

THE Servant of India

Acting Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY.

VOL. II., No. 34.]

POONA—THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1919.

[ANNUAL SUBSN. : Rs. 4

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	397
ARTICLE :—	
Calcutta University Commission.—III.	400
SPECIAL ARTICLES :—	
The Housing of the Poor. By the Hon'ble Mr. Justice T. V. Seshagiri Aiyar	401
The Turkish Problem and the Peace of Paris. By Historicus	402
Joint Parliamentary Committee. By H. N. Kunzru	404
A REPORT OF RELIEF WORK IN THE PUNJAB. By V. N. Tivary	407

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

LORD CURZON'S speech delivered at a banquet given in London to the Persian Foreign Minister was intended to remove suspicions and to answer criticisms in connection with the recent conclusion of the Anglo-Persian treaty. Suspicions with respect to the motives and the effects of the treaty were particularly ventilated in the French press, which was annoyed at the difficulties that were being placed in the way of France acquiring predominant influence in Syria, while Great Britain was believed to have established herself securely in Persia. France now seems to have secured in Syria what she has long set her heart upon, and the world is likely to look upon the arrangements made with regard to that country and the Anglo-Persian treaty as a kind of deal between England and France based on the give-and-take idea. Lord Curzon, therefore, made an effort to show how Great Britain had absolutely no desire to impair in any way the sovereignty of Persia and how the recent agreement would maintain intact Persian independence and integrity. It was with the object of protecting Persia against hostile neighbours and assisting that country in establishing internal order and in carrying out certain urgent reforms that Great Britain entered into the treaty which would confer benefit upon both nations alike. Lord Curzon's speech will certainly go a long way to clear the air and to assure the world as to Great Britain's aims in Persia. But the criticisms levelled against such agreements have their justification in the history of the past e. g., Egypt. It is to be hoped that in the future history will not be repeated and that Lord Curzon's explanation will be vindicated by actual political developments in Asia.

"THERE is no valid evidence," remarks the September *Round Table*, "to connect them (the recent disturbances in India) with Bolshevik activities, despite the importance attributed by certain sections of the Press to sensational reports from Helsingfors. It is well known that the Bolsheviks never display undue modesty in estimating the effects of their noxious propaganda, to which they readily ascribe disturbances susceptible of a purely local explanation. Gravely indeed would the future of the world be menaced by the success of their project of inoculating Eastern people with the virus of Bolshevism, and the danger is not one to be lightly regarded. But at this moment there is no definite evidence that the poison has reached India, still less that it has produced any marked effects."

* * *

THE Home Member's speech in introducing the Indemnity Bill makes it plain that the martial law indemnities are to be confined to the subordinate officials who merely executed the policy sanctioned by the superior officials. If the latter have erred in prescribing the policy, they are not protected by this Bill. Thus it is immaterial to the consideration of the measure, it is urged, what the conclusion of the Committee of Inquiry may be as to the necessity of the proclamation of martial law, for the officers who are granted indemnity under it were not responsible for it, and those who were can be held to account in spite of the passage of the Bill. Again, the preamble of the Bill which refers to the necessity of martial law will not preclude the courts from considering the whole question afresh, should any action at law be brought against those who are responsible for its declaration.

* * *

THIS is true so far as it goes, but it is not correct to say that the report of the Inquiry Committee will not affect the Bill in any way. The officers who are to be indemnified by the Bill, no doubt, exercised military force under orders from higher authorities, but it must be remembered that for the specific acts done by them they themselves are responsible. They were not given detailed orders to adopt particular measures. All that the Government of India did by proclaiming martial law was to say to them that civil power had failed and that they might use such military power as might be imperatively needed in the circumstances. As General Hudson said in his speech: "The

situation, as far as it was then known, would be explained to him (the soldier), and his action would be left to his discretion." Thus it is clear that the so-called subordinate officers must be held answerable for the acts they committed within their discretion, and if it is found on the report of the committee or on other evidence that they did not use their discretion properly, they should be liable for the consequences of their action. The Bill, however, covers all their acts in advance, and this is its fatal defect.

* * *

FOR section 3, by shifting the burden of proof on the wrong party, effectually prevents, in our opinion, the executive excesses being brought home to those who committed them. It is but right that those who plead exceptional circumstances in justification of their extra-legal acts, should prove them when called upon to do so. If the complainant is made to prove that the circumstances did not call for measures of so much severity, you require him to do what in the nature of things is impossible. It is not fair, where some of the officials engaged in restoring order are believed to be guilty of the worst atrocities, to presume the bona fides of every officer; in cases like bombing and machine-gunning people from aeroplanes, flogging persons in public streets, the issuing of the "hands and knees" order, etc., the presumption should be against the officers. And if, *e. g.*, it can be proved, as Sir H. Hudson claims, that "the use of aeroplanes provided the only possible solution" in the circumstances, it should not be difficult for the officers to prove the necessity for their acts in a court of law. It ought not to be necessary to pervert the law for their sake.

* * *

MR. CHANDA'S statement in the Viceroy's Council that it is not usual to hold an inquiry on the withdrawal of martial law is not quite correct. On the contrary, an inquiry into the conduct of the executive is usually held after a period of the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, and it is on a favourable result of such an inquiry that an Indemnity Bill is based. We find this practice followed in England almost invariably. There the Parliament itself sanctions the suspension of the municipal law, and so no question arises there, in considering Indemnity Bills, as to the propriety or necessity of declaring martial law, as it has arisen in India. But the claim is not made there on behalf of the ministers, as it is made here, that in whatever manner they may have used military force they are entitled to indemnification, since they merely acted under the orders of Parliament in using that force. They quietly submit themselves to an inquiry, and if it is proved that the force was used with due regard to the principles of humanity, then alone they ask for protection. If yet any particular officer's action is impugned, he adduces in a law court the grounds on which it was thought necessary. Here the process is reversed,

THOSE who demand that the officers, guilty of excesses, shall be suitably punished, must not be assumed to cherish a feeling of revenge. It is as much in the interest of public order and peace that official violence should be punished as that mob violence should be punished. Whether the officers to whom punishment is to be meted out are Indians or Europeans is quite irrelevant, and those who remind us that the large proportion of officers who will receive protection by this measure are Indians, in order to win our support to the Bill, do less than justice to the opponents of the Bill by attributing to them by implication a desire to punish only European offenders. Indians want that equal justice should be done to all, and it is indifferent to them to what the nationality of the offenders is.

* * *

LIEBER calls it a peculiarly Anglican principle that "every officer, however high or low, remains personally answerable to the affected person for the legality of the act he executes, no matter whether his lawful superior has ordered it or not, and, even whether the executive officer had it in his power to judge of the legality of the act he is ordered to do or not," and regards it "as an indispensable element of civil liberty." Further on he says:

"In conclusion, I would remark that it is wholly indifferent who gives the order. If it be illegal, the person who executes it remains responsible for the act, although the president or the king should have ordered it, or the offending person should be a soldier obeying his commander. It is a stern law, but it is a sacred principle; a government of law cannot dispense with it, and it has worked well."

* * *

THE appointment of a committee of two High Court judges to review the cases of martial law prisoners is perhaps better than entrusting the matter to the bigger Inquiry Committee. But it is still uncertain what the powers of this judicial committee will be. It will only make recommendations to the Government of India through the local Government, but it is open to the committee to recommend, it would appear from the Home Member's speech, whatever action it may think necessary. We hope it will be within its province not only to recommend the remission of sentences but the quashing of convictions, where it finds that miscarriage of justice has taken place. Even more than the severity of the sentences, the stigma undeservedly put upon some of our good men and true by their conviction is our chief grievance, and a mere remission of sentences will not remove the popular dissatisfaction that is felt on the subject.

* * *

THE last meeting of the Bombay Legislative Council opened with a speech of His Excellency the Governor on various current problems. It dealt with the question of control, fodder preservation, and housing both in Bombay and Karachi and was generally of a satisfactory nature. We hope that this practice of opening each session of the Council with a general pronouncement of this nature will be followed in future. The Juvenile

Smoking Bill introduced by the Hon. Major Fernandes evoked a good deal of criticism mainly on the question of the machinery proposed by him, and he withdrew it with the idea, let us hope, of bringing in a more acceptable bill on the same subject. The Tobacco Bill was postponed. The Council protested against a small uncontroversial bill to amend the Municipal Act being brought forward without due notice and this was also postponed. There were about a dozen resolutions actually discussed of which several were accepted, of course with modifications, by Government.

* * *

A LARGE number of resolutions referred to problems of irrigation. Diwan Bahadur Godbole's resolution about the taking over by Government of second class irrigation works was postponed after discussion, pending the collection of accurate information. The Hon. Mr. Purshotamdas Thakurdas was responsible for five resolutions on this question, mainly based upon the recommendations of the Irrigation Commission. The most important of them advocated a speeding up of the irrigation programme and proposed several methods. Government opposed it on the ground that the allotments for irrigation works were made by the Government of India. But the non-official majority of 22 to 17 thought otherwise and believed that such a resolution would strengthen the Bombay Government in its demands on the Government of India. Another resolution on irrigation problems was also passed in defiance of Government opposition. Mr. Purshotamdas deserves credit for the thoroughness with which he has studied these problems, and he fully deserved the encomiums passed on him by several members.

* * *

HIS EXCELLENCY THE VICEROY quoted Mr. Gandhi, Sir George Lowndes quoted Mrs. Besant and Mr. B. G. Horniman and Mr. Hailey quoted Mr. Sastri as supporting Government's policy in the Punjab. It is easy to take out isolated sentences from a speech or an article and show it to mean the exact opposite of what it would mean in its context. For instance, Mr. Sastri had said in his speech from which Mr. Hailey quoted: "When a mob goes wrong and becomes unruly it is necessary, no doubt, for the Government to take strong measures to restore order. But powerfully and fully equipped as the Government was, it was its duty to see that no more was done in the repressive direction than was absolutely necessary. What, on the contrary, is it doing? A state of 'open rebellion' has been declared, martial law proclaimed and other things done in ways which must be pronounced barbarous. Bombs are dropped from aeroplanes and people alleged to have disobeyed laws whipped in public streets—a barbarity which we all thought had passed away with the autocracy of Russia." It will be seen that Mr. Hailey who quoted the first sentence carefully left out the the following sentences. We commend them

to his attention, and incidentally to that of the *Hindu* of Madras, which, true to its character, has sought to make capital out of this incident.

* * *

UNDER the heading "An Uncalled for Outburst," the *Indian Social Reformer* writes: "New India of Madras is wroth because the Government of India have selected Mr. N. M. Joshi and not Mr. B. P. Wadia to represent Indian Labour at the International Labour Convention. We have nothing to urge against our contemporary's nominee, but it is obvious that *New India* knows absolutely nothing of the great work which Mr. Joshi, as Secretary of the Social Service League, has been doing in a score of ways to raise the status and capacity of the large working class population in Bombay." A bare mention of Mr. Joshi's extensive activities among the labouring classes—travelling libraries, free night schools, temperance leagues, open air excursions, free dispensaries, efforts to improve sanitation and housing conditions, redemption from indebtedness, co-operative stores, settlement work—must convince every impartial person of Mr. Joshi's title to speak for Labour, though no one would have been more glad than Mr. Joshi himself if it had been possible for Labour to be directly represented at the Convention. We may justly claim that no small amount of the interest now evinced in the well-being of labourers in the greatest Labour centre in India is due to the exertions of Mr. Joshi in their behalf.

* * *

ELSEWHERE will be found a report of the work done by Pandit Venkatesh Narain Tivary and his colleagues in connection with the Punjab disturbances. We are proud that the Servants of India Society has been able to be of some service in this great national work. It deserves the cordial support of all patriots, and we hope that the amount needed by the workers in the Punjab, Rs. 2,00,000, will be speedily forthcoming. This amount is really a trifle compared to the magnitude of the issues involved, and those who realise the latter ought to come forward with liberal help.

* * *

WE publish elsewhere an article entitled "The Turkish Problem and the Peace of Paris" by "Historicus." The writer is one of our ablest students of History. Though he himself is a non-Muslim, he enjoys exceptional opportunities of studying the problem and ascertaining Indian Muslim feeling on it at first hand. The fact that he is a non-Muslim, we feel sure, will only add to the weight of his arguments.

* * *

THE 51st birthday of our patriot-saint Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi was celebrated on 21st inst. in Bombay and elsewhere with fitting pomp. We take this opportunity of wishing him many a return of the happy day and a long life of still greater service to the Motherland, great as his record of service is.

CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY COMMISSION.

III.

WE have explained that the Report proposes the constitution of a Board of Secondary and Intermediate Education to which the control of secondary schools is to be transferred. To the same Board is to be transferred that part of the college work which at present goes up to the Intermediate examination. This is the most far-reaching recommendation of the Commission, and, if accepted, it will have the most important consequences. We may agree that the work done in the first two years of the present Arts Colleges is hardly of the level of University work. The same amount of work is done by the better class of boys in many an English school. In the German gymnasiums much more work is done, and we have often observed continental educationists calling many a University in England glorified high schools, so far as their ordinary degree is concerned. University work on the continent generally corresponds to what we call post-graduate work, when there is any, in India or honours work in the English Universities. But the differentiation between the school and the University is to a certain extent relative. The mental development of a student depends not only upon what subjects he actually learns, but to a certain extent also upon the way they are learnt and the age at which they are learnt. After all an ordinary student is approximately the same all over the world. In the older Universities in England the students enter generally at the age of eighteen or nineteen and stay there for three years for their degree. In the German University, students enter at the age of about twenty-two. It is absurd, therefore, to compare the entrant in Cambridge to the entrant in Berlin. On the other hand, in India the average age of the matriculated student is a little over eighteen, though the legal minimum is sixteen. A few brilliant students complete their matriculation course by even fourteen or fifteen. But for the average student it appears to suffice till he is eighteen. There are certainly many improvements that can be introduced into this course which will make it more efficient without increasing the burden. In particular, if the schools are more efficient the boys ought to learn far more and far better than they actually do at present; it is in this direction of improving the schools that the real remedy should be sought.

The Commission has of course not missed this point. But it does not realise that improved schools would be a complete remedy. In any case we would like to see a real effort made to improve them and watch the results before the other step recommended by the Commission is taken. For we do not believe that boys of eighteen to twenty or twenty-one should be taught on lines which are fitted for the school only. They ought then to learn to stand on their own legs. Mass lectures are thus not altogether unsuitable for them though

a good deal of tutorial assistance should always be at hand. A crude attempt made some time ago in Bombay to transfer the first two years of College work to schools deserved to fail, because the schools are hardly qualified to do even the work which at present they are supposed to do, but which they are unable to do well. It is not educationally desirable to collect in the same institution boys of ten or twelve and young men of twenty; nor is it advantageous to the young man to be altogether spoon-fed. The proposal of the Commission to start Intermediate Colleges deserves to be considered more fully. *Prima facie*, there is nothing objectionable in it. But we would like to see introduced on a wide scale the system advocated, as the Report says, by several of their witnesses and which was only rejected by the Commission as they had no *tabula rasa* to write upon. This proposal was to bring into existence a new class of institution which would take over the last two years of the high school and the first two years of the college. A stay of four years in the same institution will create some feeling for it in the minds of the students, but two years would not do it. Thus the proposed Intermediate colleges would not produce adequate educational results, apart from the mere knowledge gained by the pupils.

The Commission expects that the new Intermediate colleges would consist of (i) the present second grade colleges, (ii) some of the better high schools which may rise to that rank, (iii) some of the weaker colleges which at present teach for the degree but which would be content to do the lower work more efficiently, (iv) new Intermediate colleges to be started in the mofussil, one at least in each district. The expense involved is so enormous that one wonders how it will be possible to find the requisite funds. Classes are generally to be limited to fifty, and this will make most of these institutions bankrupt. Further the lopping off of this side of their work will take away the main source of income of the first grade colleges that remain, and these will also have to be heavily subsidised. On the whole, we think that the recommendations of the Commission are likely to founder on the rock of finance.

Again, it is contemplated that after the Intermediate the real graduation course will take three years; thus it will mean an addition of one year in all to the age of graduation. Considering the careers open to graduates we wonder whether parents are likely to welcome this extra cost of education. A relaxation of the age limit is likely to reduce the risk in certain cases, and, in our opinion, provided the standard of the examination is kept sufficiently high and the quality of the teaching and the personnel of the teachers improved, there is no call at all for such grandmotherly restrictions about age. We know that it is contemplated that a degree is not intended to be a necessary qualification for most posts under Government, but that the Intermediate is to serve as the necessary qualification; but human nature being

what it is, everybody will try to get a higher qualification to improve his chances of success in life, and the appointing authority will also take the best qualified men available.

In comparing the acquirements of the average Indian student with those of an English student of the same standing, the Commission has not given due weight to the fact that the former has to study English more intensively than the latter studies any new language. This necessity for English is one of the constants of the educational problem. It may be a fact that the time spent on the learning of English is not made most of, and that with better methods, smaller classes and better teachers the knowledge of English acquired would be much more extensive. Still nobody disputes that the amount of time spent on English must continue to be so spent. If that is so, the remaining time only can be devoted to other subjects and the proficiency attained in them is likely to be less. It is further diminished by our present method of teaching all subjects through English before the student has acquired the necessary command over that language. The consequence is that all the available energy of the student is not well utilised, and we have all the evils of inefficiency of the matriculates which the Commission describes. Hence it is but inevitable that up to the high school stage at least the attainment of the Indian student in other subjects should be somewhat less than that of the English student of the same standing.

THE HOUSING OF THE POOR.

Educate the Public.—The problem of housing the poor has assumed very wide proportions in the West. Here in India, a few of us are struggling for a hearing. The reason why it is so clamant in Europe and in America is that the lower classes have votes and have found that they have other rights. Apparently Mr. J. P. R. of the Indian Civil Service who wrote about the housing problem in Bombay in the *Local Self-Government Gazette* had this in mind when he counselled Indian workmen to have "divine discontent." But I hope that before the unrest of the West infects the East, the public would realise the necessity for a sane treatment of this question. Before there is pressure and before there is resort to unlawful methods or means, the duty of the few who feel strongly on the subject, is to educate the public. I have no doubt that the Government will respond to suggestions in this behalf, if it is assured that there is public opinion behind them.

The public do not realise that it is as necessary to provide the lower classes with good houses as it is for themselves to live in good ones. The immunity which they desire from diseases cannot be had unless the lower classes are decently housed. The lesson must be impressed on them that any contribution they may make to the Government, to the Municipal Corporation and to Local Boards must be utilised not only to secure

for them good water, good roads, and healthy surroundings, but also to provide good habitations for the submerged classes. There is a feeling among municipal bodies that it is sinful to devote money contributed by the richer classes to bettering the localities in which the poorer classes live. These custodians of our comforts and conveniences must be taught that in proportion as they pay attention to the conditions of the poor, they would secure comforts for the rich.

Educate the Poor.—The second matter is to carry home to the poor ideas of sanitation, cleanliness and purity of life. They have so long been accustomed to ignore these essentials of healthy existence, that they are inclined to look upon those who insist upon their observing them as emissaries of the Government for taxation or for transporting them to Mesopotamia. Persons interested in social service should visit these persons and assure them that habits of ages past must be given up if they want to rise in the social scale. This duty of educating the lower classes to the realisation of better conditions of life is as essential for a successful solution of the problem as educating the richer classes to a sense of their duty towards the poor. Economy must be preached to these classes. They are woefully negligent of their pecuniary responsibilities. They do not think of husbanding their resources and of keeping back something for use when owing to disease or infirmity they may not be able to earn. Very often the little they can save they squander in drink. They wreck themselves physically and render their homes intolerable. Therefore, ideas of thrift, economy and clean living should be preached in season and out of season to these poor people. That alone will ensure the success of the housing problem.

Legislation.—The conscience of the community should be awakened to the unfortunate condition of the poorer classes. In addition to the two lines of work mentioned above, the Government should be approached to legislate for bettering the housing conditions of the poor. There are two modes of legislation which can be thought of for the present. One is to confer upon persons who have been residing for thirty years and more in a particular house belonging to a landholder a permanent right of occupancy. Especially, in cases where the landlord has permitted the putting up of a superstructure by the tenant, this should be done unreservedly. The Government of Madras and other local Governments have passed laws which have enabled tenants of small holdings to acquire permanent rights in the soil. I do not think there will be much difficulty in giving tenants of houses in cities the same facilities. Another class of legislation is the one which has been attempted in Bombay. I think that that legislation requires broadening and deepening. The landlords have gradually been raising the rent of houses. What was called by the present Prime Minister in England as "the unearned increment" has come to stay in India. A predilection is shown by the richer classes to leave the

mofussil and to own bungalows in the metropolis of the Presidency. This has led to an artificial rise in the value of house sites in cities. This tendency of the richer classes cannot be checked by legislation. But by prohibiting the landlord from raising the rent unless it be on proved circumstances which make it desirable that he should do so, the Government will not be violating any principle of justice. In the case of landlords in this Presidency laws have been enacted which forbid them to raise the rent unless in special circumstances. In the case of ryotwari landholders, the Government have imposed upon themselves a time limit before there is re-surveying and re-assessing. Provisions of this kind may very well be enacted in regard to tenants in cities.

Corporate House-owning or Individual House-owning.—One other problem which should be taken in hand is the compulsory acquisition of property where the landholder either neglects his duty towards his tenants or attempts their eviction. The Government should encourage the formation of societies like the Public Utility societies in England. These societies must be enabled to acquire the house-sites with the aid of contributions from the Government. On such acquisition the further question will arise whether the society should continue to own the sites and allow the poorer classes to be its tenants, or whether they should parcel out the sites and make the tenants owners thereof. This is a problem of some difficulty and requires careful consideration. I have simply alluded to it in order that the point may be fully discussed by persons who have given attention to it. My own inclination is in favour of parcelling out the land. Against this view it is urged that this would offer a premium to improvident persons to mortgage their houses. But the sense of responsibility which will be engendered by making them owners of the sites and by compelling them to subscribe to a co-operative fund for paying off the debt is likely to withstand the inclination to alienate the property. This would further enable some owners to improve their dwellings and to make them models for others. However, I do not propose to discuss the matter very fully at present.

Conclusion.—My conclusion is that if we are wise we should take steps betimes to deal with the question. It would be an evil day if modes of agitation which have paralysed industry in the West are allowed to invade India before we conciliate the working classes and make them feel that they are our fellow-citizens, in whose welfare we are deeply interested. Above all, the annual visitations of epidemics can be staved off only if we pay attention to this problem. The conscience of the community and the civic authorities is very dormant at present. They are vaguely sensible of a peril ahead, but they do not probe to the bottom the cause of that unpleasant feeling. Once they realise where the root of the evil is, I feel no doubt that they would move in the directions I

have indicated and solve the problem which at present seems a puzzle to many a mind.

T. V. SESHAGIRI AIYAR.

THE TURKISH PROBLEM AND THE PEACE OF PARIS.

THE Peace of Paris shows some curious similarity to the Treaty of Vienna (1815). Then the Powers of Europe met in the capital of Austria under the dominating personality of Metternich with the avowed object "of reconstituting moral order" and "regenerating the political system of Europe." The conference of 1919 has been equally ambitious, and its declared objects amount to no less than an attainment of eternal peace, a just redistribution of territory based on fundamental rights, and the constitution of a League of Nations to settle all political questions by arbitration. We know how disastrous a failure the settlement of Vienna turned out to be; how clever men exploited the general European feeling of war-weariness for purposes of self-aggrandisement. The question at present is whether the settlement of Paris will meet the same fate as its predecessor of Vienna, whether the League of Nations will find itself metamorphosed, like the Holy Alliance of 1815, into an instrument of reaction, whether the reconstitution of moral order and the establishment of everlasting peace, so long advertised, will turn out to be nothing more than the gorgeous phrases with which European statesmen are accustomed to describe their own achievements.

The true principles of a lasting European settlement have been laid down by all the prominent statesmen of Europe. They have all agreed that the only bases on which a just peace could be established are the principles of nationality and self-determination. Mr. Lloyd George has on more than one important occasion declared that the policy of the British Government (as well as of its Allies) was in emphatic consonance with these principles, conditioned and limited by the formula of adequate guarantees, ample reparation, and complete restoration. With regard to the treaty with European Powers, Mr. Lloyd George is no doubt justified in claiming that he has kept to his declarations, that Germany, in so far as it is German, has been left intact, that with regard to her the treaty, though stern, is just. He may also be justified in claiming that he has merely applied the rights of nationality and self-determination in dealing with the ramshackle empire of the Hapsburgs. But the great and vital question for us is, what about Turkey?

The Prime Minister on a momentous occasion declared to the world that here also the same equitable principles would be applied, that Great Britain would not be a party to any policy that meant the exclusion of the Turks from the homeland of their Empire or from Constantinople which has been since 1453 the capital of Mussalman

Power. This declaration has been taken by the Great Muslim population within the British Empire to mean that England will see that Turkey is not plundered merely because she does not happen to be a Christian country.

What, in reality, are the arguments adduced by the enemies of Turkey and Islam to support their claim to the break-up of the Ottoman Empire? They are in the main three: first, that Turkey is the "sick man" of Europe and is about to die; secondly, that the Turks are Moslems by religion; thirdly, that the Turkish Empire is constituted of many nationalities whom the Turks are supposed to suppress and sometimes to massacre.

What do these claims amount to? The first hardly needs any explanation or refutation. Europe has persisted in spite of incontrovertible evidence to the contrary that Turkey is sick and that the mortal body of the Ottomani is only artificially prolonged in life by the charity of the European powers. It is remarkable that the expression of sickness was first used by the Austrian Empress, Maria Theresa, not less than 170 years ago. The Empire of the Hapsburgs has vanished into nothingness; and the descendents of the haughty queen are now living in Switzerland. The Sultan still sits on the throne of his fathers. It is also remarkable that the great exponents of the "sick man" theory were the Tsars of all the Russias, the Power that was most interested in intensifying the Turk's sickness and if possible of making him die. The sickness about which the Russian chancellery lectured the foreign offices of Europe and for which it prescribed radical cure so often consisted really in the inability of Turkey to withstand the Tsar's Cossack hordes. That, in fact, created all the troubles of Turkey in Europe.

In what other sense Europe could have called Turkey a sick man is not quite evident. That her internal administration was weak in comparison to Western European nations may be admitted. But history shows that Turkey was quite able to put down internal rebellion and administer justice in her own territory. All the fragmentary nations that have been set up in the Balkans where revolutions and assassinations are as common as in the less civilised parts of South America, are the creations of European Powers. The revolt of Greece was put down by Turkey, but the British fleet intervened; the rebellion of the Slavs in 1877 was crushed completely without foreign help, but Russia interfered. The only example of a successful revolt against Turkey in the 19th century, unaided by European Powers is that of Mehemet Ali of Egypt. Everywhere else the arm of the Sultan was powerful enough to maintain his authority. Turkey's reputed sickness therefore was like Mark Twain's death "grossly exaggerated."

The second argument is that the Turks are Moslems and therefore should not rule over Christian subjects. The Turks, it needs no arguing to show, have as much right to rule over Christians as Christian nations have to rule over Moslems. The

three European Powers directly interested in the 'Turkish question' have all of them large communities professing Islam. The argument that people of one religion should not rule over peoples of other faiths would ill become them. The claim that Christians have some divine right to rule over others remains yet to be proved and at present belongs to the same category as the pretended right of white men to rule over brown or black men, or of Brahmans to settle everything for the non-Brahmans.

The third argument that the Turkish Government has been illiberal and oppressive with regard to the non-Muslim population is also as mythical as the rest. The Turkish Empire is no doubt inhabited by people of different races professing different religions. But so is every other Empire. The United States have a large Negro population who do not seem to get the best of treatment. Great Britain has an Empire possessing a population no less varied in racial origin, religion and language, and the treatment of all the races is by no means one of equality. It is a well-known fact that the Turks are the only ruling race that did not attempt either to exterminate the aborigines or to Ottomanise them. When England was planting a colony of Protestants in Ireland and making it illegal for Catholics to hold property worth more than £5, the Christian subjects of the Sultan enjoyed religious toleration. When in France the *roi soleil* was revoking the edict of Nantes and English history was being disgraced by the shameful episode of the Popish plot, the Christians as well as the Jews of Turkey went about free and practised their religion in public. The Turks never forced their religion or their language on the people whom they conquered.

Now, if the arguments of Turkey's enemies are of no value, why is it that the demand for the partition of the Ottoman Empire is so strong in the councils of Europe? The explanation is simple. European Powers have for a long time looked upon Turkey as a legitimate prey for their predatory ambitions. One by one the great outlying provinces of the Empire have been snatched away by European Powers. Claims have for a long time been advanced even for the home-domains of the Turkish Empire. Nicholas I. of Russia had as early as 1844 proposed to Great Britain a complete partition of Turkey. France has sedulously cultivated some interests in Syria and Palestine basing her claims on the Capitulations of 1740. Russia has cultivated more than an interest in Armenia. Italy has been known to cast longing eyes towards Asia Minor. The claims of France to Syria and Italy to Asia Minor are based on the doctrine of proportional influence in the Mediterranean. Ever since the time of Bolingbroke and the Treaty of Utrecht it has been the policy of England to gain a preponderating influence in the 'vital sea.' France has always opposed this, witness her traditional friendship to Egypt and her acquisition of Corsica. Now since Egypt has

become an English protectorate, France and Italy, in order to maintain the balance of power in the Eastern portion of the Mediterranean, claim Syria and Asia Minor.

It is evident, then, that the voices that demand the break-up of the Ottoman Empire are the voices of predatory Imperialism and commercial exploitation. It is evident that the real motive of the continental nations who cry aloud for it in the name of humanity is not so much the question of Moslem vs. Christian, but merely self-aggrandisement at the expense of the weak.

What is Great Britain's interest in this matter? Her traditional policy has been to support the Porte. Is there any particular reason which makes it impossible for Britain to hold to her traditional policy? The Mohemmadan community of India has expressed in no uncertain voice its opinion that there is no reason whatever why Great Britain should deviate from the time-honoured policy. Indian opinion has been unanimous with regard to the Turkish Sultan and the Caliphate. They look upon the possession of Constantinople by the Turks as an act symbolic of their position in this world. They consider the attempt on the part of Christian Powers to reduce the authority of the Caliph in the guardianship of the Holy Places as unwarranted and unjustifiable interference in their religious affairs. They are convinced that to withhold the right of self-determination from the Turks would be a grave political crime committed under the sinister influence of religious intolerance, vested interest and commercial imperialism.

These opinions are shared by all sections of the Mussalman community. Well-known friends of the British connection like H. H. the Aga Khan and Right Hon'ble Amir Ali, whose unimpeachable loyalty to the Empire has often gained them unpopularity, have taken the same attitude as the rest of the Mussalman community on this vital question. And they are undoubtedly right. To partition Turkey would be to belie all the great and noble sentiments which, according to British statesmen, have actuated British policy during the war. Mr. Lloyd George himself has openly declared it to be so. Apart from this consideration, such a course would be highly inexpedient. It would set the Mussalman world aflame. It would create in their hearts a wound which no conciliatory policy would ever heal. Its disastrous effects would be seen all over the world. In short it would be the easiest way of undoing all the work that the Conference of Paris has attempted to do. No settlement could endure against which more than 300 millions souls felt a just grievance. It would in short be, in the words of Talleyrand, not only a crime, but a blunder.

Europe once partitioned a State and the evil consequences of that act extended over 150 years. "The partition of Poland is the breakfast of Nations; where are they going to dine?" asked

Burke. Europe, it seems, wants to dine on the Ottoman Empire. But let the statesmen who have met at Paris think for a moment before they sit down to dinner. The breakfast of Poland was found to be indigestible. The Polish State after 140 years is now reconstituted. Will the Ottoman dinner be more satisfactory? Poland gave Europe war for 140 years. For how many centuries would the partition of Turkey embroil Europe? If English statesmen, in a moment of short-sighted policy, succumb to outside pressure and agree to the partition of Turkey, thus undoing the work of a hundred years of British diplomacy, they would have failed in their duty to the great commonwealth. They would by that action give a crushing blow to those great principles of peace and religious toleration on which the British commonwealth is based. Then the war would to a great extent have been fought in vain and the settlement of Paris would go the same way as its predecessor of Vienna went. Let us hope that the British representatives at Paris and Mr. Lloyd George would stand firm in the cause of Justice and Right.

HISTORICUS.

JOINT PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE.

EUROPEAN OPPOSITION TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA'S MODIFICATIONS.

SINCE I wrote to you last, the Joint Committee, has examined twenty-six more witnesses, of whom Lord Carmichael, Sir Stanley Reed, the Hon'ble Dr. Sapru, Sir Michael Sadler, Sir William Meyer, Sir Archdale Earle and Sir Alexander Cardew may be specially mentioned. Sir James Meston appeared again before the Committee to express the views of the Government of India regarding the rules to which reference is made in the Bill and to reply to the objections urged against the modifications proposed by the Government of India in the reform scheme. The Committee held its last sitting on the 26th inst. and, after examining Sir James Meston and Dr. Sapru, adjourned to the 3rd October.

Leaving Sir Alexander Cardew out of account, there was a remarkable unanimity of opinion among the above-mentioned European witnesses in regard to the steps that should be taken to enable India to have a share in controlling her destiny. They were united in their opposition to the changes recommended by the Government of India on almost every important point. Not one of them favoured the idea of a separate purse, not one supported the suggested modification in the composition of the grand committee which would ensure its registering the decrees of the executive. Nearly every one of the alterations urged in the despatch of the Government of India, dated the 5th March, is calculated to increase the power of the official at the expense of the popular element. But they pale into insignificance by the side of the proposal to divide provincial revenues into two sections and to increase the official strength on the grand committee. We have reason, therefore, to regard the opposition of all those English witnesses who hold more or less liberal views on Indian questions to these two changes with special gratification.

THE DIVIDED PURSE.

"I think," said Sir Stanley Reed, "the question of the divided purse will inevitably tend to a division between the two elements of Government when we want to preserve unity. . . . If they (ministers and executive councillors) have fixed revenues they would be inclined to spend up to them instead of economising, which I regard as one of the primary functions we have to pursue in India." Sir William Meyer declared that there would be "even more friction under the separate purse, because whatever friction is going on will be reflected in the legislative council with increasing force on the ground that it is not fair to the transferred subjects," and that it would be much more serious "if the minister had to come and ask for taxation for the transferred subjects while the reserved portion of the Government were basking in surplus." In reply to Mr. Acland who asked if the root idea of the separate purse system that "persons who are responsible for administration might raise from the services they administer the funds necessary for the administration was a tenable one at all," he stated that the separate purse meant a continuance of the existing system of finance "Take land revenue, the sheet anchor of provincial finance," he said. "Because land revenue is judged to be fitly at the outset a reserved subject, it is proposed, I gather, by the advocates of the separate purse to hand over all the land revenue to the reserved wing of Government, subject to their giving back something later on. That, if I may say so, seems to me an absurdity, because after land revenue is general administration." Dr. Sapru stated that the scheme for a divided purse had been considered and rejected by the Feetham Committee.

DISCOMFITURE OF SIR JAMES MESTON.

It is popularly believed that Sir William Vincent and Sir James Meston are responsible for the change that has come over the Government of India. At any rate it seems to me to be beyond doubt that Sir James Meston is the originator of the idea of a divided purse. If it is accepted by the Committee, responsible government in the provinces will receive its death-blow. It is easily the most reactionary and the most dangerous of all the amendments which the Government of India desire to see introduced into the scheme. The united insistence of Indian and liberal-minded English witnesses on the necessity of giving effect to the recommendations contained in the Joint Report in respect of provincial finance may well be described, therefore, as the discomfiture of Sir James Meston. I believe it is a legitimate inference to draw from the evidence of Sir Claude Hill and Sir William Meyer that the rejection of the financial proposals embodied in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report is not warranted by anything that has happened since the publication of the Report, but is accounted for solely by the change in the Finance Membership of the Government of India.

COMPOSITION OF GRAND COMMITTEES.

The creation of grand committees which might be depended upon with absolute certainty to carry out the wishes of the executive has been condemned as strongly as the separate purse system. It has been brought out repeatedly in the cross-examination of witnesses by Mr. Montagu and Lord Sinha that the composition of the existing councils affords no guarantee that the executive shall be able to obtain the legislation it asks for. In Madras some time ago the council rejected a motion on behalf of the local Government, asking for leave to introduce a bill. The acceptance of the Government of India's proposal would, therefore,

amount to a curtailment of the powers which the representatives of the people now enjoy. It is no argument in favour of packing grand committees with officials that in future the popular will shall prevail in regard to a large number of departments which are hitherto under the control of Government. The reform scheme has been designed with the express purpose of increasing the power of the elected representatives of the people. But advance in one direction cannot be held to justify retrogression in another. Where Government is not willing to move forward, it may stand still, but it is incompatible with the new policy to take back from the people what has once been conceded to them, and experience proves that it is impossible to do so without creating discontent. The Government of India lays great stress on the fact that with grand committees constituted as suggested in the Joint Report the provincial Government will not enjoy the power of affirmative legislation even in regard to reserved subjects. It has already been pointed out that they possess no such power even now, but one may also say with Sir William Meyer that if a local Government is unable to persuade grand committees to accept a measure "there is probably a *prima facie* case for thinking that that legislation is not required."

Lord Carmichael condemned the establishment of grand committees and proposed that the power of issuing ordinances—presumably of a permanent character—should be conferred on the Governor. I believe Sir James Meston also asked that if the view of the Government of India did not find favour with the Committee, it would be better to authorise the Governor to issue permanent ordinances than to institute a grand committee. Sir William Meyer was definitely opposed to this suggestion. I do not think that it had the support of any other witness.

TRANSFER OF HIGHER EDUCATION, INDUSTRIES, AND LAND REVENUE.

The Government of India have asked that the departments of education and industries should be treated as reserved subjects. Sir William Meyer agreed with the Government of India in regard to industries, because he regarded industrial development, as distinct from the administration of the department dealing with it, as an all-India subject. But the other European witnesses strongly supported the recommendation of the Feetham Committee. Sir Michael Sadler, whose views should carry weight with the Committee, urged that education "should be treated as a national whole." With certain reservations, which in principle are practically the same as the limitations suggested by the Feetham Committee, his own judgment "inclined decisively to the view that it would be wise to transfer all." The popular control of education, he urged, would lead to greater co-operation on the part of the public and better co-ordination of the increased expenditure on the various branches of education. He had no fear that popular control would lead to the deterioration of educational standards. Dr. Sapru very ably summarised the evidence given before the Feetham Committee and showed that while Indian opinion was almost unanimous in every province in asking for the transfer of education, the Directors of Public Instruction in Bengal, Bombay, the United Provinces and the Punjab also favoured the transfer; the Directors of the last two provinces, however, wished to treat University legislation as a reserved subject. Sir William Meyer, Lord Carmichael and Sir Archdale Earle entirely agreed with Sir Michael Sadler. It may be added that Sir Archdale Earle said in reply to Mr. Montagu with regard to land

revenue and forests, "It is a point so closely in contact with the people that I think it should be transferred as soon as practicable—the same as forests." It is interesting to note in this connection the opinion which was expressed by Sir James Meston. Mr. Montagu asked him if he had been impressed with the unanimity and force of the demand by Indian witnesses for giving Indians some control over the Government of India. He replied he would rather favour the transfer of more subjects in the provinces.

RESPONSIBILITY IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT.

As regards the Government of India, the representatives of all the deputations have forcibly insisted on the need for introducing an element of responsibility into the central Government. The European witnesses have as a rule been in favour of leaving it unchanged. But some of the most important of them have given expression to views which cannot fail to strengthen our claim. Lord Carmichael stated that he saw no danger in liberalising the Government of India and that he would be prepared to support such a policy if the Secretary of State and the Viceroy agreed to it. Sir Stanley Reed was more forceful and sympathetic. "With regard to the central Government," he said, "everything hinges on the relation of the central Government to Parliament. Under the reformed or revised constitution of India the main political questions in the central Government will be fiscal and economic. Now if Parliament is going to force on that reconstituted Government, against the unanimous opinion of all members of that Government, English and Indian, a measure like the excise duty on cotton piece-goods, I say you dare not contemplate the measure of responsibility, because you would not get that policy carried out. If, on the other hand, Parliament is prepared to give the Government of India as constituted a reasonable freedom in dealing with these matters, I think we would approach that question of responsibility in a totally different manner, and I, personally, should rejoice if it were possible immediately to introduce an element of responsibility on those lines in the Government of India." He made it clear in replying to a question put by Major Ormsby-Gore that he was *emphatically* in favour of fiscal autonomy being granted to India. Sir William Meyer was less progressive than Sir Stanley Reed and Lord Carmichael, but he too thought that to postpone the consideration of the liberalisation of the central Government for ten years was to ask the people of India to wait unduly long. He suggested that the question should be re-examined after five years' experience of the working of the provincial councils had been gained, and that the bill should be so framed as to allow the Secretary of State to transfer some of the all-India subjects to popular control without asking Parliament for fresh legislation.

INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

A deputation consisting of the Hon. Mr. Surendranath Banerjea, Sir William Meyer, Sir J. D. Rees, Mr. A. Yusuf Ali, Mr. V. P. Madhava Rao, Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, Hon. Dr. Tej Bahadur Sapru, and Messrs. C. Y. Chintamani, M. Ramachandra Rao, N. M. Samarth, Hy. S. L. Polak, N. C. Kelkar, C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, Chakkarai Chetty, Chenchiah, and H. N. Kunzru, waited upon the Secretary of State for India this afternoon in connection with the Transvaal Trading and Land Act, which deprives Indians of rights which they already enjoy and which in particular makes it impossible for them to own land. The deputation was introduced by Mr. Surendranath Banerjea who read a memorandum in which they prayed that the Trad-

ing and Land Act should not receive the Royal assent, that Indians should be given full rights of citizenship in South Africa and that responsible Indians should be associated with the Commission which will be appointed by the Union Government to examine the entire Indian question. Finally they asked that the reciprocity resolution passed at the Imperial Conference of 1917 should be given effect to as it would tend to enhance the status of India throughout the Empire and strengthen the hands of the Imperial Government in its efforts to secure just and humane treatment for Indians in the Dominions. Mr. Banerjea was followed by Sir J. D. Rees, Sir William Meyer and the Hon. Dr. Tej Bahadur Sapru. Sir William Meyer expressed his sympathy with Indians and said that the Government of India was in entire accord with the sentiments of the educated Indian community on the subject. A great deal could be done by friendly persuasion, but if persuasion failed the Government of India should be allowed to pass retaliatory measures against South Africans. Dr. Sapru agreed with Sir William Meyer in the desirability of the Government of India being allowed to pass retaliatory legislation, but he feared that its practical effect would be very little. He therefore wanted that the Imperial Government should consider its duty to protect Indian interests even after the reciprocity resolution had been given effect to.

The deputation was described by Mr. Montagu, who spoke very feelingly and eloquently, as the most representative of public opinion in India and of its strength and unity that he had received. He shared the sentiments expressed by the deputation with such earnestness and force. They were shared by the Government of India also. The deputation might rely on their doing all in their power to assist in finding a solution. There was legitimate ground for grave disappointment after the speeches of General Smuts and Mr. Burton at the Imperial Conference of 1917 and 1918 promising the most sympathetic consideration of the memorandum presented to the Conference by Lord Sinha. If Indians thought that retaliation was necessary Mr. Montagu hoped that retaliatory legislation would be passed, but he agreed with Dr. Sapru in thinking that it would not have much effect on the situation. After dealing with the other suggestions made by the deputation, he said that the Commission of Inquiry which the South African Government was going to appoint would have to deal not with a domestic but with an Imperial matter. On its decision would depend the relations of the various parts of the Empire towards one another, and it would also be a test of the sincerity of the welcome allowed by the Dominions to Indian representatives at the Imperial Conference. The Union Government had been asked to allow the Government of India to be represented on the Committee by two persons, an official and a non-official Indian, who, if the request were acceded to, would be chosen from men enjoying the highest confidence of the people of India. The Colonial Office had supported this request and forwarded it to the Union Government.

H. N. KUNZRU.

London, August 28.

THE PUNJAB DISTURBANCES.

497 FAMILIES RELIEVED

WE print below the report of the work so far done in the affected parts of the Punjab in giving relief to the sufferers from the recent disturbances, submitted to the Hon'ble Pandit Madan Mohan Mala-

viya, President of the Allahabad Seva Samiti by its Honorary Secretary, Pandit Venkatesh Narain Tivary, M. A., of the Servants of India Society:—

I am desired by Sriman Swami Shradhdhanand Sanyasi, Vice-President of the Allahabad Seva Samiti, under whose supervision the work of organising relief has so far been conducted, to send you, for your information, a brief account of the Samiti's efforts to render help to the sufferers from the recent disturbances in the Punjab.

In order to enable the Samiti to appeal for funds and to determine the general line of work, a preliminary inquiry into the extent of distress and the character and amount of relief needed was considered necessary. Some members of the Samiti accordingly visited Lahore, Amritsar and Gujranwala, and also met at Lahore a fairly large number of respectable gentlemen from other affected parts in the Punjab. The investigation disclosed that the number of persons in distress was considerable, and that relief, to be effective, must be immediate. An appeal asking for Rs. 1,00,000 was immediately issued to the press over the signature of the Samiti's president, the Hon. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, and Sriman Swami Shradhdhanand was requested to take charge of the distribution of relief. The first batch of volunteers left Allahabad on 15th July for the Punjab and devoted the first week to find out the cases of urgent relief. It was then decided to make Amritsar an independent centre of work, as it was felt that it had been hit the hardest under martial law and the number of cases in distress there was bound to be considerable. The rest of the affected area was to be dealt with from another centre at Lahore, which was to be the provincial headquarters of the Samiti. I was put in charge of the Amritsar centre, while the Swamiji, besides exercising general supervision over the Amritsar centre, kindly undertook to organise the distribution of relief at Kasur, Lahore, Gujranwala, Lyallpur, Gujrat, Hafizabad and Wazirabad. I should like to pay my tribute of respect to the Swamiji whose high-souled devotion to duty and ceaseless activity, notwithstanding his age, are an unflinching source of inspiration to us all, who are working with him in the Punjab.

The Swamiji has personally visited these places at least once and had the relief distributed in his presence. He has also arranged with local gentlemen of these places for the distribution of relief in future.

JALLIANWALA BAGH INCIDENT.

In the course of our work, we have had to investigate over 2,000 cases. I may in passing mention that we have so far received the names of 472 persons who were killed at the Jallianwala Bagh, Amritsar, on the 13th April, 1919, besides 60 whose names are unknown and who were cremated by some local kind-hearted gentlemen. In addition to these, 192 persons were wounded, who have now recovered. The list is as yet far from being complete; and I am afraid more names will soon reach our office. With the object of relieving as many deserving cases as possible, the volunteers of the Samiti are going about from village to village distributing relief in the districts of Amritsar, Lahore, Gurdaspur and Sialkote. Arrangements have also been made to print advertisements in the Urdu and Gurmukhi papers, requesting people to communicate to the office the names and addresses of those who have been either killed, wounded or sentenced, so that the Samiti may, after making proper inquiries, give them relief. It is, however, extremely to be regretted that, even in spite of these efforts, we shall not be able to reach all those who are in need.

METHODS OF RELIEF.

The method of giving relief is as follows: Either the person seeking relief comes to the office, or the Samiti's volunteer approaches the party in distress at his or her house; but in either case a written statement in the form of an application and containing full details regarding the number of adults

and children, the cause of distress, and the present position, of the family, is taken after being duly signed by the applicant. If, after making local inquiries, the office is satisfied that it is a deserving case, then only is relief administered; otherwise not. Relief is given in three different ways. Besides the maintenance allowance, widows are persuaded to learn sewing, and the Samiti undertakes to supply them with sewing-machines in case they have received adequate training. The idea underlying this form of relief is to make as many of them self-supporting as possible. Adequate arrangements have been made to impart training in sewing to such widows; and such of them as, owing to the social status of their families, cannot attend a school, can learn at home. In addition, we are distributing cloth to the deserving cases. Owing to the abnormally high prices of cloth, and also to the fact that during the period of the martial law administration at Amritsar, when the police were searching houses for the recovery of the Bank cloth, a good many people out of sheer panic threw away the few clothes they had; and as a result of it they are now going about wearing rags which even by courtesy cannot be described as garments fit to clothe human beings.

DETAILS OF RELIEF.

I append herewith a statement in tabular form giving the number of families in each place, to whom relief was given, arranged according to religion:—

Name of place	Hindus	Muhammadans	sikhs	Christians	Total
1. Amritsar	129	120	100	1	350
2. Kasur	7	14	1	0	22
3. Lyallpur	3	0	3	0	6
4. Gujranwala	4	35	3	0	42
5. Lahore city	5	14	0	0	19
6. Gurdaspur	5	9	0	0	14
7. Wazirabad	6	15	0	0	21
8. Chuhan Kana	1	0	0	0	1
9. Nawa Pind	0	3	7	0	10
10. Other places	9	3	0	0	12
	169	213	114	1	497

The reasons for giving relief are noted below:—

1. In the case of 142 families the bread-winner was killed.
2. In the case of 52 families, the bread-winner was wounded and required temporary relief.
3. In the case of 303 families, the bread-winner was sentenced.

RS. 2,00,000 NEEDED.

With the exception of Amritsar, the relief for three months has already been distributed, amounting to Rs. 7,500. In Amritsar, we have given relief for two months to about 100 families, and in the remaining cases relief has been given for the first month only. The money already distributed at Amritsar comes in round figures to Rs. 7,500. Cloth worth Rs. 2,000 has been purchased. If relief is confined to a period of six months only, the Swamiji and I estimate that rupees seventy-five thousand will be required. This sum, however, includes the cost of 100 sewing machines. Our firm conviction based upon our experience of the work, however, is that relief, to be effective, should in most cases be continued for a period of not less than 12 months, and that in the case of some young widows, permanent relief will be necessary. For this purpose, a sum of rupees two lacs in all is required, and I doubt not that so small a sum will easily be forthcoming as soon as the people realise the full extent of the distress in the Punjab and the urgent need of relief thereof.

Before closing, I should like to mention that two more centres of work have recently been started at Kasur and Gujranwala, while the Lahore centre is closed from the 14th of this month. The provincial headquarters of the Seva Samiti are now at Amritsar.

ACTINA CURES DEAFNESS.

Not merely improves the sense of hearing temporarily as do Electrophones, Ear Drums, etc. but really cures the disease permanently. The secret of Actina's success is that it removes the cause of the disease and that is where it differs from all other treatments.

The principal cause of Deafness is Catarrhal Inflammation of the throat and middle ear and until this is removed the hearing cannot be restored. The powerful vapours emanating from Actina inhaled through the mouth and nostrils and applied to the eye, course through the delicate nerves and blood-vessels, removing Congestion stimulating and invigorating and restoring the organs to their normal healthy activity.

Actina is the surest, simplest and most natural cure for Deafness and is just as effective in other Catarrhal diseases such as Eye Troubles; Hay Fever, Asthma; Bronchitis; Headache; Sore Throat; Influenza, etc. Costing only Rs 25-8 (plus postage etc.) This wonderful instrument should find a place in every home. Booklet entitled "Prof. Wilson's Treatise on Disease" containing useful health advice and full Particulars of our Conditional Trial Offer, post free on request. Write to-day to Mrs B. S. Bhandari, M. A., Batala (India.)

3 **ACTINA NATURAL TREATMENT.**

HOW TO BECOME A DRUGLESS-DOCTOR.

IF you want money, happiness fame; be a doctor of drugless-therapy. This chance will be given to our candidate in a town and two candidates in a city. Read our booklet "How to become a drugless-doctor" sending two annas stamps to—

Dr. SURATKER, (S.) N. C. Institute,
ERODA

Indian Reforms.

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA BILL, 1919.
WITH

The full text of the Bill, the memorandum, Mr. Montagu's speech and Sir Sankaran Nair's Minutes: summaries of Southborough Committee's reports, Government of India's despatches and connected papers: Also schemes of reforms of the Congress, the Muslim League, the Indo-British Joint Conference; Sir W. Wedderburn, Gokhale, Lord Islington and H. H. the Aga Khan.

Re. 1. To Subscribers of the "I.R." As. 12.
G. A. Natesan & Co., Publishers, Madras.

JUST A WORD

we to remind you to send your order To-Day for our famous
COSSI SILK SUIT PIECES
Worth the price, and a piece guaranteed for one year: complete
Price Rs. 8 per piece.
Order from:—GOOD LUCK COMPANY, BENA RES CITY,

Latest Books.

	Rs. as. p.
Indian Home Rule by M. K. Gandhi ...	1 0 0
Rights of Citizens by S. Satyamurthi ...	1 0 0
Footsteps of Freedom by J. H. Cousins ...	2 0 0
Moulted Feathers by J. H. Cousins ...	0 8 0
Sir Sankaran Nairs Minutes of Dissent ...	0 8 0
Kural or Maxims of Tiruvalluvar by V. V. S. Iyer ...	2 4 0
Do India Civilized by Sir John Woodroffe ...	2 8 0
Mahatma Gandhi. His Life and Teachings ...	2 0 0

V. N. Sama Rao & Co.,
135, Devaraja Mudaly Street, Madras.

Ramchandra Govind & Son,

BOOK-SELLERS AND PUBLISHERS, KALKADEVI, BOMBAY.

INDIAN CURRENCY AND BANKING PROBLEMS

BY MOHAN LAL TANNAN, B. COM., (Birmingham), BAR-AT-LAW, F. R. E. S.
Lecturer in Banking, Sydenham College of Commerce and Economics, Bombay.

AND

KHUSHAL T. SHAH, B. A., B. SC. (Econ. London), BAR-AT-LAW.
Professor of Economics, Maharajah's College, Mysore.

Crown Octavo. Nicely bound, Gold-lettered, nearly 350 Pages with Index. Price Rs. 5.

GOVERNANCE OF INDIA, Price Rs. 3.

BY KHUSHAL T. SHAH, B. A., B. SC. (Econ., London), BAR-AT-LAW.
Professor of Economics, Maharajah's College, Mysore.

(1) Higher Accounting With Auditing Notes. By S. R. Davar.

Officially recognized by the Government of Mysore for use in Colleges and Schools of Commerce and recommended as a text to the Students of the Premier College of Commerce in India.

A book specially written for the use of Professional Accountancy students as well as that of Accountants, Legal Practitioners and Businessmen, Price Rs. 6-8.

(2) Elements of Indian Mercantile Law. By S. R. Davar.

Recognized and Recommended as a text-book by the Government Accountancy Diploma Board, as well as by the Premier College of Commerce for the University, Commercial and Accountancy Examinations Specially written for the use of "Commerce" and "Accountancy" students as well as that of Businessmen and Accountants. Rs. 6-8-0.

(3) Business Organization. An excellent book for the use of students of commerce and businessman, particularly those in charge of the management of large enterprises such as public companies, Mill Agencies, etc., By S. R. Davar, BAR-AT-LAW.

(In Press. Expected to be out shortly.) Price Rs. 6. net.

Twentieth Century English-Marathi Dictionary:—Pronouncing Etymological, Literary, Scientific and Technical by N. B. Ranade, B. A. 2 vols, half Morocco bound. Rs. 25.

Shah and Haji's (Profs.) Guide to Economics:—In form of question and answer very useful to students of Economics. Rs. 4.

Shah's (Prof.) Guide to Indian Administration:—Very useful to Intermediate Arts students. Rs. 1-4-0.