

In the case of the riots an appeal had been taken to the High Court by a certain Bengali gentleman of rank, regarding the ownership of a certain piece of land on which stood a Mohammedan place of prayer. The High Court, on reviewing the evidence, sustained the appeal and ordered the premises to be vacated by the Mohammedans. When they refused to do this, the Government officer proceeded to remove their building. Hence the riot. Up to the present date I have seen no pretence made, even in the most disloyal papers, that the decision of the court was not in strict accord with the law, equity and the facts of the case. And because, with its usual passionless impartiality between men of rival creeds, the government insisted that the decree of the High Court should be obeyed, the Mohammedan mob of Calcutta rose. Where in all this was the "frightful oppression?"

In Poona and Bombay, as the world knows, the terrible black plague has been raging for months. As the only means known to modern science of combating the pestilence with any hope of success, the Government ordered the segregation of all that were stricken in special hospitals, either provided by government or, wherever preferred, by the members of the different castes and religions, each for themselves. But the people generally would not let cases be known, and constantly secreted the sick in close and poisonous quarters, thereby intensifying the infection and spreading the disease. Under these circumstances the Government ordered a compulsory house to house inspection of such infected cities, the compulsory cleaning of filthy houses, the removal and burial or burning of the corpses frequently found in them, the forcible removal of all in them found sick with the plague to the hospitals provided, where all who chose might have the best treatment known to modern science. These searches were carried out by organized parties made up of native gentlemen, British soldiers and English ladies who volunteered for the purpose. In Bombay even private soldiers were not commanded to undertake a duty so perilous to life, but government then called for volunteers from the army for this service, when more brave fellows offered themselves to face the deadly danger than were required!

But all this, instead of moving the people into gratitude, excited a fierce tempest of angry hate, of which the deepest secret doubtless was to be found in the intense caste pride and superstition of the Mahratta Brahmans, who were thus compelled to admit into the sacredness of their houses these unclean foreigners whose very shadow falling on their food is supposed to render it so unclean that it must be thrown away. Those who have been engaged in this work have been threatened with death, sometimes violently assaulted, assailed both in India and even at home, by Radical members of Parliament, with the most atrocious and unmentionable calumnies, and at last this culminated on the Queen's Jubilee day in the Poona assassinations, wherein the officer in charge of these plague operations was shot at night, by one of these same Mahratta Brahmans, as now confessed by the assassin himself.

If this fearless and utterly self sacrificing devotion of scores of government officials, brave soldiers and heroic ladies, in order to stay pestilence and save the lives of the very people who were continually threatening them with death for their labors, was "frightful oppression," then only oppression was the cause of these assassinations, and brave Mr. Rand only deserved his fate for superintending this work; but not otherwise. To attribute the Calcutta riots and the Poona assassinations to British oppression, shows an astonishing ignorance of the facts, and is the exact reverse of the truth. Both alike were the direct result, I repeat, not of the ill-doing, but of the well-doing, of the British officials.

Again, Professor Des Islets makes this astounding assertion: "that from the wretched millions of India 'England extorts every year, without any compensation, the enormous sum of \$150,000,000.' Without any compensation." How any intelligent man can say that England gives "no compensation" to the people of India for the taxes she takes, passes comprehension. In the first place, in return for these, she has given the people, from one end of India to the other, a system of government which, in so far as it is administered, not by natives, but by the members of Her Majesty's Coven-

anted Civil Service, stands to day as a model to the whole world for purity and incorruptibility, and magnificent labors for the help of the poverty-stricken millions of this over crowded country. A few years ago I was preaching in the region of Allahabad, in a large country town, and was greatly tried by a noisy, pestilent Brahman, who persisted in declaiming against the government for their "frightful oppression," telling, as an instance, how they had repressed suttee and would no more allow a pious widow to burn herself alive with her dead husband, etc., etc.; and assured me that they wanted none of the religion of a people like these English. When he stopped to take breath I asked him: "Will you be so good as to tell me then why is it that, since these English rulers are so exceedingly oppressive, you people will spend your last pice to get a lawsuit before an English judge instead of one of your own people?" The crowd shouted out the answer: "Sahib! The Englishman never takes bribes!" And that was not a friendly crowd. Is the maintenance of a government, thus regarded by its bitterest enemies among its subjects as incorruptible, no "compensation" for taxes taken from the people? Would we not be glad in the United States if we could be sure, as one can here in India, that a murderer, when once the crime is proved against him, will be hung, and that not by lynch law but by due legal process? I have lived in Allegheny and I have lived for years in different cities of North India, and I can assure Professor Des Islets that life and property are safer to-day in the cities of British India, generally, than in Allegheny and Pittsburgh. It was not so once. In the days of the Mohammedan rule of India, Tavernier wrote that a traveller in India "ought always to take with him twenty or thirty armed men." Is the present security no "compensation" for revenues taken from the people?

It is true that the salaries paid the British officials are high; but every one should be able to understand that only by such high salaries, and liberal pensions when retired, can first-class men be induced to come to a country like this with all that this involves of exile from home, of broken families and often serious risk to health. Even in contemporary history we have not a few illustrations of the fact that where good government is required, that which is in name the cheapest is not always the least expensive in fact.

Yet again, the British rulers of India having during a comparatively short period developed a system of education which has planted schools, colleges and universities in every part of the land. These are supported in large part by revenues taken from the people. Is a great educational system like this, supervised by cultivated university men from home, no "compensation" for the taxes taken from the people?

Again, out of the revenues gathered from the people the Government has constructed—to illustrate—in the northwest provinces alone, and within the life-time of the present generation, 10,173 miles of irrigation canals, which last year supplied water to 11,437 villages and watered over 2,000,000 acres. This has been in the northwest provinces alone; similar figures might be given for the Panjab and other parts of British India; and the Government is at present planning another magnificent system of irrigation for Oudh and Rohilkhand which, when carried out, will be of even greater magnitude and irrigate over two and a quarter millions acres. In addition to this most wise and far-seeing policy for the diminishing and mitigation of famine, it has been for years the established custom of government, when not prevented by extraordinary expenditures like those of this last disastrous year, to lay aside a certain proportion of the revenue for the direct relief of sufferers from famine, whenever and wherever in India it occurs.

And notwithstanding all this and much more of the same kind that might be adduced, did space permit, we are told by Professor Des Islets that the British Government in India exacts its enormous revenues "without any compensation" in order "to pay interests, pension, dividends and other expenses of the British metropolis!" and that the present famine "is due directly to British domination in India!" As every one here knows, and none better than the intelligent natives themselves, the fact is the exact reverse. The real truth is this, that except for the tens of thousands of miles of irrigation