It has been proved (vide paragraphs 38 to 64 of this note) that the use of ganja and charas is physically, mentally, and socially very deleterious, and that their use is religiously prohibited and socially much disapproved (vide paragraphs 19-29 of this note). When such is the case, I believe that the country is quite ripe for the introduction of prohibitory measures in respect to the injurious intoxicants. In paragraph 354 of the report this view is supported thus, "Now a certain number of persons deem it to be the duty of the British Government to suppress the trade in all intoxicants in all the countries under its sway, and there are, no doubt, special circumstances in India which render it less impossible than in some other countries to consider even so drastic a policy. These are notably the general sobriety of its race, and the feeling, popular as well as religious, which prevails against their use among a large section of the community."

80. In paragraph 262 of the Report some doubt has been expressed as to whether the article called hashish resembles the Indian products of the hemp plant. But the following authorities clearly show that in Arabic hashish is a synonymous term for the hemp drugs, especially bhang.

1. Hashish is the Arabic name of hemp. It is bhang, or charas (see pages 4 and 9 of Hem Chanda Rai's report).

2. Dr. Watts in his Economic Products of India states that "The Arabic hashish would seem to be given in allusion to the green intoxicating liquor" (see page 5); that bhang is generally known by the Arabic name hashish (see page 21); that salai, hashish, bhang, and sidhi are synonyms of bhang, and all are applied to the drug as well as to the intoxicating drink prepared from it (see page 44).

81. Proceedings of other countries. In paragraph 357 of the Report an allusion is made to precedents for the prohibition of hemp drugs in other countries, and the statements are taken, I believe, from the journal of the Temperance Society, the Abiari for July 1893, which should be consulted in original.

The production, sale, and consumption of the hemp drugs are prohibited in the following countries:

1. Lower Burmah.—By the order of the Government of India, dated 17th December 1875.
2. Upper Burmah.—Under the above order.
3. Trinidad, a British colony (see Trinidad Commission's report, paragraph 9).
4. Mauritius, a British colony (see above report, paragraph 9).
5. Greece. By Circular No. 22, dated Athens, March 27th, 1859, when the use of hashish in cafes and other places was forbidden, and establishments in which it was found that hashish was supplied to persons frequenting them were closed.
6. Turkey.—Under note dated 1st March 1879, addressed by the Grand Visit to the Ministry of Commerce.
7. Egypt.—By decree of March 29th, 1879, by order of Khedive.
8. Nishta State in the Punjab (see paragraph 735 of the Report).
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82. The prohibition of ganja in Burma has proved successful and of immense benefit to the country, and no change in the present administration is needed or advocated, as will be seen from the following few quotations:

(i) Letter from Mr. Bayne, Secretary to Chief Commissioner, dated 23rd November 1893, paragraph 5.—“No one in Burma desires any change in the existing law, so far as intoxicating drugs are concerned.”

(ii) From the Commissioner of Tenasserim Division to the Financial Commissioner, Burma, dated 30th January 1894.—“The effect of the prohibitory system has undoubtedly been to render it somewhat difficult and dangerous for any one to possess the drug, and this must have very largely tended to keep it out of the hands of Burmans. In my opinion if this system had not been adopted, the results would have been disastrous. Burmans would very certainly have taken to use ganja, for which they have no desire, and from their national character those who took to it would have used it to excess, as is the case with opium, which taken in moderate doses does no harm. Were the consumption and even possession of ganja not prohibited its effect would be terrible.”

(iii) Memorandum by Mr. Coloden: Assistant Collector of Customs and Superintendent, Preventive Service, dated 1st December 1893.—“Ganja has always been considered a prohibited drug in Burma. The prohibition of its importation has so far been successful that the drug has been kept out of the local market to a considerable extent; this is proved by fact, that whenever traced to any one possessing it, only very small quantities of the drug have been found on them.”

(iv) Letter from the Deputy Commissioner, Akyab, dated 1st December 1893.—“The system of prohibition has on the whole been successful.”

(v) Colonel C. B. Cook’s answer, page 5.—“I think the prohibition should not be omitted.”

(vi) Letter from Deputy Commissioner, Togoo, dated 12th January 1894, page 6, paragraph 1.—“In my opinion the system of prohibiting ganja in Burma has been to a very large extent, though not entirely, successful.”

(vii) Letter from the Commissioner, Arakan Division, dated 19th December 1893.—“I don’t think there is any necessity for altering the system of prohibition in force in Burma.”

(viii) Letter from the Commissioner, Southern Division, dated 10th January 1894.—“As far as my experience goes, the system of prohibition of ganja has worked well. This is based on my experience in different places.”

(ix) Letter from Deputy Commissioner, Moulvi, dated 24th January 1894.—“As far as the general public are concerned, the use of ganja is practically extinct.”

(x) Witness No. 1, Colonel H. R. Skippen, Commissioner.—“The consumption of ganja would have been very much larger among the natives of India if there had been no prohibition.” “And should continue to be absolutely prohibited.” “I am exceedingly
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... anxious to prevent as much as possible the Burmans from becoming consumers.

(11) Witness No. 12, Major G. S. Eyre, Deputy Commissioner.—“The existing prohibition is effective.” “The total prohibition now in force is absolutely necessary. Were the use of the drug to be sanctioned, the spread of the habit would be great and the results lamentable.”

(13) Witness No. 9, Mr. A. M. B. Irwin, Deputy Commissioner.—“I do not think the present prohibition causes any discontent, and that therefore it would be unwise to withdraw it without very strong reasons.”

(15) Witness No. 2, Lieutenant-Colonel C. B. Cooke, Commissioner.—“... but still I think the prohibition should not be annulled.” “Yes, I think it should be left unchanged.” “Even if ganja could not be obtained from the plant as grown in Burma, I should still be adverse from licensing its sale, because I consider that the licensing system raises up a class whose interest it is to spread consumption. I think that any licensing system would be far less effectual as regards the Burmese than the present prohibition.”

(14) Witness No. 14, Mr. de la Courneuve, Deputy Commissioner.—“The absolute prohibition of the production and consumption of ganja in the Province in 1872-74 has had the best results and cannot be improved upon.”

(16) Witness No. 3, Mr. J. G. Bridges, Commissioner.—“The Burmese generally approve of the prohibition of the drugs. As a people they disapprove the use of the drug.” And that “I think the prohibition should be maintained.”

(17) Witness No. 10, Mr. H. Adamson, Deputy Commissioner.—“It is certain that the use of these drugs among Burmans is quite insignificant, and I have no doubt that this fact is due in great measure to their use being prohibited by law.”

(18) Witness No. 15, Mr. Fraser, Deputy Commissioner.—“The prohibition as regards Burmans should be maintained under penalties to both buyer and seller.”

83. Prohibition desirable.—Now I turn to examine the evidence of witnesses who have expressed any opinion upon the question of prohibition. It was unfortunate that no question was specifically put to them to ascertain the desirability of prohibition, as mentioned in paragraph 568 of the Report, and thus most of them abstained from directly expressing their opinion on the point.

I do not agree in the conclusion arrived at in paragraph 569 of the Report, that the majority of witnesses are against prohibition; but, on the contrary, hold that an overwhelming evidence is for prohibition, and my reasons are as follow:—

(1) Because they have been shown to be most deleterious, physically and mentally (vide paragraphs 58-59 of this note).

(2) Because the consumption of these articles produces bad effects upon the society (vide paragraphs 60-64 of this note).

(466) Page 431

Permanent URL: http://digital.nls.uk/74574998
(467) Page 432

Permanent URL: http://digital.nls.uk/74575000