

Home (1918) Department.
(miscellaneous)

Ordinary SERIES.

G.O. No. 836

DATED 29. 11. 18

[Despatch Abstract.]

HOLIDAYS.

Recording the notes connected with certain misstate-
ments in the Madras Mail in connection with the notifying of
a holiday for the Victory's ^{of the 11.11.18} ~~day~~ celebrations.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Sectt. II-8 (a)-160,004-16-1-17.

NO

Page

A VICTORY HOLIDAY.

ALL-INDIA REJOICING.

The following telegram was received in this office from a Northern India newspaper:-
 "What is the date of the Madras Victory Holiday?" A rumour has been circulated that Madras is to participate again in the general rejoicing with a holiday on Wednesday, the 27th instant, but enquiry from the Government has only resulted in our being referred by one Department to another - from the Home Department to the Public Department and back again. It will be seen from our Calcutta correspondent's letter in another column to-day that there we are getting credit for being very prompt in our celebration of the signing of the armistice and the practical end of the war; but in Madras there is a feeling that for one reason or another the two holidays which we have had have been unsatisfactory and have failed in their purpose, namely the bringing home to the people the significance of the occasion. It is felt that this can best be done by participating in a general simultaneous celebration brought India. We have received the following of the subject from a correspondent:-

as usual England nearly
 in 1914; is
 the victory

Rep.

Please see underlined portion
 (from Madras Mail)
 above. The enquirer never came
 to me. I raised it because

I did not
 see him
 Lids (1)
 23.11.18

went to the Secy. Did he come to
 you or to any Dept? Or to
 any responsible person in this
 Dept at all? Or has any of

(2) been heard of him. Quick, please.

Good

(1) No. The High Court Registrar telephoned
 to the Secretary yesterday afternoon
 and he was told in reply that there
 was to be no holiday. In the evening
 Rao Bahadur Ch. Muniswami Aiyar
 Editor of the Madras Mail asked
 me whether there was any

Foundation for the rumor that the 27th was the a holiday. I told him in reply that we had received no orders. This enquiry would not have affected the ~~proposed~~ cutting overleaf.
(2) nothing is known here.

Ca
23.11.18.

To The Editor,

Madras Mail.

Dear Sir,
With reference to the following passage in your issue of last evening: will you be so ~~kind~~ (i.e. passage underlined)

will you please let me know of whom, in the Home Dept., the enquiry was made. It was not made of me, nor of the Secretary, nor of the Registrar, nor of any of the Superintendents nor, so far as I can ascertain, of any responsible person in this

Department whatever. I shd.
be glad of a reply at
your earliest convenience.
Yours faithfully

LDS
23.11.18

S.
It is for consideration whether
the above D.O. shd. issue. There is
a rather insistent instruction
underlying the removal of the
statement in the paper seems
to have no basis whatever.
The mail has made several
wild statements of late & seems
to be losing tone & going down
generally. Perhaps it is not
worth going on with but I
put it up for consideration.
C.S. will have to be consulted.

Would Chief Secretary
kindly permit the
issue of the D.O. as above?
LDS
23.11.18

Who is the Editor now? I think
 it would be better if Mr. Hilton Brown
 could see him. They would be as
 likely as not to publish any letter
 we sent them with an attempt
 at justification. Mr. Munro's name
 has played us tricks like this before.
 Our remedy is to refuse their
 facilities.

S
 23.11.18

U.S. might telephone
 to Editor if he does not
 care to go out to see him
 LWS
 23.11.18

Sent this to by a box, please
 I have fallen the cutting
 L.S.

S
 C.S. I succeeded in getting an
 interview with the Editor yesterday
 After I had told him what we thought about it
 afternoon. He said he would insert
 any apology or statement we
 desired. I said I did not think
 anything of that kind would be
 necessary unless he heard to
 the contrary he must consider the
 incident closed. If S. or C.S. wd.

Notes

I don't suppose
 we want an apolo-
 gy. We only wish
 to draw attention
 to the misrepresentation
 of fact by the Mails
 representative
 LWS. 25.11.18

like any statement inserted will
 they please indicate the lines it
 is to take? If our paper may be
 I quite agree
 26.11.18
 Recorded
 LWS

When signed

191

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH LITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.