

expenditure really amounted to in the different provinces, and on what the money was spent.

Frere writes to Sir C. Wood :—

“ May 3, 1860.

“ There is nothing in hand relating to either military or police ; no information you get on either subject is complete ; all that appears wildest and most exaggerated in Sir Charles Napier's later diatribes on these subjects is strictly and literally true. Lord Ellenborough will tell you how he found matters in both departments when he was here, and they are far worse now—the worst feature of all being the incapacity of most of the official men here to discover or admit that all is not perfection. I could not give you a better instance than the one before you in the discussion between Sir C. Trevelyan and Lord Elphinstone on the one hand, and Mr. Wilson on the other, as to the cost of the army and police for this year now ending, and the amount of reduction which can be relied on as in progress for 1860–61. The difference between the two results is not a few thousand rupees, but millions sterling, and this, not on a question of calculation, but of fact, such as you would learn from the War or Home Offices in a few hours to within a few thousand pounds. The discussion has been going on for weeks, and it is still difficult to prove conclusively who is right : I am convinced that Mr. Wilson is, and feel assured that if he has erred, it is in under-estimating the charges. But when you see the time and trouble required to prove a fact which ought to be clear from turning over a few leaves of a ledger, you may imagine the difficulty of getting materials for framing schemes of altered organization and reduced expenditure. . . .

“ You will naturally ask, what is to be done ? I should say, in the first place, leave much more to the Governor-General to do and give him more aid to do it. . . . The Commander-in-Chief must be in reality a ‘ Commander-in-Chief in India,’ and not, as Sir Charles Napier truly called him, ‘ only a gigantic Adjutant-General.’ Let him cease to be troubled with the petty details of this vast and heterogeneous Bengal army ; make over to a Commander-in-Chief of the Forces in each Lieutenant Government the same duties which a Commander of Forces in Bombay or

"In making this demand, they claim to represent the wishes of the very great majority of the Boer population of the Transvaal.

"They consider that the Boers now assembled represent the very great majority of that population.

"In proof of this they give me the strongest assurance that, besides those whom I saw there on the occasion of my visit to the camp, and who I may state undoubtedly represented a strong party, there had been from time to time many more, fully five thousand burghers of the land, who they state all cordially agree with their expressed wishes and views, and that such a number would certainly be a decided majority of the burghers of the land, as estimated by the latest official authority. How far this is the case, I have, of course, had no opportunity of judging personally, but there can be no doubt that I may say, as the result of my own observations in the camp and elsewhere, that it certainly is a very strong party that has kept up this movement to the present time. As a proof of their earnestness, I can confirm the fact that they have been in an open camp for four weeks waiting my arrival.

"And looking to the bearing and the temper of the members of the Committee whom I met, who are men of position in the country and respected, and leaders who have, since the earliest establishment of the Republic, taken a prominent part in the government of the country, I think I may say that their representations are worthy of your earnest consideration.

"They maintain that they are voluntarily assembled, and that what the Committee states is the voice, not of delegates or representatives, but of the very great majority of the people.

"They, therefore, pray that Her Majesty's Government, taking these facts as herein represented into consideration, will restore their independence.

"I have endeavoured in the above sentences as correctly as possible to epitomize their statements and view of the case, as explained to me at great length, and I have requested the members of the Committee, named in the margin, to inform me, after the perusal of this letter, whether I have truly described what they said to me.

"They have this day assured me that they are fully satisfied with my summary of their arguments."

The names in the margin are M. W. Pretorius, Chairman, S. J. P. Krüger, J. Maré, J. S. Joubert,* and H. J. Schoeman.

Frere writes from Pretoria to Sir M. Hicks-Beach about the meeting at Erasmus Farm :—

“April 14, 1879.

“They were evidently much disappointed. . . . Our meeting separated with no more definite decision than that they must report to the ‘people,’ and be guided by their decision as to what was to be done.

“If I may judge from the gentlemen composing the deputation, and others of their class, whom I have had the honour of meeting since coming to the Transvaal, the leaders are, with few exceptions, men who deserve respect and regard for many valuable and amiable qualities as citizens and subjects. . . .

“The few exceptions are mostly foreign adventurers of various sorts and nations, English, Irish, and Scotch, Jews, Americans, Hollanders, Germans, Belgians, and Portuguese, who though often well educated and naturally able, are rarely men of high character or disinterested aims. They acquire great influence among the less educated Boers, but foster the tendency to suspicion, which, mixed with extraordinary credulity in many things, is a marked feature in the Boer character, and makes them very difficult to manage by any one who does not enjoy their entire confidence.

“They are extremely sensitive to ridicule, and to opprobrious or slanderous imputations, feeling most keenly unjust charges against their race by any in authority. Hence perhaps they are very liable to be deceived by men who, for their own ends, flatter and pretend to sympathize with them.

“Of the results of our meeting it is impossible at present to say more than that it must have cleared away misconceptions on all sides. If they have learnt anything as to the finality of the act of annexation—that I have no power to undo it, and do not believe it will ever be undone, in the only sense in which they will ask it—I have on the other hand been shown the stubbornness of a determination to be

* Not to be confounded with Piet Joubert, who refused to sign.

of a loyal and homogeneous population with an organized and reliable staff of officials, there was a heterogeneous aggregation of men, with, for the most part, little or no sentiment of loyalty to the Government, and, in Northern India, not yet returned to their normal condition of acquiescence in submission to the ruling powers from which they had been aroused by the Mutiny. Frere himself had been inclined to think that the balance of expenditure and income might be re-established by the natural increase of revenue and by a reduction of expenditure, such as could be effected by better administration, a better system of local audit, and by the cutting down of needless and wasteful expenditure which he knew to be going on, and which if inquired into would come to light. But he knew also that the waste and abnormal expenditure was not entirely owing to the Mutiny, but was of older growth, and was due to causes which would take, not months, but years to change and reform, and that in the mean time some such source of additional revenue as an income-tax, however perilous, was a necessity.

The proposal to impose an income-tax did not in general meet with a favourable reception from Indian officials. A suggestion had been made that, instead of levying an income-tax, revenue should be raised by the imposition of local octroi and transit duties, which it was said would be productive, and would excite little opposition. To this Frere replied in a Minute:—

“ February 17, 1860.

“ The course (proposed) is, in every respect, retrograde. All these various and very incongruous modes of collecting money are revivals of abolished native modes of taxation, condemned long ago, not by speculative theorists, but by all our wisest and most experienced practical administrators, on the very solid ground, that for every rupee they

brought into the Treasury, they kept out two which would otherwise flow in by some legitimate channel; that such taxes strangled trade and industry, and that their productiveness was an exact measure of the indirect mischief they did.

"Their abolition on these grounds has been generally the first measure with which our rule in a lapsed Native State commenced. It has always been the one measure most popular with all classes, save the great capitalists. . . .

"I should have much preferred, if it were possible, to have so far reduced our current general expenditure that it could be met by our ordinary revenue, and that the large sums which ought to be raised and spent on objects more or less local (roads, canals, education, and many others), should have been provided by local taxation, locally arranged, by local bodies, acting on general principles laid down by the general legislative body of India, and in distinct and perfect subordination to the general Government of India.

"I am sanguine that in time such economy as I have described may be enforced, but that time cannot now be allowed. Our wants are urgent, and owing, as it seems to me, to the erroneous mode in which for twenty-five years we have attempted to centralize, we cannot now enforce economy as rapidly as a really strong centralized Government would, and as our need requires.

"Nor can we, by a stroke of the pen, resuscitate that spirit of local and municipal administration which is never entirely extinguished in an Indian community, but which for years past so many of our measures have tended to check and paralyze, and which must be in vigorous existence before any extensive plan of local administration of local affairs can be organized.

"Situating as we are, a general system of direct taxation, such as our Right Honourable Colleague will, I understand, propose, seems to me the only really effectual measure which can be desired. I am not blind to the risks and objections which beset any such measure; I look upon them as truly formidable; but I see no escape. The alternative is nothing less than absolute and early ruin, if peace continues—ruin still more rapid should the strain of war come upon us."

The most serious opposition to the income-tax proposals came from Madras. The Governor, Sir Charles Trevelyan, not content with recording his objections and those of his Council in a Minute for the consideration of the Governor-General and Supreme Council, took the unprecedented, and for a man of his official experience, the inexcusable step of sending a copy of the Minute—in spite of the protest of the two Civil Members of his Council—to the Press, for publication. Thus, in the face of all India, European and native, he proclaimed himself, at a critical time and on a vital question of policy, to be in marked opposition to the Governor-General and his Council. Little progress could be made with the Budget proposals till the question was referred home.

Frere writes to Trevelyan :—

“ April 9, 1860.

“ I cannot tell you what a source of sincere regret it has been to me ever since we received your letter regarding the financial schemes brought forward by Mr. Wilson, to find myself in any way opposed to you. Not only because I had hoped that occasions would rarely arise on which we should differ, but because I cannot help fearing that the course you have taken will interfere very seriously with the emancipation of the Government of Madras and Bombay from that interference by the Government of India, which you, I know, think quite as mischievous as I do. You have taken the battle on a question of finance and army organization—two of the three classes of questions which, it seems to me, must always be left to the Government of India, external politics being the third. . . . What new taxes are to be imposed is a question on which probably no two men would exactly agree, and much must, it seems to me, be conceded by all of us to whoever is to bear the responsibility of setting our finances to rights, and as we cannot all of us be Chancellors of the Indian Exchequer, we must do our best to aid him who is. Were we all in Parliament, if the Opposition had the best of it, they would, of course, change places with the Ministry

and try their hands at finance ; but even if that could be done in our case, how would you as Governor-General prevent the new Governor of Madras from making a similar stand against your scheme ? I greatly fear that whatever the Secretary of State and people at home may think of your arguments, they will begin to doubt how the Government of India can be carried on while such opposition on a financial question is possible."

To the objections relied upon in the "Letter from the Madras Government on the Income and License Tax Bill," that Mr. Wilson's scheme "was entirely on the English model," that "the taxes he proposes are utterly unsuited to India," and that "his plan embraces the introduction into India of direct taxation" (as if it were a novelty), Frere replied in a letter to Sir C. Wood:—

"April 23, 1860.

"There is no part of Mr. Wilson's plans that might not have had a place under a different name in any scheme of Akbar's—no single tax which is not at this present moment levied by almost any independent Native State when in difficulties ; and if you look at the various suggestions of those men who know the natives best, you will find that they, with scarcely an exception, recommend one or more taxes identical in principle with the three proposed taxes, but not either so simple or complete. The scheme, as a whole, is, it is true, a financial revolution, and like all revolutions a thing to be avoided, if possible. . . . But it is not a revolution from Indian to English finance, as they who object to it assert ; it is rather a return to modes of taxation, once universal in India, and even now existing in every unaltered Native State, and which we only gave up in our own provinces within the last twenty-five years, the main alteration being that the new taxes are uniform and simple in their incidence, and free from the arbitrary exemptions and anomalies of every kind, which made it difficult to reform the old taxes without abolishing them. If you refer to the proceedings of Government about 1834 and '36, when the Mohlurfa and other direct taxes were abolished in Bengal and Bombay, you will find that many of the most experienced men then advocated their reform

rather than their abolition, and it was the difficulty of any real reform, joined to the then flourishing state of our finances, which led the Government of India to abandon all the multiform direct taxes, which were more or less income-taxes and taxes on trades and professions, and which were nearly as ancient and universal as the land-tax. I doubt whether you could consult a single native prime minister of any native sovereign who would not recommend something of the kind as his native panacea for our financial difficulties."

Sir Charles Wood, on the matter being referred home, at once recalled Sir C. Trevelyan. Sir Henry Ward took his place at Madras, and after Ward's death, a few months later, Sir William Denison succeeded.

From Bombay also, Lord Elphinstone, to Frere's regret, for he greatly valued his opinion, wrote a Minute, expressing disapproval of the income-tax. He felt convinced that had Lord Elphinstone had a complete statement of the financial position before him, he would have come to a different conclusion; but there was no time for discussion with him, for in the spring of 1860 he went home, and was succeeded by Sir George Clerk.

Sir George Clerk had done good work, and held high offices in India, including, in 1847-8, that of Governor of Bombay for about a year; and had lately been at the Board of Control and at the India Office, under Lord Stanley and Sir Charles Wood. He was an intimate friend of Frere's, wrote frequently and confidentially to him, and being a racy and vigorous writer—occasionally perhaps, tempted into using exaggerated language—as well as an able and energetic administrator, their correspondence shows unreservedly the thoughts of each on the questions of the day, on which they were generally in accord.*

* Frere, writing in 1849, speaks of him as "a liberal, enlightened,

Frere writes to him :—

“ May 9, 1860.

“ Mr. Wilson has been again very carefully over his calculations, and finds that Lord Elphinstone is nearly four millions out in his Indian calculations alone. . . .

“ I much wish that Lord Elphinstone had taken for granted the correctness of Mr. Wilson's estimate of the deficiency to be provided for, for without the materials which he has in the offices here, and the time and attention he can devote to them, it is impossible to frame a better—and in no single minute particular has he yet been found in error. By next year, no doubt, there will be the materials for framing such estimates as you have in England. At present it can be done only very roughly—errors are continually coming to light, but, unfortunately, they are all on the wrong side, and make the deficit worse than was expected. . . .

“ Everybody has lost confidence in Government and in every one else, and Mr. Wilson's plain statement of his difficulties, and the plan he proposed for getting out of them, were the first gleam of light that the non-official public here had seen for many a day. There was a visible return of confidence, and all was going on well, till Sir C. Trevelyan's Minute appeared, and this gave to those who dislike the new taxes—always, of course, a numerous body—just the sort of encouragement they wanted.

“ There are, of course, many details in Mr. W.'s plan which I should have liked to have seen otherwise arranged, . . . and in many things a little less haste would have been better speed ; but as a whole, I hardly think he had an alternative ; and if he is now thwarted or defeated, I do not see what his successor can do ; further reduction—I mean beyond the point allowed for by Mr. Wilson—seems to me impossible without dictatorial powers given to the Governor-General (and then they must be given to a man who can and will use them), or without opening a fresh loan, which is only another road to ultimate ruin. . . .

far-sighted statesman, with great determination in carrying his own measures, and great skill in managing men ; detested by the jobbing, jog-trot office men in Bombay ; not liked nor supported, as he should have been, by men who ought to have known better, but universally regretted by all whose opinion was worth having.”

“Nothing can be better than Lord Canning’s own intentions, as far as I can judge, but Dalhousie principles are still in the ascendant with B. and the rest of them. As for Bengal, the longer I stay, the more I am amazed at the wonderful patience of all classes. To me it has the appearance of anarchy in everything but that the Government revenue is still paid, and judging from Western experience I should have expected that last sign of obedience to Government to disappear two months ago. But to all one says, the Government officers reply with a smile of contemptuous pity, and no man of influence seems to realize the risks they are running except William Grey, who is a first-rate man in every way, save that he has no Mofussil experience. — shuts himself up and is almost inaccessible, lies in bed till late in the day, and sits up at night splitting hairs, after his old fashion. It is a great pity, for he has the abilities of five Lord Chancellors, but (is) fossilized by long residence here, and by the worship of the little clique about Calcutta. Here and elsewhere all the great questions about the army, police, and the courts are in abeyance, drifting till some strong hand takes the helm.

“As far as I am myself concerned, I do not dislike the place, or the work, though there is just now about four times as much as mortal man could do properly, owing to Outram being away, the Civil Council one short, and Mr. Wilson able to do little but his own Financial Department, which is a Herculean labour in itself, if he is to set it right in five years; but I feel much like the fly on the coach-wheel, with little real power to direct the team. Daily do I wish we had you here. But if you cannot take the whole thing into your own hands, you will, I hope, at least stop Bombay from following the example of Madras. . . .

“I believe if we could only get our finances in order all would come right, and therefore, though on many points of minor detail I might take a different view from Mr. Wilson, I support his general measure with all my might. His defeat seems to me equivalent to leaving the whole thing to Parliament and the Council of India,—in other words, to ruin,—for until ruin overtakes them they are not likely to see that you can have but one real Government for India, and that that Government can only safely be in India.”

Nor did Sir George Clerk like the idea of an income-tax. He writes to Frere from Bombay—

“ May 17.

“ Why on earth could not Mr. Wilson have let India bide still awhile? With what I know about enormous waste in North-West Provinces and Punjab, no one will persuade me we might not have made healthy progress in finance and have prepared the people to go with us two years hence in almost any form of new taxation, provided they were first consulted, and *allowed time to deliberate* about it.”

As to Sir G. Clerk's opinion, Frere writes to Lord Canning :—

“ June 11, 1860.

“ You must, I think, draw a distinction between what he would wish to do, if circumstances were other than they are, and what he would propose to do under existing circumstances. I do not think he sees any escape from the necessity which we all lament, or that if he were now in your Council he would give his voice against the proposed measures, or their immediate introduction in October next.

“ There are some men—Sir G. Clerk himself is an admirable specimen of the class—who might be dropped into any native community and would rule it, as Englishmen should always rule a weaker race, with little need of English troops ; but such men are always rare ; and since the proceedings connected with the Affghan War debased so many of the then rising generation of political officers, they have been in proportion rarer than before. Meantime our dominions have extended with marvellous rapidity, and the Government has had to employ many men who have no capacity for any but the French or Cossack style of dealing with natives—a style the inherent evils of which are sometimes mitigated by English good nature, sometimes aggravated by doctrinaire conceit, but which always requires an enormous visible preponderance of physical force to back it. . . .”

Whether he liked them or not, Sir G. Clerk loyally accepted the income-tax proposals and did his best to

make them work smoothly, while he gave his mind to the still more important matter of retrenchment.

To Mr. Barrow Ellis, Frere writes :—

“ July 31, 1860.

“First as to your accusation that I have become a wretched Qui Hi * Centralizer, . . . forgetful of his old principles and old presidency. Be it known to you that I do not intend to plead to any charge in the Revenue or Financial Department, everything connected with which goes to Mr. Wilson, and I see and hear nothing of it, unless he asks my opinion, or the matter comes before Council, neither of which, generally, happens till it is rather late for advice to be of use. We are excellent friends, and he always expresses himself as valuing my opinion very highly on all matters, and I often recognize bits of my own suggestions in his propositions. I urged at the outset of the income-tax that he should refer to the Governments of Madras and Bombay for their solution of the financial difficulty, and ask them what they thought of his suggestions ; very possibly this would not have stopped or prevented the Trevelyan row, but it would have saved heartburning and time, and made the measure a better one. On various occasions since, I have counselled a similar course, with but rare success, for he has a great idea that to treat India as containing numerous different nations is as great a mistake as to dissolve the Union or restore the Heptarchy, and friend — rather encourages this idea, and is apt to argue that you may do what you please in India, if you only do it with a high hand ; so the upshot of it all is, that having more, much more than I can do, of my own, I leave my Right Honorable Colleague to do his work his own way, only always telling him when I think he is going wrong, if I know it before it is done, which is not often, and remonstrating even afterwards, if I see the papers, which is not always. I think this will dispose of most of your accusations, at least all connected with customs accounts and establishments. I must say that when a matter is discussed in time, it is difficult to meet with a more clear-headed, sensible, reasonable, and liberal man than Wilson is. . . .”

* Bengalee.

Wilson's Budget passed the Legislative Council, and the Income-tax Bill became law. It was his last public work. The Indian climate, to a man who goes there late in life and works hard, is too often fatal. He died after a few days' illness, during which Frere was frequently with him, early in August.

Frere writes to Major F. Marriott :—

“ August 11, 186a.

“ It was a very sad sight that funeral of Wilson's. Twelve days before he had been talking to my wife about his plans for going away to the Neilgerries when his Bills were all passed, and we went to see him the day before he was taken ill. He sent us many messages, asking my wife to take care of his unmarried daughter, if the married one left, and desired that I would take up and carry through his unfinished measures. I felt this proof of his confidence the more, because he knew that in the manner of carrying out many measures, and in some of the measures themselves, I did not entirely agree with him. No ancient Stoic or modern Red Indian could have met death more composedly, or made more calm preparation for carrying on the various schemes he left incomplete.”

Frere had now, therefore, in addition to his own department, to take up and carry on the whole of the financial work, as well as the military finance—which last employment enabled him to look after the “ Military Finance Commission,” which, “ since Wilson's death, had got into a good deal of hot water,” and to keep things together till Wilson's successor, Mr. Laing, arrived six months afterwards.

He writes to General Cotton (January 8, 1861), apologizing for an unanswered letter :—

“ I hope Forbes will have told you how I have been worked since poor Wilson died and Outram left ; and now I look forward to Laing's arrival, and to the appointment of some good man to succeed Outram, much as a shipwrecked sailor watches the sail that may save his life.

Even then we shall be trying to work a first-rate man-of-war with the crew of a coasting collier."

To Sir Charles Wood he writes :—

"November 23, 1860.

"I trust we are not to take the diatribes of the *Times* as an index of the general feeling in England as to the mode in which the Government of India has acted in financial matters since Mr. Wilson's death. There is no single difficulty which has arisen for which any one now here is fairly responsible, but they are all attributed to Lord Canning and his Indian advisers.

"I would not have alluded to this had it not been connected with one of the great popular mistakes regarding Indian finance. It is generally believed that Indian insolvency is only to be averted by some miracle of financial statesmanship, such as would save Austria or Turkey. This is a dangerous error, first, because it leads the public to expect novel and striking plans, instead of being content with what is homely, obvious, and comparatively easy of attainment ; and secondly, because it sets your financiers to search for such striking novelties instead of being content to work hard at more useful drudgery. . . . You simply want good accounts, and steady, good management in a hundred small details to extricate you from all embarrassments. Our real defect in India, hitherto, has been want of power in any one man, not to make great alterations, but to supervise and get into order a number of branches and departments which have heretofore been nearly independent. . . .

"All this Wilson would have done and much more, but I was struck in the last letter he wrote to you, and which Lord Canning showed me, with the number of plans which he had in hand, and which would have taken him twenty years to work out. He had described most of them more or less in conversation, but I never observed the hopelessness of any one mortal executing them till they were compressed into that single letter—most of them, as you know, were merely in embryo ;—but no one out of India can conceive what a task it is to work out any one such plan, and many of them, though excellent in themselves, were not at all necessary to bring your finances into a condition of solvency."

How much there was to be done, how difficult it still was to get reliable accounts, and to detect the various channels through which the public money was running to waste, the following letters, written nearly a year later, serve to indicate.

Frere writes, May 8, 1861, to Sir G. Clerk :—

“ It seems incredible, but it is a fact that we started this time last year in the belief that the police of India must cost near twenty lacs (£200,000). No one could tell exactly, but from the best accounts forthcoming here it seemed certain it would not be less.* Bruce was certain it was more, and after a year's digging it is clear that four crores (*i.e.* four hundred lacs, or £4,000,000) is nearer the mark, though two and a half are all that as yet figure in the estimates. Bengal was supposed to be above twenty, and certainly under twenty-five lacs, and it is clear now that forty would be about the mark.

“ You will wonder how it is possible for such things to be in doubt—but so it is. Our accounts, till Wilson came, were utterly worthless and are only now beginning to improve. It is really at the bottom of all our financial difficulties. We have no accounts at all trustworthy, and it will take two or three years' hard work to provide them. Had I not come here and seen it with my own eyes, the utter rottenness of the whole system of accounts would have been quite incredible. Lord Ellenborough tried to improve matters, and ordered something very like the present Budget system, but as soon as his back was turned Dorin and Co. got back to their old ways.

“ Bruce is doing excellent work, but the jealousy of anything from a Bombay or Madras source seriously impedes progress. It would be ludicrous, were it not something worse, to see the way in which, between the Military and Police Commissions, whole corps are discovered which no one ever knew of before, but which had been concealed under some head of Political or Judicial charges. . . .” †

* Colonel Herbert Bruce was Inspector-General of Police and was engaged in overhauling the expenditure of that Department, and reforming the system of Police throughout India and Burmah, in a great part of which work Mr. R. Temple was his coadjutor.

† Colonel Bruce writes to Frere, August 5, 1861—“ Of this I am sure

To this Sir G. Clerk replied :—

“ May 20, 1861.

“ I am much obliged to you for the useful figures and remarks that Colonel Bruce has been good enough to send. I made some discoveries here, too, of *dark* levies, so dark that no one but their Commanding Officer knew of their existence, or how paid ! However, it was all a drop in the ocean, compared, I imagine, with what has gone on these last ten years in the Punjab and the North-West Provinces, and at double pace since the rebellion. I have at length got to the bottom of all here, excepting, by-the-bye, a party of Sowars, discovered only last week ; but they never had been a charge, having not yet seen a dumree of pay—*that's* a comfort. But I suppose they must get something here. Intermediately, I presume, they have lived on loot.”

The absence of an intelligible system of audit of accounts throughout India, especially in those parts that had been disorganized by the Mutiny, and the difficulty of ascertaining what proportion of expenditure ought to be set down as local, and what as Imperial, gave rise to optimistic and erroneous views on the part of the local Governments as to the proportion of revenue to expenditure in each particular province. In order to check, if possible, these fallacious ideas, the Supreme Government passed a financial resolution, one of the chief objects of which was to call the attention of the Governments of the larger provinces to the fact that “ Imperial expenses were much larger than is generally supposed, and that a province may have a surplus after paying its local Civil expenses, and yet fail to contribute anything like its quota towards the Imperial expenses which admit of no

viz. that the Police of all India was not costing much, if anything, under four crores on May 1, 1860, which is the date fixed for all our returns, and I am equally certain that it can be done much more efficiently under the new system for less than one half.”

localization." The Punjab was mentioned as being amongst the worst offenders, and the greatest drain on the Imperial finances. To this the Punjab Government, which held a long-cherished belief that the exact contrary was the case, and that they were contributing a handsome surplus to the Imperial Treasury, replied, altogether repudiating the imputation. The Supreme Government rejoined in a Minute written by Frere, which showed conclusively that of the enormous military and quasi-military expenditure which was going on there, a much larger proportion was expended for purely local purposes than the Punjab Government charged itself with, while a much smaller proportion was required for the Imperial purpose of frontier defence than they had taken credit for.

There were at that time three distinct military bodies in the Punjab, under separate commanders: the regular army, the local army and frontier force under the direct control of the Lieutenant-Governor, and the military police, which had no military functions, but was simply a native local force. The total annual expenditure on these forces exceeded a million and a half sterling. At Peshawur there were more than 9,000 soldiers, of whom 5,264 were Europeans. How excessive this force was for any frontier or Imperial object may be estimated by the fact, that the entire army, which twenty years before had conquered Affghanistan and held it for three years, numbered 13,500, of whom less than 3,300 were Europeans.*

"February 25, 1862.

"When Montgomery † was here," Frere writes to Sir G. Clerk, "we went over the calculation. He with the aid of Temple and Davies (his very able secretary) could not

* Minute by Frere, January 14, 1862.

† Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab.

get the absolute deficit, after deducting every item which even he could call an Imperial charge, below thirty or forty lacs (£300,000 or £400,000), but he could not say how the deficit could be got rid of. . . . But it is uphill work.

* * * * *

These Punjabees work the Press, and work the Indian Council, and men still think the Punjab a mine of wealth."

General Sir Robert Napier (afterwards Lord Napier of Magdala) had, on his return from the Chinese War in 1861, succeeded Outram as Military Member of the Supreme Council, and thus become one of Frere's colleagues at Calcutta. Between him and Frere there had existed from the first mutual liking and respect, soon ripening into cordial friendship, which helped forward the heavy work of army reform, in which both were so keenly interested. Five years later, when the course of service had brought them together again, and Napier was Commander-in-Chief of Bombay, Frere writes of him as being "as charming a combination of the Royal Engineers and a knight of the Round Table as it is possible to imagine."

Napier describes his relations with Frere at Calcutta as follows:—

"My first acquaintance with Sir Bartle Frere was when I was fitting out and embarking the Bengal troops for the campaign in China in 1860.

"Sir James Outram was the President of the Council and Sir Bartle Frere a member. Sir James Outram, fresh from the exigencies of war, knew well how injurious would be the application of regulations adapted for peace measures to the wants of a military force under newly developed conditions, and in the application of his experience he was cordially supported by his colleague Sir Bartle Frere, who took an intense interest in, and a masterly view of, the wants of the troops, and the necessity

of delivering them on the field of their work in the most perfect condition possible.

“ Instead of having to fight for everything under the harrow of regulations never intended for such occasions, all official red-tape obstructions were brushed aside. Liberal outfits for European and native troops, with foresight for all contingencies, were at once sanctioned; all just pay arrangements settled with liberal facility. The transports, in spite of the resistance of the Superintendent of Marine, and of their captains, were made healthy by proper ventilation and sanitation. Officialism vainly tried to interfere. Though the power to influence these matters rested with Sir James Outram, such a colleague as Sir Bartle Frere, whose courteous persistence put aside all controversy, was very valuable. Under such auspices I was enabled to deliver the Bengal portion of the troops in China in excellent condition and fit for immediate service after a three months' voyage.

“ I again came in communication with Sir Bartle Frere when I joined the Council of the Governor-General in 1861.

“ His courteous bearing and cordial kindness made my entry into a new and very responsible office, at a very difficult time, comparatively easy. His wise and temperate advice was ever ready.

“ The first military business was to reduce the war establishment of the Mutiny years to a peace footing.

“ Sir Bartle Frere pointed out how necessary it was to effect this work ourselves instead of waiting until some Special Commission might be sent from England to do with a rough hand what we could do with more consideration. . . .

“ As Military Member of Council in all matters relating to my department, I felt the value of the friendship of one who had so wide an experience and so comprehensive a grasp of public affairs both in England and Europe as Sir Bartle Frere.”

The “ Military Finance Commission ” already referred to had been appointed early in 1859. It consisted of three members, one from each Presidency, and was charged with the all-important and gigantic task of investigating the

military expenditure throughout India, and reporting on the best means of reducing it. Colonel (afterwards Sir George) Balfour was appointed from Madras, Colonel Jamieson from Bombay, and Colonel Mure from Bengal. The last two had to leave India from ill-health or other causes before the completion of the work, and the chief burden of it, during a period of more than three years, fell on Colonel Balfour. Experienced, persevering, and determined, he was eminently fitted for the laborious and difficult work, and in the statistical calculations incident to it he was materially assisted by his wife, a daughter of the financial reformer Joseph Hume, who possessed the family capacity for dealing with figures. The questions with which the Commission had to deal involved a reduction, not of thousands, but of millions sterling—if the finances were to be made to balance;—and the Indian Budget each year had to be framed with reference to its investigations and conclusions.

In a Minute dated March 11, 1862, Frere wrote :—

“ I consider the possibility of preserving the present financial equilibrium of income and expenditure depends mainly—I believe it might with truth be said, entirely—on the maintenance of the Military Finance Department, or of a department similarly constituted, as a separate department, in free and confidential communication with the Governor-General in Council—qualified to submit sound professional opinions on every ordinary branch of military expenditure; free to express those opinions, and bound to do so on all questions which are likely to affect, directly or prospectively, the aggregate of that outlay.”

As regarded the Bombay Presidency, Frere was often able to smooth the way of the Commission and assist it by his local knowledge and by his reputation for fairness and sound judgment on military matters. He wrote several letters in this and the following year to old friends

in Sind and elsewhere to endeavour to reconcile them to the inevitable ; it was a sore point when the question of a reduction in the Sind Horse was raised. Cutting down expenses and disbanding regiments was a weary and thankless task, rousing opposition and discontent wherever the smart of the pruning-knife was felt. Military officials everywhere were, as was natural, inclined to be hostile. Even in the Military Secretary's Department at Calcutta, where there was less excuse for it, there was sometimes a disinclination to assist the Commission or to work cordially with it, so that Frere's good offices were occasionally required to make peace. At last matters went so far that Balfour, considering himself aggrieved beyond bearing by the tone and purport of a letter addressed to him by the Military Secretary, sent in his resignation. The occurrence was due partly to a mistake, partly to faults on both sides. Frere immediately set himself heart and soul to unravel the threads of the misunderstanding and to heal the breach. A correspondence between Balfour, Napier, and himself followed, in which he speaks of Balfour's resignation as a public misfortune, and, in earnest words appealing to him to "speak frankly and freely" to Napier as "to an old Addiscombe comrade," begs him to withdraw it. He was at last successful. It will be enough to quote the brief entries in his private diary to show what pains he took to avert the catastrophe.

"*Jan. 31st, 1862.*—Balfour and Napier. On returning, found B.'s note resigning, on a snub from the Military Department.

"*Feb. 1st.*—Saw Balfour before breakfast. Determined to resign. Spoke to Lord Canning. B. saw him after, and they had a long and not very satisfactory discussion. B. positive to resign. Told him he was very foolish and wrong.

"*Feb. 2nd.*—To Bruce and Napier early about Balfour. Wrote to N., who was ill in bed, and saw him evening. All a mistake about the censure to B. N. agreed to write a conciliatory letter to, and see B. Wrote to B.

"*Feb. 3rd.*—To see Balfour early."

Colonel Jamieson, one of the three Commissioners, writes to Frere :—

" March 18, 1862.

"Balfour's energy has done wonders, and India owes him much for the present satisfactory state of Finance.

"To your kind and constant support to Balfour and to myself the success of the Finance Commission is to be attributed. Balfour always acknowledges this and feels your kindness most gratefully. I will to my last day retain towards you the same feelings of gratitude by which I was actuated when I left Calcutta."

Towards the end of April, 1862, Colonel Balfour left for England. The value and importance of his work on the Finance Commission had obtained full recognition. Lord Canning, Frere, Napier, Laing, and Beadon, each wrote a minute expressing their high appreciation of his services, in which Lord Elgin expressed his concurrence. In sending a copy to Frere, Balfour thus touchingly refers to his difference with Napier.

" May 19, 1862.

"I cannot allow this last opportunity to pass without writing to say how gratefully I bear in mind the noble and unvarying support I have received from you, and to acknowledge the fact that I owe to your encouragement and countenance the openings I have had of being useful to Government. I enclose two copies of the Minutes thanking me for my services, and I confess that you have always judged wisely in urging me to do my duty, trusting to the efforts being fully appreciated; and I feel assured that you will be pleased to learn that, as I failed to see Sir R. Napier owing to his absence at Barrackpore, I wrote to express my regret that I should have thought hardly of him, and have allowed myself to entertain

thoughts so much opposed to the noble sentiments he had recorded in my favour. I mentioned that I had requested Colonel Browne to wait on him frequently, and as there were now few questions likely to create differences, and as Colonel B. was of a more conciliatory disposition, I trusted that the public service would be better carried on during my absence. . . . ”*

This was not the only occasion on which Frere played the part of peacemaker between men high in office at Calcutta.

In Lord Canning's time it had not yet become the custom for the Governor-General or the Members of his Council to go to the Hills in the hot weather. The press of official work was too great, and railway communication not yet sufficiently developed. During Frere's stay at Calcutta, he was never able to go up the country except once, at the end of 1861, when he went to attend Lord Canning's Durbars at Agra and elsewhere. The following letter to his third little daughter describes a trip of a few miles up the Hooghly :—

“November 11, 1860.

“I think you will be amused with an account of a trip I made with Lord Canning when we were staying at

* More than five years afterwards, Frere, then in London, wrote to Sir Stafford Northcote :

“General Balfour deserved the lion's share of the credit for the great reduction in Military expenditure, which enabled Wilson and Laing to balance income and expenditure. Such service, of course, did not make him popular anywhere, and when all in high office who had seen his work were dead or departed from Calcutta, he came home, and, I imagine, was not received as he should have been after such services. What occurred between him and Lord Halifax I never exactly knew, and have not had time to inquire ; but he was deeply hurt, and declared he would never set foot in the old India Office again.

“I hope his vow does not hold valid as regards the new building ; for he is quite the most valuable man of his class I know, and able to render most excellent service in an unpopular and uninviting department. . . . ”

Barrackpore some weeks ago." (Here follows a description of the chief localities of Calcutta, and a beautifully drawn map of the Hooghly, showing the position of Calcutta and of all the chief places for thirty miles up the river.)

"We started very early from the Governor-General's house, and drove through the station and up the river to Phulta Ghaut, near Ishapoor, where we were to embark, but the steamer was not then come, so we waited, watching the fishermen and making sketches for half an hour, and then embarked on board the Governor-General's 'Flat,' as it is called—a sort of floating house with two sitting-rooms, sleeping cabins, drawing-rooms, etc., with a deck above as a promenade, under an awning. This was towed by a steamer, and away we went up the river, taking what is called the 'small breakfast'—tea and bread-and-butter—as we went. The river is here a very fine one, much larger than any you have ever seen, and crowded with boats, large and small, the big ones carrying on a great trade with all Bengal, the smaller fishing. The banks are low but lined with the most luxuriant vegetation and thick groves of large trees, with a swarming population in huts, interspersed here and there with brick houses, and occasionally the palace of some great native proprietor or European planter; a few temples and numerous ghauts, or flights of steps leading down to the water, occur every few hundred yards along the bank. Budrashahur would be a very large brick town in Europe and is the great centre of the Bengal salt trade. Fleets of salt boats lined the banks, and the only remarkable buildings were salt warehouses. Then we came to Chandernagore, the only remnant of French empire in Bengal—a pretty, neat town, with well-kept esplanade along the bank of the river, a neat Governor's house, public offices, etc., all as became a dependency of la belle France. There are two or three large hotels too, rather apt to be occupied by people who wish to escape their creditors in Calcutta, for M. M. Hayes, the polite and well-informed Governor, though he rules over a territory about the size of an English parish, keeps up all the rights and privileges of French territory, and under the tricolor, which waves over his Government House, no English sheriff's officer can serve his writ on any

unfortunate debtor. Zouaves, or men dressed like them, were on sentry at the various public offices, and there was a great running to hoist the flag when they saw ours and recognized the Governor-General's barge, and it was duly dipped as a salute as we passed. Beyond this we came to Chinsura, where was formerly the Dutch factory, and it has as evident marks of being a Dutch town as Chandernagore of being French. We visited a queer little church which . . . retains little of its Dutch origin but its general shape, a bit or two of wooden carving, and some funeral achievements of old Dutch Mynheers, whose arms are all duly painted, with their names at full length. . . . Then to the Imamharra, a great Mahometan seminary just outside the town. . . . You enter by a fine gateway into a large court or quadrangle with a very fine mosque at one end, kitchens and refectory on one side, and the lecture-rooms and students' cells all round the rest of the quadrangle. He took us over his own rooms—not quite so well furnished and comfortable as a Fellow's of Trinity, but very neat and scholarlike, with plenty of books, but all Persian or Arabic, for this is a great stronghold of Islamism. There are trim little gardens behind the cells and in the quadrangle, and beautiful views up and down the river from the top of the mosque. The old gentleman with his Calendar's cap and crutch-headed staff, introducing his scholars and their tutors in the courtyard, might all have just dropped from Bagdad. The next place we visited, about a mile on, looked like a bit of Portugal. It is a fine old Portuguese church, between two and three hundred years old, with a little, old Portuguese priest in surplice and skull-cap, and attended by his quire and a dozen or two of his congregation, looking quite as antiquated and as little like India as his church. He took us over his little parsonage—a comfortable house, connected with the church by a cloister. His sitting-room was evidently intended only for distinguished visitors, for no one could sit in it on account of the number of ornaments of every kind with which it was crowded, the gifts, he told us, of his people, and which he did not know how to dispose of—busts and figures of all kinds: Queen Victoria, Cupids, French shepherds and shepherdesses, dogs, stags, etc., in plaster, marble, china, and bronze; shells, bead-work, crochet, and

worsted; samplers, prints of all kinds, the Duke of Wellington and Pope Pius IX., the Prodigal Son's progress under the guise of Spanish costumes of the eighteenth century, the Church's Sacraments of about the same time, and various other prints of every kind. At last he got a chair for the Governor-General and Lady Canning, and produced his deeds and charters, some of them granted by the old Emperors of Delhi a hundred and fifty years ago. He was greatly delighted at the first visit of a Governor-General since Lord William Bentinck's time.

"I have nothing to tell you of our return voyage, except that we saw eleven elephants bathing at one place, some of them lying down in the water and being scrubbed."

To Mr. Bouchier, Frere writes :—

"October 6, 1861.

"We often wish ourselves anywhere on your downs or among your lanes, and think that if we could only have our children with us, a quiet turnpike on a not too noisy road would be a good exchange for our house in Chowringhee. We should care less for the separation if we felt we were doing the children much good by staying here, but what with reduced pay and greatly increased expense of living, income-tax, and the accident that, almost immediately after I came here, the removal of Ricketts and Outram left me senior Member of Council, with no additional salary, which my predecessors had formerly, to cover the increased expenditure when the Governor-General was absent, we have given up all hopes of ever being anything but a copper imitation of the ancient golden Nabob. However, I shall not have earned my pension for another year, so there is no necessity for any immediate decision, and the longer one lives out here the more one feels the folly of forming plans long in advance. Meantime the work is absorbing, and as long as Lord Canning remains, it is a great pleasure to be able to aid, however slightly, in carrying out the only policy worthy of England which has been formally acknowledged by the Indian Government since Lord W. Bentinck's time. Off and on ever since we came here the work of the five Members of the Executive Council has had to be done

sometimes by three or even by two, and has been very hard and not at all satisfactory, owing to the impossibility of really looking after any one Department. But the difficulties have been reduced as far as possible by Lord Canning, who has always dealt with me quite in the way my uncle * would have wished, and I sometimes think that if he could see how we worked he would not be displeased at the kind of work I have been able to do for the son of his old friend. It has, at any rate, been honest support, for Lord Canning's policy and objects have always been worthy of his father's son, and such as any man might be proud of aiding; and had he been better supported by those about him in 1857-8, he would have escaped much of the unmerited obloquy to which he has been exposed, and the true value of his services to India and to England would have been sooner appreciated."

Mr. Laing had arrived to take Wilson's place early in January, 1861, but his health also soon failed, and within five months he had set out on his return to England on sick leave. Frere writes to Lord Canning:—

"June 11, 1861.

"I must say I quite agree with him (Laing) that it is useless to attempt importing another Financial Minister from England. You know I do not undervalue the labours of either poor Wilson or Laing, but the net result is not worth the cost. In reductions you are where your own Military Finance Commission (appointed two years before any English Financier was appointed) would have brought you, at least as soon, by simply working on as it began. In Civil reductions and Police reform the work done has been by Indian impulse as well as by Indian machinery, and if the Finance Minister has given valuable support and aid, you would certainly have got on faster and better without any other interference from England.

"In taxation, what Wilson did Laing has condemned.

"In all, that relates to management of Loans, Budget and Audit and general organization and management, we have been great gainers through Wilson's and Laing's

* Hookham Frere. See chap. I.

labours. But at what cost? Will the loss of Wilson and Ward, Laing's breakdown, the damage of Trevelyan's official repute and the interruption to his usefulness, the increased acerbity of local jealousies, the consequent delay and loss of time in effecting real reforms—will these be balanced by what we have gained? and is what we have gained equal to what we might have had, if what you began early in 1859 had gone on undisturbed by external interference?

"I really believe it is not. The great advantage we have derived from Wilson and Laing has been the sort of authority with which they came out, and which enabled them easily to overcome obstacles which might otherwise have been serious; but this advantage cuts both ways and makes their errors, in proportion, of graver moment.

"Nor, as Laing shows, are you likely now to command even this advantage of authority for any good purpose. Whoever comes will feel he has, like a Roman Consul, to make his name famous in a single year, or at most two or three, and will not be content honestly to carry out his predecessor's policy. An active man, even if of the first class, will probably be actively mischievous, and a second or third-class man, whether active or passive, will be far worse than useless.

"I quite concur in what Mr. Laing says of the character of our real want, and I like his proposed organization better than what I once talked of to you—a plan for getting out, not a Minister of Finance, but simply a Minister of Account."

Amongst other duties which fell to his share, Frere generally had the task of piloting the Government measures through the Legislative Council; and small though the Council was—there were only twelve members, of whom frequently not more than five or six were present—there were sometimes animated debates. To what length these debates were carried, may be gathered from the fact that the printed Report of them for 1860 runs to over fourteen hundred pages.

The struggles of the Mutiny had left behind a legacy

of bitter race hatred and suspicion. The Europeans, particularly the non-official and mercantile community of Calcutta, were greatly incensed with the native population, and angry with Lord Canning for his firm moderation in dealing with them. Some measures affecting the relations between Europeans and natives came before the Council, which gave rise to the expression of a strong feeling of antagonism to the latter. It was unfortunate that the usual exponent of this feeling was the highest judicial officer in India—the Chief Justice, Sir Barnes Peacock.

The law passed in 1857 to restrict the bearing and selling of arms expired early in 1860, and to take its place a new Arms Bill was introduced. Frere had not seen it before it was brought in. In its original form, however, he had no particular objection to it. Writing to Mr. Barrow Ellis, he says—

“ August 6, 1860.

“ It was then all that was really needed—a law to limit trade in arms and ammunition, and to prevent people from carrying arms without a license or permit—our Sind law, in fact. The alterations made in it were no children of mine. I do not approve of any general attempt to take away arms from the people, for I believe it will be made everywhere, but especially in the North-West and Punjab, an instrument of frightful oppression, and be quite ineffectual, except to make rebels. I hold the power to subject a district to domiciliary searches for arms, such as go on in the North-West, to be quite as much an imperial power as that of making peace and war, and would limit it accordingly to the Supreme Government. . . . The Bill as it stands is a vile Bill, and should not have passed in its present shape if I had got hold of it earlier.”

During its progress the Chief Justice had moved and pressed an amendment for the exemption of Europeans, Americans, and Eurasians from its restrictions, although

in 1857 he had as Member of Council concurred in rejecting a proposal for their exemption, and his Minute was on record. Such a race distinction was especially distasteful to Frere. Patriotic to a fault as he was, and profoundly convinced that Englishmen were capable of holding their own against all comers without any adventitious aid, it was alike offensive to his sense of justice and galling to his pride in his countrymen that such a distinction should be made. In the course of his speech in opposition to the exemption he said—

“ He could not answer for other Members, but judging from his own experience, he confessed he was frequently reminded by his own feelings that we come of a very irascible race, prone to get angry and to be guilty of assault and battery to an extent unusual amongst other races. There was no denying this fact, which every one knew: no race in the world knew better how to use such weapons as Nature gave them, or were better able to defend themselves under the greatest disadvantages. It was difficult therefore to find any section of the community for whose exemption as a class from any such police regulation fewer good reasons could be shown. . . . But there was a stronger reason. Such class exemptions, unjust to all, were most injurious to the exempted class. . . . We were never tired of inculcating this on nations in which slavery prevailed. We were convinced of it ourselves, and were, as we flattered ourselves, fast persuading other nations to agree with us. . . . The Government was most anxious to do all in its power to promote the settlement in this country of as many Europeans as could make a fair livelihood in it, convinced that they would add greatly to the strength of the Government and to the resources of the country. The way to encourage them was not by making special exemptions in their favour, but by improving our administration, so that we could reasonably expect them to live under the same laws as their fellow-subjects.”

He spoke with deep feeling and conviction, and with even more than his usual force. Not only did his opinion

great, and there are no means of effectually solving the doubt, save by a decision of some competent Court of Law—that is, if the opinion so wantonly thrown out carries with the public the weight which, from his high and well-deserved character as a lawyer, it ought to carry.”

To this Sir Charles Wood replies—

“June 9, 1861.

“I am utterly shocked by Sir B. Peacock’s proceedings. The declaration about the titles to land is the most unjustifiable thing a man ever did. That he should have thrown out such a doubt seems to me to be monstrous, and if anything could be added to make the course worse, it is his own confession that he had not had time fully to consider it.”

Another circumstance illustrating the anomalous position of the Council occurred in December, 1860.

The Mysore Princes, members of the family of Tippoo Saib, who had fallen at the storming of Seringapatam in 1799, had had large revenues assigned them under the treaty which followed. These revenues, by their supposed complicity in the Vellore Mutiny of 1806, they were held to have forfeited; but nevertheless, and in spite of the disreputable course of life pursued by several of them, they were still considered to have certain undefined claims on the Government. Sir Charles Wood settled the matter by assigning them £34,000 a year for their lives, together with a sum for purchasing houses.

Frere, concurring with Lord Canning’s opinion, wrote a Minute deprecating the proposed arrangement as “a fatal gift tending to increase in each generation the number of unworthy recipients, and to diminish the proportion of those members of the family who will bear a trace of their brave and energetic ancestry.” He also pointed out that, to take up such questions, except at the instance of the Viceroy, would have the effect of dangerously weakening

worse than a failure, it was a crime. If by leaving the Zulus alone they can evolve civilization and liberty from among themselves—if they can live alongside the white race in Natal and Transvaal without coming into a struggle for supremacy, then the course we have taken during these last three years, as during the preceding fifty, has been wrong.

“But I have always regarded that view as a mischievous dream, the folly of which is proved by history everywhere, but especially by four thousand years of negro existence without one single step of spontaneous advance throughout this vast continent, every step out of their general animal existence being clearly traceable to some external impulse or impression.”

While in England Frere was being censured and vilified, in South Africa an overwhelming majority of the colonists, of whatever race or origin, were declaring, in unmistakable terms, that he had gained their warmest approbation and admiration.

The first note was sounded (March 24) at Capetown, at a public meeting, called to protest against the gross misrepresentations of the *Argus* newspaper of the state of public opinion at the Cape. The *Argus* was Saul Solomon's paper. The editor was one McLoughlin, an Irishman, formerly a private soldier, who had got into some trouble, for which he had been suspended from the Capetown City Club; afterwards some evidence which he gave at a trial was so strongly animadverted upon by the judge, that there was a question of his indictment for perjury, so that Solomon, to his regret, for he was a clever man, had to drop him. Solomon was an influential politician, who had at first professed to be friendly to the Government; but for some personal reason he changed his ground, and the *Argus* became the organ of an incongruous minority, comprehending the Opposition led by Mr. Merriman, Bishop Colenso, the Aborigines Protection

Society, and the Dutch Afrikaner party, who agreed only in wishing to oust Mr. Sprigg's Ministry and thwart his and Frere's policy.

The meeting was the largest and most enthusiastic known at Capetown since the days of the anti-convict agitation. An attempt by Solomon and his friends to move an amendment failed utterly, and resolutions of enthusiastic approbation of Frere's action were carried by acclamation.

The note thus sounded was taken up wherever British rule extended in South Africa. From town after town and village after village kept pouring in addresses and resolutions, in different forms, and mixed up with different local questions, but almost without exception * agreeing in enthusiastic commendation of him as the one man who had grasped the many threads of the South African tangle, and was handling them so as to promise a solution, in accordance with the interests of all the many and various races which inhabited it.

"In the opinion of this meeting," one of them (from Cradock) runs, "his Excellency Sir Bartle Frere is one of the best Governors, if not the best Governor, this Colony has ever had, and the disasters which have taken place since he has held office, are not due to any fault of his, but to a shameful mismanagement of public affairs before he came to the Colony, and the state of chaos and utter confusion in which he had the misfortune to find everything on his arrival; and this meeting is therefore of opinion that the thanks of every loyal colonist is [are] due to his Excellency for the Herculean efforts he has since made under the most trying circumstances to South Africa. . . ." †

Another, from Kimberley, says—

"Your Excellency may rely upon our assurance that

* There is *one*, in a contrary sense, amongst them all.

† C. 2367, p. 28.

his authority, and lead to the inference that justice was not to be obtained in India itself.

The Home Government, however, held to their opinion and the proposed arrangement was decided on. In December the amount of the grant leaked out, and a storm of indignation arose at Calcutta. Coming at a time when strenuous efforts at retrenchment were being made, and new taxes being imposed, the new settlement was denounced almost unanimously by the Europeans as lavish and excessive, and a petition against it signed by nearly all the leading merchants and professional men. The Chief Justice moved an address in the Legislative Council, asking for the production of Papers and the correspondence with the Home Government on the subject. It was in vain that Frere, who in Lord Canning's absence was acting President of the Council, pointed out that whatever the merits of the case, the Council had nothing to do with it, and that the only effect of producing Papers would be to raise a debate on a subject which the Council had no authority to entertain. The Chief Justice persisted, and the debate was adjourned for a week. Lord Canning was up the country, but in the interval Frere was able to obtain his view of the question. It was a great satisfaction to him to find that he entirely approved of the course he had taken.

Lord Canning writes :—

“ December 12, 1860.

“ I had seen in the newspapers the Petition which was presented to the Legislative Council on Saturday, and I was expecting a breeze. . . .

“ It is now clear that the battle of the Legislative Council must be fought out. The other side are committed to it ; and there is no escaping a full, open, public discussion of the question.

“ The claims of the existing Council to a larger scope

of responsibility and authority is a more difficult part of the question than the outside demands for a more numerous and independent Council.

“But the whole must be fought in England, not in India, and our study should, in my opinion, be to keep out of the fray as much as possible. Irritation amongst our respective champions at home will do us little harm, but any increase of soreness between the Government and the Patriots in India is greatly to be avoided.

“If Peacock should carry a motion of which the gist should be a request for Papers on the Mysore Grant, I would answer it by a message declining, very civilly, to give the Papers, on the ground that the interest of the public service forbids it—indicating, gently but clearly, the right of the Governor-General so to decline—and adding that the request would be made known to the Secretary of State. This will transfer the contest to London;—and to do this quietly, and with as little exasperation here as possible, is what we should now aim at.”

The Chief Justice pressed his motion to a division, and the numbers being four to four, carried it by his casting vote as Chairman. Frere, in studiously courteous terms, declined to give the Papers.

Sir Charles Wood, in answer to a letter of Frere's giving a detailed account of the debate, approves the refusal of the Papers, and says—

“The truth is that the Legislative Council has assumed, gradually perhaps, a position that does not belong to it. . . . From 1833 to 1853 the Executive Council of the Governor-General legislated, with the addition of an English barrister, to give some legal shape and form to their ordinances and laws. Would anybody have dreamt of the Council with this member addressing the Council without this member for papers?”

Already, before Frere went to Calcutta, it was generally felt that the Legislative Council, as then constituted, did not work well, and recent experience had strengthened the conviction that a change in its constitution must be

made. It had originated in 1833 as an enlargement, for legislative purposes, of the Governor-General's Executive Council, all the members of which were ex-officio members of it. The enlargement was effected by the addition of a legal member nominated by the Home Government—the first of whom was Macaulay—whose presence was made necessary to the passing of any law affecting British India ; and subsequently, in 1853, when Sir Charles Wood was President of the Board of Control, by the addition of a member of the Civil Service from each Presidency and Lieutenant-Governorship, and of two of the Judges of the Supreme Court. At this stage, Lord Dalhousie gave it a character never intended by Sir C. Wood, by making its debates public, and thereby inviting public comment. Thus, from being an offshoot of the Cabinet, it had gradually assumed many of the functions of a little Parliament.

As early as the previous March, before he had been three months in Calcutta, Frere had sent in a Minute on the changes which he deemed necessary in its constitution and functions. It was necessary either to go backwards and restrict it to its original functions, or forwards, so as to develop its representative character. Frere advocated on all accounts the latter course ; and, moreover, public opinion, both in England and India, would, he contended, render it impossible to lessen the independence of the Council, or to do away with the publicity which had been given to its debates ; it was necessary, therefore, boldly to face the second alternative, and to endeavour to make it as far as possible a representative body. But in any case, he insisted it was necessary to take out of its control all local matters, the management of which should be committed to a local Council in each Presidency and Lieutenant-Governorship.

Sir Charles Wood writes to Frere :—

“February 18, 1861.

“Whatever notions may now prevail, nobody at that time (1853)—and I myself introduced the Bill—ever dreamt of a debating body with open doors and even quasi-independence. Lord Dalhousie began wrong, and I am afraid that everything since has tended in the same direction. He, I believe, generally presided and kept things straight. This, I believe, is not the practice, and everything has gone in the direction of fostering the notion of their being an independent legislative body. It is all wrong and very unfortunate, because there is always a sympathy here for independent deliberation.

“I am writing for Lord Canning’s views on the matter, but I confess I am very uneasy as to the future bodies to be constituted in India. Representative bodies, in any real sense, you cannot have, and I do not think that any external element will *really do good*. It may satisfy the English at Calcutta to have an English merchant or English planter in the Council, but I am by no means sure that it would improve the legislation; and you cannot put natives in who are in any sense the exponents of active opinion, or who could take any part in the deliberations.”

It was with doubts and misgivings such as he expressed in the foregoing and subsequent letters that Sir Charles Wood brought in and passed the Bill of 1861 to amend the Legislative Council of India. Frere’s reply to one of these letters is inserted at some length, as it expresses the views that he had long been urging, and which he again pressed with the hope that the Bill might not fall short of what was needed.

“April 10, 1861.

“You may rely on it that no one is a safe adviser on this subject unless he is a very far-seeing statesman who looks below the surface, or has seen India within the last two years. No mere Indian experience of five years ago is worth much as a guide on this particular question, and it is of little use now inquiring what were the intentions

of Parliament when the Council was first constituted. You have declared that the Council alone has power to make laws. Lord Dalhousie gave the Council the form of a deliberative assembly, and the Mutiny of 1857 rendered it necessary to impose new taxes. The result may make the government of India more difficult than before, but whatever the result, I believe it to be impossible to recede, and I see the gravest danger to make legislation more autocratic, or more secret, or to raise taxes without the kind of discussions which now precede legislation. But I would go farther than saying it is impossible to recede. Looking at the very altered condition of India within the last five years, I am convinced that it is not desirable, even if it were possible, and that had you not enlarged the Council and had not Lord Dalhousie opened its sittings to the public, and the necessity for taxation drawn general attention to its proceedings, our difficulties now would have been far greater than they are.

“You can have little idea how much India is altered ; but if you consider that in these five years we have changed from an aggressive and advancing power to a stationary one ; that the sympathy which Englishmen, whether long resident or fresh to India, felt for the natives has changed to a general feeling of repugnance if not of antipathy ; that instead of a general feeling of content with their Indian lot and an inclination to live in India, to think of India, and consider things in an Indian rather than an English point of view, the English here are, almost generally, openly discontented, disinclined to remain here, or to care for India, and disposed to look at things in any but an Indian light ; that all this feeling is inevitably reciprocated by the natives ; that our debt and our unavoidable expenses have greatly increased, and that not only increased taxation, but great reduction of expenditure are necessary ; that this produces more or less discontent in every class both of Europeans and of natives, and that every day increases the intimacy and frequency of intercourse between this country and the people who are seething around you in Europe, inquiring, intriguing, money-getting, revolutionizing ;—think of all this, and you will have some notion of how different the task of governing is, from what it was when Lord Dalhousie landed here.

“How Lord Canning got on with the old machinery is to me an unaccountable marvel, but no human ability could get on with it much longer, and with a Governor-General of less judgment and calm courage you might any day have some terrible disaster.

“You will perhaps say this is not a case for enlarging the Legislature, or making it less official in its composition; and if there were any means for law-making in the several divisions of the Empire; if they could get on, as the Punjab does, without anything which lawyers consider a legal code, I should say, wait for quieter times without making any change. But since 1833 you have concentrated all law-making with most other functions here in Calcutta, and the machinery is ridiculously inadequate, in every way, to the task it has to perform. After twenty-eight years there is not a department of administration in which the concentration is real and perfect; even in finance and military affairs, it will take a year or two more of well-directed labour to effect real centralization, and they are the only great branches of administration in which I believe it is possible. But laws of some kind you must have, and it is in legislation that the inadequacy and incapacity of the present machinery is most clearly and frequently apparent.

“You cannot do much to remedy this by enlarging the existing body. It would still be most imperfect if it were five times as strong in numbers of well-selected men, and I much doubt if any one body you could devise would be able to shape the laws wanted for so many and such dissimilar races, and nations, and interests.

“The utmost you can hope to do is to assist the Viceroy with some sort of senate, which shall advise him in framing laws which can be of general application (*e.g.* such as relate to post-office, customs, etc.), and in confirming or annulling laws shaped by those who have had local experience and knowledge of local wants and wishes.

“To ascertain and to put into shape those wants and wishes you require local bodies, and I am sure the time is passed when it would be possible to constitute such bodies exclusively from among the servants of Government.

“Here, again, you must not be misled by those who recollect India only when the traditions of ancient exclusiveness still leavened the whole community in India.

Increasing trade, accelerated communication, and thirty-three millions of English capital invested in railways, made and owned by unofficial people, have rendered the servants of Government less able than ever to decide what even their own countrymen want or wish for and will have, if it is to be got by perseverance in asking here or in England.

“ Unless, then, you give us non-official Europeans in these local legislative bodies, you must be prepared to legislate in Westminster on every subject which touches that class. They will not rest content with our official legislation out here, and whether our official-made laws are bad or good, you will have to debate them over and over again in London.

“ Then if you admit non-official Europeans you must also admit, in at least equal proportion, natives, who in intelligence and education are their equals, and who have a far greater stake in the country. None but the best of your officials, men who cannot be spared from the administration of distant provinces, will give you as good an idea of native views and wishes as a very ordinary native gentleman or merchant will ; and your legislative bodies will make fatal mistakes unless they have some native members to aid them. . . .

“ You say ‘ representative bodies in any real sense we cannot have,’ but this is only true of representative bodies responsible to those whom they represent, which is not the sort of representation I mean. The members must be selected by the Government, but if well selected, they must represent the great interests of the country as well or better than if elected by popular suffrage. You doubt ‘ whether any external element will really do good.’ I can only say I doubt whether you can possibly get on much longer without it. It is certainly possible even now for a considerate, far-sighted, judicious man of some experience in Indian affairs to ascertain and anticipate the wants and wishes of those under his charge ; he will learn from representative men and bodies, such as Panchaits and Chambers of Commerce, what is thought of his measures or what is wanted, and shape his course accordingly ; but you do not often meet with men with the tact and knowledge necessary to do this effectually. I can remember very few, perhaps only one—the late Sir Robert Grant, who was new

to the country and did it effectually, excluding men who, like Mr. Mountstuart Elphinstone or Sir George Clerk, from past Indian experience and knowledge of mankind know more of most great interests under their charge than any one man of each interest could tell them. Then you must recollect that if this process of feeling the people's pulse is resorted to regularly and habitually, it is only doing in a circuitous, imperfect fashion what local legislatures would do directly and perfectly, while there is less responsibility on any one for the result, and it carries much less weight. I often see opinions of Sir George Clerk's, which I know to be not only sound in themselves, but the expression of the general opinion of the best-informed and most interested parties in Bombay, set aside and pooh-poohed by the sages here in a manner which would be impossible if it were embodied in a vote of a legislative body in Bombay.

"Men of great experience in the working of Colonial Councils, like Sir W. Denison or Sir H. Ward, are often averse to introduce Legislative Councils where they do not exist, from a feeling like that of our Generals towards *Times*' correspondents in their camps—they are always an additional trouble, and may be a serious embarrassment if inclined for mischief. But the question is, Can you exclude them or do without them? Lord Raglan had perhaps good cause for wishing Mr. Russell out of the Crimea, but he was only one feature, though an essential and indispensable one, of the system which enabled you in the second year of the war to be stronger than in the first, and to be ready to renew the contest when France and Russia were equally exhausted. The days are gone when you could govern India without much caring what the Europeans and Europeanized community say or think of your measures, and unless you have some barometer and safety-valve combined in the shape of a deliberative Council, I believe you will be always liable to very unlooked-for and dangerous explosions.

"Some men who advocate such bodies at the great Presidency towns would not have them at places like Rangoon or Lahore. No doubt autocratic government and legislation is, for the present, more possible at such places; but not, I think, less dangerous in the long run; nor can you, without some device like a local Legislative

Council, give to your pro-consuls in such provinces the real power they ought to possess. Aided by such a Council, you may as safely leave men like Sir R. Montgomery * or Colonel Phayre † as independent of all control in local matters and legislation as Sir George Clerk at Bombay, or Sir W. Denison at Madras; without it, all their acts are open to question, and, if Sir Barnes Peacock's law is correct, are utterly illegal. At best it is only their individual character, their distance, and the check which a considerate Governor-General imposes on the energies of his secretariat, which prevent a constant and most mischievous interference. I would remedy this by letting each head of a great administration organize the best Legislative Council that he can devise, and give to its enactments, approved by the Governor-General, with the advice of his senate, the force of law in all local matters.

“These are some of the reasons which make me anxious to see Lord Canning's plans sanctioned by Parliament, and perhaps carried further even than he contemplated in 1859. I believe it would contribute, more than anything we could do, to unite governors and governed, both European and native; to restore a healthy tone to the Administration; to turn the thoughts of the discontented from Imperial measures, which they can neither understand nor amend, to local wants which they can supply; and, above all, to strengthen the Executive in every province, and thereby strengthen the Imperial Government also. . . .”

Frere's opinion and that of Lord Canning prevailed. The Bill, though not in all details such as Frere approved, was drawn and became law on the lines suggested by them. Under its provisions two members of the Legislative Council were nominated by the Crown; and the Governor-General was given power to summon to it, besides the existing members, not less than six nor more than twelve additional members, of whom one-half at least were not to be officials under Government. The Judges

* Lieut.-Governor of the Punjab. † Commissioner in Burmah.

no longer had seats on it. That the Executive power might be strengthened, a new and extraordinary power was conferred on the Governor-General of making and promulgating ordinances, in cases of emergency, on his own responsibility. Councils more or less similarly constituted were provided for Bombay, Madras, and Bengal, with powers of legislation in local matters. On questions affecting the whole Empire of India these local legislatures might enter only with the previous sanction of the Governor-General. Finally—and this was the newest feature of all—the additional Members of the Legislative Council of India, as well as of the local Councils, might be either Europeans or natives.

A native gentleman was appointed to the Council at Madras, and at Bombay Sir George Clerk selected for this honour no less than four natives.

When Frere was with Lord Canning at Allahabad at the beginning of November, 1861, and the appointment of the new Members of the Legislative Council of India was pending, the Maharajah of Puttiala, anticipating that he himself might be nominated, came to see Frere and ask him about it. In Frere's diary is the following entry :—

“Memo. of remarks of the Raja of Puttiala, November 1, 1861. Enquiry as to the mode of doing business in the Legislative Council—how the members sit, speak, and discuss matters ; difficulty of language—of managing his own State if always away.

(“ Answer. Sessions brief—power of resignation.)

“ Of decision off-hand without consultation with skilled and experienced persons—difficulty of a single native in such a Council—he will have to bear the unpopularity of all measures not acceptable to natives.

(“ Ans. He will also share the popularity of good ones, and will have many to share both popularity and unpopularity with him.)

“ Of what class will his colleagues be ? Division of

business—military, civil administration—Finance—a ruler or legislator should know all branches, but some are quite ignorant of any but Finance. The mistakes they make in military and administrative matters : *e.g.* Raja of Burdwan.

(“ Ans. Parliament, Cabinet, Durbar—various kinds of fitness, but all eminent.)

“ Can you tell me who are likely men ?

(“ Ans. I believe none yet fixed, but sure to be men of mark and eminence, with whom it will be an honour to be associated.)

“ Is the Raja of Burdwan likely ? It is not pride makes me ask, but that such men really know nothing of the management of State affairs.

(“ Ans. What are the sort of people who do know ?)

“ Nawab of Raunpore. But we (chiefs like Puttiala) know little of our fellows. I hope to go to Benares if H. E. would speak to me after I have been there. I should be better able to speak, for I would inquire characters ; but the G. G. sees and knows all. . . .”

The entry in the diary for January 29, 1862, is :—

“ Legislative Council Debate. First occasion when Native Members of Council spoke. . . . Dinkur Row, Deonarain, and Maharajah of Puttiala on Inam Bill for preventing alienation of lands granted for services.”

And to Pelly, he writes :—

“ February 18, 1862.

“ The Councils have met under the new Act. There is the germ of much good, accompanied by much dross. But I am glad to see natives and non-officials sit and vote, and to save the principle of publicity—sorely endangered by the want of judgment shown by the Judges.”

But Sir Charles Wood's misgivings as to the probable effect of the Act were not to be easily dispelled.

He writes to Frere :—

“ August 17, 1861.

“ The Councils Act, which really alters the constitution of the Government of India, is by far the most important of the measures which I have introduced.

“It is framed upon Lord Canning’s despatches, and will, I hope, meet your views and answer your expectations.

“It is undeniable that it is a great experiment and I can only hope for its working well. That everything is changing in India is obvious enough, and that the old autocratic Government cannot stand unmodified is indisputable.

“But I confess that I cannot look forward without some apprehension to the phase which obviously the English population looks forward to, and which your letter indicates, namely, something approaching to Colonial self-government.

“I am as much as anybody can be for the self-government of a Colony of British settlers. They can manage their own affairs, and if they misgovern themselves they suffer and will learn to mend their ways. But such a form of government seems to me singularly unsuited to India. The worst of all governments is a popular government of one race over another. It is notorious that the treatment of slaves is best in despotic, worst in free countries. The Spanish Code is by far the most humane, the American the worst in the world.

“You know that in the Mutiny the Governor-General was unpopular with the English because he would not go their length against the natives; and I have heard of language being held at Calcutta which would have shocked an American slave-driver. Do you think a jury of indigo-planters would convict a planter or acquit a ryot? And how would they legislate for matters pending between them? . . .

“In India the Government is really the protector of the natives and their representative, if you will consider the Government representative, and if the Government has nine-tenths of the assembly—it might do. But I am by no means comfortable at the prospect of English settlers legislating for Indian dependents. . . . I suspect the control of the Home Government and its support to the *Government* in India will become more necessary as the popular element gains strength.

“The future Government of India is a problem of the most serious import, utterly unexampled in history, and one of which it seems to me very difficult to foresee the progress.

“Forgive me this long story, but your letter raises all these considerations very forcibly to my mind.”

Upon the points thus raised by Sir C. Wood, and repeated by him in a letter to Lord Canning, in which he deprecates a “Colonial policy” towards the natives, Frere wrote a Minute, from which the following are extracts :—

“October 2, 1861.

“Certainly nothing was further from my thoughts than to advocate what is commonly known as ‘Colonial policy’ towards the natives; by this I understand a policy which puts all real power into the hands of European officials and European colonists, and treats the natives as at best in *statu pupillari*, to be ruled, taught, and perhaps petted, but to be excluded from all real power or influence on the measures of Government, and to be governed, not with reference to their own reason and sense of right or wrong, but according to our latest English notions of what is best for them.

“These principles, be it remembered, under one disguise or another, are nearly as common among our present race of officials as among the non-official class. The two classes differ as to the division of power between officials and non-officials. But as between Englishmen and natives they are generally agreed, and the crack Collector or Commissioner is often as little inclined as the most rabid member of the Landowners’ Association to let a native landholder with an estate of £10,000 a year, which has been two hundred years in his family, have a voice in deciding how his property shall descend or be divided, or how his own children shall be educated, and the civilian would probably be less inclined than the non-official to give the landowner any share of administrative power.

“There is, no doubt, a large and, I trust, an increasing school of officials who hold with Warren Hastings and Cornwallis, Wellesley, Malcolm, and Mountstuart Elphinstone, rather than with Lord Dalhousie and Mr. Thomson and the later school of resumption and annexation; but they are still in a minority, and the latter school have it

all their own way in the Secretary of State's Council, where, since Sir George Clerk left, there has been hardly any zealous representative of the other school. Here, in India, Madras and Bombay officials generally hold more or less the opinions of Malcolm, Munro and the Elphinstones, while a majority of the older servants in Bengal, the North-West, and the Punjab belong to the school of levelling, resumption, and annexation, which, till the Mutiny, was paramount, and they have among them some of the best and ablest, most energetic and most conscientiously fanatical in religion and political economy of our working men. They are also from their position generally more influential with the Government of India. Many of them are sincerely anxious for the improvement of the natives, provided it be effected in their own—the European—fashion; but not one of them I ever met has a particle of real sympathy with any native who does not belong to the small Anglicised class, or would allow the natives at large any voice in the decision of the question how the natives can be best governed or improved. . . .

“Except in Lower Bengal, where the conditions of the case are quite exceptional, I believe it will be found that the English non-official settler is closely identified in interests and feelings with the native landowner or merchant. This is always the case where there is a really strong and even-handed administration of the law to all, white or black.

“It seems to me very important to bear these facts in mind. Otherwise we shall make the dangerous mistake of believing that in the prominent representatives of the present fashion of Indian official opinions, we have some check on the ‘Colonial policy’ towards the natives, as it has been above defined; and it would, I believe, be an equal mistake to suppose that, with the exception of a limited but rather noisy section in Bengal and at the Presidency towns, the non-official European class has, as a body, any sympathy with that policy, or any antagonism to native rights, as Elphinstone and Metcalfe would have defined them. However that may be, Sir C. Wood cannot condemn more strongly than I do what is called the ‘Colonial policy’—the policy of governing India merely for English interests and according to merely English ideas; nor can he feel more convinced of its danger; and

I most cordially concur in the belief that the policy which Lord Canning has pursued from 1857 up to the present date, was not only the main cause of our escaping from a war of races, following the Mutiny, but that it is the only policy by which we can hope to retain India.

"The only 'Colonial' feature which, as far as I recollect, I ever wished to see introduced into our form of government, was in the relations between our Home and the Indian Government. It seems to me a fatal mistake to attempt to govern India in London. The Court of Directors did so in theory, but in practice, till very lately, great latitude of independent action was allowed in all important matters, and more was often assumed by the local government by virtue of their distance, and the difficulty of enforcing previous reference for orders to England. We are now, however, carrying out in practice the theory of the Court of Directors, and attempting to govern India much as in former times we attempted to govern the Colonies by a Secretary of State in London, with deputies in the Colonies, who look to him for orders instead of acting for themselves, subject to his criticism after the act.

"We shall probably produce the same results as we did in the Colonies, *i.e.* chronic disaffection leading to incessant agitation, making our Indian possessions, like our Colonies, sources of anxiety rather than of strength, and sometimes, as in the case of America, losing them altogether.

"The proper remedy seems the same which was applied with so much success to our Colonial system, *viz.* that the Secretary of State should cease to endeavour to govern India himself; that he should give India the best government he can, with such mixture of absolutism or representation as he thinks best, and leave it alone, contenting himself with acting as the representative and colleague of the Viceroy in the Cabinet and Parliament, and as the exponent of the Viceroy's measure to the English Parliament and people. . . .

"I believe some sort of representation of property, influence, and intelligence is essential to safety. But let the despotism be as absolute as can be conceived, it would still be better exercised on the spot than if the ruling powers resided in London. The more absolute

the form of government, the greater the danger of excluding all sensible checks and all channels of indirect information. These are few and precarious in the most vigilant and intelligent despotism. They must be all but absolutely wanting in a despotism separated by half the globe from the nearest point of the country governed, and the difficulties of governing must be enormously increased."

CHAPTER X.

LORD CANNING'S POLICY.

India best governed in India—The Nil Durpan incident—Wuzzeeree Campaign—The annexations—The Adoption Despatch—Star of India—Lord Canning leaves India—Frere appointed Governor of Bombay.

THE power of legislating on local matters conferred by the Indian Legislative Councils Act, and accorded to the different centres in India, would, Frere considered, have another important and beneficial result. Many local questions could and would in future be decided without reference to Calcutta, and there would be, in consequence, henceforth, not only less delay, but less chance of antagonism between the rulers of distant provinces and the Supreme Government, and fewer occasions for reference to England. Interference by the Home Government in matters of administrative detail he always especially deprecated. Throughout the discussion of the question as to the constitution of the Government of India he strongly insisted on the principle that India must be governed in India and not in England.

In this Lord Canning entirely agreed with him. The following correspondence explains and illustrates his opinion.

Frere writes to Sir Charles Wood :—