

Then, as to the distribution of the exaggerated £7,200,000, on articles of export, according to Mr. Labonchere,

	Per Ann.
coffee .....	£3,000,000
Sugar .....	1,200,000
The remainder of the apocryphal £7,200,000, consisted of	
Cotton; Wool, Tobacco, Hides, Gold, and Miscellaneous	3,000,000
<b>Total</b> .....	<b>£7,200,000</b>

-Distribution, according to the French Consul's account :

Coffee .....	£2,000,000
cotton .....	1,540,000
Sugar .....	1,100,000
Miscellaneous .....	1,500,000
<b>Total</b> .....	<b>£6,140,000</b>

“ So that, in point of fact,” said Mr. Gladstone, “ the article, with regard to which we have so much protection, is sugar, constituting *one-fifth* of the exportable produce of the country.”

But I find a lamentable ignorance, or culpable mis-statement of the phases of the **case**—still more obtrusively and offensively forced upon us as we proceed, by the circumstance of the great *decrease* of the number of slaves carried into **Brazils**, not being known to him, or, if known, not alluded to, or admitted by Mr. Labouchere. Here was an argument upon which Mr. Gladstone very properly insisted. He said, “ In 1838, the number of slaves carried into the Port of Rio alone amounted to more than 30,000 ; and in the years 1841 and 1842 that enormous number was reduced to 8,000 or 9,000.”

Is this not a proof, that if the present system were persisted in, that desirable end, for which so many toiled, numbers lost their lives, and the whole British nation united to put down—namely, the **slave-trade**—would be at length triumphantly and happily attained ? What need, therefore, of this interminable intermeddling with the **fixity** of West India property ?

Now, though I am of the same opinion with the *Times*, that “ arithmetical schemes are, after all, the mere skeletons of knowledge, and impart little more notion of the real working of the system than the contents of the charnel-house do of the living congregation that once worshipped in the adjacent church ;” yet, in order to show still further the utter want of verity in the statements of Mr. Labouchere upon the sugar duties' question, I must, however reluctant to do so, have recourse' to them. That honorable gentleman stated that the duty on

sugar in France was 26s. 6d. per cwt., in Austria 7 3s. 8d., per cwt., in Germany (the Zollverein) 15s. 4d. per cwt., and in America  $2\frac{1}{3}$  cents per lb. on **Muscovado**, and 4 cents per lb. on **refined**. But what are the facts? And from a “ source of information (said Mr. Gladstone) open to all the members of the House, the library of the House of Commons”—in p. 47 of Mr. **M'Gregor's** compilation of Tariffs, the duty or impost levied by the Zollverein is 27s. per cwt., and not **15s. 4d.**, as stated by Mr. Labouchere ! And if this be not a protecting duty, I know not what is. In France the lowest duty on foreign sugar is 65s. per two cwt. if imported in a French ship, and **105s.** if imported in a foreign ship ; “ so that there is a differential duty against foreign **sugar** varying from **17. 14s.** up to two guineas.” How then does this plain statement agree **with** the line of argument advanced by Mr. Labouchere, that all the Continental nations have adopted a more liberal scale of sugar duties than we have ourselves ?

Is it possible that high minded men—that English gentlemen who, in their ordinary individual intercourse with their-fellow subjects, would shrink from the bare suspicion of deception and deceit, as they would recoil from the contact of an asp ; nevertheless, when it suits their party purposes, hesitate not only to garble and distort, but to pervert, and even falsify statements, with as little reluctance and deliberate **non-chalance**, as they would unfold their morning papers ; or, having drank their wine, complacently lean back in their *fauteuils à-la-Voltaire*, to dream away a drowsy hour ? I stand astonished that gentlemen-representatives of the most powerful nation the world ever **nursed**—should condescend to such base and paltry-such mean and dishonorable devices, to support a bad cause, and annoy hated, because successful, rivals. It seems, indeed, **that** the party with which the honorable gentleman is identified, would be content with nothing short of the physical and commercial annihilation of the West Indies, and that, they care little by what means this may be effected. But I warn them to beware ! Though the body lie prostrate, the spirit which animated the forefathers of the earlier settlers in the West Indies is not departed ; and though, hitherto, those who should have been united, have been disunited by cabal and party jealousy, a union may **take** place among them which will place **the** seals of office and the sweets of power still further from their expectant grasp. Desperation has sometimes **vercome** not only opposition, but foresight and skill.

I am not one of those looking-out-for-evil-persons, in which no country more abounds than England, but I cannot help remarking that so far as the settlement and government of the West Indies are involved,

some mysterious taboo-some species of **syncretic** junction of hypocrisy and philanthropy-some undefined, because undefinable, **union** of common sense and folly-some obscure conjunction of agents answering to the **Manachéan** entities of good and evil-seems always to have been at work to perplex, annoy, harass, impede, **discomfit**, and defeat all and every attempt at final adjustment. There has been a perpetual cohobation of the poison of party spirit in the political alembic, every new elimination acquiring more subtilty, ductility, and venom, till it has now assumed a spirit of irremediable rancor and **almost** incurable fierceness. Forced as were our ancestors, the original settlers in Barbados and Jamaica, by the exterminating violence of Republicans to seek refuge beyond the waters of the broad Atlantic, they had scarcely landed in the country and built their cabins and wigwams, when the Government that succeeded the Protectorate imposed almost as galling and as &tolerable burdens upon them as those they had fondly deemed had been cast away for ever. **This**, however, did not shake **their** loyalty-they submitted ; and **the** mother country benefited by their industry and submission, in the shape of the Four-and-a-half per Cent. **extracted from** the pockets of the inhabitants of the Windward Islands, **up** to a very recent period. Next came the Slave-trade. "**You** shall not continue to **have** any more patents for land," said the Government, "unless you bid yourselves to locate upon each 100 acres of land ten slaves." This was acceded to ; what else could they do ? But they **re-**monstrated nevertheless, though in vain, and- shortly after, finding that the Government compelled them not only to hold but to purchase slaves, they petitioned against the slave-trade as immoral, dangerous, and inhuman, unbefitting a free nation, and contrary to the laws of God and man. What was the reply ? "**Gentlemen,**" said the Minister of the day, "all you say is very true, but the trade at present is too valuable to our merchants to be abandoned !" But why exhaust the patience of your readers ? In process of **time** all-everything that the West Indians prophesied has come to pass. They showed by their remonstrance that slavery would be abolished at a convenient period, and the present outcry for cheap **sugar**, proves that what they said of the failure' of the sugar crop contingent upon emancipation, was founded on wise and conclusive data. I protest I do not know in the whole history of the world a class of people-perhaps the Jews excepted-who have been more persecuted, more hardly dealt with, or more unjustifiably treated than the West Indians, even on political, not to say anything of just and honorable principles.

Another notable mis-statement of Mr. Labouchere is, that while the consumption of tea and coffee has increased, the supply or consumption of sugar has diminished. In the first place, the honorable gentleman did not take into consideration the enormous quantity of foreign sugar smuggled through the Channel Islands in the form of sweet-meats, which, after being subjected in London and elsewhere to a manufacturing process, found its way, not only into the cottages of the poor, but the palaces of the rich. I will not insist upon the incredible adulteration of the coarse sugars by means of sago, flour, and salt, considerable as it is, but shall refer to Sir Robert Peel's masterly and commanding, because veracious and official, denial of the statement, that there had been a falling off in the supply or consumption. But first I shall extract the mis-statement, and place it in **juxta-position** with the contradiction—the bane and antidote.

Mr. Labouchere,	Sir Robert Peel,
" In 1841 . . . . 4,100,000 cwts.	" In 1841 . . . . 4,065,724 cwts.
,, 1843 . . . . 4,082,000 . , ,	,, 1842 . . . . 3,876,343 ,,
	,, 1843 . . . . 4,045,105 ,,

" Being a greater consumption," said the Right Hon. Baronet, " *than was ever known in this country at any former period, with the single exception of the year 1841; and I have already accounted for the increased consumption of that year as arising out of the deficiency of the supply in the preceding year; but, after all, the difference, even under these circumstances, was only to the extent of 20,000 cwt. more than that of the last year; and therefore this fact is established, and before us, that in the year ending the 1st of January, 1844, the consumption of sugar in this country was greater than was ever known with one exception. \* \* \** But did that lead to increased prices, the average prices of the last five years? Sir, in the year—

1839	the price was	39s. 2d.	per cwt.
1840	,,	49s. 1d.	,, .
1841	,,	38s. 3d.	,,
1842	,,	37s. 3d.	,, .

In 1843, the year of the greatest consumption, the average price was 34s. 1d. \* \* I have established these two facts—that the last year there was not only the greatest consumption, but that prices were also lowest."

Thus far Sir Robert Peel; and with that right honorable baronet's withering contradiction, from which there is neither appeal nor escape, I take leave of Mr. Labouchere.

I shall now draw the attention of the honorable members of the House, and that of your readers generally, to the extraordinary speech, and abominable doctrines propounded in it, by the honorable member for the city of Durham, Mr. Bright. That a distinguished member of a Society, which, whether justly or not I will not take upon myself to decide, has always claimed for its members, and in most instances had that claim allowed, distinctive morality and rigid virtue, should

stand up in his place in the House of Commons, and, after censuring Mr. Gladstone for what his ancestors had not done, should suddenly forget his own argument, his creed, condition, state, station, and position in the House of Commons, and turn round and demand, what "were the morals of the Brazilians to us?" is something so repulsive to all fixed notions of honor and virtue, and so repugnant to justice and morality, that I know not what to think of the character, or feelings, or principles, of the honorable gentleman himself. Would the honorable gentleman, in the course of a business walk from Aldgate to Temple-bar, negotiate sales of bullion, or cotton, with Ikey Solomons, Money Moses, or any pickpocket or housebreaker; and, when his friends should call his attention to the scandal of the transaction, turn round upon them snappishly and exclaim, "What are the morals of Mr. Ikey Solomons, or Mr. Money Moses to me?" Yet this is the very result to which the sentiments he so boldly expressed in the House of Commons, on the morals of the Brazilians, directly tend to lead all who adopt them. I will ask Mr. Bright, if it was not because England was desirous of eradicating the root of the evil of slavery, and that she felt deeply the stain of that accursed condition, which induced her to inflict the burden of 8800,000 per annum upon her heavily-taxed and struggling population? All the world thought so; but the honorable member tells us it was not so, for "what are morals to us?" A question 'that comes in somewhat the shape of a parody on Sir Boyle Roche's query in the Irish Parliament, "What has posterity done for us?" According to Mr. Bright, morals are a *floccinaucinilipilification*—a mere bug-bear; "a thing of sound and fury, signifying" cheap sugar, cheap corn, cheap anything, and curse the expense!—that is, if Quakers ever swear. And, by the way, this pretty little code of quaker principles, grafted on Parliamentary morality, reminds me of an anecdote of a very thriving and ingenious member of the Society of Friends, who used to supply myself and others, while at college, with confectionary and wine. He was a very conscious, upright man, physically and quakerly-refused, with exemplary fortitude, to be drawn for the militia, to pay taxes, or contribute, in many other ways, to the support of church and state. Among these conscientious objections, was giving a receipt upon stamped paper; consequently, 'whenever any one paid his bill, he wrote at the bottom of "the sum tottle" "*Received us per Stamp,*" stamping his right foot at the same time, with commendable violence, on the floor. Thus his conscience and his pocket mutually assisted and kept each other in countenance, somewhat after the manner of the honorable member for Durham.

Before I conclude, I may be pardoned, Sir, if I allude to the paragraphs quoted by Mr. Gibson, the honorable member for Manchester, in the House, from my article "On the Available Resources of the West Indies," published in your last number. I have not the honor to know that gentleman, and therefore take this opportunity of thanking him for the terms in which he was pleased to introduce my name into the House of Commons; but, at the same time, I think, in common fairness, the honorable member should not have garbled the quotation, so as to make it appear that I said exactly the reverse of what I have ever upheld, namely, a fair protection for the West Indian, not in the shape of monopoly, or for monopoly purposes, but, because the West Indians were forced into the purchase and possession of West **India** property, solely and entirely by the irresistible force of Acts of Parliament, and guarantees of Government. The so-called compensation was not five shillings in the pound; but we would have been silent even under this act of injustice, had we been permitted to keep together in the way that seemed best to us, and in consonance with the laws of the empire, that little, which an imperial act of the three Estates of the kingdom had (as it appears in the eyes of Mr. Bright and his party) too generously permitted us to hold; but they begrudge us even that little. What we say, is, abolish **all** restrictions upon Colonial trade; extend a more friendly hand towards the West India **colonists**; look upon them as fellow subjects and as fellow men. Do not continue, for party purposes, under the veil of philanthropy, to pursue this prurient agitation; let us alone, and we have no fear that, in the end, we shall regain that healthy state of trade, and our merchants that prosperity, which enabled them, in the city of Kingston alone, between eleven and two o'clock of the day, to subscribe the large sum of 5100,000 to assist **the** minister in carrying on that long and glorious **war**, for which we have the tattered banners in St. Paul's to look at, and the interest of **£800,000,000** to pay. Such is our appeal to the minority of the House of Commons; but it is addressing **the** deaf adder. The West Indians have nothing to hope, and every thing to fear **from** their malice, their hatred, uncharitableness; hypocrisy, and avarice. Let them be up, therefore, and doing—the days of the sugar duties are numbered.

I am, **Sir**,

Your obedient Servant,

EDWARD **BINNS**.

Bellevue, near **Hounslow**.

## ON THE AGRICULTURE OF HINDOSTAN.

BY GEORGE W. JOHNSON, ESQ., BARRISTER-AT-LAW,

FELLOW OF THE AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY OF INDIA, CORRESPONDING  
MEMBER OF THE MARYLAND HORTICULTURAL SOCIETY, ETC.

(Continued from p. 320.)

**FARMS.**—When I speak of an Indian farm, the image must not rise to the mind of the European reader of a **substantial** dwelling-house, enclusted by commodious out-buildings, and conveniently placed among its compactly enclosed fields ; such an agricultural establishment bespeaks a far advance in the art of cultivation, the employment of large capital in that art, and highly remunerating prices to the cultivator. Now, none of these contingencies occur in Hindostan ; but, on the contrary, the operations of agriculture are rudely executed, the cultivators are poor, and the **profits** are small—the results are correspondent.

The dwellings of the **ryots** throughout India are in no degree superior to the other mean huts with which they are associated in the village. No barn is attached to the residence of the poorer cultivators, for the pittance of grain annually raised is immediately beaten out, the major part sold at once to the merchant, and the small residue for seed and sustenance is stored in baskets or jars (*gumlahs*), and these placed, **usually**, in the room where the family dwells.

The out-buildings rarely extend beyond an enclosure in which to secure the cattle at night; the better *munduls* and other landholders, having **ryots** under them, are tolerably rich, and have their houses surrounded **with golaahs** (or granaries) well stored with grain, often to the number of ten or twelve, even besides long *golaums*, or cow-houses, a shed for the reception of visitors **or** travellers, and another for worship; besides those huts necessary for their own dependants' residence, and the shelter of their cows and bullocks. **Indeed**, as you advance into the north-western districts of India, a village farm is often a neat and pleasing sight.

The land is allotted by the Zemindars throughout India into spaces varying in size from one biggah to more than one thousand; but of the smaller holdings none deserve **to** be considered as farms which do not employ one plough.

By far the greater number of farms do not extend beyond a size requiring this single yoke of oxen ; for they are necessarily restricted to suit the cultivator's capital, which is usually very trifling, the occupier being the only ploughman.

Farms must continue thus small, and Indian agriculture remain without those improvements which large capitalists only can afford to introduce, until the richer classes of natives more generally abandon that most groundless of prejudices, that the cultivation of the soil is suited only as an employment for the lowest of the population.+

In the Dooab one plough is sufficient for the cultivation of about sixteen biggahs.†

Near Seringatam farms vary in extent from one to seven ploughs. The first is considered a poor farm, but the largest is esteemed a mark of great wealth.

The total want of land measure, and the scattered disposition of the cultivated plots, render it very difficult to ascertain the extent of a plough land. This difficulty is increased by the different proportions of the watered and dry field culture pursued in each. A plough land, however, must be inconsiderable, for the ploughings are very numerous, and Dr. Buchanan was assured that one plough does not turn up an acre once in less than seven days. Dr. Heyne in his tracts says, that in Mysore one plough is sufficient for about eight biggahs of watered land, and from fifteen to twenty-one biggahs of dry land.

Rent in India, as in other countries, is very varying in amount, being necessarily regulated by the fertility of the land, its proximity to towns, &c. About Allalabad, Dr. Tyler informs us, the farms vary from less than 100 up to 1,000 biggahs. The lowest annual rent being for land covered with jungle, four annas per biggah. Three or four rupees per biggah is the average rate of land rent, though in some very rare instances it amounts to nine rupees. This includes all taxes; for out of the rent the zemindar is responsible for all the Government imposts.— (*Trans. of Agri.-Horticultural Soc. of India*, vol. i., p. 15.)

In many parts of Bengal, rice and other common lands rent from 12 annas to 1 rupee the biggah, varying according, not only to the quality of the land, but the description of crop placed on it by the cul-

---

\* “ The twice-born man (or Brahmin) may practice agriculture, money-lending, or trade during the seasons of his distress ; and if he puts aside a portion to propitiate the deities, and priests, they will absolve him from blame.” So says the lawgiver Vrihaspati, in which he is confirmed by Menu.

† *Tenant's Indian* Rec. ii., p. 280. Unless otherwise explained, I consider the biggah is equal to one-third of an acre.



tivator. Sugar lands, which are those of the best quality, **realise** per biggah of **14,400** square feet in Rungpore, **2r. 4a.** ; in Burdwan, **5r. 8a.** ; in Ghazeepore, **5r. 5a. 4p.** ; in Behar, **10r.** ; in Moorshedabad, **9r. 10a. 8p.** ; but. such good land forms but a small portion of the rented land generally.

Upon a **farm** requiring **one** plough, and **having** as much of **waste** land as will. support his oxen, the ryot maintains his wife, children, and two or three laborers. This will cause no **surprise** to those who know that the whole clothing of the family is composed of a few yards of calico, and their food of the cheapest kinds of grain, a little vegetable oil, and a less modicum of salt. With such limited provision they are **contented**, and it is an instance of the goodness of Providence that happiness is so **\*easy** procurable. I do not intend **to** maintain that the existence of the **ryot** is so pure, and such a 'series of **innocent**, calm days as 'is described by St. Pierre, Raynal, and **others**. The **narratives** of **these visionists** are very beautiful, but **unfortunately they are** not true.

A **very** clever **little** treatise was printed, but I **believe** never published, at the **beginning of the** present century, entitled "**Remarks** upon the Agriculture and Commerce of Bengal." Its anonymous author, who entitles himself "**A Civil Servant of the Company**," states as follows, the **annual** charges and returns of a biggah of land, supposing it to produce two crops of the usual average :—

COST.

	Rs.	As.
Ploughing .....	1	8
Rent (¼th the produce) .....	1	6
Seed, reaping and harvesting .....	1	6
Two weedings (40 days' labor) .....	1	4
.....	5	8

PRODUCE,

	Rs.	As.
Seven maunds of rice .....	3	49
Three and one-half maunds pulse.. ..	2	3
.....	5	7½

This shows a loss against the cultivator, but it supposes him to pay for the labor whereas, it is chiefly done by **himself** and family; and the time not consumed in agricultural occupations, is otherwise profitably employed. In fact, says this author, it is **not** upon these crops that the peasant depends for profit. In **grazing districts** it is the **dairy**, in other

localities it is the **culture** of the sugar-cane, &c., that more highly remunerate him. In grazing districts the occupying of arable land is necessary to entitle him to pasturage in the forests and wastes, his herd being restricted proportionably to the extent of his arable land.

Sir J. Malcolm, writing in 1842, gives the following statement of the expenses and produce of 10 biggahs of land in the Malwa, when cultivated with either *khureef* or *rubbee* crops.<sup>3</sup> The statement was framed from the village accounts at Naulcha.

## KHUREEF.

EXPENSES.			RECEIPTS.		
	Big.	R. A.	Maunds.		R. A.
12½ seers of juar seed . . . . .	5	1 4	2½ juar . . . . .		35 6
7½ „ oaruddo . . . . .	1	0 12	3 onrud . . . . .		6 0
7½ „ moougdo . . . . .	1	0 12	3 mooug . . . . .		6 12
1½ „ til do . . . . .	½	0 2	1 oil, &c., of til . . . . .	3	0
1½ „ toowardo . . . . .	½	0 4	1½ toowar . . . . .		3 0
3 „ chowrahdo . . . . .	½	0 2	1 chowrah . . . . .		2 0
30 „ flax do . . . . .	1	1 0	3 flax . . . . .		7 8
10 „ cottondo . . . . .	½	0 4	3 do. seed . . . . .		3 0
Weeding . . . . .		8 8	1 cotton . . . . .		6 0
village expenses . . . . .		12 12			
Iron for plough, ropes, &c.		8 0	Produce . . . . .		72 4
Government tax 2r. per big.		20	Deduct expenses . . . . .		57 4
		<hr/>			
		57 4	Ryot's profit . . . . .		15 0

## RUBBEE.

EXPENSES.			RECEIPTS.		
	Big.	R. A.	Maunds.		R. A.
1) maunds of gram for . . . . .	2	4 10	6 gram . . . . .		16 0
3 „ and 30 seer wheat . . . . .	5	11 8	15 wheat . . . . .		40 0
7½ seers barley . . . . .	½	0 8	4 barley . . . . .		15 0
7½ „ mosoor . . . . .	½	0 10	2 mosoor . . . . .		4 0
7½ „ peas . . . . .	½	0 9	2 peas . . . . .		4 0
3½ „ linseed . . . . .	½	0 5	1½ linseed . . . . .		4 8
15 „ koosm . . . . .	1	1 4	7½ koosm . . . . .		7 8
Village expenses . . . . .		22 13			
Harvest, &c. . . . .		2 12	Produce . . . . .		91 0
Government tax . . . . .		20 0	Deduct expense . . . . .		64 15
		<hr/>			
Total expense . . . . .		64 15	Ryot's profit . . . . .		26 1½

\* The *khureef* crop is that which is reaped in the autumn, The *rubbee* that which is harvested in the spring.

† *Malcolm's Rep. on Malwa*, p. 430. Other statements relative to this subject may be seen in *Dr. Buchanan's Notes on Dinapore*, and in the *Gleanings*, and the recently published work of- *Montgomery*.