

We do not, therefore, feel much anxiety about the person caught in Western India, and alleged to be Prince FEROZE SHAH, of the Imperial House of Delhi, one of the most noted leaders of the rebellion. Our readers are acquainted with the circumstances of the capture of the suspected man by Major ARTHUR in the vicinity of Deesa. There are always persons ready and willing, under such circumstances, to bear witness to the identity of the captive, for, if they do not look for actual reward, they derive an amount of personal consideration from their show of knowledge, more attractive to them than the charms of naked truth. We were not surprised, therefore, to read that the unhappy wretch had been identified; but we shall be very much surprised if he should be proved to be FEROZE SHAH. FEROZE SHAH had been wise enough to leave India; and he was known to be at a so great a distance from his alleged place of capture, within so short a time of its date, as to render it most improbable, if not wholly impossible, that he should have been at Deesa on the first day of the present year. That he is one of the wretched Sullateens littered in the great sty of Delhi is not very unlikely; but we doubt whether much stress will be laid by the Bombay Government on the evidence of a sepoy of a native infantry regiment, with such information as we may presume they have in their possession respecting the movements of the real FEROZE SHAH. In the height of the mutiny this evidence would have been sufficient to send the miserable Mahomedan to the gallows. But, in these days, we may be sure that we shall not see another instance of "hanging the wrong man."

and while we will permit no aggression upon our dominions or our rights to be attempted with impunity, we shall sanction no encroachment on those of others; and again, 'We hereby announce to the native princes of India that all treaties and engagements made with them by or under the authority of the Honourable East India Company are by us accepted and will be scrupulously maintained;' so, in the opinion of this House, where differences of opinion have arisen with respect to the interpretation of such treaties, the questions at issue ought to be referred for decision to her Majesty's Privy Council."

Such of our readers as have done us the favour to note what we have written from time to time, and especially on a recent occasion, on the subject of our treatment of the native States of India, will readily believe us when we say that there is very much in this resolution to which we cannot refuse our sympathy. We believe that Mr. BAILLIE is a thoroughly honest statesman, with a sincere desire to bring about a state of things at once just to India and honourable to England; and that he sees clearly that the manner in which it has hitherto been our wont to interpret treaties between the British Government and the native States of India, has been neither the one nor the other. But we do not share with him any apprehension that under the new order of things, the *sic volo sic jubeo* principle will be brought to bear by any future Governor-General of India upon the interpretation of a treaty with a native State, or even with an hereditary titular prince. Certain it is that, up to the present time, the pledges given in her MAJESTY'S Proclamation have been scrupulously fulfilled. We have in no degree extended "our present territorial possessions;" but, on the other hand, have given large tracts of territory to princes and chiefs who were true to their allegiance during the troubles of

MESSRS. SMITH, ELDER & Co., beg to announce to their CONSTITUENTS returning to Europe, and who may be desirous of appointing their FIRM to act as their AGENTS for the receiving and remitting of their FURLOUGH PAY and ALLOWANCES from the COUNCIL OF INDIA, that they can procure and execute the required POWERS OF ATTORNEY in their favour, upon application at their Offices, 45, Pall Mall, S.W., or 65, Cornhill, E.C.

## The Homeward Mail.

LONDON: THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 26TH, 1863.

\* \* All communications to the Editor, intended for publication in the HOMEWARD MAIL, must be accompanied by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee of good faith.

### HANGING THE WRONG MAN.

NOR one of the least of the difficulties with which the authorities in India have to contend, in regard to criminal processes, is the difficulty of identification. How often the wrong man may have been hanged, during the years of the mutiny, we shudder to think. Some of our countrymen, we believe, consoled themselves, in their uncertainty, with the reflection that, "any how, doubtless, the fellow deserved hanging;" and, acting upon the old maxim turned inside, decreed that it was better that ten wrong men should be hanged than that one right man should escape. But since the great fire of rebellion has been trodden out, we have become "less Irish and more nice;" and we do not much relish the idea of making vicarious sacrifices of sham NANA SAHIBS, and hanging men for offences committed by others living in security many thousands of miles away from the place of execution. The authorities have now, when they catch a suspicious person, ample leisure to investigate the nature of the evidence against him; and as the desire for retribution even upon the most guilty grows every day fainter and fainter, we may be sure that they will take every possible care fully to establish the point of identity before they take measures to bring to punishment any man alleged to be one of the chief actors in the tragedies which have given to the year 1857 such an unhappy notoriety in the annals of the nineteenth century.

We do not, therefore, feel much anxiety about the person caught in Western India, and alleged to be Prince FEROEZ SHAH, of the Imperial House of Delhi, one of the most noted leaders of the rebellion. Our readers are acquainted with the circumstances of the capture of the suspected man by Major ARTHUR in the vicinity of Deesa. There are always persons ready and willing, under such circumstances, to bear witness to the identity of the captive, for, if they do not look for actual reward, they derive an amount of personal consideration from their show of knowledge, more attractive to them than the charms of naked truth. We were not surprised, therefore, to read that the unhappy wretch had been identified; but we shall be very much surprised if he should be proved to be FEROEZ SHAH. FEROEZ SHAH had been wise enough to leave India; and he was known to be at a so great a distance from his alleged place of capture, within so short a time of its date, as to render it most improbable, if not wholly impossible, that he should have been at Deesa on the first day of the present year. That he is one of the wretched Sullateens littered in the great sty of Delhi is not very unlikely; but we doubt whether much stress will be laid by the Bombay Government on the evidence of a sepoy of a native infantry regiment, with such information as we may presume they have in their possession respecting the movements of the real FEROEZ SHAH. In the height of the mutiny this evidence would have been sufficient to send the miserable Mahomedan to the gallows. But, in these days, we may be sure that we shall not see another instance of "hanging the wrong man."

### THE REALITIES OF AMALGAMATION.

WE insert, in another column, a letter from a correspondent, who notices in detail the general denials of the Duke of ARGYLL that any injury had been inflicted upon officers of the Company's army by the scheme of amalgamation. Facts are stubborn things; and individual instances are potent to refute general denials. Moreover, scarcely a day passes in which some memorial or other from

an old Indian officer is not presented to Parliament—a memorial complaining of some injury done to him, and praying for redress. We willingly admit that it was almost impossible to carry out any general scheme of reorganization without inflicting injury of some kind or other on individual officers. But, if the officers thus injured were many, the scheme was bad; if few, we may still hope that redress is not impossible. We believe that, considering how impracticable a scheme it was, the amount of injury inflicted on individuals is not very large. Indeed, we sometimes feel surprised that so little wrong has been done. But still enough, and more than enough, has been done to call for an inquiry into the practical working of the amalgamation, and nothing short of this will satisfy those officers who have suffered by the change. Our correspondent says that there are many old officers now in England who will be ready to give evidence, if called upon, as to the working of the new system and its effect upon the present state and future prospects of the old regimental officers of the Company's service. We do not see any sufficient reason why this evidence should not be called for. Without it Parliament cannot satisfy itself that its guarantees have been fulfilled. It will probably be said that it is now too late, that the injured officers ought to have moved before the scheme had been carried into effect. But how could they tell what amount of injury they would sustain until the scheme had actually been carried into effect? Had they remonstrated prospectively they would have been told to wait, told that they were crying out against imaginary evils. It almost always happens thus: if you complain before, you are told that you are too soon; if you complain after, you are told that you are too late. The Indian officer will, doubtless, now be told that it is "too late;" but we hope that he will not be condemned to suffer for what ought properly to be regarded only as an excess of loyal forbearance upon his part, which would not suffer him, especially after the promises of Parliament, to cry out until he was actually hurt.

### THE INTERPRETATION OF TREATIES.

—MR. BAILLIE'S MOTION.

MR. HENRY BAILLIE, who was Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for India during Lord DERBY's last incumbency of office, has given notice of his intention to move, this evening, on going into Committee of Supply, the following resolution:—

"That whereas by a royal proclamation addressed to the native princes and peoples of India, published the 1st day of November, 1858, it is stated that 'We desire no extension of our present territorial possessions, and while we will permit no aggression upon our dominions or our rights to be attempted with impunity, we shall sanction no encroachment on those of others;' and again, 'We hereby announce to the native princes of India that all treaties and engagements made with them by or under the authority of the Honourable East India Company are by us accepted and will be scrupulously maintained;' so, in the opinion of this House, where differences of opinion have arisen with respect to the interpretation of such treaties, the questions at issue ought to be referred for decision to her Majesty's Privy Council."

Such of our readers as have done us the favour to note what we have written from time to time, and especially on a recent occasion, on the subject of our treatment of the native States of India, will readily believe us when we say that there is very much in this resolution to which we cannot refuse our sympathy. We believe that Mr. BAILLIE is a thoroughly honest statesman, with a sincere desire to bring about a state of things at once just to India and honourable to England; and that he sees clearly that the manner in which it has hitherto been our wont to interpret treaties between the British Government and the native States of India, has been neither the one nor the other. But we do not share with him any apprehension that under the new order of things, the *sic volo sic jubeo* principle will be brought to bear by any future Governor-General of India upon the interpretation of a treaty with a native State, or even with an hereditary titular prince. Certain it is that, up to the present time, the pledges given in her MAJESTY'S Proclamation have been scrupulously fulfilled. We have in no degree extended "our present territorial possessions;" but, on the other hand, have given large tracts of territory to princes and chiefs who were true to their allegiance during the troubles of 1857-58; and we have given *sumuds*, or engagements under the hand of the VICEROY, to a large number of others, confirming them in the possession of all the rights and privileges which they at present enjoy, and securing the same rights and privileges to their children, whether by birth or by adoption. Of the only opportunity recently afforded to us for the extension of our territory by legitimate conquest—we speak of the little war with Sikhim, which was brought on by the unprovoked aggressions of