

A. C. W.

ADDRESS
notional
TO

SIR RICHARD. TEMPLE. *Baron*
Lately Governor of Bombay.

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE PICTURE.

Bombay.

1880.

Printed at the "NATIVE OPINION" and the "INDIAN PRINTING"
presses and published at the Native Opinion Office.

BOMBAY.

1880.

PREFACE.



THE title of this collection partly suggests its scope and occasion, and but a few words are necessary to explain why it has been made and published.

The administration of Sir Richard Temple at first as a Famine Commissioner and then as Governor in this presidency has been universally felt to be so hurtful to the interests of the people and has been marked by such high-handedness and inconsiderate rigour that to think of honouring it with a memorial in recognition of its merits and beneficial results in the name of the public was adding "insult to injury." When, therefore, taking advantage of the excitement caused by His Excellency's sudden departure, a few interested admirers hastily carried through the farce of a public meeting and voted a fulsome address joined to the proposal of erecting a statue, the popular feeling of dislike grew to indignation and showed itself in a free expression of opinion. The Native Press faithfully reflected this feeling, though necessarily in reserved language. Under an astute but self-seeking politician like Sir Richard Temple, it was to be expected that a powerful section of the community like the Europeans in India would be conciliated, and certainly they as a body probably have not the same cause of complaint against Sir Richard as the Natives. Still such of their organs as have looked to the subject from a large point of view, have not failed to notice the highly injurious character of his rule and principles of conduct and policy and have spoken without the reserve which native publicists labour under. The extracts given in the following pages,

therefore, may be taken to represent correctly public opinion in India regarding the character of Sir Richard Temple as a ruler and statesman, and as he has now gone to a sphere of labour where his power of mischief is greater than in this country and his policy and views are likely to be placarded as meeting with the approval and appreciation of the Indian public, it has been thought in the interest of truth and fair-play desirable to collect the various comments on the character and administration of the late Governor of Bombay and to publish them in this shape.

These extracts criticise the subject from all points of view and upon the whole convey a very fair view of it, and no further comment or analysis is required from the compiler, except to say, that he has been unable for want of sufficient time to embody into the collection opinions of the other Anglo-Indian vernacular papers in this presidency who have as a body condemned Sir Richard's career in Bombay both as a statesman and an administrator.

ADDRESS TO SIR RICHARD TEMPLE.

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE PICTURE



IN the winter of 1873-74 the famine in Behar and Northern Bengal opened up a new field in which his powers of rapid locomotion, his utter indifference to fatigue, his skill in organization, and his knowledge of individuals pre-eminently fitted him to labour, and he will probably be longest remembered in India for his services in connection with famine relief, then and afterwards. He threw himself into this new work with all possible energy. He was given *carte blanche*—and he used it. The sensational accounts of the special correspondents, notably Mr. Forbes' letters in the *Daily News*, sent a thrill of horror through Europe, and when the Government became quite unnecessarily lavish of the public money, they found a ready distributor in the person of Sir Richard Temple. Without accepting all the statements of the civilian author of the *Black Pamphlet*, the waste that ensued was certainly uncalled for, and little short of a public scandal. But Sir Richard, who as a civilian too, has always prided himself on rigidly enforcing the orders with which he was entrusted, was not perhaps so much to blame as the Government he served. On another occasion nearer us he knew how to carry out orders of a very different nature, and this has been taken as evidence that he acknowledged the extravagance of his former policy. Perhaps a little independence as an official entrusted with such high duties would have benefitted the State far more thoroughly than the rule of tacit acquiescence he had laid down at that period of his career, and the fact that he maintained two pounds of food to be essential to the preservation of life in Bengal, and that he afterwards declared one pound to be ample in Bombay, will have to be reconciled and explained by his biographer. A show of firmness on his part would indisputably have saved the State much money in the one case, and the people much misery in the other.

* * * * *

It was, then, on the 30th April, 1877, that Sir Richard Temple formally succeeded Sir Philip Wodehouse, who left

him as a last legacy the duty of urging the construction of the Rajpootana Railway on the broad gauge system, and it is one of the few regrettable features in his administration that he was not able to agree with his predecessor on a point so vital to commercial interest of Bombay. Another point on which we, at all events, must continue to differ with him was his conduct of the famine, and as this occupied his main attention for a time, it is best perhaps to discuss it first. The following table of the daily average of labourers employed on the relief works in the Bombay Presidency during the last week of each month from November, 1876, until November, 1877, conveys as good an idea of the growth and severity of the famine as can be briefly exhibited :—

18th November 1876	97,956
Last week of November 1876	167,322
Do. December	296,586
Do. January 1877	286,849
Do. February	227,086
Do. March	252,225
Do. April	278,700
Do. May	367,307
Do. June	356,078
Do. July	266,828
Do. August	264,122
Do. September	241,314
Do. October	69,076
Week ending 10th November 1877	41,375

The total cost of relief up to the following March was £1,140,000, but owing to the sums spent in long contemplated public works the actual outlay was only £490,000. Here the Bombay Government had successfully held their own against the Government of India, who were anxious to avoid the construction of large works of great utility, such notably as the Dhond and Munmar Railway, and it is only when we come down to questions of daily rations, piece-work, and the enforced fast on Sunday that we disagree with Sir Richard Temple's policy. In Hyderabad and in Madras the one pound ration was condemned as too small, but it was nominally maintained to the last in Bombay for all ordinary forms of relief, though through the remonstrance of the public and the press it ceased to be rigidly enforced. Again the sudden enforcement of task work on the P. W. D. works, and the transference of labourers from the civil works to the P. W. D. works in June 1877, led, as we can see from the table, to the ex-

traordinary reduction of more than 100,000 persons who had previously been in enjoyment of relief, and undoubtedly resulted in great suffering and heavy mortality. It will, we suppose, be impossible now to arrive at any accurate idea of the mortality throughout all the famine districts of Bombay and Madras, but the idea still prevails in native circles that Dr. Cornish of Madras and the Madras Correspondent of the *Times* knew what they were about when they set the total mortality due to famine causes down at the enormous sum of 6,000,000 people. Some of this mortality, we think, was preventible, and we are unable to forget that Sir Richard Temple, who thought a 2 lb. ration only just sufficient in Bengal, wished to maintain the 1 lb. ration in Bombay. Some experiments approaching the 1 lb. ration were attempted in Tanna gaol, and with disastrous results; and it is important that in the conduct of future famines this experiment should not be forgotten. Again the almost absolute refusal of remission of the land revenue after the famine was over, and the even harsher collection of arrears due while the famine lasted, led to much further misery, which eventually found a vent in the Deccan dacoities.—*Times of India*, March 13.

SIR RICHARD TEMPLE has departed amidst such a shower of flowery hyperbole, such a flow of platitude, as would have fairly overwhelmed any ordinary mortal. The whole thing has, we fear, been overdone: a little more, and those of his admirers who are indiscriminately gushing, must force on a violent reaction. Some of the public orators of this city, and some of the public prints, have been carried away in such a mad whirl of enthusiasm as to make one dread they will never stop until the arrival of a new idol, in the shape of a new Governor, gives another direction to their cries of admiration. To a certain extent the remarks of the Press, flowing from columns into pages, have been tempered with some attempt at criticism and some feeling for the fitness of things. But never in Bombay, nor perhaps, indeed, anywhere else, have such sounds arisen as those that mourned Sir Richard Temple's departure, during the four and twenty hours before he left. On Friday afternoon an address was read in the Town Hall and eleven long speeches delivered in his honour, to be supplemented four hours later by a

dinner and twelve still longer speeches at the Byculla Club—enough, one would think, to have satisfied the veriest gourmand of local oratory. But early on Saturday morning the applause and the lamenting began again. At eleven the address passed the day before was presented at Malabar Point, and the fire was kept up briskly all day long. The address of the citizens was succeeded by an address, and a very sensible one too, presented by a deputation from the Chamber of Commerce; and the members of the Chamber only left the audience hall to be succeeded by the members of the Bombay 'Trades' Association. Most men leaving India for good would fain require a little leisure for their private preparations. But at five Sir Richard Temple was at Mazagon, receiving a further address on behalf of the Parsee community; and at six o'clock he shook hands with half Bombay at the Apollo Bunder before escaping into the steamer that was to bear him to England. To each of these several addresses he has made a ready and kindly reply, and the compliments exchanged on both sides fully justified the Rev. Dr. Meurin's shrewd observation that Sir Richard owed something of his greatness, as well as much of his popularity, to the knowledge of how to be all things to all men. This is perhaps the truest tribute that can be paid to that many-sidedness which every orator agreed to be his chief characteristic for all sorts and conditions of men were loyally anxious to express the sympathy awakened in them by his invariable urbanity and his attention to their individual interests. And it was, of course, no fault of his that this sympathy was expressed in unmeasured terms. He is at most answerable only for that sincerest form of flattery—imitation. Sir Richard has, according to Mr. West, "founded a school—a infant school—of administrators." It would perhaps be at least as true to say that he has founded a school—an infant school—of orators. And surely the voice of the great master can be heard in one of the speeches delivered on Friday evening—when a gentleman informed us that "to the genius of Mackintosh we owe some of the best words of the English language; to Kinloch Forbes most interesting annals of a country which has been termed the garden of Western India; and to Arnold the finest work on that interesting commercial subject—Marine Insurance. And the men of the present day (having apparently cast authorship aside as a vanity) are quite equal if not superior to these

of the past. . . . That our friends should have the benefit of trained minds like those of Sir Richard Couch, Sir Michael Westropp and Lyttleton Bayley is one of the glories of British rule." For the mode, then, of this style of personal laudation Sir Richard may perhaps be answerable, but for nothing else.

Diogenes, we imagine, would scarcely bring his lantern to bear on the genial flow of after-dinner eulogy or the farewell plaudits of official admiration. "Where are the bad people buried?" asked the child, after spelling out the epitaphs in a graveyard. Still the old saw of *de mortuis* really applies, if it should ever apply at all, quite as aptly to Governors departing in search of honours elsewhere, as to heroes who leave us for ever, and we chiefly protest against the kind of praises levelled at Sir Richard because he is a man of whom so much can be honestly said without exaggeration. As it happens, the eulogy with which he has been bespattered was injurious to others and hurtful to himself, and were he now with us he would be the first to cry for deliverance from his friends. The framers of the address only made it ridiculous when they maintained that he deserved a statue because he had assisted at the opening of the Tulsi Water Works, the Prince's Dock, and the University Tower, when he cannot in the remotest degree claim a tittle of the credit for any of the schemes. Had they said that Sir Richard was of material assistance in preserving the Tulsi Dam, at a time of great peril, or that he had forced on the amalgamation of the Foreshore Properties, and insisted on the protection of the Trade by the appointment of mercantile members, these things would have been quite as much to his honour, and within the strictest bounds of truth. Again, the credit of the Dhond and Munmar Railway, which half the speakers attributed to Sir Richard Temple, was really due to his predecessor, Sir Philip Wodehouse, who with the members of Council of that day fought the Government of India on the question of large and remunerative famine works, and by a rare show of independence came out conquerors after a severe tussle. But Sir Richard's admirers might have referred here to the Kandahar Railway where he adopted the same independent course, even out of his own Presidency, and with the same signal success. Already the important part played by His Excellency in expediting the despatch of the Malta Expedition has been exaggerated into the most insufferable in-

terference with the properly constituted authorities. To say, as has been said, that "some of the most richly deserved laurels which were ever worn by Sir Richard Temple are associated with the historic expedition of Indian troops to Malta," is to make very light of his Indian career, and to cast a slight on the Bombay army. He assisted as well as a layman who was also a governor could assist, but still he was neither the general of a division nor an officer in the transport service. The officers who had the real charge of despatching the expedition were general Burrows and Colonel Hogg, and when the former was appointed the other day to the command of a Bombay Brigade in the field, the Commander-in-Chief knew how to refer to his eminent services on that occasion. Much has been said, too, about the late Governor's services to education, more especially in connection with physical science, and Mr. Latham, smitten, to the astonishment of all who knew him, with the same infection as the others, actually declared Sir Richard to be "a second founder" of the University. Sir Richard may have had vast educational schemes in his mind, interrupted by his sudden departure, but he actually did little for higher education but make a few appointments of doubtful propriety; and as for furthering the study of physical science in Bombay he accomplished nothing at all, but the appointment of Dr. MacDonald as a Curator of a Museum that is still empty. There are other points to which we might refer, such as his nomination of native members to the Legislative Council who could either not speak English at all, and consequently had to be directed by others, or of gentlemen who as Government officials were bound to vote with Government through thick and thin. But we have already quoted enough for our present purpose, which is not to criticise Sir Richard Temple's administration—that has been done elsewhere—but to show the evil results and the utter folly of such indiscriminate laudation.

As a first result every native journal of standing in Bombay has already turned round. The public meeting which might have been made to express the honest feelings of a loyal community has been almost unanimously disowned. Even before the meeting the terms of the address seem to have transpired, and an audacious broadsheet, of a nature such as is fortunately seldom seen in India, was openly circulated among the audience, though we have been unable to trace it to its source. This hand-bill gives a dozen

(7)

ironical reasons "Why Sir Richard Temple should have a Statue." And the reasons include the one lb. ration, the collection of arrears of land revenue, the passing of the Land Revenue Cess Bill, the Salt and Abkari Acts and the Irrigation Bill, his sanction of the extravagant scheme of the Port Trust, the introduction of the Sewage System, the non-employment of natives, the legacy of the C. D. Act as a final bequest, and so forth. Taken by itself the manifesto would have had little importance except as bearing on the growth of freedom which renders such squibs possible. But now that it has been followed up by articles in the same strain in all the native papers, and by the publication in our local contemporary of a signed communication by a well-known Parsee, it is difficult to estimate the mischief that has been thoughtlessly done by those who perhaps merely wished to make themselves agreeable to a man of Sir Richard Temple's influence and position. Something of the present dissatisfaction may, for aught we know, be due to jealousy of the individual promoters of the address, but even so, the promoters were surely in fault not to have made such enquiries and taken such precautions as would have prevented the unseemly spectacle presented when we see the promoters ranged on the one side and the native public on the other, of a scheme in which all should have joined.—*Times of India, March 17.*

THE departure of our late Governor which we had to describe with somewhat of prophetic responsibility, is still the event of the day, or rather,—as Foote once remarked in a wicked jest—the day after. The morning's reflection has come with its inevitable damper to the evening's, that is last week's diversion of spasmodic enthusiasm; and many gentlemen, "desirous of publicly expressing their respectful and grateful recognition" of His Excellency's services, are uncomfortably conscious of having rather overdone their zeal. Happily they have not been put to the severe test, which we suggested might be in store for them, of going all over again with their valedictory eulogies. But it will have been noted what narrow escape they have had, seeing that the *Sumatra* did meet with an obstruction in the shape of an unoffending native craft; only, as in the case of Stephenson's "coo," the incident proved "varra bad" for the *prao*. The flood of

unqualified eulogy which filled most of the speeches at the Town Hall and Byculla Club last Friday might be described, as Mr. Disraeli did the American Civil War, as 'a marvellous exhibition of human energy,' but the elements of political intelligence and discrimination, as applied to the object of all the laudation, diffused through the whole, were present only in infinitesimal dilution. The demonstration will confirm the fame of Bombay for energy and enthusiasm; but it will detract, and that very seriously, from the reputation of our community for genuine and thoughtful public spirit, as contra-distinguished from its factitious, gregarious, and somewhat flighty counterfeit. And this reproach must, we grieve to say, attach to our daily press, wherein some decent show of moderation and discriminating criticism might be looked for. But we must not be hard on our contemporaries; they are already enduring the dyspepsia that follows surfeit. The *Times of India* took its black draught manfully at a gulp, when last Wednesday it did penance in a whole white sheet, and humbly confessed "to the evil results and the utter folly of such indiscriminate laudation." Who shall say after this that we have not a free and independent press in Bombay; only it was a little too bad of the repentant sinner to turn round on his quondam leaders and deride the fine periods of the Chief Justice, the Hon. Raymond West, and the new Advocate-General. The *Gazette* was less tractable. It made many wry faces over its black dose, which was administered, the day before, by that strenuous dry nurse Mr. Pheroazshah M. Mehta. But that journal also treated Sir Michael Westropp harshly in citing his Lordship's very hazardous prediction, repeated amongst the flow of post-prandial oratory, to wit—"Sir Richard Temple who, as I have already to-day said in the Town Hall, will never sacrifice the interests of India, where he has spent the best years of his life, to those of party or of placemen whether expectant or present." Unfortunately, most of those who have closely followed the very successful Governor's course, are entirely convinced that the failing to which he is most prone is that of ministering to, or yielding under more powerful authorities or temporary dominant influences which determine the chances of his personal promotion and success. Sir Richard is, by nature, an "opportunist;" and as this is such a generally accepted fact, of which a public man of

(9)

Sir Michael Westropp's calibre must be well aware, one cannot but suspect that, in making that point, his Lordship intended to insinuate the 'wholesome tonic of irony. But, after the *Gazette* had itself evolved a *post facto* apology for the "one pound ration" policy, perhaps our respected contemporary was not in the mood to perceive the Sir Michael's delicate sarcasm. As to the formal address passed *nem. dis.* at the Sheriff's meeting, and which, *mirabile dictu*, was moved by the editor of the same journal in his character as a private citizen, it reminds one of a Queen's Speech, for its literary poverty, its platitudes, and vague generalisations. There was fair scope for presenting an address to the retiring Governor; but we suppose violent haste and the heated sensorium of the inditer must be the excuse for its not being a document worthy of the occasion. Perhaps, however, some critics will say it was remarkably fitting as an expression of the overstrained excitement and overdone fervour of the whole movement. As we have said there was good excuse for a public address to Sir Richard; but when the Hon. Magnus Mowatt declared that "the monument which is about to be erected to him will claim equal attention with those which have been raised to Mountstuart Elphinstone and others" he gave a fatal blow to the Statue project; which, unless a very few admirers pay smartly, will remain a prediction and nothing more.

* * * * *

It is not needful that we should go into any argument to prove this; and we have already consumed too great a proportion of our own scant space in reviewing the crude and ebullient orations of last week. Our estimate of Sir Richard Temple's administrative course has been plainly enough expressed in other columns in past years, and we have not concealed in these our convictions opposed to very many of his measures during the last year or two. As a public man, we claim to know him as well as do any of the orators of last week, and very much better than most of them. They are only occasional observers; it has been our duty by him, as by all the notable Anglo-Indians of our day to follow their course and watch their tendencies continuously. We entertain as high an opinion of Sir Richard Temple's abilities, as do any of his reasonable admirers; but we perceive his fatal tendency to au-

tocracy, his invincible dislike to real freedom of discussion, his inclination to sacrifice principle to expediency, his readiness to subordinate the interests of the people to the official policy of the day, to postpone the genuine claims of India to pseudo-imperial exigencies, and, as Bishop Meurin, with perhaps unintentional frankness, remarked, his facility of "becoming all things to all men," if so (this is ours, not the Bishop's) he may thereby enhance the fame and further the personal success of Richard Temple. This being so, we cannot but regard the popular movement of last week as an unfortunate and mischievous mistake. Still, for all that, Sir Richard 'knows the right'; and it will be partly the fault of the people of India if he ever be allowed 'to pursue the wrong' with impunity.—*Bombay Review*, March 20.

EAST Worcestershire in Western India seems a curious geographical expression; but there was something very like it in Bombay on Friday and Saturday last. Sir Richard Temple was about to leave the city to contest East Worcestershire in the Conservative interest; and no doubt it was part of the purpose that he should leave Bombay in a blaze of fireworks, retiring much as certain others returned from Berlin bringing "peace with honour." To this course certain sections of the Bombay community readily lent themselves. It would seem not improbable that a good deal of this enthusiasm was inspired and arranged for. When the Viceroy enters or leaves the capital, the streets are lined with chowkeydars, about as thickly spread as the gas-lamps. Sir Richard leaves Bombay for Worcestershire with the roads lined with troops, and probably with *claqueurs* at intervals to lead the enthusiasm. It is somewhat astonishing that the people of Bombay should allow themselves to be deluded and used in this way, on behalf of a man who, professing to be an Englishman, has not the very smallest conception of the rights of Englishmen who are not in office. A more abject and servile worshipper of power does not breathe than Sir Richard Temple. A more contemptible champion of the rights of Englishmen it would be impossible to find. The right of Englishmen to meet for the redress of grievances, the right to petition Parliament, or the Queen, or the Viceroy, or any authority whatever, is not a privilege,

(11)

but the *right* of Englishmen. And yet it is but a few months ago that this wretched charlatan, who now goes to England to contest for a seat in the freest assembly in the world, positively refused to these same citizens of Bombay the use of their own Town Hall, to hold a meeting which they had a *right* to hold for a constitutional purpose, an object which they had a *right* to seek to attain. These free and enlightened citizens of Bombay were actually indebted to the courtesy of a travelling showman for a place to meet in, because the political Barnum, at the head of the city, thought it would be pleasing to "his betters," if he could stifle the voice of public opinion that desired to protest against an abuse of authority in the interests of his party at home. Surely, Bombay has not stultified itself; or is the proposition ironical merely, to erect a statue to Sir Richard in—the Town Hall! Is it a shrewd attempt to draw the citizens into a scheme for erecting a standing monument of their own servility that might be instructive to future ages? In this sense we can understand it. But we cannot conceive of a fairly free and independent constituency in England sending to Parliament a man like the ex-Governor of Bombay. There was no flourish of trumpets, no dinner, no address, no lined streets, when Sir Richard left Bengal. There might not be much to hope in the way of improvement; but the province was at least rid of an official who would not hesitate to subordinate the interests of India, and the most cherished rights of Englishmen, if, by-so doing, he could only add to the glory or advancement of Sir Richard Temple.—*Indian Daily News*. (From the *Times of India*, 18th March 1880.)

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "BOMBAY GAZETTE."

SIR,—I think it is necessary to enter a strong protest against the bold attempt that has been made to represent the address voted to Sir Richard Temple as having emanated from "the citizens of Bombay" instead of simply from his admirers. The requisition to the Sheriff only asked him to call a meeting of "the European and native inhabitants of Bombay *desirous of publicly expressing their respectful and grateful recognition of the administration*" of Sir Richard Temple; the address passed at the meeting called in compliance with this requisition, presumes to speak gene-

rally in the name of the citizens of Bombay. If the intention of the promoters of the meeting was really to convene a Public meeting of the inhabitants of Bombay, it was their duty to have taken care, as it certainly would have been most easy, to express themselves without ambiguity. I venture to say that if any such intention had been openly expressed the proposal to erect a statue to Sir Richard Temple would have encountered very strong opposition. I knew that many gentlemen attended the meeting with that object, who were dissuaded from expressing their views, by the representation that the meeting was meant to be only of those who concurred in their common admiration of Sir Richard Temple's services. It would be hardly worth while to expose the true character of the address voted to Sir Richard Temple, if it would have gone the way of most farewell addresses to departing governors and were destined to be interred in the calm oblivion in which they generally retire after leaving India. But those who know anything of electioneering tactics in England on the eve of a general election, know well that this address, in the name of the public citizens of Bombay, will figure prominently in every Conservative paper in East Worcestershire and will be placarded in large type throughout its length and breadth. The electors of East Worcestershire need never know that it proceeded only from the admirers of their candidate, such as a man in his position could always command in India, and that it is only by clever manipulation that it is transformed into a public address. If there was any reason to suppose that this manipulation was consciously performed, the first city in India would be fairly entitled to claim the credit of having initiated, for the first time in the history of British rule, an active participation in the warfare of an English general election by successfully carrying out a device such as would gladden the heart of the sharpest electioneering agent in England. Under its shelter, Sir Richard Temple can now pose before the East Worcestershire electors as a candidate, whose Conservative opinions on the many important questions of Indian policy on which the two parties have now joined issue, are stamped with the approval of the unanimous public opinion of the foremost Presidency in India, and cover with confusion the pretensions of the Liberal candidates to speak and fight on behalf of its voiceless populations. I am afraid

that a very large majority of the native gentlemen who attended the meeting to give vent to their admiration of Sir Richard Temple's great services never contemplated the prospect of their admiration being turned to such good account. Otherwise, with all their lack of public spirit and independence, I do firmly believe that they would have hesitated before placing in the hands of a candidate who has now openly pledged himself to support an Indian policy against which they have so often pronounced themselves—a weapon which he can use with such pernicious effect against those great statesmen who have been fighting their battle so nobly and so valiantly in and out of Parliament,—such men as Bright, Gladstone, and Fawcett, whose names are cherished with affection and veneration by all thinking and intelligent natives. God knows we do little enough, or rather absolutely nothing, in the way of active co-operation with the efforts of these great defenders of Indian interests. But nothing could exceed our humiliation if we lent ourselves in utter ignorance, in apathetic indifference, in blind adulation, to thwart their generous exertions on our behalf. That such a stigma should not attach against us, it is desirable to proclaim widely and loudly that the address to Sir Richard Temple does not represent the unanimous or independent public opinion of this Presidency. I am in a position to know that a large proportion of the native public holds very different views of the title of Sir Richard temple to a statue, and I trust that they will come forward in such ways as may be open to them to give expression to their views, so that, though it is a far cry to East Worcestershire, some echo may even penetrate these distant lands.

That the meeting which voted the address was not a very representative or spontaneous or crowded gathering, it will not be very easy to dispute. A departing Governor, leaving with the prospect of high promotion, can always gather round him men who have reason to be grateful to him, or who are connected with him by personal or official ties, and men who will follow because others have gone before them. Leaving these alone, the meeting was singularly thinly attended. The Mahomedan community, in spite of the sop thrown out to them only the day before, was represented by certainly not more than three or four members, while the gentleman whom we have generally seen leading them with spirit and independence was conspicuous by his absence. The Hindu community was not much better repre-

sented, and it is worthy of note that the only one of them who took part in the day's proceedings was a gentleman unknown to fame in that way. The Parses were certainly in stronger numbers; but they openly avow that they are grateful to Sir Richard for the sweet words he has showered upon them. Even their numbers, however, were eked out by some very demerutive specimens of Bombay citizens, and it would not be without interest to ascertain if any of the Parsee Schools had not a half holiday on the day of the meeting.

But the numbers that attended the meeting would not be very material, if the title of Sir Richard Temple to the grateful recognition of the people over whom he ruled, stood on a solid foundation. That he possesses many high and estimable personal qualities, nobody, I think, will be disposed to deny. That he possesses administrative talents of no mean order will be readily admitted by all. His untiring energy, his single hearted devotion to work, physical and mental, his astonishing versatility, his amiable private character, are worthy of all respect. But unless we can find that these qualities and talents were devoted to noble and statesman-like claims and were productive of good and useful work, we cannot recognize his right to rank with those great statesmen, whose names are landmarks of Indian progress, and whose memories are gratefully perpetuated in marble and bronze. Do we then find any great act of statesmanship distinguishing Sir Richard Temple's administration of this Presidency? No better man could have been found than Sir Michael Westropp who presided at the meeting, to lay his finger with unerring precision on any such act, if there was one. One might almost imagine that the Chief Justice was quietly indulging in that keen and polished irony for which he is so famous, when he singled out Sir Richard's exertions to push on the native contingent to Malta, and his two expeditions to hurry on the construction of the Kaudahar line as giving him high rank among the foremost Indian statesmen, and deserving to be commemorated by the erection of a statue. The Hon'ble Mr. Mowat who has been earning for himself the reputation of an orator, and who moved the principal resolution, had absolutely nothing to say. It was painful to observe the way in which he floundered among rhetorical platitudes, and at length took refuge in discreet brevity and poetry. Mr. Latham spoke of Sir Richard's services

(15)

to the cause of University education, but I am sure nobody would be so ready as himself to acknowledge on reflection that he was carried away by the impulse of the moment when he eulogized Sir Richard Temple as a second founder of the University. That Sir Richard Temple took great interest in the advancement of scientific education must be warmly recognised ; but it must not be forgotten that he set about it in a way that was fraught with danger to the independent growth and development of the University. In a public lecture, which years ago Sir Alex. Grant delivered in Oxford, he earnestly warned Sir Bartle Frere never to confound the Chancellor with the Governor. Sir Richard Temple never forgot that he was Governor when he presided as Chancellor. While grateful for the interest he took, Sir Richard Temple's departure releases all true friends of the University from the anxiety that the very warmth of his interest occasioned—viz., that he might transform it into a department of Government. Mr. Budroodin Tyabjee, who followed Mr. Latham, went into ecstasies, because Sir R. Temple promised him the assistance of Government to found a Mahomedan school. Turning from the speeches to the Address where, if anywhere, we might expect to find his titles to glory set forth clearly, if succinctly, our astonishment at the courage of its promoters is only destined to increase. A more wonderful document it has never been my fortune to come across. Concocted to bless, it only curses him beyond redemption. First and foremost it mentions Sir Richard's services in alleviating the severity of the Deccan famine. Surely the framer of this paragraph must have been an unconscious disciple of the bold Danton with his famous battle-cry of *L'audace, toujours l'audace*. How did he chase away, when he penned those lines, the gaunt and hungry spectres that must have thronged round him of the victims of the inhuman experiment of the one pound ration? How did he silence the clamours of the starving ryots from whom the full assessment—arrears and all—was mercilessly wrung out? The audacity of the address reaches, however, its culminating point, when pretending to enumerate the important works urged to completion during the last three years, it cleverly conveys to the minds of the East Worcestershire electors the idea that their candidate had something considerable to do with them, and deserved nearly the greater portion of the credit at-

taching in respect of them, by assuring them with the most innocent earnestness that he was present when they were opened ! The framers of the address must have been hard pressed, indeed, for material, when they were reduced to eulogize Sir Richard because he opened the Prince's Dock, the University Tower and Library, and the Tulsi Water Works, when not a little of the credit in respect of them can in the remotest degree be claimed for him. Nor does he deserve any acknowledgment for fostering free municipal government in this city, for the Bombay Municipal Corporation came into existence long before his time and has preserved its independence in spite of his attempts at dictation. After mentioning his services to the cause of education to which we have already referred, and relating the stories of the inevitable Malta and Kandahar raids, the address abruptly comes to an end. All the energy and enthusiasm of his admirers are, we thus find, quite impotent to point to one single act of high statesmanship, which can be fitly commemorated by the erection of a statue. But while the reasons for doing him such honour utterly fail, we have, on the other hand, a heavy bill of indictment against him for high crimes and misdemeanours committed by him during the short period that he ruled over this Presidency. Never had an Indian statesman more brilliant opportunities for distinguishing himself in the ranks of those illustrious men who firmly and fearlessly trod in 'that path of wisdom, of national prosperity and of national honour,' so eloquently, yet so sagaciously depicted by Lord Macaulay. He could have covered himself with glory by exposing the shortsighted weakness and impolicy of the Vernacular Press Act. But he gave it his 'loyal support,' as it has become the fashion euphoniously to describe servile obedience. He could have assisted in a statesman-like solution of the question of the admission of natives into the Civil Service. But he heartily co-operated in bringing about the most disastrous solution of it that could be imagined. He could have protested against the iniquitous repeal of the cotton import duties and the imposition of an unequal Licence-tax. But he refused even to let the public indignation against these measures find voice in its own Town Hall. He could have fostered the public spirit and independence for which this Presidency had acquired a name. But he tried to control it in its municipal organization, he anni-

hilated it in its Legislative Council. But the gravest charge still remains behind. He found this a free and independent Presidency; he leaves it a servile appendage of the Government of India. To crown all, he now offers himself for election to Parliament as an admirer of that shortsighted and disastrous Imperial policy which gave birth to all these measures, to which may be added that most unwise, if not unjust, Afghan war. It is prophesied that Sir Richard Temple may return to India as Viceroy. Unless the bracing English climate leads him to juster and truer views of Indian policy, it will be an evil day for this country that sees Lord Lytton followed up by Sir Richard Temple.—*Bombay Gazette, March 16 1880.*

March 14th

PHEROZESHAH M. MEHTA.

THE Address to Sir Richard Temple was voted last Friday afternoon, at a meeting calling itself a meeting of the inhabitants of Bombay, but really consisting of a few Europeans, largely officials, and some Parsis; and it was read to his departing Excellency by a dutiful delegation of admirers on Saturday morning. It is, we think, the feeblest and falsest document of the kind we ever saw; it fails to mention one single act of the late Governor's which could justify such a mark of grateful attention as the presentation of an address is supposed to be; and instead makes Sir Richard's claim to the affectionate remembrance of posterity to consist in his official connection with several events and transactions which were planned and begun long before he became Governor, and which would have been brought to a successful issue at about this time, whether or no,—even if John Smith Esq., or the Hon'ble Mr. Jones had been Governor instead of Sir Richard Temple. It would have been as appropriate to thank him because the sun had risen every morning, or to vote him a statue because the last monsoon was not a failure, as to do so on account of his part in the ill-starred Malta expedition, or his connection with the Tusli Water-Works—that fruitful source of public grumbling—or with the second white elephant of Bombay, the Prince's Dock.

The native papers of Bombay have been prompt and manly in pointing out that the meeting of last Friday afternoon was not in any real sense a representative meeting of the inhabitants of Bombay; and that the extravagant and undiscriminating

laudation of which Sir Richard Temple has recently been made the willing subject is not cherished certainly by the more intelligent part of the native community. It is an ungracious task to write in this manner about a man who has really done so much to distinguish himself, and of whom so much of good can truthfully be said, as of Sir Richard. Yet a few words of this kind are not out of place when such an insanity of eulogy has suddenly afflicted a certain portion of the community.—*Dnyanodaya*, Bombay, 18th March 1880.

THE rather sudden dissolution of Parliament resolved upon by the Ministry is a bombshell thrown into the liberal camp. The dissolution was expected but it was not thought that it would come so soon. Lord Beaconsfield has chosen his time well. There is nothing stirring in Europe, while in India the apprehensions entertained as to the chances of the unjust war proclaimed against Afghanistan are allayed. For good or for evil India is growing to be a factor in the party politics of England, and since under the leadership of Lord Lytton and Sir John Sturtevant the finances of India have prospered, paid the expenses of the Afghan war, and are expected to show a surplus next year, it is no wonder that Lord Beaconsfield should choose to dissolve Parliament and make hay while the sun shines. The import duties on English cotton goods have gone and what remains of them is destined to go. So much wind is therefore taken out of the sails of the Liberal party, and as the finances of India have suddenly taken a favourable turn, there will be no necessity for asking succour from the English exchequer. These are, so far as India is concerned, some of the considerations why the Ministry have determined to dissolve Parliament just now. But it would seem that the Conservative party is not satisfied with taking advantage of the circumstances detailed above. Should fortune retain them in office, they seem to be determined to be strong in Parliament so far as the discussion of the Indian questions is concerned. Sir Richard Temple, our late Governor, is or is likely to be considered in England a great authority on Indian matters, and Sir Richard is to stand as a candidate for

East Worcestershire, where, it is said, he has every chance of success. It may be all ambition (and he is credited with a desire of ascending the viceregal throne at Calcutta) or the restless temperament of Sir Richard which may have prompted him to throw up the Governorship of Bombay and enter a life entirely novel to him. If the Conservatives succeed during the coming contest, and Sir Richard allies himself closely with them, serving at the same time as an extinguisher of Mr. Fawcett and others who have caused so much trouble to the party in power, there is every likelihood of Sir Richard returning to India as a Viceroy or being appointed to govern one of the English colonies. These would appear to be some of the circumstances why unusual importance is attached to his candidature. And the ease with which he is allowed to release himself of the onerous duties of the Governorship of Bombay by the Secretary of State goes to strengthen all these considerations.

It is therefore the duty of the Press in India to tell the electors of Worcestershire the kind of representative they are going to have, and it is with such a view that we propose briefly to review the career of Sir Richard Temple in India, and particularly in this Presidency.

Sir Richard is a peculiar man. There is, so far as we know, no other soul that may be likened unto him. He is considered the favourite of fortune and a favourite of fortune is almost always a person whom the world, while his star is in the ascendant, outwardly admires but inwardly dislikes. A favourite of fortune, moreover, is not, in the majority of instances, endowed with strong faith in fixed principles, and we do not think that this peculiarity cannot be traced in Sir Richard Temple. Obedience to the orders of his superiors and an inclination to execute them with promptitude and exactness combine in him to a remarkable degree, so much so indeed, that he did not, on several occasions, shrink from immolating himself at the shrine of duty in a manner which was truly heroic but not very comprehensible to the outside world. This very convenient and comfortable faith has been the secret of his success in life. Combined with this, Sir Richard possesses, in an eminent degree, passion for flash and thunder, no matter how short-lived and

unreal these may be. These are a few of his prominent characteristics—characteristics which have, during his time, raised “time-serving” to the dignity of a science. We shall not be unjust to Sir Richard and are ready to confess that he possesses, besides these, other accomplishments which may well be the envy of the cleverest and luckiest man in the world. He possesses an iron constitution and can ride any number of miles in a day. He is besides a sweet talker, a voluble speaker and a pleasant writer—accomplishments, which, we make no hesitation to say, he did his best to prostitute to his upper-most passion—the passion for flash and thunder.

Such is the man whom the electors of Worcesterhire are going to have for their representative in the next Parliament, and if our tiny voice could reach them, we would tell them—consider well before you go in for Sir Richard. It is not the man that we are writing against. He may be an agreeable companion and a true friend. We know for a fact that he is a generous patron. But the whole official career of Sir Richard Temple, has, instead of raising the tone of the administration, lowered it to a degree. This is the opinion of the native public and we make bold to express it. It is indeed certain that he stands high in official favour, and is even considered the pillar of the Indian Empire. For our part, we think and believe, we carry the whole native public with us, (the addresses and parties given to Sir Richard notwithstanding) when we say that instead of strengthening the empire he has done great damage to it. The high respect in which the great officials were once held, and the confidence that was put in their code of ethics, do now no longer exist. We do not say that Sir Richard is alone answerable for the change; but we ask whether the brief review that we have taken below of his official career in India is calculated to engender in the native mind the respect and esteem that they ought to bear towards their governors.

It was in the Panjab that Sir Richard first began to be known as the rising star. The rose-coloured and flashy reports that he wrote for the late Lord Lawrence, the then Commissioner of the Panjab, attracted attention all over India and the

land of the five rivers soon came to be designated as "the model province." The truth however leaked out in time that all that glittered was not gold. The first responsible post he filled was that of the Chief Commissioner of Nagpore. He toured through the country like the great Mogul, made the rural population to receive him with tom-toms and evergreens, held an exhibition at Nagpore, and made roads that were washed away the next wet season. What permanent good did he do to Nagpore is a question that may well be left unasked. Next we find him at Hyderabad and thence in the Vice-regal Council. As Finance Minister he was a failure and as the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal he was neither admired nor liked by the Bengalis.

Next he came to Bombay as Famine Commissioner of the Government of India and then became the Governor of this Presidency. Here we have made a closer acquaintance with Sir Richard, and we confess that all our anticipations of him have been verified. He brought with him not only the repressive policy he inherited from his patron (the late Lord Lawrence), but also the flash and the white-wash of what is known as the Panjab civilianism. The famine record will bear us out in this respect. The public press recorded thousands of deaths from want of food and its effects. Papers published by him or under his authority do not record hundreds. But his readiness to fall in with the views of his superiors was most glaring in the matter of the one pound ration and the collection of land revenue. He was quite at one with Lord Northbrook that a stinted expenditure during a famine time would not only involve a great loss of life, but that it would be opprobrious to run such a risk. He equally agreed with Lord Lytton and Sir John Strachey that it would be demoralising a whole population to give them sufficient food or not to exact task work from them. At least we are not aware of a protest written by Sir Richard Temple against the instructions that were issued to him. Although nobody was at the time either for lavish expenditure or a charitable distribution of food to able bodied persons, Sir Richard maintained that a pound of grain was quite sufficient to sustain human energy and would not increase the ration. What the result of the stinted ration has been we shudder to mention. And yet some of

our *Dassas, Jees and Bhoys* have voted Sir Richard an address! Sir Richard has all along tried to be popular with natives and we think he does not take them for such a bad lot of people as some of the Anglo-Indians suppose them to be. But when a public meeting of the inhabitants of Bombay was held to inaugurate a volunteer movement, he excluded them from it. When the Surat trial came, he easily fell in with the official view of the disturbance, notwithstanding that it was brought about by the inconsiderate and insolent conduct of the officials themselves and as if to show his respect for those officials and particularly that forgotten being Motilal, he shook hands with the latter gentlemen when he had been to Surat! During the recent fires and dacoities in Poona he sent a telegram to the Secretary of State which conveyed the idea that the disturbance was a plot hatched by natives, and the educated natives were its ring leaders. If Sir Richard really believes, as we think he does, that the majority of natives is a loyal and well behaved body of men, such action as he took during the above occurrences was most inconsistent. But we never looked for consistency in Sir Richard. He is the pupil of a liberal chief, he has now thrown his lot with the conservatives. He was once the admirer and follower of the policy of "masterly inactivity." He is now to all intents and purposes for extending our frontier in the North West!

Other instances in which he has allowed himself to be carried with the strong current, and where he has made "words do duty for things" may be cited. But we think what we have said of him is enough. Such a career as that of Sir Richard Temple is not calculated to elevate the character of the high dignitaries in India. It does not inspire the populace with confidence in their Governors. We therefore say that instead of being the pillar of empire, he has been the means of doing much injury to the noble fabric. Let the electors of Worcestershire look to this before they elect him for their representative. But what shall we say of some of the gentlemen of Bombay, who have got up a meeting and voted an address and an equestrian statue to boot to Sir Richard simply because they personally basked in the sunshine of his favour. Equestrian statue to a man to whom the mortality of the famine stricken is so much due! The idea is novel and to

make the farce complete in all its ludicrousness we hope the statue will be placed in a place which was lately affected by the famine.—*Native Opinion*, Bombay, March 14th, 1880.

SIR RICHARD TEMPLE'S career as Governor of Western India has abruptly come to an end on account of the dissolution of Parliament. He left by Saturday's Mail for England to be able to canvass for votes in his favor as a candidate for East Worcestershire and he has left amidst circumstances which are of a strangely novel character. Some of the citizens of Bombay held a meeting on last Friday and voted an address to Sir Richard and also an equestrian statue. The Meeting professed to express the general public opinion of Western India in regard to Sir Richard's administration and it becomes our duty to carefully examine the fact and show to our readers that the public of Western India—at least the Native portion of it, which of course is not confined to and represented by the speechifying *Shettias* of Bombay but which dwells in the country does not sympathise with the movement at all to the undue extent to which its supporters have gone. The fact that what was called a public Meeting was held may show at first to anybody that we are saying what we are not warranted by facts to say; but it deserves to be known that not more than 300 persons were present at the Meeting and most of those persons were young Parsee boys. The Meeting itself was got up under some very unpleasant circumstances. If Sir Richard Temple has really become popular with the Native public and if, as has been incorrectly stated in one or two papers, a great enthusiasm prevailed about him, why should the supporters of the Meeting have been so hasty about it? Would it not have been better to have waited for some days, when, if the enthusiasm existed at all, there would have been ample and freer scope for its display? But perhaps its supporters were not sure of this and it deserves to be mentioned that several of those who signed the requisition to call a public Meeting did so not because they sympathised with the movement but because they were taken by surprise and had to give way to the urgent appeals of friendship! This is not very creditable to the way in which some of our Native grandees have acted on this occasion.

In judging of Sir Richard's administration impartially, it is not at all proper to overlook the serious blemishes of his administration. That during these three years he showed much energy as Governor and took a wide interest in all the public movements of the day is what nobody denies. Former Governors never cared for the University, nor were they so anxious as Sir Richard to know the Natives thoroughly; that he has made all Government officials more careful and diligent and that he never left to others what he could do himself and see with his own eyes are facts which are known to all; and in his time Bombay society has been one scene of activity and intellectual pleasure; and we are also well aware of the scrutiny with which at the end of every week he used to go over the weekly Reports submitted by the Government Reporter on the Native Press and instituted departmental enquiries into the complaints of the Vernacular Press. All this merits praise and we do not grudge its meed to Sir Richard; but surely is this enough to entitle him to the honor of an equestrian statue? An address was more than enough; but some of the citizens of Bombay have gone further for reasons which are best known to themselves. Let us glance a little at some of the events which have marred Sir Richard's popularity.

Bombay made her first acquaintance with Sir Richard as Famine Commissioner of the Government of India. He had already distinguished himself during the Behar Famine of 1874 by a policy of humanity and extravagance, for which he was afterwards taken roundly to task. He however did not scruple to go to the other extreme in his management of the famine which affected lately Western India. We are all familiar with the manner in which Sir Richard rode from one famine stricken district to another, represented things to be all right, put deaths to the credit of cholera and other epidemics and when the Duke of Buckingham asked from Madras whether any pecuniary aid was wanted from the subscriptions raised by the generous public of England, informed him that matters were not bad and no money was wanted. But above all, the ugly memory of the famous one lb. ration stands still crying in the name of Sir Richard. A man, who but three years ago preached the doctrine

that 2 lbs. of food were necessary to feed a Native daily, hurried to preach the opposite doctrine that one lb. of food was quite sufficient. He adhered to his new theory with strange obstinacy, regardless of all remonstrance and medical advice, founded on experience and the result was death and misery were rampant in the famine districts. But Sir Richard's sturdy heart was not to be moved. This fact was forgotten at the Meeting held last Friday—not one speaker ventured to remember it in his anxiety to praise Sir Richard's horsemanship and energy. But what surprises us most is that Mr. Grattan Geary, the accomplished Editor of the *Bombay Gazette*, should have come forward in the columns of his paper to justify or at all events palliate Sir Richard's responsibility in this matter while but a few years ago as Editor of the *Times of India* it was Mr. Geary who wrote thundering articles against the inhumanity of the 1 lb. ration. We are now told that the experiment of one lb. ration was not at all productive of misery and deaths—that people died because there was not the sufficient quantity of grain to be had in the famine districts, whereas the fact has been all along asserted and notoriously known—we appeal to Mr. Geary himself for the truth of it—that *there was no scarcity of food but the want of buying power in the people*. We are ready to acknowledge that Sir Richard was at the time placed in a delicate and difficult position, that he had instructions from Lord Lytton to carry economy to its bitter limits. But surely is that a reason why Sir Richard should have sacrificed principle for economy? And yet the *Gazette* would have us suppose that that reason is sensible and excuses Sir Richard's conduct. If it is, why, Sir John Strachey, against whom our contemporary has been writing fiery articles does not merit at all the censure that has been passed on him! But let that go. How is it none of the gentlemen who the Meeting referred to Sir Richard's land revenue policy—the spoke at way in which he steadfastly refused to grant remissions of the of land revenue arrears? We in Bombay are not perhaps aware evils which this policy has engendered but the fact is that many Ryots have had to give up their holdings and be turned out because they could not pay what was so rigorously exacted from them. Then again, when the Government of India recently asked Sir Richard if the system of levying land assessments which had been represented and found by experience to be productive of many evils, could not be safely modified, he informed them that the system required no change, though almost everywhere it is asserted that the assessments have been pitched so high as to ruin the Ryots. The same has been unfortunately the case with Sir Richard's License Tax policy.

We next come to Sir Richard's policy as a legislator. And here unfortunately we find the same spirit of impatience and

high-handedness which we find in many of his other measures. In the first place, he hated the idea of having intelligent and English knowing Natives in the Council and distributed the honors as if they were toys for ignorant grandees rather than responsibilities carrying with them certain sacred obligations. Men not knowing English and unable to understand what was being done in the Council were selected as Councillors and the result has been that the non-official Native element has been most pitifully weak in the Council these two years! And yet Sir Richard till the last moment of his departure from Bombay spoke well of educated Natives and said they deserved well of the Government. If we come to the legislative measures passed in his time, the same conviction stares us in the face. The Land Revenue Code Bill is itself enough to show us how stringent a legislator Sir Richard has been. And yet Mr. Geary has had the good sense to give Sir Richard credit for it! Does Mr. Geary remember the proceedings in the Council at the time the bill was under discussion—how Rao Saheb Mandlik and Mr. Mahomed Ali Rogay were silenced and put down? Nor is the Irrigation Act less indicative of Sir Richard's disregard of public opinion. We are ready to give every credit to Sir Richard for the efforts he has made to guard the country against famines but the good intention of the Act has been marred by the compulsory labour clauses which were taken off from even the Bengal Irrigation Bill by Sir Ashley Eden because of their oppressive character.

We now come to the Surat Trials and the Dacoities. And here we must say that indefensible as Sir Richard's conduct was during the Surat Editors' trials, the failure which attended them and the exposé that was made of the attempts of certain underlings in service to mislead Government were well borne in mind by Sir Richard who took a wise lesson from them and turned that lesson to a good account during the recent dacoities. It is true Sir Richard soon after the Poona fires telegraphed to the Secretary of State that the dacoits were led by "one or two educated Natives" but we must remember that the times were of a character to lead astray foreigners and Sir Richard was away from Bombay and thus liable to be duped by malicious scribes. And moreover the fact that on returning to Poona Sir Richard carried all enquiries quietly and made no fuss as in the Surat trials but restored confidence in the Native community deserves our praise. In the last Administration Report, again, he has retracted the statement made by him in his telegram, by saying that "*the only Brahman accomplices, he (Wasdeo Bulwant) had (three or four in number) were mere school-boys.*" So far we readily acknowledge that Sir Richard has done justice to the educated Natives,

On no subject has Sir Richard said so much as he has said on the question of the loyalty of educated Natives. He is said to have written a Minute when Resident of Hyderabad to the effect that Natives are passively loyal but that composed as they are of different communities, the Government should be cautious lest this difference leads to some rebellion. And at the Byculla Club dinner on last Friday he gave the same advice to his audience in speaking of the excellent uses to which the European Volunteer Corps movement could be turned in a country like this. In the first place, the ambiguous language in which Sir Richard says in one breath that Natives are loyal and in another tells his countrymen that they should develop military instincts because *the communities of India* are varied shows his usual anxiety to please all the parties and favour the one that he really likes. But is there any logic in saying that because Native society is made of different sections, the Europeans should have a Volunteer Corps lest that difference rises one day "into cyclones and tornados." Sir Richard could not even understand that this very difference between the different communities of India is against the doctrine he preached. If the Indian people are divided amongst themselves, there is so much the less necessity for a Volunteer Corps to keep down such a lot of people amongst whom by the very force of that difference unity is impossible. But above all, Sir Richard's greatest blunder has been to widen this difference. Only two years ago he had the hardihood to say that a certain section of the Native community was more loyal than the others—a statement which came from his mouth with a bad grace.

We have now to say a few words as to what Sir Richard has done in respect to the appointments of Natives to higher posts in the Public Service. When Resident of Hyderabad now many years ago, he wrote these memorable words :—

"There are also one or two cardinal points wherein the British Government might, and probably will, do more than it has heretofore done to the advantage of the country and to the increase of its own popularity. Last year there appeared a thoughtful article (the author is not known to

me) in the *Calcutta Review* on the Native Press. It declared, on an analysis of the outspoken sentiments of their own Press, that the Natives did not really complain of some evils which we Europeans so often lament in our own system, such as corruption in our Police, inefficiency in our Courts of justice, and the like; evils which the Natives know but too well to spring themselves, and not to be attributed to us. But it classed their complaints under two main heads: first, that the British Government does not sufficiently associate in its administrative system the Native gentry and the more respectable classes; second, that the British Government does not allot to Natives an adequate share of public patronage, and does not promote them sufficiently to lucrative offices in their own country. The shortcoming in the latter respect was pronounced to be particularly dangerous inasmuch as state education was rearing up swarms of intellectual men, whose aspirations would never be satisfied by the narrow field now open and who would be compressed into discontent unless some expansion was afforded. All this seemed to me to be but too true."

Now these words, which were written many years ago and showed a great anxiety on Sir Richard's part to admit the Natives to a fair share in the administration of their own country are really generous but unfortunately he has failed to carry out what at one time he so strongly advocated. When but a few months ago the Government of India asked Sir Richard to appoint any capable Native to the joint Judgeship of Tanna on Rao Bahadur Gopalrao Hari's retirement, Sir Richard opposed that Government (the only sort of opposition he has shown to his superiors). The same with the vacant judgeship in the High Court, and the Professorship in the Deccan College. It is strange that this fact was forgotten by those Native gentlemen who made speeches at Friday's Meeting. One Native gentleman gave him credit for the Volunteer Corps, —forgetting that at the time the Volunteer Corps was formed, the Native Community were treated in a manner simply shabby, another gave Sir Richard credit for his energy but none cared to say a word about Sir Richard's weak points, which cry out for prominence. That Sir Richard has done much good to the European community there is no doubt; that he showed as if he were a friend of the Parsee community we would not deny; that he possessed and displayed unusual energy is also readily admitted; that he presided everywhere is also true; we also thank him for having just before his departure sanctioned a scheme to encourage the education of that neglected but important sanction

of our society—the Mahomedans; he also did something for the University; let him by all means have his due for all this; but in praising him for all this, it is simply absurd to lose sight of the failings of his administration—failings which every Native, rich or poor, acknowledges and has acknowledged but which our *Shettias* foygot because *there was no help for it!* No greater absurdity and folly could be conceived than that of men professing to be the leaders of society saying like children that they were compelled to sign the requisition; that they would not attend the Meeting if *Mr. So and So* would not attend and so on. And yet such has been the fact! There were both ble Hindus and Parsees, occupying prominent positions in socaty, ready to attend the Meeting and protest against its determieation to speak in the name of Western India but they were deinrted by some of those who let them know that in reality they seid not sympathise with the movement but joined it because thdre was no help for it. And we say what is only the truth when ewe state that Sir Richard's administration generally has not been popular with the general public of Western India, the real opinion held by whom about him may safely be expressed in the words of the subaltern, who when asked by Napoleon what people thought of him said :—“Sire, *They admire your genius but hate your despotism.*”—*The Indu Prakash, Bombay, 1st March 1880.*

WE see it stated, that a movement is about to be set on foot for presenting an address on behalf of the inhabitants of Bombay to His Excellency Sir Richard Temple on the occasion of his retirement from the Governorship of this Presidency. We confess that we cannot persuade ourselves to sympathise with this movement, and we can only look upon it as another manifestation of that mania for addresses which has for long taken possession of the public of Bombay. We are, of course, quite free to admit that there are sundry good qualites in Sir Richard Temple—but we must be permitted to doubt if the possession of those qualities entitles a Governor to an address from those over whom he bears sway. For instance, Sir Richard is a man of extraordinary energy, though it may be open to question if the energy is not almost morbid. He has shown considerable interest in educational matters; he has spoken in pretty satisfactory terms about the just claims of the Natives of the country; he has always shown a laudable readiness to lend

his countenance to any public movement to which his presence has been invited; and, if we may say so, he has even invited himself to one or two such movements within the past few months. He is said to have inspired the heads of all departments of administration with a wholesome awe, for it is generally supposed that his lynx-eye watches the working of every department. All this, no doubt, Sir Richard Temple may be admitted to have done. But what does it all come to? Each one of the virtues we have enumerated has a strong leaning to the side of the kindred vice. And when the net profit of all this, indefatigable and many sided activity comes to be calculated, it seems to us, we own, to be a clear case of much cry and little wool. Take education. Sir Richard Temple has not missed a single opportunity of talking on that topic. But what is the net outcome of all his activity here? He has, we believe, been a source of some mischief at the University; he has made more than one educational appointment of more than questionable propriety, and in the defence of one of them, if a very trustworthy report may be believed, he has done very grave injustice to other and deserving members of the Educational Department; and he has got the Ahmedabad College established, which we can only hope, but can hardly expect, may prove successful. What else has he done? He has talked about scientific education, without making any provision for attracting students to it—though, we apprehend, under present circumstances, such provision is very necessary, if scientific education is to be widely disseminated. And now as the crown and consummation of all his educational activity, he is said to be about to hand over the inspection of our schools to the District Revenue Officers! We can only say *Absit Omen*.

On the subject of the legitimate claims of the Natives to a share in the administration of their country, the facts lead to pretty nearly the same conclusion. Sir Richard Temple has talked excellently on that topic. But what has he done? Well he has done this. He has appointed a European Judge at the High Court, where a Native Gentleman formerly officiated. He is about to appoint a European Magistrate in the room of a Native Magistrate whom he is said to have called upon to retire. He appointed a European Professor of Mathematics in the place of a Native. He has passed a Government Resolution requiring graduates of the University to work for two years at 40 Rupees a month to qualify

for the posts, which, under Sir Bartle Frere's Resolution, they could get without such preliminary apprenticeship. He has suffered Mr. Gopalrao Hari's Civil Service appointment to "lapse," after Mr. Gopalrao's retirement; and under the fresh nominations, he has got a young man appointed, who is said to have failed to get into the service by open competition, and who was unsuccessful in his candidature for University Honours. What, we ask again, has he done for the Natives? He has appointed one Graduate, and one very ordinary undergraduate, of our University to two very good posts in the Revenue Department—but both appointments have evoked, and not altogether unfairly, considerable adverse criticism on the motives which led to them.

Coming next to Sir Richard's lynx-eyed superintendence of everything under him, we have, certainly heard complaints that this superintendence often degenerates into mere meddlesomeness. But this is a point on which we have no materials for judging one way or the other, and we shall not therefore dwell upon it. We venture however to say, that the result of the very cursory examination here made of Sir Richard Temple's career is not at all such as to justify the movement which is said to be impending.

One or two other points there are in connexion with this subject which merit a slight notice. Sir Richard Temple's recently announced conversion on the question of the "forward policy" in Afghanistan is not calculated to inspire us with any confidence in his political character. And the same conclusion follows in our mind, when his lavish expenditure of public money in the Bengal famine is contrasted with his cruel niggardliness in the Bombay and Madras Famines. All these matters coupled further with his recommendation to the Government of India about the License Tax, serve to lead us very clearly to the conclusion—that Sir Richard Temple is very much of a time-serving politician. He is undoubtedly very clever, very able, very energetic—but he is also, we venture to think, very slippery, if we may say so—and he is further very autocratic. There is besides a particular appropriateness in his casting in his lot with Lord Beaconsfield—for he has on a small scale a gift similar to that which, as pointed out the other day by Mr. Lowe, belong so peculiarly to Lord Beaconsfield—the gift of making words do duty for things. "These be thy Gods, oh Israel!—*Subodha Patrika, Bombay, 7th March 1880.*

We confess then to a sense of intense disappointment at the sum total of the results of Sir Richard's statesmanship in Bombay. We have to say that the bad preponderates when weighed with the good in the scales of justice. * * * * Unfortunately, Sir Richard, from the very commencement of his career in Bombay, was led away by the notion that he felt constrained by duty to rule the Presidency as his masters bid. Consequently, it is notorious that while affecting to court it he set public opinion on all important matters at nought. He nominally invited opinions from all independent unofficial public associations, but heeded them not. All petitions and remonstrances were either pigeonholed or consigned to the waste paper basket. He dogmatically stuck to his servile instincts or triumphantly carried them into action to the disgust of all right thinking and independent men. He came here when a part of this Presidency as well as a portion of Madras were suffering from a dire famine the effects of which the wretched peasantry have not yet shaken off. With that exuberant energy which never deserted him, he at once set himself to mitigate the distress by personally inspecting the afflicted districts. But how did he proceed with this work? Why, by informing the Government of India, who had been previously accused of gross carelessness and extravagance, that a pound of rice was more than enough to keep together the body and soul of a famished ryot. And this opinion he elaborated in a formal minute notwithstanding the strong protests of Dr. Cornish of Madras, and of a few native gentlemen of Bombay who had, by their superior experience and personal presence in several of the famine districts, satisfied themselves as to the inadequacy of the one pound ration per head. Public opinion, both here and in Madras, waxed wrathful; thousands died of famine fever; yet the great Goliath, the whilom advocate of the two pounds ration during the previous Bengal famine, buckled on his armour and resolutely fought against all comers, to prove that the one pound ration was more than sufficient for the Bombay labourer on famine works! The history of the bitter controversy which followed is so well-known that we shall pass over it in deep silence. Suffice it to say that Dr. Cornish, backed by all the scientific authorities of Europe, eventually demolished by the stern logic of facts the theory so persistently and mischievously advocated by Sir Richard, and won for himself from a repentant though still reluctant Government the coveted dis-

tion of a C.I.E. This was the first episode. Soon after Sir Richard openly insulted the public of Bombay by denying them the right of the use of their own Town Hall for the purpose of petitioning the House of Commons against the iniquitous License Tax Act of 1878. He refused it a second time when the petition for constructing the Rajpootana Railway on the standard gauge was to be discussed. Though there was a consensus of opinion among the engineering authorities, both here and in England, as to the immeasurable advantages and ultimate saving in cost of a line so reproductive, he advised the Government of India to stick to the narrow gauge originally advocated by those brilliant luminaries of the Supreme Government known as the Castor and Pollux of India—luminaries whose baneful influence is yet being sorely felt in various quarters, and the erratic wanderings of one of whom is at the present moment astonishing the world of finance. What a singular 'irony of fate' that has compelled a Viceroy and an advocate of the freedom of speech to gag the expression of honest public opinion by passing the Vernacular Press Act, and obliged a Governor to hanker after a statue erected in the very Hall which he did not scruple to refuse for a purpose the most constitutional! Then there are the Irrigation, Khote, and Abkari Bills, so fresh in our memory. In passing each of these enactments Sir Richard has not failed to set at naught the opinions of the native public against the injurious character of some of their provisions. He overrode the opinions of the independent members of the Legislative Council, a body which has sunk since his arrival into utter insignificance of strength and impotence of speech. The enactments named above have obliterated ancient rights, brought many to the threshold of beggary, and will yet bring others to the same condition of woful poverty. These are some of the legacies he has bequeathed to the people of Bombay—legacies, which instead of enhancing their happiness, are sure to involve them in a maze of woe and destitution. To crown the whole he has left to the city of Bombay another precious present which in times to come may yield a crop of misery untold and unexpected. We mean the 'scientific' Drainage of the Town.—*The Indian Spectator*, Bombay, March 21st 1880.

EVER since Sir Richard Temple first came to the Bombay Presidency in his capacity as the Famine Delegate of the Government of India to the time of his departure from amongst us last Saturday for his native country to contest East Worcestershire in the forth-coming elections, there has been a difficult problem in connection with Sir Richard Temple which we do not think can be said to have been yet solved. The difficult problem is nothing more or less than an accurate and faithful estimate of his real character. If there ever was any living man whose real character was an enigma difficult of solution, that man we have not the slightest hesitation in saying is Sir Richard Temple, our late Governor. The mythology of the ancient Greeks and Romans possesses a character known to all the students of classical history by the name of Proteus, a demi-god, who could at times and at his pleasure assume any form and shape, and thus successfully baffle his captors. We think it is not inapt to like the character of Sir Richard Temple to that of this classical demi-god Proteus; for as we have already remarked above, the variations in his character have been so Proteus-like that the future historian of India will find it very difficult to form an accurate estimate of the same. In the Panjaub before the Mutiny he was the trusted Secretary of Sir John Lawrence, and so identified himself with his master and chief that he came to be regarded as his right hand and firm disciple. As a member of the Government of India in 1868 he wrote against the impolicy of the forward frontier policy, the same man who did and does still identify himself with the present policy of the Government of Lord Lytton. Again as the responsible and constitutional adviser of the Government of Lord Mayo in financial matters he thought the minimum limit of taxable income at Rs. 750 per annum so low that he raised it to Rs. 1000, the same man who maintained in 1878 and 1879 that it inflicted no hardship to lower and maintain the minimum limit of taxable income at Rs. 100 per annum. Again during the Bengal Famine of 1874 in his capacity as the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal and the trusted adviser collaborateur of Lord Northbrook in the famine policy of the period, he maintained that two pounds of food were essentially necessary in Bengal to keep the body of a famine-labourer in a fitting condition, the same man who afterwards with equal resoluteness maintained that one pound of food was quite sufficient in Bombay, and

Madras. Having regard to all these circumstances one cannot but come to the conclusion that whatever his individual character might be, Sir Richard knew well how to accommodate himself to the prevailing views and to carry out diametrically opposite instructions of two or more diametrically opposed chiefs and masters, in such a way as to show that he entered into the spirit of both. We firmly believe that turn wherever we may, it will be almost, if not altogether, impossible to point out one single act in his chequered and diversified career on which Sir Richard Temple may be properly said to have left his individual mark. We think that from the moment when he first came out to this country in 1848 as a member of the Bengal Civil Service to the day when he resigned the Governorship of Bombay, Sir Richard Temple has been nothing more or less than a loyal and faithful recorder and executor of the orders and views of his master and chief for the time being, and we are afraid that whatever the future career before him may be, he will continue to be up to the end of his life, we mean public life, nothing more or less than what he has been for the last thirty-two years of his life,—the loyal recorder and executor of his master's decrees. We think it is not in his nature to act independently, for Nature never meant him to be in independent charge of a Province or an Empire. We believe the highest post for which he was fitted and which he did hold in India was when he continued to represent the British Indian Government at the court of His Highness the Nizam of Hyderabad. Farther than that he ought never to have been elevated.—*The Dnyan Prakash, Poona, 18th March 1880.*

(THE following is a translation of an article in the Rastgoftar the leading Parsee weekly of Bombay.)

(1). "The views of the party which Sir Richard Temple has joined are prejudicial to the interests of India. True native patriots will, therefore, not like to see *his* party successful, and that of Mr. Gladstone overthrown. During the last ten years, Mr. Gladstone has rendered important services to India; and those citizens of Bombay who wish for the success of Sir Richard Temple against the son of that same Mr. Gladstone, betray their ingratitude towards Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Fawcett, Mr. Bright, and many other men of note."

(2), " And it behoves us to confine ourselves within the aforesaid limits (i.e. giving *merely* an address to Sir Richard Temple). But the friends and admirers of Sir Richard have transgressed these limits. Not content with giving him an address, they have resolved to erect a statue in his honour; and this resolution we consider it our duty to oppose. They carry their admiration too far; they disregard public opinion for the sake of private friendship; and they are thus reading a bad lesson to future generations. Sir Richard Temple has many friends here. His Excellency is a master of the art of multiplying friends by sweet words. He conferred honours and dignities on prominent men; he brought the sons of well-known gentlemen to public notice; he gained over Europeans by kind treatment:—thus extending his flattery far and wide, Sir Richard facilitated his way to the honour of a statue. But that these men should undertake to raise a statue in honour of Sir Richard Temple because he raised them to high dignities, or that certain English officers, who fully regaled themselves at Ganesh Khind (i.e. at the Government house at Poona) as the Governor's guests, should combine in a body to stifle public opinion is not merely improper, but positively degrading. It would have been proper for the friends of the Governor to have held themselves aloof from this movement, for the very reason that they were his friends; and we are inclined to think that Sir Richard Temple would himself wish that his friends should so far curb their spirit of friendship as not to despise public opinion. But no. The friends of Sir Richard Temple do not like to do so. Had they left the matter in the hands of the public, we are quite sure that the latter would not have shown themselves wanting in rendering due honour to Sir Richard Temple. But the public would never have gone the length of erecting a statue in his honour.

* * * * *

Had his friends done so (i.e. erected a statue) at their private expense, we would have laughed in our sleeves and kept silent. But when, in order to express their private sense of gratitude, they step forth to render the highest honour of erecting a statue in the name of the public, we cannot but say that Sir Jamsetji Jeejeebhoy Bart. and Dossabhoj Framjee C.S.I., do not constitute the *whole* pub-

(37 .)

lic; nor are the Government officers and "Government house-Guests" the only organ of public opinion. We have moreover heard that some protests against this movement which were sent to the editors of the English dailies for publication, were not placed before the public.

* * * * *

We have heard that several influential gentlemen plainly refused to sign the requisition sent to the sheriff of Bombay for calling a public meeting while others signed it after much hesitation. And it is worthy of remark that excluding the intimate friends of Sir Richard Temple, who had obtained some share of praise or obligation at his hands, there was very little of the popular element to be found in the meeting. There lay two courses before the promoters of this movement: to rest satisfied with merely giving an address, or to erect a statue in his honour at their private expense without at all discussing this matter in a public meeting. The honour of a statue is not to be given to all.

* * * * *

An address is an embodiment of our *present* regard and affection. But a statue is intended to commemorate one's memory in ages to come. It is quite proper to give addresses to Governors and Government officers of average abilities, if they be found worthy of the same. But the honour of a statue is reserved for mighty heroes or brave personages who sacrifice their lives for the welfare of nations, or for those great souls who undertake enterprises of high importance.

* * * * *

If the name of any worthy survives his death, people erect a statue in his honour. A statue is but lately erected in honour of Lord Byron, fifty years after his death; and here is an example of due honour rendered to real sterling worth. But to erect statues in honour of names, very likely to pass into oblivion in the very next generation, is to make the value of those names consist merely in the value of the material of which the statue is made. It is sufficient for us to express our sense of gratitude to Sir Richard Temple by an address. Our duty is fulfilled if we render due honour to Sir Richard Temple in the same sweet language

with which he flattered us so long. What more has Sir Richard Temple given to us than sweet words; what great and permanent benefits has he conferred upon this country; what political improvements has he devised; what beneficial policy has he introduced; what important rights has he conferred upon us; that he deserves to be honoured with a statue, and to stand in the rank of Lord Wellesley, Mountstuart Elphinstone, or Lord Canning? It is more important to examine what Sir Richard Temple has not done than what he has done. We must find out how much of all that he said is carried out. On a little thought we shall come to the conclusion that instead of effecting any momentous improvements, instead of inaugurating some new line of policy, instead of rendering any permanent service to the country, Sir Richard has inflicted such serious injuries on the people as will continue to harass and oppress them for a long time to come. Public opinion is the strongest governing power, and the justest of tribunals. We therefore hope that the force of public opinion will ever remain unabated, in spite of the attempts of Sir Richard Temple's interested friends to serve their own private ends.—*The East Gofur, Bombay, 14th March 1880.*

COPIES of the following hand-bills were distributed during the course of the public meeting at the Bombay Town Hall, on Friday the 12th Instant, which was convened to do honour to Sir R. Temple. They contain the following reasons for the question 'Why Sir Richard Temple should have a Statue' ?—

1. Because, after having waged war on Bengal Famine, utterly regardless of expense, he put the screw on during the famine in the Deccan five times more severe, and by insisting on the "one pound ration" caused an immense addition to the rate of mortality.

2. Because he insisted on collecting as much land revenue as possible, arrears included, during the year of famine 1877-78.

3. Because he refused the offer made through the Madras committee of aid from British charity, to ameliorate the distress—though the grants afterwards obtained from Madras, in spite of his discouragement, helped to pay the land revenue arrears aforesaid.

4. Because he zealously supported the most stringent provisions of the Land Revenue Code Bill, especially those which eliminated the term "owner."

5. Because he sanctioned the heavy enhancements of assessment in Salsette and elsewhere, and supported the most stringent provisions of the Salt and Abkari Acts and Irrigation Bill.

6. Because under his Presidency of the Legislative Council, the freedom of discussion even occasionally manifested by official Members of Council, has been effectually frowned down.

7. Because he has conformed, without protest, the extravagant scheme of the Port Trust, thereby fastening a ruinous burden on Bombay.

8. Because by weakly yielding to the Bengal Military authorities last year, without appealing by public remonstrance to the Secretary of State, the campaign in southern Afghanistan was abortive and Ghazni remained unoccupied.

9. Because, by superceding public opinion, he forced on a sewerage scheme for Bombay at the beck of the Army Sanitary Commission and in the teeth of the best scientific knowledge : and he obeys the same extraneous influence by leaving the hated C. D. A. as a legacy for Bombay.

10. Because while giving the best possible reasons for the employment of natives of Indian positions of responsibility, he has done next to nothing to give practical effect to that policy.

11. Because he tamely submitted to the Government of India's orders for stoppage of Public Works, given under the officially invented panic of April last year, thereby seriously increasing the difficulties and distress in the Deccan and elsewhere.

12. Because he did his utmost to fasten on the educated natives of Poona and the Deccan the foul stigma of having excited the dacoities and incendiarisms of last year.

The Hindu, 17th March 1880.