britannicus' swoops upon the pen, as it drops from his nerveless fingers, and airs his views, until her lord

and master, like a giant refreshed, once more possesses himself of it, and dashes off two columns more." As my wife has written only one letter, namely, that in which she courteously declined the compromise offered to British women through the *Statesman*, and as that short letter appeared in the same issue as one of my letters, and as my letters do not fill two columns I leave you and your other correspondents, at whom he also spits his venom, to apply to him the *vera vocabula rerum* his statements deserve. As he places me in the same category with you as to the doubtfulness of my grammar, I am quite willing to remain for ever in such good company, though I doubt his ability to be a judge in the matter. The object of his letter is plain. He wishes to curry favour with the Parsees and Borahs, who, at a meeting lately held in Bombay, smothered, for a time, their bitter hatred of each other, in order to join in making long-winded speeches, without point, in support of the Bill to subject the, to them, still more hateful Briton to the criminal jurisdiction of native Magistrates. Blame from such a creature is praise indeed. I therefore say to him in the words of *Punch*,

"I care not for your blame, rusty Christopher,

"Tis your praise fills me with shame, crusty Christopher."

If the *Times of India* acts rightly it will republish from your columns this refutation of the incorrect statements of its Calcutta correspondent.

BRITANNICUS.

May 9, 1883.

SIR ASHLEY EDEN'S LETTER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—With reference to the departure to the Hills of the Lieutenant-Governors of the North-West Provinces and the Punjab, you quote in your issue of the 4th instant as follows, "*Ultima caelestium terras Astræa reliquit*," but you omit to add in the words of Juvenal, "*Ad supuros Astræa recessit, Hæc Pudicitia comite*." Your reason for omitting to do so, I suppose, is that purity (*Pudicitia*) cannot accompany those who are unable to see the impurity of a Bill whereby their pure sisters are subjected to the criminal jurisdiction of native Magistratres, whose ideas of women are impurity itself.

My attention has been specially directed to the purity, or otherwise, of the authors and supporters of the obnoxious Bill by the following passage in Lord Lytton's speech in the House of Lords on the 9th ultimo. After saying he had "reason to believe" certain things with reference to the letter from Sir Ashley Eden of which the supporters of

Bill have made so much, he, in connection with that passage, says, "But I believe, in the first place, that his action, so far from being gratuitous, was the result of communications previously made to him on behalf of the Government itself, and, in the next place, that he had the best reasons for believing Lord Ripon to be fully aware of the extreme delicacy of interference with the privilege of Europeans in India." Now, since it is repugnant to reason to imagine that Lord Lytton would have said he had "reason to believe" these things, unless he had been assured of their truth by Sir Ashley Eden himself, what are we to think of the purity of the following statements put forth by the Government of India?

Mr. Ilbert, who, not being a member of the Government when Sir Ashley Eden's letter came, merely spoke upon information he had received from another member, says, "It" (the Bill) "originated with a proposal for legislation which was made by the Government of Bengal to the Government of India in the month of March 1882." If Lord Lytton's "reason to believe" is founded upon information received from Sir Ashley Eden, the person who instructed Mr. Ilbert to make that statement deliberately instructed him to state that which he (the instructor) knew to be incorrect. For, leaving Maharajah Jotindro Mohun Tagore's action out of the question, the fact is, that the Bill originated with a suggestion from the Government of India to Sir Ashley Eden to write a letter recommending the adoption of such a measure.

Sir Stuart Bayley follows in Mr. Ilbert's wake with the following statement. "Those who read the papers of the case must be aware that the Bill had its origin in a suggestion made in March last by the Government of Bengal, when Sir Ashley Eden was at the head of that Local Government." If that be so, then either the communications previously made to Sir Ashley Eden on behalf of the Government of India were verbal, and were kept secret from Sir Stuart Bayley, or if they were in writing, they are not with the papers of the case.

Mr. Gibbs says: "The fact is the measure came from Sir Ashley Eden, was couched in the usual terms, and was taken as the opinion of the Government of Bengal." The caution observed in the preparation of this statement is very remarkable. "The measure came from Sir Ashley Eden." He does not say from the Government of Bengal. This is strictly true, as far as it goes, but if Lord Lytton's "reason to believe" is as well founded as it must be, the statement ought to have been, "the measure came from Sir Ashley Eden at the request of the Government of India," and since it does not contain the words in italics, it is a *suppressio veri*. This cautious statement goes on to

say, "and was taken as the opinion of the Government of Bengal." Now a thing is taken as another when it is not that other. They then, who took Sir Ashley Eden's opinion as the opinion of the Government of Bengal, knew that it was not the opinion of the Government of Bengal. Subsequent events have shown us why a measure which Mr. Gibbs, cautiously keeping within the truth, though not within the whole truth, tells us, "came from Sir Ashley Eden," "was taken as the opinion of the Government of Bengal." The reason is that that Government was known to be adverse to the measure.

Lord Ripon says, "We received a letter from Sir Ashley Eden," &c, but His Lordship fails to add that that letter was "the result of communications previously made to Sir Ashley Eden on behalf of the Government" (of India) "itself," as Lord Lytton stated, evidently upon the authority of Sir Ashley Eden himself. Can it be that those communications were made to Sir Ashley Eden on behalf of the Government of India without Lord Ripon's knowledge, and that he has never been informed of the fact of such communications having been made? That indeed is the only solution of what would otherwise be a *suppression veri* in Lord Ripon's statement. If that be the case, who is the guilty person who made those communications without His Lordship's knowledge, and concealed the fact of his having made them from His Lordship? Whoever he is, his name ought to be made public, and he ought to be severed from all connection with the Government of India. Until this be done we cannot be expected to believe in the purity of the principles of that Government.

Lord Ripon also says. "There was not one word in Mr. Cockerell's letter from which I have quoted, which indicated any probability that a proposal of that kind would be received, I will not say with resentment, but even with disapproval by any portion of the community," and "Sir Ashley Eden did not accompany that letter by any other communications." Those statements clearly imply that he (Lord Ripon) was not aware that the proposal would be received with disapproval by the British community in India, and that Sir Ashley Eden did not enlighten him upon the subject. Lord Lytton, in his speech in the House of Lords, said, evidently upon the authority of Sir Ashley Eden himself, "I have reason to believe that that able and experienced officer" (Sir Ashley Eden) "has felt considerable surprise at the imputation apparently cast upon him of having gratuitously thrust upon the Government of India unavoidable obligations in regard to this measure without warning them of its probable unpopularity," and "he" (Sir Ashley Eden) "had the best reasons for believing Lord Ripon to be fully aware of the extreme delicacy of interference with

the privileges of Europeans in India." Sir Ashley Eden's statement is utterly irreconcilable with the spirit of Lord Ripon's. Under these circumstances we have a right to ask Lord Ripon to enlighten us upon the matter on which he has been flatly contradicted by Sir Ashley Eden.

In conclusion allow me to say to the Government of India in the words of Cicero, "*Quid? qui omnia recta et honesta negligunt, dummodo potentiam consequantur, nonne idem faciunt, quod is, qui etiam socerum habere voluit cum, cujus ipsi audacia potens esset? Utile ei videbatur plurimum posse alterius invidia: id quod inustum in patriam quam inutile et quod turpe esset, non videbat.*"

BRITANNICUS.

May 8, 1888.

THE BILL TRIED BY THE TEST.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—Mr. Ilbert, in his speech delivered on the 2nd February last in support of his motion for leave to introduce 'the obnoxious Bill,' stated as follows:—"These, then, are our proposals. I repeat that in making them the only object which we have in view is to provide for the impartial and effectual administration of justice. It is by that test that we desire our proposals to be tried." There is no mention of anomaly or administrative inconvenience in that challenge. The test which the Government of India, through Mr. Ilbert challenges us to apply to the Bill is this: Does it or does it not provide for the impartial and effectual administration of justice? You have already pointed out that justice is at present impartially and effectually administered, so that the proposed legislation is unnecessary. I propose to show, that, if the Bill be tried by the test offered by Government, it will be found that instead of providing for the impartial and effectual administration of justice, it actually provides for justice being less impartially and effectually administered than it is at present, so that the proposed legislation is injurious.

Mr. Halliday, whose testimony is entitled to great weight, when asked by the Committee of the House of Commons, "Is the impression upon the minds of the natives of India generally, that the law as it is is impartially and honestly administered by the authorities who administer it?" replied, "Speaking of the native Courts, that is to say of the Courts presided over by natives, without desiring to attribute to them faults, I must say that at present, owing to the long experience of natives of the corruptibility of their own countrymen, and their great want of confidence in them as compared with the confidence

they have acquired in the Europeans, there is not generally in the minds of the natives such a complete reliance upon the impartiality and incorruptibility of the Courts under native Judges as could be wished."

The Committee of the House of Commons also put the following question to Mr. Halliday:—"Have they (the natives) complete confidence in the administration of justice in those (the Company's) Courts by the English Judges?" and he replied, "As far as regards the integrity of the Judges their confidence is complete; they have little or no notion of the possibility of corrupting an English Judge; it scarcely ever enters into their imagination * * * in the honest and earnest desire of the English Judges to do justice impartially between man and man the natives have the highest possible confidence."

Mr. Halliday's words still remain as true as when he uttered them, for natives still prefer their civil and criminal cases to be tried by British Judges and Magistrates. At present criminal jurisdiction over European British subjects is intrusted only to European British subjects in the Covenanted and Uncovenanted Services. The Bill provides for natives sharing that power with British Covenanted Civilians and for depriving British Uncovenanted Civilians of the power of exercising that jurisdiction for the future. The Bill then substitutes those in whom long experience of their corruptibility has taught the natives not to have confidence for those in whose integrity their confidence is complete. Consequently the Bill, instead of providing for the impartial and effectual administration of justice, provides for a state of things in which justice must necessarily be less impartially and less effectually administered than it is at present. The test then by which the Government, through Mr Ilbert, said they desired their proposals to be tried, proves those proposals to be injurious instead of beneficial. Therefore the Government, if they keep their word, are bound to abandon their proposals and withdraw the Bill.

BRITANNICUS.

May 12, 1883.

THE PUBLIC MEETING OF NATIVES IN BOMBAY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISHMAN.

SIR,—On the 28th April last a public meeting was held in the Town Hall of Bombay to support the Criminal Amendment Bill. The requisition to the Sheriff to convene the meeting was signed by 86 Parsees, who, one of their own people truly says, are not natives of India, 27 Hindus, and 3 Muhammadans. The meeting was attended by Hindu,

Muhammadan and Parsee inhabitants of the city (not the Province) of Bombay. A few of them were educated men, many were only half-educated, many more were less than half-educated, and the rest could boast of no education worth the name. A very large majority had so imperfect a knowledge of English that they were unable to understand the speakers. They were brought to the meeting to laugh and applaud whenever the educated portion did so, and they performed their duty well, without knowing, or caring to know, why they laughed or applauded. In fact they acted like the gendarmes in the following French triplet;

“ Quand un gendarme rit
Tous le gendarmes rient
Dans la gendarmerie.”

If, then, we eliminate all who were unable to understand the speeches, it will be found that the meeting was really held by a few educated Hindus, Muhammadans and Parsees. It is a well known fact that the Muhammadans and Hindus, however outwardly polite they may be to each other, have no real love for one another. As for the Muhammadans and Parsees, the free fight they had with each other only a few years ago, when Sir Seymour Fitzgerald sent for artillery from Kirkee to overawe the combatants, proves how cordially they hate each other. The fact then of these bitter enemies coalescing against the British proves that, bitterly as they hate each other, they hate the British more. I may be met with the statement that the way in which all the speakers lauded the British Government proves that they do not hate the British. No one who knows the educated native and Parsee mind would use that argument. It separates the Sirkar or Government from the race of which that Sirkar is composed, and treats it as the incarnation of power, before which it abjectly bows down in the hope of obtaining something, at sometime or other, from that dispenser of pice and place. But natives and Parsees, in order to indemnify themselves for the abjectness of their submission, never lose a safe opportunity of treating with insolence and injustice the non-official members of the race to which the Sirkar belongs.

This heterogeneous mass of disjointed members, who would be at one another's throats to-morrow if the restraining hand of the British were removed, pretended with the characteristic arrogance and inaccuracy of the educated, native and Parsee, to be the representatives of the 250 million native inhabitants of India, without even the shadow of an authority from those millions to represent them—“ Now,” in the words of the Parsee Barrister^o Pherozesha Mehta, “ of all the cool and astonishing things which have been said ” (by the Ripon party) “ in the