

princes and people. Now the nobles, the old class of zemindars, have been turned into landlords, and that is a very different thing from the old way of holding land. Then you have insisted on giving to the peasant the right to sell his land, the very last thing that he wants to do, the thing which takes away from him the certainty of food for himself and his children. No peasant in the old days had the right to sell his land, but only to cultivate it. If he needed to borrow at any time, he borrowed on the crop. Now, in order to free the people from debt, they are given the right to sell their mortgage holdings, and this means the throwing out of an agricultural people on the roads, making them landless, and the holding of the land by money lenders. The revolution in the land system of India is one of the causes of the recurring famines, the second, perhaps of the great causes. The natural result of it is that you put new power into the hands of the money lenders, and you take away from the peasant the shield that always protected him.

#### A PRINCIPLE, NOT A BELIEF.

An extract from a speech made by Mr. W. Trueman, of New Haven, Conn., at a public hearing of arguments relative to the question of municipalizing the city's gas supply, as reported in the New Haven Evening Leader of August 16.

The most insidious of all the arguments in this controversy is the one that assumes that this great public question is simply one of belief, just as Methodism or Presbyterianism, or that it can be taken up and laid down in the same way that we decide if we shall continue to be carnivorous or whether a purely vegetable diet is not best for human beings.

Gentlemen, I submit that this question of the public ownership of monopolies is not in this category at all, but is one of the most vital and fundamental character. It is a question of property rights, and as I am a firm believer in the sacredness of property, I stand ready to defend my own first, and my brother's next with all the force with which I have been endowed.

The right of property is founded upon the self evident statement that "to the producer belongs the product." It therefore necessarily follows that if we find persons in possession of that which they did not produce, and for which they rendered no equivalent to those who did produce it, then they are simply in possession of that which does not belong to them.

Now this is precisely the case with

this gas company. It, like other public service corporations, enjoys the privilege of doing an exclusive business with 108,000 people, for which it renders no return, but rather makes the public pay through their gas bills, a round tax on this privilege, as though it were something the company had produced or laid out capital for.

Gentlemen, there are three broad divisions in regard to property. There is Thine, Mine and Ours. To be able to clearly draw a line of demarkation between these, claiming for each that to which he is entitled, will in the future be the simple test of an able, honest man. Failure to do this from now on must be regarded as clear evidence of culpable ignorance or known dishonesty.

Taking this ground for an unassailable foundation, the advocates of public ownership of public property stand upon higher ground than that of expediency, knowing full well that unless a structure is raised on a sure foundation no amount of good management can keep it from falling, and no amount of municipal corruption can ever alter a principle.

#### THE TERRIBLE POVERTY OF INDIA.

The Manchester Guardian, in a leading article on the recently issued Blue-book on the "Moral and Material Progress" of India, sums up as follows the history of the past ten years in India:

Most people, it seems, have been quite wrong about the Indian peasant. What that much-misunderstood man really needs is to form habits of thrift. Such, at least, is the climax and moral of the Blue-book just issued from the India Office upon what is officially described as the "Moral and Material Progress" of India. In one sense, indeed, the truth of the remark is obvious. If a man's annual income is about 80 rupees or 40 shillings; if he has to pay a tax of many hundreds per cent. upon his salt; if he is hopelessly in debt already and yet has to borrow more to pay his landlord, the State; if, moreover, he and millions like him are under an obligation to maintain an extremely costly Government manned by a foreign race, and to train and keep a large army ready for use in India or elsewhere—then he must needs be thrifty. But probably this is not what Lord George Hamilton means. Always a sturdy optimist where his helpless clients, the taxpayers of India, are concerned, he has never made a more cheerful appearance than in this imposing volume, prepared under his instructions and issued from his office. Yet the temptation to moderate his cheerfulness must have been severe. The Blue-book deals with a period of ten years ending with the year 1901-2, a period which includes the closing years of Lord Lansdowne's, the whole of Lord Elgin's, and the early years of Lord Curzon's Viceroyalty. It has been a decade of war, pestilence and famine, of aggression beyond and repression within the borders of India. If

progress is the title of the book, reaction is the story which it tells, or ought to tell.

The writers, the Guardian added, "show a nice discrimination. They have learned the arts of omission and of euphemism."

But the record as it stands is painful enough in all conscience—millions of much-needed wealth squandered in trans-frontier adventures, beginning with the retention of Chitral and the breaking of the promise given to the tribesmen in the name of the Government; two of the worst, if not the two worst, famines of the last century; the terrible and enduring scourge of bubonic plague; and, when the suffering people showed signs of restlessness under protective measures dictated more by zeal than by discretion, a series of repressive measures culminating in a new law of sedition and a new law of criminal procedure. Yet the authorities, surveying their work, report that it is very good. "Everywhere there are signs of commercial activity and industrial awakening, and if, as may reasonably be hoped, a cycle of seasons favorable for agriculture is now commencing there appears good ground for anticipating that India is on the threshold of a period of rapid material development."

"However rosy may be the anticipations of official optimists, it may be hoped," the writer continued, "that the public will not be blind to the actual facts. The famine of 1896-7 affected an area of 300,000 square miles, with a population of 63,000,000. The famine of 1899-1900, which has not even yet wholly disappeared, affected an area of 400,000 square miles, with a population of 60,000,000. Each famine in turn was described by the viceroy of the day—Lord Elgin in one case and Lord Curzon in the other—as a famine of unexampled intensity. The government, or in other words, the Indian taxpayers, spent more than £5,000,000 on relief in the first and more than £6,000,000 on relief in the second famine."

With regard to the recent famines, the Guardian emphasized the fact that they point to the poverty of the people:

The Blue-book does recognize that the famines were "money famines rather than food famines," and the compilers in their remarks on railways observe with pride that "nothing was more striking in the recent famines than the freedom with which grain passed from place to place in accordance with local requirements." Is it not at least equally striking that the peasants nevertheless died by tens of thousands? And what becomes of the theory that famine is due solely to a failure of the monsoon, when not only was there enough food in India, but India was actually exporting foodstuffs? Clearly we are thrown back upon the terrible poverty of the masses of the Indian people, and until the Government of India has ascertained and boldly grappled with the economic causes of that poverty it cannot be said to have discharged its duty. The last Famine Commission, ap-