The Indian States' Peoples Conference

Report of the B'bay Session

THE INDIAN STATES' PEOPLE'S CONFERENCE.

REPORT OF THE BOMBAY SESSION.

17th, 18th December 1927.

PUBLISHED BY

Prof. G. R. ABHYANKAR, B. A., LL. B.,

General Secretary.

MANISHANKER S. TRIVEDI, B. A.,

Secretary.

The Indian States' People's Conference,
Ashoka Building, Princess Street,
BOMBAY.

Printed by B. M. Sidhaye, at the Bombay Vaibhav Press, Servants of India Society's Home, Sandhurst Road, Girgaon, Bombay.

26th September 1928.

Conference

Bombay

INTRODUCTORY

The Problem of Indian States, always difficult, has grown tremendously so in the years after the visit of the Montague Chelmsford mission to India. The establishment of the Princes' Chamber as a direct result of this visit, and the repercussions of the introduction of elements of Responsible Government on the states as foreshadowed by the illustrious authors of the Reforms Report are the main causes that have aroused an intelligent and keen interest in the discussion of this Problem and created a demand for constitutional rule as well as a desire for participation in all matters of common interests with the people of British India on the part of the people of the Indian States.

This demand has increased with years, and signs are not wanting to show us the intensity as well as the earnestness that have inspired it. The People of the States have begun organising themselves by various means. The establishment of the Deccan States Conference, the Kathiawar States Political Conference, the Rajputana Seva Sangha, and such other activities working for the Political rights of the people of groups of Indian States, as well as Conferences of the people of individual States such as the Sangli State's People's Conference, the Bhor Political Conference, the Bhavnagar Praja Parishad, the Cutchi Praja Parishad and the Hyderabad State People's Conference, Janjira State Subjects Conference, Miraj State People's Conference and the Idar Praja Parishad are the clear manifestations of the New Spirit that is abroad.

Those who knew the placidity and seeming contentment existing amongst the Indian States about a dozen years ago, and those again who are acquainted with the comparative absence of all healthy public activities which go to rouse the masses of the people will be amazed at the ferment that is at present brewing into the hearts of these citadels of conservation and absolutism. All unnatural barriers are being broken up, the spirit of Enquiry and wonder has taken the place of placidity and torpor, feelings of uneasiness and healthy discontent have begun to permeate the common people, searchings of heart have begun both in

official
Gover
gents
everyday increasin
and march hand to hand
the hearts of the people.

The transformation is visible in the sessions of the States Subject Conferences that are being held with the Indian National Congress almost every year for a few years, and in the increasing interest that is being taken by the Indian as well as the British Press in this Problem by devoting more space to it instead of regulating it to a back place as was done in the old days.

The Princes have combined in their Princes Chambers for the protection of their rights, privileges and prerogatives. They are protesting against the enchroachments of the Political Department of the Government of India and demanding freedom from many irksome restrictions. They are claiming representation in Imperial and International gatherings and desire to participate in the formulation of Imperial as well as All-Indian Policies. While on one hand they are putting forth those claims and strengthening this position, they are, on the other, found to be too slow and unwilling to part with the power that they have derived from the people in their favour. They have not thought fit yet to shed their autocracy and irresponsibility. They do not desire to take the people into their confidence in all their doings. Their Princes' Chamber has closed the door against the public gaze, their confabulations with the Government of India are all secret and behind closed doors. The People are never kept informed as regards the foreign and political affairs of their own states, they are not supposed to know or have any opinions on the commitments that their Princes make in their name and on their behalf and whose burdens they themselves have to undertake. The Press laws are all obsolete and know the simple procedure of confiscations and deportations. Free Press and free associations are scarcely known. The elementary civic rights of the people are at the mercy of the Executive. Taxation and Legislation are undertaken at the instance of the subordinates of the Administration without any consultation with the people who are most concerned. The Revenues of the State are mostly regarded as personal revenues and the expenses on the palace, royal family as well as guests amount to huge proportions. Education, sanitation, medical relief, industrial development and such other nation building departments are practically starved, and

even local self-Government is unknown. Barring a few honourable exceptions the Princes have taken care to see that the desire for constitutional rule and Responsible Government does not spread amongst their people, and they have maintained that they are not accountable for their doings to anybody on this earth.

This state of things naturally exasperates people and the demand for reform is steadily growing. A move in the direction of solidarity in the ranks of the workers in this field was long overdue. A few students of this Problem who were ploughing their lonely furrow to educate public opinion had tried to form themselves into a central Institution when Mr. Montague was conducting his Reform Enquiry in the good old days of 1918. The efforts of late Mr. Mansukhlal Ravjeebhai Mehta, the father of all political movements in Kathiawar, needs specific mention. These attempts could not succeed as they were a little premature.

On March 5th 1922, certain prominent workers interested in the Indian States met together in the premises if the Servants of India Society at the invitation of Messrs. N. C. Kelkar and A. V. Patwardhan, the Hon. secretaries of the Deccan States Association. Twenty-six workers were present. Mr. Kelkar in opening the proceedings dwelt on the reasons why the meeting had been convened, how the progress in the Indian States was essential for the progress of the country as a whole, how new problems were daily emerging into prominence, and how consciousness was growing in the Deccan States in these matters. He also gave some information regarding institutions established for the same purpose in different parts of the country and requested Mr. Sukla, Barrister of Rajkot to take the chair.

The President in his speech, explained how new problems were cropping up relating to subjects of Indian States, how the subjects were groaning under the antediluvian system of administration obtaining in the states, what measures of reform were immediately needed, how to achieve them without clash with the authorities, and how the Bombay Government had adopted a tyrants' attitude in this case of the Indian States in this Presidency.

The question of the imperative need of an 'All India States People's Conference was taken up, and after discussions and speeches, the following resolutions were adopted.

(1) An All India States Peoples Conference should be held in Bombay in August or September next.

(2) A Provisional Committee should be formed.

(3) The work of defining aims and objects of the Conference should be entrusted to the Conference itself.

(4) Messrs. Kelkar, Patwardhan, S. S. Mehta, Popatlal Chudgar and J. R. Gharpure should be the secretaries of the Provisional Committee.

This Committee did some propaganda work approached some of the worker's of the states, and raised discussious on the various aspects of the Problem of the States.

The next step forward was taken in 1926. A few workers again met, formed a Provisional Committee and set about considering the advisability of convening the Indian States Peoples Conference. Dr. Sumant Mehta, A. V. Patwardhan, and L. R. Tairsee, the provisional secretaries convened the first meeting of the Committee on the 31st October 1926. The committee held some meetings and considered various items in connection with the Organisation of this work. They published a manifesto in which they declared inter alia "The ideal of a Federated India, in which the British Provinces and the Indian states would unite on a footing of equality to form the great consolidated nation of India, would, in order to be achieved, presuppose a much greater degree of public consciousness and political advance in the States than has been the case so far, and it has been considered that the peoples of the Indian states must now obtain Political Institutions and forms of Government calculated reasonably to place them on a par with the rest of the federating India.

The Organisation of a Conference will therefore, be devoted to make the Princes realise that their best friends are, after all, their peoples, working in harmoney with the rest of India. A conference is therefore necessary to see how far this or the like aim common to the whole of the Native States of India is attainable; and, if attainable, to devise the ways and means and permanent Organisation for the maintenance of the struggle for the betterment of the states and their peoples."

This Committee desired to convene the Conference in January 1927, but the various other preoccupations of the nation prevented its early fruition as desired in that month. On the 1st April 1927, Messrs. Amritlal V. Thakkar, Prof. G. R. Abhyankar, A. V. Patwardhan, Prof. K. T. Shah, Dr. Samant B. Mehta, Manilal Kothari, and Ramnarayan Chaudhary again invited the workers in the Indian States to meet together on the 17th and 18th. The following subjects were suggested by them for discussion :—

(1) Formulation of the aim of Political advance in the Indian States as integral parts of the Indian Nation,

(2) Consideration of the question whether a larger and more representative Conference should be convened, and if that is agreed to, the determination of the time, place, and programme of such a Conference,

(3) Preparation, if so determined of a representation to be laid before the forthcoming Constitutional Commission, embodying the aim of politiical advance in the Indian States, and suggesting the ways and means and the methods by which the said aim can be accomplished.

This meeting was accordingly held on the 17th and 18th April 1927 at the Servants of India Society's Home, Bombay, when the following were present. Amritlal V. Thakkar (Bhavnagar), professor K. T. Shah (Cutch), D. V. Gundappa (Mysore), professer G. R. Abhyankar (Sangli), Amritlal D. Sheth, M. L. C. (Limbdi), Shet Govindlal Petty (Hyderabad), Shankerlal Varma (Gwalior), R. M. Sudarshanam (Travankore), Balvantray G. Mehta (Bhavnagar), A. R. Nageshwar Iyer (Mysore), Nathalal M. Shah (Limbdi), V. K. Mainkar (Sangli), Trilokchand Mathur, (Karauli), Raghavendra Rao Sharma (Hyderabad), H. Venkatramia (Mysore), Durlabhjee Umedchand (Limbdi), Wamanrao Tahmankar (Baroda), Niranjan Sharma Ajit (Bharatpur), A. V. Patwardhan (Sangli); K. J. Chitalia (Bhavnagar), Rangildas Kapadia (Baroda), R. R. Bakhale (Sangli), and S. G. Vaze (Kolhapur).

The meeting resolved to convene a Conference of the representatives of the people of Indian states in Bombay in or about the last week of May 1927 to consider the problem of the Constitutional advance in the Indian states under the reformed Constitution of India.

The following manifesto was adopted and published under the signatures of those present.

"The principal aims of such a Conference of the peoples of all Indian States should be to demand and secure that Indian states should be regarded as integral parts of a common Indian nation, on a par with this principal provinces of what is known as British India in all national matters, and founded on the basic principles of responsibility in Government and representativeness in their governing Institutions, similar to that prevailing in British India, under the aegis of their respective rulers.

Subject to this central ideal, the position, powers, and functions, of the Indian Princes; the rights and obligations under treaties and other engagements of the States with the rest of India, and the rights and privileges of citizenship in each such unit and the body politic of India must be left to be determined and regulated by appropriate institutions.

Representations embodying these points may be addressed, under the authority of the Conference, to the statutory Commission and to such other authorities as may be concerned with this Problem."

This Committee met from time to time and began the work of organising the Conference. The unexpected calamity that overtook the people of Gujerat viz. the unprecedented floods suddenly intervened and the work of the Conference had again to be postponed.

It was at the fourth meeting of the Working Committee held on the 20th of November under the chairmanship of Mr. G. B, Trivedi which 26 workers from different parts of the Country had attended, that a further step was taken for the fulfillment of the resolve that was taken.

There was a general discussion in which the prominent workers stressed the advisability of holding the session in the course of the next month so as to give the Country lead in the affairs of the Indian States which were going to figure prominently before them for sometime to come.

At the invitation of the Committee Mr. Balvantray Mehta, secretary of the Bhavnagar State People's Conference, agreed to devote all his time and energy to the organisation of the Conference, and with this assurance the Committee resolved to hold the Conference in the third week of December.

Five sub-committees were appointed with prominent workers of those parts as members to do the propaganda work in Cutch-Kathiawar, Gujerat, the Deccan, the Rajputana and Hyderabad States respectively. The fees for the membership of the Reception Committee were fixed at Rs. 10, and the delegates were asked to pay Rs. 2 each.

The Reception Committee was thus organised and it held its first meeting on the 4th of December with Mr. A. V. Thakkar of the Servants of India Society in the chair. 29 Members attended it.

The following office-bearers of the Reception Committee were elected :—

Chairman.

R. B. Govindlal Shivlal Motilal.

Vice-chairmen.

S. A. Brelvi, Editor, the Bombay Chronicle.
G. B. Trivedi, ex.-M.L.C. of Bombay.

General Secretaries.

A. V. Thakkar, member, Servants of India Society.
G. R. Abhyankar, Professor of the Poona Law College.

A. D. Sheth, Editor, "Saurastra."
Balkrisnalal Poddar, merchant, Bombay.
Rangildas Kapadia of the Baroda Praja Mandal.
Balvantray Mehta, member, Servants of the People Society.

Treasurer.

Manishanker S. Trivedi, Secretary, Kathiawar Praja Mandal Bombay.

Sub-committees were elected to look after the arrangements about the erection of the Pandal, the draft of the resolutions, the organisation of volunteers, propaganda work, and the accommodation of guests. An Executive Committee consisting of 29 members was elected to carry on the work of these preparations.

Diwan-Bahadur M. Ramchandra Rao of Ellore, ex-M.L.A., was elected to the Presidentship of the Conference.

The Committees carried on vigourously the work allotted to them. A number of public meetings were held under the auspicies of the Kathiawar Praja Mandal, the Idar Praja Mandal, the Jamnagar and Bhavnagar Prajamandals, and such other organisations working for the amelioration of the people of the States. The Press was flooded with pamphlets, leaflets and bulletins issued from the office. Articles on the Problems of the Indian States appeared in the leading papers. Popular attention was focussed on the grievances and aspirations of the people of the States. The country was awakened to its sense of responsibility towards the 70 millions of their brethren of the States who are deprived of all civic rights and who are crying for a Rule of Law and a Government conducted on a constitutional basis. The fact, that barring a few honourable exceptions the States are at present governed on old obsolete principles of personal rule and the Divine Right of Kings reminiscent of an age that has long disappeared and that the Princes are out for the perpetuation and the extension of their special rights and privileges as well as still more to strengthen their entrenched position without any reference to the rights of their subjects or any guarantee for the introduction of an element of responsibility towards them in their systems of Government, aroused considerable sympathy of the people of British India and wakened up those of the States to work for their salvation. The vigourous agitation that marked out the success of the Conference in advance was primarily due to the incessant efforts of messrs. Popatlal Chudgar, G. R. Abhyankar, Manilal Kothari and a host of other leading lights of the Indian States. The arrivals of Sjt. B. S. Pathik, aptly termed

the Lion of the Rajputana and the President-elect D. B. Ramchadra Rao were the occasions when scenes of wild enthusiasm and fervour were enacted and processions were formed to honour the illustrious leaders and greetings were received from all the public bodies dealing with these Problems.

With the ground thus well prepared, the Conference sessions opened at 3 P. M. (S. T.) on Saturday the 17th December 1927. More than 1,500 people attended. Of these 750 were members of the Reception Committee, and Delegates representing more than 70 States and the rest were visitors.

The President-elect was conducted to the dais by the leaders of the Conference amidst tumultuous scenes of enthusiasm. The volunteers of the Conference, who were drilled into discipline under the inspiring leadership of Mr. Amritlal Sheth, the Captain, presented a salute to him. Prominent amongst those that adorned the dais were Sir Purushottamdas Thakurdas, Mr. Fenner Brockway, Prince Dhairyashilrao Gaikwar, Sir Lallubhai Samaldas, Mr. S. A. Brelvi, Mr. Laxmidas Tairsee, Dr. Sumant Mehta, Mrs. Atiya Begum, Mr. A. V. Thakkar, Mr. N. C. Kelkar, Mr. D. V. Gokhale, Mr. Manilal Kothari, Sir Jugmohandas Varjiwandas, Sheth Jamnalal Bajjaj, Mr. B. F. Bharucha, Mr. Motichand Kapadia.

The proceedings began with the sweet songs of welcome and a call to Duty sung by the girls of the Vanita Vishram. Messages of sympathy and success were received from the following amongst others:—

SUCCESS.

S. K. Yagnik, Secretary The Idar Praja Parishad.
Khan Bahadur Colonel Sardar Asghar Ali.
Gulabrai G. Desai Bhavnagar.
Dolatrai Sakarlal Secretary Bhavnagar Praja Parishad.
Nagindas Mody.
Pandit Vasanji Ranchod Porbunder.
Harilal Govindji Amreli.
Thakorlal Parekh Navsari.
D. V. Gundappa Bangalore.
Jog, Pleader Ramdurg.
Jainarain and Bhanwarlal Secretaries Marwar Hitkarni Sabha, Jodhpur.
Indralal Dewra, Fatehpur.
Shyamlal Sharma Jodhpur.
Ganesh Datta, Malwa.

Ramkrishna Acharya, Merta.
Anandraj Surana Jodhpur.
Jivraj Nensey, Tera.
Labhuram Kalia, Kapurthala.
Sheokaran Joshi, Jodhpur.
Ramkrishna Mohta, Bikaner.
Hoskoppa Krisnarao, Secretary The National Progressive Assoccia tion, Mysore.
Nageshvarer, Bangalore.
Limye, Secretary Bhor State subjects association.
Secretaries, Cutchi Praja Parishad, Cutch Mandvi.
Vamanrav Naik.
Doctor Dahigavri, Mandvi.
Ravisingh Deepsingh.
Venishanker G. Bhatt, Bhavnagar.
Alimohmad, Palitana.
Jayantial Mehta Editor " Deshi Rajya ".
Dr. D. R. Hulgalkar, Secrerary Loksabha, Jamkhandi.
S. M. Londhe, Gwalior.
Ramchandra Amin Member Baroda Legislative Council.
Chotalal Pandit, Baroda.
K. T. Mathew, Secretary The Indian States' Subjects Conference, Madras.
J. Bhimrao, Bangalore.
Shrinivas Patel, Sangli State.

The proceedings terminated amidst great enthusiasm at 9 p. m., on Sunday the 18th December after raising the funds of about six thousand rupees for carrying out the work of the Conference during the year.

BALVANTRAI G. MEHTA.
MANISHANKER S. TRIVEDI.

THE INDIAN STATES' PEOPLES' CONFERENCE.

ADDRESS

OF THE

Chairman of the Reception Committee,

Mr. Govindlal Shivlal Motilal.

17th, 18th, December, 1927.

Bombay.

Brother-delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is impossible for me to express in words, the pride and the pleasure I feel in greeting you all on this occasion, and tendering you on behalf of the Reception Committee the warmest welcome to this great and cosmopolitan city of Bombay. When I reflect at what great sacrifice and inconvenience to yourselves you have come here from all parts of the country, representine States large and small and deeply interested in their concerns, intent on the one object of finding out after due deliberation, a satisfactory solution of the Indian States' problem, my heart beats with gratitude and fully realises that even the utmost that we can do to make your stay here during the conference comfortable, cannot but be considered inadequate. I I see in this place many prominent and devoted workers who have been working for the cause of the people in the States with admirable zeal, continuous sacrifice, and steadfastness of purpose.

You will agree with me that a better selection could not have been made for the venue of this year's Session than this modern City surrounded on its border by so many States, large and small, nearly 440 States out of 563, a city so centrally situated, noted for its public spirit and public life, for sober and rational thought, Capital of a Province, which has the honour of producing India's greatest men Dadabhoy Nawroji the father of Indian Swaraj, Tilak the father of Indian Nationalism, Tyebji the staunch and sturdy Nationalist and Gandhi the Apostle of National freedom.

NECESSITY AND ADVANTAGES OF SUCH CONFERENCE.

We are living in an age of progress and advancement when human mind is discovering means and methods of securing human happiness in every sphere. There is a wide awakening everywhere. People in Europe taking ideas and theories from Greece and Rome have developed Government and States which are better instruments of promoting their welfare and progress. The East has long since come in contact with the West and has been observing institutions of the West, and weighing the comparative advantages and disadvantages of the institutions of the two. A great change has come over most of the Eastern Countries. They hav

shaken off such institutions as hindered their progress and have established in their place what according to their lights, needs and environment they have found suitable for their uplift. Japan has long since transformed herself into a modern Nation and adopted the constitutional and parliamentary system of Government. She stands in the ranks of the most enlightened and advanced countries of the world. Her rapid progress in so many spheres of man's activity is an object lesson for us all. Nationalism in China is struggling to throw off the foreign and reactionary elements that come in the way of consolidation of the National fabric. Turkey has emerged from the old order and has established republican Government. Egypt, Persia, Afghanistan are all fast changing and growing into modern nations. Brother-delegates, India could not remain unaffected by these influences. A new spirit has entered the hearts of her sons whether they live in that part which is known as British India or the part which is not red but yellow on the map. This spirit has manifested itself in the National movement which has been incessantly expanding itself and has attracted to its service men who have been endeavouring with more than a religious zeal to raise India's position, lift up her people and emancipate her inhabitants. The National Congress founded some 40 years ago has been the chief organ of this movement. That body long ridiculed and criticised by our opponents stands today like a tree which has weathered the storm and has laid deep in the soil its roots and branches and presents a bulwark of Indian Nationalism and Liberty. The Congress had to contend against many difficulties in its early stages, it had large probems to deal with which did not arise in the Indian States, it marched from step to step, it hesitated to take too many steps at a time and has but recently admitted representatives of Indian States to its fold but has not completely overcome its nervousness to deal with questions of Native States, perhaps confident in the belief that freedom in Larger India firmly established, would facilitate and render smooth its march from that base to her neighbouring tracts, and that the pace of this march must primarily depend on the people ruling in the States. What then is the duty of the peoples, of the States ? Do the dictates of the human conscience enjoin in action and inertia ? I am sure your reply would be one and one only and that is an emphatic "No." Action, persistent action and utmost effort will be your heart's reply. Brother-delegates, the call of duty is clear. People in Larger India have advanced by their efforts, by their own exertions. They are with you, you have before you in your very midst to day the worthy President-elect as the proof and evidence of it. You must be prepared to stand on your legs, work for your liberties and emancipation and not only they but the whole world will appreciate

and extend its support and the high souled amongst Indians will help and assist you in your legitimate nay noble mission as in duty bound.

Brother-delegates, what is the purpose for which we are meeting here? The answer is simple. Inspired by the noble desire and lofty patriotism to contribute our quota in however humble a manner to the solution of the problems of our country of which the States are an important part, to exchange views with the thoughtful and enlightened amongst us the people of the States as regards their disabilities, to devise means to end these disabilities and elevate the people, to chalk out plans and programme for that purpose, to obtain redress from those in power and authority by drawing their attention in an organised and corporate capacity to our grievances, and last but not least, to assist the Rulers in a manner that it is the duty of every citizen to do, to improve and reform the administration, to adjust the machinery of the Government to suit the requirements of modern life, to move and advance the States out of anachronism and serve God by faithfully and affectionately serving the people and the Country.

While there are larger problems that are common to the people of British India and Indian India, the latter have some problems peculiar to themselves in respect of which the former are more fortunately situated. We congratulate, them, we emulate them for their good fortune, we assure them that we are with them in their problems, they affect us as much as they affect them, and the highest dictates of duty call upon us to serve with them for the sacred cause and to the best of our ability. We will consider it a previlege to serve with them the cause of Indian freedom and Nationalism. To serve that cause and to devote more time to and bestow more attention upon all the problems that are peculiar to ourselves we have assembled here. Our progress is their best title and authority to their political aspirations and the world opinion would recognise and value it. We believe we fondly hope that our princes will be more generous than have been the people of England with you. Their proud ancestry unrivalled in the history of the world will prompt them to extend a genuinely sympathetic I would say, not ear, but heart. They are the inheritors of the inspiring traditions of Shri Rama and Budha, Vikramaditya and Akbar. Even today there are princes in India who have one object in life the happiness of their people. It would be odious to mention their names and I refrain from doing it. They are few, very few in the nature of things, but it is my firm conviction that many will sympathise with us, appreciate our efforts, meet our

requirements, and give us opportunities of shouldering the responsibilities of the States and of rising to the full height of our stature and work hand in hand with our com-patriots in the larger sphere of building up the National edifice.

THE INDIAN STATES.

Politically India is divided into two parts, British India and the Indian States. The area under British rule is 1,094,300 sq. miles while the States cover an area of 7,11,032 sq. Miles, with a population of 247 millions and 71 millions respectively. The States are scattered all over India from North to South and East to West and their number, not many years ago was said to be 694, but looking to the authoritative list published by the Government of India in 1925 this number has come down to 561. By what process of elimination the States have contracted to that number I am not in a position to state ; it may be known to the Political Department of India. What process will work in the future cannot be predicted with certainty. These states are the remnants of the former Indian Governments. Some of the Rajputana States are the most ancient monarchies existing in India. Other States had sprung up on the break-up of the Moghul Empire in the 17th entury, and the downfall of the Maratha and the Sikh powers in the 18th and 19th centuries. These and the Rajputana States were subordinate to those powers—the Moghul and the Maratha—in some degree or other. On the rise of the power of the East India Company in the 18th and 19th centuries they entered into treaties with the Company. The Government of the Company was transferred to the Crown in 1857 after the Mutiny, and along with this transfer of the power of the Company treaties between the States and the Company, were also more binding on the Crown under an Act of Parliament. Before this transfer the Princes were in a position to observe the treaties as it suited them and not infrequently they observed them in a way that suited their conveniences and interests better than the provision of the Treaties. The attitude of the Company was in no way different and observance of the treaties was rather loose on either side. Since the transfer, the position changed. The Princes could not evade the engagements without serious consequences, they could only overdo their part. But, did the attitude of the Crown change from that of the Company and to what extent ? It is a matter of every day discussion between one Ruler or the other on the one hand and the representative of the British Government on the other. While the treaties were under solemn pledges and Acts of Parliament declared binding upon His Majesty, not only interpretations, consistent or inconsistent, but also practice and usage at variance with them have been exploited to complement them. The recent

reply of Lord Reading to H. E. H. the Nizam furnishes an idea as to how those treaties have been upheld. True, these princes have lost their power to impel the Mighty British Government to perform their obligations of the treaties, and one party to them only possesses it.

An announcement of a Committee has been made recently by the Viceroy, to enquire into the nature of the existing treaties and make recommendations. Gentlemen, you will observe that this Committee is also to enquire not only into the obligations imposed upon each party by the terms of the treaties but also as to the force the departures from those treaties possess.

Do you not know too well to be under any hallucination the outcome of such Committees and Commissions ? But let us assume that the recommendations of the Committees will reinstate the Princes in their original position or even above it by recommending new treaties between the Governments. Yet I wonder what power the Committee will place in the hands of the Princes for holding the other party to the carrying out of the terms of those engagements. The Power which the Princes can in this situation look to with some confidence is the support and the good-will of their own people and that of British India by entering into an honourable partnership with them.

INTERNAL ADMINISTRATION.

The hereditary Prince who succeeds to the Gaddi or Musnad is the Ruler of a State and he is the head of the administration. His will is supreme in all branches of the Government. He appoints all officers, Executive, Judicial, or Revenue or any other and he can remove them at his pleasure. Promotions and degradations depend solely upon his sweet will. He makes and unmakes laws. Systems of modern law and procedure are unknown in a majority of States. Where some fragments of law exist, the Ruler can set them at naught by his will at any moment. He can supersede the Courts of Law appointed by himself, he can appoint special commissions and tribunals to hear certain cases over-riding the jurisdiction of his Courts, he can interfere with the judicial administration of his Courts and can appoint Benches of the choice of a litigant on payment of Nazar by him, he orders State Court to put the imprimatur of their seals on the decision of an extraneous body to give it the force of a " COURT'S " decree, so that it may be executed in a British Court of Law, he overtly and covertly influences the decisions in cases pending before the State Courts through his dependent judges, he can turn down the decision of the highest of his

judicial Courts and can refer the decision at his discretion to another set of persons, he can refer the decision of the Highest Tribunal to the executive to advise him whether it is correct. He can spend the whole of the Revenue in any way he likes, a large or a major part of it generally goes to his extravagance, while the poor ryots, his subjects, are starving for want of food. Even a king of the richest Country in Europe has not so much allowance for his private purposes as a Raja of this place. He can get a part of the Revenue allotted for State purpose to be used for his stables or for his attendents. He can levy taxes and impose rates. He receives Nazars from rural officers who in their turn collect much more from the peasants and labourers in the field to meet the Nazars. Before making appointmets he can put it to a virtual auction as if it were to the highest bidder. He can deprive any one of his subjects of his or her liberty. He can dispossess people of their property. He can detain a citizen for any length of time in prison without semblance of trial or without bringing any charge against him if he so wills it. He can prevent people from holding a meeting and responsible speakers from addressing it; if they want to make any public representation they cannot do it. He can arrest an Editor of a paper however rational its criticism may have been, he can proscribe any paper or magazine entering into his State. He can order the best of his people to be removed or deported and can interdict entry of the noblest of India's sons into his territory. In short, he is the Monarch of all he surveys and there is none to dispute his despotism. Gentlemen, I do not say that in every State every Prince does all or any of these acts everyday of his life, but I maintain that the incidents, of this kind of the exercise of absolute power are neither uncommon nor rare. As against this it gives me great pleasure to say there are States whose Rulers are above some of these evils. But the point I have to make is that there is no check to the Ruler's arbitrary and absolute power, constitutional or otherwise. The Non-Intervention policy of the Government of India when people's interests are concerned has had its part in aggravating this tendency of despotism. Some of them, of course, encourage Education, Art and Industry, a few of them introduced Representative Institutions in their States even before they came into existence in British India; others introduced free and compulsory education, established Universities as in Hyderabad and Mysore, and have fixed Civil lists; all honour to them. But the point remains, that all this depends upon the Ruler's sweet will alone; the system is there and we are concerned with the system alone and have to grapple with the problem in this light. Here I ask you, have I in any way overdrawn the picture? I am sure what your answer will be, but I do not desire to pursue the subject further though undoubtedly there remains much more to be said about it.

DEPARTMENTS.

I will now touch the other essential features of the administration in the States. Below the Prince comes the Dewan who has the genera supervison of Finance, Revenue, Police, Law and Order, Education, Agr. culture, Military, Medical, Sanitation, Political, in fact all the Departments of the State. Of late some of the leading States have constituted Councils of the Departmental Heads under the Dewan or President of the Council. The Dewan must be an able man endowed with talents of a high order and possessing high character required for the discharge of the responsibilities of his high office. But oftener than not, the Dewan is a subservient person without power to take the initiative. The autocracy at the top influences his outlook and he takes his cue from it. If a man of high character and outstanding ability comes to be appointed to this office he has soon to bid good-bye to the State for obvious reasons.

JUDICIARY.

The Judiciary is rarely independent, and corruption is rampant. It is a handmaid of the Prince. Nor is it competent to try a case. The maxim that justice should be done in fact and so done that the parties should feel that justice has been done, is beyond their comprehension, only the converse of it is held to be a true rule of conduct. Corruption is an open secret and dishonest judges are notorious but they continue undisturbed. Honesty is at a discount. Another feature of the Judicial administration is the long delay in the decision of cases. Several years pass before any decision whether just or unjust is given and one can well imagine the strain to which the parties are put on account of this delay. It is universal experience that justice delayed is justice denied. The worst of it is that such delays occur in Criminal cases too where the hardships of the delay increase ten-fold Some States have on the analogy of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council for India, a tribunal to which appeals lie from the State Courts. One naturally expects that the personnel of an august body like this would be composed of upright and straightforward men of sound and deep learning possessing great legal experience and knowledge. But what are the facts? Heads of departments who hardly possess judicial frame of mind and know little of Law and are of a status from whose departments Appeals may lie are drafted to compose the Bench of the highest Tribunals in the States. Of their principle and independence more need not be said.

The lower services are corrupt to the core. The people are subjected to all sorts of exactions. Extortions, malversation and arbitrary rule prevails from top to bottom in the States. In short—life nor honour—and we

value honour many times more precious than life and property—not property is safe in a State. It cannot be said that the prevalence of such corruption in the services is an indication of their incapacity for administration. If one would care to go deep into the matter and try to discover why so much corruption exists, it would be clear that wrong selection of persons, low salaries, uncertainty of tenure, lack of expert supervision are among the reasons that give rise to such corruptions. We all know that the "Rule of Law" does not obtain in British India either; a citizen can be deprived of his liberty by the executive power at any time and several partiotic men of high character have been kept in detention on suspicion and ex-parte evidence judged by the Executive itself. But for this arbitrary and wholly unjustifiable power in the hands of the Executive, the Administration in British India is as a rule carried on according to law and procedure, and there life, honour and property are safe though liberty is qualified.

I do not intend to convey that all the worst features of absolute power exhibit themselves every day in the States, but there is no certainty either of the standard of effiency or purity of the Administration. It varies from State to State, it sometimes changes for better or worse during the life time of one and the same Ruler and it takes a diffrent shape very often with the change in the person of the Ruler. What then is the people's duty? Are the people to meekly and in a spirit of resignation to submit to all this tyranny, oppression and mis-rule and allow and suffer them to continue unabated? If not, what are the measures required to purge the system of these evils? Should they as men not make efforts to mend this system as men have done in other climes and devise means for that purpose.

RULE OF LAW.

Let us therefore, turn to the consideration of some of the Remedies for this state of things.

First and foremost our efforts should be directed to establish what is known as the Rule of Law. The Rule of Law according to Professor Dicey means in the first place "Absolute supremacy or predominance of regular law as opposed to the influence of arbitrary power and excludes the existance of arbitrariness of prerogative or even of wide discretionary authority on the part of Government." Secondly it means "Equality before the Law or the equal subjection of all classes to the ordinary law of the land administered by the ordinary law Courts". It is unnecessary for me to state what great importance is attached to this Rule of Law by

the people of United kingdom and of almost all the enlightened countries of the world. As long as this Rule of Law is not established in the Indian States one can have little hope of any real reform coming. For the arbitrary will of the Ruler,as long as it exists will render ineffective the advantages of any reform.

LIBERTY OF DISCUSSION.

As a preliminary to the Rule of Law, the rights of the people such as the liberty of speech, the liberty of association, and more important than either of these, the liberty of the Press should be guaranteed. In a country like the United Kingdom these rights have evolved out of the ordinary and ancient Law of the Realm. But in new countries whose constitutions are recent such for instance, the Free State of Ireland the constitution itself contains due Declaration of Rights. It will be admitted that the non-recognition of these rights of the people in the Indian States is one important cause of the backwardness of the public life therein compared to the public life in British India. The press is like a search-light, which helps to keep administration pure and efficient and is an agency of creating an informed public opinion. Steps should therefore, be taken to guarantee these rights to the people of he Indian States.

As regards administration of justice, effective reforms are necessary. The Judiciary must be entirely independent of the Executive. Once the Judges are appointed, it should not ordinarily be in the the hands of the Ruler to dismiss them. Some conditions should be laid down after duly fulfilling which alone the Ruler may be empowered to take action. For example, the Representative Assembly should first consider the question and only when this Assembly takes the initiative and requests the Ruler to remove a certain judge, should the Ruler be allowed to take the action. Until such an Assembly is appointed the Government of India should be invested with this right.

STATES SUPREME COURT OF APPEAL.

While on this subject I should like to submit to your consideration an important proposal here for ensuring justice to the citizens of the State. My proposal is that one States Supreme court of Appeal should be created by the States to hear Appeals from their Courts. In someleading States an institution corresponding to the Judicial Committee of England exists as we have already said before, under different names in different States but there are other States even among the advanced, whereit does not exist and where the need of such a Court of Revision is keenly felt. It is generally found that where it exists its level is much below what a high-

est tribunal can and should be and can by no means be compared to the high standard of the Privy Council in England or the Courts in British India. If each State were to employ men of the requisite calibre to form a Judicial Committee in each State it would be exceedingly expensive for it to maintain it; for this and other reasons it is expedient that a Supreme Court should be brought into existance and should be permanently located at a central place like Delhi. All the States should contribute to the upkeep and maintenance of this Supreme Court according to their capacity. By such distribution of its costs, no State will be put to any heavy expense and they will be in a position to mete out to the public a pure and impartial justice. The judges of this should be appointed by the States in consultation with and by the approval of the Government of India. Some of the leading States like Hyderabad. Mysore, Baroda may each have the choice of proposing one Judge and the choice of nomination is not to be confined necessarily to the citizens of the State. The services of the best legal luminaries in India and in England should be enlisted on salaries of five to seven thousand rupees a month. A Supreme Court so constituted would prove a palladium of Justice and its decisions would command respect from every body concerned. Thus it will be a source of strength to the States themselves. The establishment of a Supreme Court of Law like this is bound to give a new tone to the administration of justice in the States; Judges of the subordinate Courts in the States will then begin to realise their responsibility better under the influence of a Supreme Judicial authority, and the correctness of their judgment will come to be tested by men of great ability, sound judgment and up-right character. Besides this the rulings of the Supreme Court will become a new source of principles for State judges to follow as binding upon them. A sort of uniformity of legal principles and legal practice will come to prevail and all uncertainty will for ever vanish.

The decisions of the Supreme Court shall be final and binding on all concerned and it will have both Civil and Criminal jurisdiction. This Criminal jurisdiction is quite essential because it is in Criminal cases more often than in the Civil that official influence is felt most by the Judges while deciding a case in the Court of Law. The citizen of the State therefore requires protection in Criminal matters as well, and this protection he can get only by an appeal to a superior court like the Supreme Court which stands beyond the influence of any authority in the State and whose Judges are independent men appointed by the States and the Government of India. I desire particularly to emphasise the importance and the usefulness of this Supreme Court of justice, because I think it is a step which the

Government ought to take and we may well trust that there would be no objection on the part of any State. It will lead to an impartial administration of justice which is the greatest and the most urgent need of an Indian State.

RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT.

The next Reform necessary in a state is the initiation of a policy to bring democratic Government within reach of the people. The first step that a Ruler is to take in this direction is to make an announcement and a declaration that in response to public feeling and sentiment and out of solicitude to meet their wishes he has decided to adopt a policy leading to the realisation of responsible Government in his State. The Rulers should now realise that the minds of Indian State's Citizens are growing restive owing to the uncertainty of their Political future. The people of these States do not yet know whether they would live perpetually under the personal rule of the Ruler or whether they would advance towards responsible Government, along with their brethren in British India. If they once have their doubts set at rest and if they feel that sooner or later they will reach the goal desired by them of their political future, that would steady their minds and win over their co-operation in the work of the Ruler.

REPRESENTATIVE INSTITUTIONS.

The Ruler, of course, is not expected to rest content with the declaration of his policy, but should immediately set up representative institutions in his State where the citizens will be trained in the essentials of a Democratic Government. The plea is too often advanced that the people in Indian States are educationally and politically backward compared to those in British India and may not be equal to the working of representative institutions. It may be true that their progress in most of the States has not been on the same level as in British India, but one may be permitted to point out that if they had been allowed the opportunities for it, there is no reason why they should have remained backward. Is it not a fact that the people of Mysore are considered equally if not more advanced than those of some parts of British India ? Competent observers have acknowledged from time to time that the capacity of the Mysoreans for democratic Political institutions is on the whole on a par with the citziens of British India. The reason is obvious enough. They have had the advantage of an enlightened Government, liberty of discussious denied in other States, facilities for education and last but not least the representative institutions which were inaugurated in the State some years ago and which are now yielding their results. What Mysore could do, other States can

also do. It will be considered that the people of all the districts of British India are not equally advanced and no-body would seriously contend that on this score the people of any particular ordinary province should be kept out of participation in the representative institutions obtained in the country, After all, both the people in the Indian States and those in British India are of the same stock with common social institutions and habits and common ways of thinking, and they have the same inherent capacity of free political institutions. They have associations with one another, they receive a common type of education, and the modern influences which exercise the minds of the people in British India affect equally the minds of the people in Indian States. There is no reason therefore, to doubt that if representative institutions are introduced and worked in a fair spirit it will gradually equip the people for larger and stil larger advances in the direction of full responsible Government. The powers given to these representative institutions should not be too resl tricted in scope but should be wide enough to develope a true sense of responsibility. The franchise should be sufficiently broad to arouse general interest of the masses in political affairs. Next to the press, the agency that would help the political education of the people most is the electione *to* the Assembly in the state. Further, the use of their own tongue, unlik as in British India in the business of the Government and in the discussions in the Council, will acquaint large sections of people with the working of the Government with rapidity which will help them in exercising their vote intellegently. From among public men and people's leaders should the administration in the State be selected. The Indian States are, in a favourable position as compared with British India in one respect, namely that the administration in a State is carried on entirely through Indian Agency and it should not be difficult for these States to invest people's leaders with the responsibility of the administration. The Ruler of a State is regarded as one of themselves by the people and there is no unbridgeable gulf between them as there is in British India between the people and there foreign Rulers. The Ruler therefore, can with confidence and without the least hesitation and misgivings entrust the conduct of the administration to the care of the people's leaders.

CIVIL LIST.

One other important reform that in my opinion is imperatively necessary is the separation of what is known as the Civil List from the general revenue of the State and the allocation of a fixed annual sum to the support of the dignity of the Ruler and the Royal house-hold. At present, the Ruler is free to use for his personal expenses as much of the general revenue as

he likes and it is often overlooked that the revenues of the State form a sacred trust for being used in the interest and for the welfare of the people.

COMMISSION OF ENQUIRY.

Such are some of the lines on which the internal administration and constitution of the State should be reformed. But there are numerous other matters which call for reform. When one comes in contact with people of different States, he necessarily hears of hundred and one customs and practices ranging from forced labour to illegal exactions and even the irregular system of taxation and impositions. To examine what these exactly are and how and to what extent they can be improved, a commission of committee may be appointed. This Commisson should examine the state of administration in each State, enquire into its needs and requirements and report on the Reforms necessary which the States should carry out without undue delay. In the personnel of the Commission may be included some public men possessing administsative experience and while examining the condition of things in any particular State, a representative of that State may be included in the Commission.

UNION OF SMALL STATES.

Another Reform which would prove of considerable value to the States *i.e.* the smaller States is their union in one big State whereby the expenses of administration would be minimised and funds would be released to promote the welfare of the people in varius directions. At present there are separate establishments for each State which lead to unnecessary waste. The formation of this new union of the smaller States should of course be on a democratic basis. There should be one constitutional Governor and he may be selected from among the Ruling Chiefs, when he gives evidence of his special aptitude for constitutional Government. In bringing about such a union liberal allowances should be fixed and provided for the Prince and his house-hold. This arrangement will bring into existence a new class of States ruled by an Indian Constitutional Governor.

UNITED STATES OF INDIA.

I have so far dealt with some of the pressing problems relating to the internal administration of the States. I propose now to offer a few observations with regard to the larger question of a National character. Are the States to continue with the future Responsible Central Government of India

the indefinite and loose connections in which they stand at present with the British power in India or are they to have a constitutionally defined relationship within a federated India ? Of these two courses, the one which conduces most to the best interest of the country as a whole as well as the interest of the States themselves has to be adopted. These States are an integral part of India and anything that affects the life of the one affects the other. There are matters of vital interest common to both and the two have to act together in such matters for their mutual benefit. Most of the States have land frontiers but there are some which are open to sea. For each State to maintain an army or a navy or both is not only, wasteful but impossible. The smaller states have particularly to realise this fact and when they do so, they would admit that their Union is a necessity, which should not be regarded with a feeling of soreness. Similarly questions of interstate relations are of no less consequence, particularly when we remember that the largest States are not fewer than a dozen and the number of the smaller States is no less than five hundred. It is unnecessary for me to dilate upon the subjects and to enumerate the spheres in which common action is necessary.

These common interests impose common obligations which call for adequate means to discharge them. The course of history has provided some of the means of discharging these obligations and of placing their control in the hands of the Government of India. These obligations must continue to be performed jointly and nobody would have the rashness to suggest that either the interests of the States or the Government of India would justify separate action by individual States, or by British India. It has to be noted however, that in the present arrangement, although the States bear their share of the responsibilities they have no hand in the control of the measures adopted for that purpose and as Ilbert says "the permanent supremacy of the Government of India presupposes and implies the subordination of the latter" *i. e.* the States.

As against this the advantages to the States of entering into a partnership with the future federal Government of India are clear. Let it be understood here that the word State should not be interpretted as is usually done in the narrow sense, but should be taken in a wider significance as including the people of the State. The States enjoy a large amount of autonomy which at present the British provinces do not possess, and the sentiment is strong among the States that these powers of the States must be maintained intact. Federation is the only means whereby the States will be able to continue their individual existence and powers of autonomy and also have an effective voice in the control of the Central affairs. Here we may quo-

te from Professor Dicey's "Law of the Constitution" a passage bearing on this aspect of federation. Says he :—

"A federal State requires for its formation two conditions. There must exist, in the first place, a body of countries so closely connected by locality, by history, by race, or the like, as to be capable of bearing in the eyes of their inhabitants, an impress of common nationality. It will also be generally found that lands which now form part of a federal state were at some stage of their existence bound together by close alliance or by subjection to a common Sovereign.

A second condition absolutely essential to the founding of a federal system is the existence of a very peculiar state of sentiment among the inhabitants of the countries which it is proposed to unite. They must desire union and must not desire unity. The phase of sentiment, in short, which forms a necessary condition for the formation of a federal state is that the people of the proposed state should wish to form for many purposes a single nation, yet should not wish to surrender the individual existence of each man's State".

In every federation, the powers of the individual State are preserved by a division of functions between the Federal State and the component parts, and the same will apply to India. This is no new idea and some of the enlightened among the princes imbued with a spirit of foresighted statesmanship have also foreshadowed it. But of late a reactionary feeling seems to have come over certain princes who in their recent utterances have asked for direct relations with the crown ; probably taking the cue from reactionaries like Lord Sydenham in England who has suddenly developed an amazing solicitude for our Princes, which was remarkably absent in him during his regime in India. I may be permitted to emphasize that the points of contact really arise between the Government of India and the States and it is neither the interest of the State nor is it consistant with the interest of the Country as a whole that any state should have direct relations with the Crown over the head and without the intervention of the Government of India. Besides, the idea itself is retrograde, and we hope it will not be entertained by the democratic British Government. If the underlying idea is to preserve absolute powers and autocracy, we may well assure them that it will not avail and it is futile to think that the democratic instincts of the British people would allow them to ally themselves with the reactionary forces of obscurantism whether the relations are direct with the British Crown or through the,

Government of India. It may be that the responsible minister of the Government of India will sympathise with the aspirations of the people in the States and may bring his influence to bear on the princes to meet the people's legitimate aspirations; but the British ministers who also will be sympathetic to the people, unless they have all are of their own to grind will never bear the idea of keeping them down, when British India is going to have responsible self-government to which the British Government is committed. It need not be said that the world opinion which acts upon the British Government is not prepared to tolerate denial of liberty to the seventy million inhabitants of the States. Recently in a most refreshing tone the Maharaja of Mysore on the occasion of the Silver Jubilee of his rule speaking at the Viceregal banquet said that "a way may be found in which it would be opento us to play an honourable part as partners with the British provinces in whatever form of federal Government may hereafter be decided upon". This is the spirit you find in a Ruler of a State where as the Viceroy observed, efficient and progressive administration was always a feature of the Government and where the Viceroy found a contented people and a State wisely governed.

REVISION OF TREATIES.

Whenever one discusses Reform of the Indian States it is not seldom that treaties are brought forward as formidable obstacles to progress. This state of things cannot continue and if the treaties are an impasse it has to be overcome. It is not suggested that treaties should not be observed; far from it. On the other hand I object to the strained interpretations which have not infrequently been resorted to. Some Princes themselves have little regard for engagements between their subjects and freely trample them under foot. But their example is not worth following. The remedy lies in the direction of revision of the treaties. New treaties have always been made from time to time from the dawn of day, and it is this line which affords ground for a real solution of the problem. Not long ago a leading State had, as we all know, pressed for reopening an Agreement between it and the British Government. All this points that new treaties have to be made to conform to the present conditions of life and it cannot be objected to by any party when the people's voice demands it.

CONCLUSION.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I have now come to the end of my address am conscious I have t[illegible]en much of your time, but you will please allow me

to say that the problem is so vast and so complex that it necessarily and involuntarily draws forth from us all that there is to be said on it when once we begin to think about it. And yet I feel I have done but scant justice to the subject and look with confidence to the authoritative pronouncement of our worthy President.—Elect. Our destiny lies in our hands and if if we are but true to ourselves, and work with zeal and patience, I feel no doubt whatsoever that we stand to WIN. Obstacles may face us, delays and disappointments may sometimes damp our spirit but the sacred cause reared by our devotion and nursed by our service would surely gain in strength and momentum and in no long time VICTORY will be ours.

Printed at "The Bombay Chronicle Press" by Sorabji Kapadia and
Published by the Honorary Secretaries of the Conference.

ALL INDIA
INDIAN STATES' PEOPLES' CONFERENCE.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

OF

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao,
B.A., B.L.

17th, 18th, December, 1927.

Bombay.

CONTENTS.

GENTLEMEN,

My first duty is to tender to you my sincerest thanks for the honour you have done me in inviting me to preside over your deliberations this year. Having had no intimate personal knowledge of the administration or the political conditions of the Indian States I was at first inclined to decline your very kind invitation. I was informed, however, that it is your desire to invite a public man from British India to take the chair at this annual Conference of States, subjects. I very much appreciate the compliment. An occasion like this is a fitting opportunity for an exchange of views on the many important questions of the day in which both of us are mutually interested. We live under different administrations but there are many problems common to us in which our mutual co-operation is needed. For many years the people of the States and their leaders appear to have taken the view that they are not much concerned with or affected by British Indian politics and policies and I believe that similar considerations actuated the leaders of political thought and the various political organisations in British India in abstaining from interesting themselves in the problems and the general welfare of the people of the Indian States. This policy of mutual isolation has greatly retarded the political education of the subjects of Indian States and the growth of their political institutions. In recent years, however, there has been a very healthy change and the dependence of the States and of British India on each other in the development of an All-India polity is now being more and more clearly recognised. I take this opportunity, therefore, of acknowledging at the outset that the credit of bringing about this change and focussing public attention on the problems of the States belongs to all those responsible for the organisation of this and similar conferences and to all other public men in the States who have been patiently working for years for the political emancipation of the subjects of the States. As I said there are at the present moment some very eminent public men in India who have taken the view that it is better to leave the Indian States alone to work out their salvation. I entirely differ from this view. At present the people of British India, it is true, have no right to interfere in the internal affairs of the Indian States; and similarly

the subjects of Indian States have no right of interference in the affairs of British India. It is obvious, however, that in our struggle for national emancipation and for the development of India as whole into a self-Governing world State the people of British India and the Indian States have to act in concert till the goal is reached. It is unthinkable that the States can remain unaffected by any scheme of Swaraj for India as a whole. I am, therefore, glad that the subjects of the Indian States are making strenuous efforts to come into line with the national movement in British India for the attainment of Swaraj, and in your struggles for the development of your political institutions in the Indian States on a democratic basis, you are entitled to such co-operation and assistance as we in British India can give you.

THE PROBLEM OF DEFENCE.

The identity of Indian States with British India in all matters of general national welfare and the necessity for co-operation with each other in the pursuit of a national policy has been recently brought home in several ways to the people of British India and the Indian States. The events are so recent that they do not need any lengthy recapitulation. I may refer at the outset to the questions relating to the defence of India from external aggression and to the demand for the nationalisation of the Indian Army. The glorious part played by the Indian troops including the State forces in all theatres in the late war is still fresh in our recollection. The willing co-operation of India in that great crisis and the gallantry of her soldiers received unstinted praise and admiration from all parts of the British Empire. Every country is now developing a new military system based upon the experience of the great war. No longer are wars settled between armies or professional soldiers but the entire strength of the nations is thrown into the conflict. The wealth, the industries and the manhood of the whole nation are called up and citizens of whatever class or creed and industry in every form are being mobilised in every country. As admitted by eminent witnesses before the Indian Sandhurst committee, India is gradually losing the somewhat isolated position it had occupied for the last two generations in the politics of Asia and it will have to meet complications of a different character than the purely frontier disturbances with which it has been familiar of late years. The implications of the change in the position are too well known to need further elucidation. The creation of a national army in India officered by Indians, the reduction of the British garrison and its eventual abolition, and the reconstruction of the whole military system from the stand point of nationalist India have occupied public attention since the

war. A self-governing India within the British Empire necessarily involves a vital change in the present policy of the emasculation of the people. This matter has found the subject of acute controversy in the central Legislature of India and you are familiar with all aspects of the problem.

The Indian Sandhurst Committee which was appointed three years ago and of which I had the honour to be a member had to consider the whole question of the training facilities for Indian Army Officers in this country and other cognate questions. In that connection, we had necessarily to consider the position of the Indian States and representatives of many of the important States came up before the committee and stated their requirements for the training of Officers. The committee came to the unanimous opinion that the participation of the Indian States in an Indian Sandhurst would be an advantage to India as whole as tending to increase the efficiency of the State forces and it accordingly recommended that a certain number of vacancies should be reserved for the Indian States at the military college to be established in India over and above the number of vacancies for the regular Indian army. The subjects of Indian States are already eligible for the King's commission and it is our recommendation that candidates from the States should be eligible for admission to the Indian Military college on the same terms as the residents of British India. The States are, therefore, as much interested as the people of British India, in the establishment of the requisite institutions for military training in India and the nationalisation of the Indian army.

In this state of things can any responsible person say that the people of British India and the Indian States have no identity of interests and a common obligation for the defence of their motherland? They are already held together by immemorial ties and by fundamental unity of thought and culture, of race and cultivation and they have the same social and economic problems. But apart from all these a self-governing India for which all of us are yearning without an efficient national army trained under the same general system, co-ordinated and acting together under a single general command is unthinkable whether the troops are drawn from British India or the State forces. Some action in this direction has already been taken in the training of the imperial service troops and the recommendations of the Sandhurst Committee if carried out, would be a further step in consolidating and improving the efficiency of the State forces and the British Indian Army and to promote that sense of unity so necessary for the success of a national army.

FISCAL POLICY OF INDIA.

Another group of subjects in which the interdependence of British India and the Indian States has recently occupied prominent public attention relate to the currency, fiscal and commercial policy of the Government of India. The results of the present policy which has brought about a disastrous economic exploitation of the whole country affect the Indian States as much as the people of British India. The Indian States are enclosed within the limits of the Indian customs circle and they are closely concerned in the tariff policy of the Government of India and their interests both as consumers and as producers are identical with those of the population of British India. The Indian fiscal commission dealt with the whole question of the tariff policy of India and the discrimination to be exercised in the selection of industries for protection so as to make the inevitable burden on the community as light as is consistent with the due development of industries. The recommendations of the commission were discussed a few years ago in an important debate in the Legislative Assembly and the fiscal policy of India as now accepted has its inevitable reactions on the Indian States. You are familiar with all aspects of the problem and I need not refer to the subject in any detail. The incidence of taxation in the States is equally affected by the fiscal policy of the Government of India. The Indian taxation committee which sat two or three years ago also had occasion to deal with all phases of the same problem and the difficulties that have cropped up between the maritime Indian States and British India in regard to the imposition and collection of custom duties and the preventive arrangements against smuggling and the maintenance of internal customs lines. The committee expressed the opinion that many of the present difficulties could be surmounted and suggested that in the circumstances of India a customs Zollervein between the Indian States and British India would be an ideal arrangement. Such an arrangement, as you are aware, was come to between the various states in Germany before its unification in the middle of the last century. The loss of customs Revenue at the British India ports on account of the action of some of the maritime States in Kathiawar has very recently attracted wide public attention in this country. The failure of the conference at Mount Abu between the representatives of the Indian States and the Government of India and the re-imposition, a short while ago, by the Government of India of the customs cordon in the Kathiawar States are the subject of acute controversy at present. The action of the Government of India has raised constitutional issues of the greatest importance and has brought to the forefront the absolute necessity of a statutory constitutional tie between the States and British India. Be this as it

may, my point is that unless the Government of India and the States find a satisfactory solution of the problem they may cause a great deal of damage to each other. The many holes in the fiscal sieve can only be properly closed and sewn up by mutual co-operation between all the parties concerned. It is only by such a co-operation that the agreement come to in 1917 between the States and the Government of India was carried out in practice and without a common understanding between the States and the Government of India it is impossible to give effect to an all India tariff policy.

THE STATES AND THE OPIUM POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

The States opium conference held in May last was another occasion where the States had to consider the present policy of the Government of India in an important branch of its administration. The controversies at the Geneva Conferences have already familiarised all of us with the general features of the problem and its humanitarian and international aspects and it is not necessary for me to refer to it at any length. In order to fulfill their international obligations in the largest measure, the Government of of India are now committed to a policy of reducing progressively the exports of opium from India so as to extinguish them altogether within a definite period, except as regards the export of opium for strictly medical purposes. This policy was accepted in the Central Legislature but it is impossible to carry out this policy unless the States actively co-operate with the Government of India in the reduction of the large areas under poppy cultivation in the States and the substitution of other crops therefor. His Excellency the Viceroy explained the salient features of the problem and appealed to the representatives of states for their hearty co-operation and assistance without which he felt it was not possible to carry out the undertaking given by the Government of India to the League of Nations.

The acceptance by the States of the policy outlined by the Govern ment of India and also the agreement reached between the representatives of the States and the Government of India for the appointment of a committee of investigation of the whole subject in which the States are represented shows the very large measure of co-operation necessary between the States and British India in carrying out a common policy on behalf of India. This is the latest instance where the Government of India and the States have acted together in furtherance of a common policy more or less in the same way as the constituent states in a federal constitution.

THE FEDERAL PRINCIPLE.

I have invited your attention to these three matters as illustrations of the manner in which British India and the Indian States are already acting together in many matters involving broad questions of national policy and the way in which they are compelled for working together in many spheres of administration. The States and British Indian authorities are also co-operating with each other constantly in matters relating to Revenue and Financial administration. and their co-operation in the administration of Police and Justice is a matter of daily occurence. The range of matters in which the States and British Indian Provinces are realizing their dependence on each other is daily increasing and their dealings with each other have already established, by precedent and usage, a loose kind of tie and certain rights and obligations though they are not defined by statute and crystalised in a written constitution common to both of them. In our relations with the outside world India is regarded as a single unit and there is in our international relations no distinction between British India and the States. The disabilities suffered by Indians in the British Colonies and foreign lands extend to British Indian subjects as well as to the subjects of the States. In these circumstances, the exact position of the Indian States in an all India polity has been the subject of serious thought for several years and since the declaration of August 1917 it has been obvious to everybody that their incorporation in the body politic of India is no longer a matter for speculation for constitutional theorists but the subject has become a matter of immediate practical interest. Writing on the subject ten years ago before the publication of the Montagu Chelmsford report, I expressed the opinion : "that the States should be brought into touch with the ultimate facts of the political life in this country and that this can only be attained by a federal Union in which the Indian States should be constituent partners sharing common obligations and rights along with British Indian Provinces." The authors of the Montagu—Chelmsford report also gave an indication of their conception of the eventual future of India as "a sister-hood of States self-governing in all matters of purely local or provincial interest, in some cases corresponding to existing provinces, in others perhaps modified by the area according to the character and economic interest of the people." They then proceeded to state that over this conjeries of states would preside a central Government increasingly representative and responsible to the people of all the States ; dealing with matters both internal and external, of common interest to the whole of India ; acting as arbiter in inter-state disputes and representing the

interests of all India on equal terms with the self governing units of the Brititsh Empire. They expressly pointed out "that in this picture there is also place for the Indian States and that it is possible that they too will-wish to be associated for certain purposes with the organisation of British India in such a way as to dedicate their peculiar qualities to the common service without loss of individuality." In advocating a federal union between the Indian States and British India we are only pressing for a vital reform which was foreseen as inevitable 10 years ago.

GROWTH OF PUBLIC OPINION.

It is not, therefore, surprising that the future relation of Indian States to British India has received unusual attention during the last few months for a variety of reasons. The growing agitation in the States for the establishment of responsible Government in the States and the conferences held by the subjects of the various States from time to time have given ample proofs to the Indian Princes of the repurcussions of the national movement in British India as also of the desire of the subjects of the States to take their legitimate part in an all India polity. The subject also attracted a good deal of public attention in Great Britain on account of the activities of the delegation of Indian Princes which left for England subsequent to the Simla Conference. The British Press during the last few months has frequently discussed the question not from an unbiassed point of view but solely with a view to protect the present position of the Indian Princes and Anglo-Indian pundits like Lord Sydenham, Lord Meston and Sir Michael O'Dwyer have suddenly conceived a great affection for the Indian States and the perpetuation of their treaty rights. In his address last year, my esteemed friend Professor Abhyanker very rightly contended that many questions of policy vitally affecting the interests of the subjects of Indian States and relating to defence, custom and tariffs, commercial services such as posts, telegraphs and railways, currency and banking, excise and opium are decided by the Government of India and the Indian Legislature; but the States have at present no opportunity in the formulation of that policy. The rulers of the States have naturally desired to know what their exact position would be in the future constitution of India and though we have no authoritative information, it is understood that they have formulated their views on the whole subject at the conference held in Simla in May last. The appointment of the Royal Commission which has been expected for some time has also stimulated interest in the subject in this country and many eminent men who are authorities on the Indian constitution have publicly

discussed the position of Indian States in the future constitution of India. The Commonwealth of India Bill and the Bill formulated by the Independent Labour Party have also dealt with the problem of the Indian States and have given some indication of the position assigned by their authors to the States in the future constitutional arrangements for the whole of India. It has been generally conceded that the Indian States should be allowed to occupy the same dignified Status in the Indian constitution as the federal states under the constitution of the United States of America.

The Maharaja of Alwar has expressed the sentiment that his goal is the United States of India where every Province, every State, working out its own destiny in accordance with its environment, its tradition, histroy and religion will combine together for higher and imperial purposes. The plea for union has thus formed general acceptance and support and it is a matter for great satisfaction that the problem has now come within the range of active public discussion both in the States and in British India

THE ATTITUDE OF THE PRINCES.

No one who has any acquaintance with the subject will deny the difficulties surrounding the problem of evolving a federal constitution applicable to the whole of India. These difficulties are not, however, unsurmountable and can be successfully solved with the will and co-operation of all the parties concerned. The rulers of the States are vitally affected by the application of federalism to their States. Doubts have been expressed about their attitude in regard to the future political evolution of India The recent conference of the Princes at Simla has given rise to very grave apprehensions and misgiving. It is a matter for great regret that the proceedings of the conference have not been made public and that the Government of India and those responsible for the conference at Simla have not chosen to issue any authoritative statement as regards the purpose for which the conference had been summoned or as to the conclusions arrived at by it; and it would have been in the fitness of things if the Government of India had issued a communique on the subject to clear up the misunder standing. It has been suggested in the press that the Indian Princes ar- being used at the present juncture as a sort of smoke screen for vitiating the judgment of the Royal Commission on the subject of an Indian constitution.It has also been stated that the object of the Conference was to find a solution for checking the democratic onrush in British India, and that under the guise of safeguarding their existing status, rights and dignities Indian Princes are being advised and incited to oppose a grant of full constitutional freedom to India and to retard India's advance to Swaraj.

I can hardly believe that the Indian Princes will be so unpatriotic as to enter into a conspiracy with the enemies of India's freedom. It may be that the conference was intended to ascertain the wishes of the Indian Princes as to the place of the States in a future Indian constitution.

Whatever may be the object of the recent conference of the Princes in Simla some light is thrown on the present attitude of the Princes as expressed by their delegation in England. As you are aware Col. Hasker and Dr. Rushbrooke Williams left for England immediately after the Simla Conference and have received a good deal of attention from the British press. They have issued a statement on behalf of the Indian Princes that they are not opposed to the legitimate aspirations of India to become fully self-governing but that the position and status of the Princes as guaranteed in the treaties should bemaintained.

HIS HIGHNESS THE JAM SAHEB.

His Highness the Jam Saheb of Nawanagar recently gave expression to similar sentiments and stated publicly last month that the Princes have full sympathy with the aspirations of their countrymen in British India and that such a feeling can and in fact does co-exist with the natural instinct of self—preservation. He went on to say that the Princes have no desire to interfere in the affairs of British India and that they do not wish that there should be outside interference in their own domestic affairs and he appealed to the Viceroy that their position in the new India that is being evolved needs to be thoroughly safeguarded and that whatever form the future constitution will assume the existence of Indian States as separate political entities will demand an adjustment which while recognising and meeting modern conditions will not ignore history and traditions. It is clear from this that the present attitude of the Indian Princes is not hostile to the Indian national movement. But that is not enough. They have to come into it and the creation of an organic constitutional structure for the whole of India including the Indian States is hardly compatible with the general attitude of the Indian Princes as indicated by H. H. The Jam Saheb. The Princes cannot ignore the requirements of the situation and must face the essential conditions for the evolution of a common constitution for the whole of India.

SOME DIFFICULTIES—LOSS OF SOVEREIGN RIGHTS.

Before I close this part of the subject, I should like to make a brief reference to two or three cognate matters which of late attracted considerable

public attention and which have an important bearing on the general acceptance of the federal principle. I refer to the contention that has been put forward that the Indian States will be surrendering their sovereign rights by coming into a federal union with British India. The position has been examined at considerable length by me 10 years ago and quite recently by eminent public men in the country and a controversy on the subject has been going on in the press for some time past. I do not like to worry you with further details at this stage. The restrictions placed upon the independent action of the States and the obligations which habitually govern their external relations and even to some extent their exercise of internal sovereignity are well-known. The present position of the States as summarised by Sir William Lee Warner is that the "British Government has drawn to itself the exercise of the entire external sovereignity of the Indian States and it has also gathered into its hands some of the internal sovereignty of even important States." They share the obligation for the common defence of India and are under a general responsibility to the Government of India for good Government and the welfare of their territories. The tie that unites the Indian States to the British Government is, therefore, not international in any sense of the term nor is it feudal and it has been described as semi-sovereign. The question as to whether and in what manner has now been discussed for sometime by eminent constitutionalists in India as well as in Great Britain and many nice questions of constitutional law such as, as to whether sovereignity is divisible have also formed the subject of controversy. I do not wish to refer to these matters nor to the varying degrees of internal sovereignity enjoyed by the bigger and the smaller States. While the theoretical sovereignity of some of the Indian States cannot be denied and while some of the bigger states like Hyderabad, Mysore, Travancore. Baroda, Gwalior, Indore, Patiala and Bikaner enjoy at the present day an undoubted measure of internal sovereignity we cannot forget the actual conditions of the present day. Notwithstanding the fact that some of the treaties have provided that the chief shall remain the absolute ruler of his country, the Government of India have not been precluded in the past and are not even now precluded from the interference with the administration of the States through the agency of its representatives. The treaties have, therefore, to be interpreted not so much in the light of the relations established between the parties at the time when a particular treaty was made but also by subsequent developments and in the light of practice and usage which have considerably modified them, Whatever may have been the rights established by treaties a century ago the present position is that many of the States have been stripped of many

real attributes of sovereignity in actual practice. In these circumstances, it is futile either for the Princes or for the people of Indian States to refuse to come into the line and join in a scheme for the political evolution of India into a self-governing dominion on the ground that such a step would entail a loss of their sovereign rights. I trust, therefore, that those interested in the matter will realise the difference between romance and reality and take a dispassionate view of the actual facts as they exist to-day in arriving at a decision on this question. At the same time I agree that every effort should be made and every guarantee should be given to preserve as far as possible, the individuality of the States in the new constitution. The position of the States in a federal constitution both in regard to the discharge of common obligations and in regard to their rights of internal administration would be, in my opinion, much better than it is now. Notwithstanding their treaties the States are now squeezed by the "gentle" persuasion of political officers and by the Political Department of the Government of India in many important matters. This cannot happen in a constitution where their rights and obligations are clearly defined.

In one of the recent conferences of States subjects I have noticed that a desire was expressed for the formation of a confederation similar to that of the Germanic States in the latter half of the last century. The unification of a number of little principalities and the creation of a federal state was in a large measure due to the genius and energy of Bismark. He had a clear insight into the real needs for the establishment of German unity which was partly brought about by diplomacy and War. On the other hand the national unity of Italy was achieved by Cavour and Italian patriots by a process of assimilation of the different principalities into a single Kingdom and by the sympathy of France and England with the national aspirations of Italy to free herself from the Austrian yoke. I wish we had a Bismark or Cavour in the Indian States European parallels may be very useful but perhaps we shall have to strike out a new path and make a constitution suitable to our own peculiar conditions.

And if it is necessary for the Indian Princes to make any sacrifices of their present powers and positions with a view to create a new federal constitution for the whole of India, I trust they will not hesitate to do so.

THE SMALLER STATES.

Another point that arises for consideration is the question as to whether a federal constitution for India should include all the States or whether a

federated India should include only the more important ones. It will be admitted that in a large majority of the smaller States, all the administrative powers are now exercised by political agents. Out of a total 562 States 374 have an area of less than 1,000 square miles i.e., ¼ of an average district in British India. Of the 562 States only 30 possess the area, population and resources of an average British Indian District. Three of the States are stated to have a population of 100 souls and 5 of them a revenue fo Rs. 100 Whatever may be the circumstances under which many of these tiny states have been recognised as feudatories in the early part of the last century, it is clear that, before a federal union can be carried out between the states and the British Indian provinces a thorough investigation will have to be undertaken as to which of them should be admitted to a federal union. It is unthinkable that a large majority of the smaller states which are no better than petty Zamindaries should be put in the same category with Hyderabad, Mysore, Baroda or Kashmir. The problem of the smaller states and their future position in a federated India requires very careful consideration.

THE POSITION OF THE PRINCES IN A FEDERAL UNION.

A third point is the exact position of these hereditary princes as heads of their states in a federal constitution. It is clear we cannot go solely by the precedents of federal constitutions elsewhere nor will it be practicable to ignore existing conditions. The recognition of the dignity, status and position of the princes of the more important states in a new constitution under appropriate safeguards will be necessary. It does not follow from this that the present system of autocratic personal rule in the Indian states should necessarily continue. One of the objections raised by Lord Meston to the creation of a federal constitution for the whole of India including the Indian States is that the constituent states in the federation would be of two entirely different types, hereditary monarchies and provincial Governments under a democratic parliamentary system and that the creation of a common constitution for both of them would be like mixing oil with water and that the two cannot really coalse. This objection is not so formidable as Lord Meston wishes to make out. But even if there is any force in this objection it is clear that the princes are realising the inevitable trend of events in their states for the establishment of constitutional responsible Government. As an illustration, I may refer to the statement made by H. H. the Jam Saheb quite recently on a public occasion " that if it be the desire of his subjects to progress on the lines of British India they will not find him behind hand in enthusiastic response o their aspirations and that he shall be prepared to grant them in the

administation a share adequate to their capacities." This is a very encouraging statement and I trust that every other prince will follow him in this matter. The words "adequate to their capacities" in this pronouncement introduce a qualification the exact import of which is not clear. I hope that His Highness will not imitate the methods of the British Government in appearing to make promises but at the same time making reservations with a view to evade them.

A NATIONAL GOVERNMENT AND THE STATES.

There is yet another fundamental point to which I must make a reference. That point, to put in the words of Lord Olivier, is, " Whether and how far the relations now subsisting between the King and all other Indian States can be transferred to the execution of an Indian National Government not responsible, as now to the British Parliament but to a federal Indian assembly." During the discussions in the Legislative Assembly on the subject of dominion Self-Government for India during the last two or three years, the spokesmen of the Government of India pointedly raised the same question more than once. Sir Malcolm Hailey said that the Government of India would like to know " whether the states would continue as heretofore to deal with the Governor-General in Council who is responsible to the British Parliament or with the executive Government responsible to the Indian Legislature ? "Is Indian self-Government to be confined to British India only or was it to be extended to the states also ? Under what terms should this be done? Are they to be dependent on the Crown or are they to be controlled by a new Government responsible only to the Indian Legislature instead of a Government responsible to the British Parliament."

The Constitutional issue thus raised by Lord Olivier and Sir Malcolm Hailey has been answered more than once by eminent Indian statesmen who are recognised authorities on Indian Constitutional Law. The contention that Indian States have entered into treaty relations with the Governor-General as representative of the British Crown and not of the executive head of the Government of India for the time being is without foundation. Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Iyer very recently examined the question again and has clearly expressed the opinion that " the treaties do not merely confer a personal right or obligation but impose obligations on the rulers for the time being of the Indian States in favour of the authorities for the time being in charge of the Government of India." It is not, therefore, correct to say that the treaties were entered into with the Crown, irrespective of this sovereignty of British India and if this sovereignty is transferred by the Crown acting with the British Parliament to an Indian National Par-

liament the Indian States cannot claim to have any constitutional relations solely with the British Crown and independently of the Government of India as defined in a new Constitution.

Sir Malcolm Hailey expressed the opinion that some kind of federation is the objective frequently suggested to the Government of India and his speech leads one to conclude that, in his opinion, some such federation would be necessary but that the terms on which such a federation should be secured between British India and the Indian States should first be settled. Sir Malcolm could not have forgotten the public pronouncement of the Indian princes in regard to the Political evolution of India and should not have had any doubt as to their attitude. Ten years ago the Maharaja of Bikaner gave in a general way the answer to these points. He said "there can be no more mistaken view that the Indian Princes will look with disfavour or apprehension upon political development in India. On the contrary, they would rejoice to see India politically progressing on constitutional lines under the British flag." Nor do I see any reason why the Princes should hesitate to be constitutionally connected with a Govern ment responsible only to the Indian Legislature. The states will have suitable representation in the federal Legislature and in the federal executive that may come into existence and in all other federal assemblies for the control of federal affairs. A federal executive and a federal legislative in the making of which the Princes and the people of states will have a voice would undoubtedly protect their rights very much better than a Government which is not responsible to them and than a Parliament in which they have no representation. I do not, therefore, believe that the Indian Princes as a body would not co-operate with us in coming into a federation with British India and in the political reconstruction of India. Their active help and assistance is necessary in attaining our ideals for the political emancipation of our motherland and we may rely on their lofty patriotism to come into line with the political aspirations of the people of India as a whole. Some of our enemies will, however, continue to cherish the hope that the Indian Princes may be used for creating difficulties in the reconstruction of our political edifice on a democratic basis; but I sincerely hope that they will be disappointed. The time spirit is rapidly changing even the most conservative rulers of the Indian States and the most conservative institutions in the country. Sir William Lee Warner predicted this change at the beginning of the century in pregnant words: "The day has passed when the East could bow low before the storm in patient deep disdain. The legions still thunder by oriental society can never go back to what it was. To-morrow will not be as Yesterday. It is certain that the presen century will witness

alterations in the character of British relations with the native states." This prophesy is now beginning to be fulfilled.

I have referred briefly to these vital aspects of the problem and do not feel called upon to take up any more of your time by the discussion of further details nor do I wish to refer to any of the schemes that are now holding the field. Our energies must be devoted to evolving a scheme acceptable to the Princes and the people of the Indian States and of British India, the further details of federal constitution such as the composition of a federal legislature, or of a federal executive, the functions of the federal state, the constitution of a federal Court and the settlement of inter-state disputes, the system of federal finance, the exact powers of intervention to be observed to the federal Government in the internal administration of the states and various other matters should receive detailed consideration only after the states are scheduled into (1) real sovereign States, (2) States which are feudal in their character, (3) States which are altogether non sovereign; and for that purpose, I trust, you will, while agreeing to the general principles appoint a suitable committee to formulate a scheme purposely for fina adoption by this and other Conferences of State subjects in the near future.

INTERNAL ADMINISTRATION.

I have so far referred to the difficult problem of the establishment of constitutional relations between British India and the Indian States and the evolution of a federal constitution for the whole of India. I have referred to the difficulties surrounding the problem. The reform in the internal administration of the Indian States is even more important and is of immediate practical interest to the members of this conference than even a Federa Union between the Indian States and British India. I do not wish to make any detailed comparison between the political condition of the poeple in British India and of the Indian States and the defects and merits of the systems of administration under which they are now living. Nor do I wish to refer to specific acts of misgovernment and maladministration in the Indian States which have occupied public attention during the last few years but I shall confine myself to the broad general features of the problem. The characteristic feature of all the states including the most advanced is the personal rule of the Prince and his control over legislation, administration and justice. The states are in all stages of development patriarchal, feudal or more advanced while in a few states, representative institutions which have been described as the dim colourless copies of those prevailing in British India have been established. The new constitution of Mysore has received

a considerable measure of approbation and is the only outstanding development of constitutional importance in the States in recent years. A government which owes its success to the personal character of the ruler can never afford any guarantee for progress. Akbar was a great ruler and it was impossible even for an Akbar to provide that he should be succeeded by another Akbar. A settled constitution which recognises the responsibility of the administration to the people and containing all the essential elements of a popular government is the only safeguard for the protection of the people.

THE NEW ORDER.

Many of the Princes have moved in the warm currents of world politics and are also cognisant of the reactions of world forces on India. As members of the League of Nations they have taken part in recasting the map of Europe and have pleaded for the self determination of small nationalities and the protection of minority communities. They have also taken part in the financial, economic, and political reconstruction of many countries in the world, and in activities which have given a new sense of humanity to all nations. They cannot refuse to co-operate and give their helping hand in the political reconstruction of their own motherland. As members of the League they have had opportunities of surveying the political conditions of every country in the world and of realising that the divine right of the monarchial order is an anachronism at the present day. They cannot expect its continuance in their own states on the old basis. On behalf of the Princes of India, the Maharajah of Bikaner assured the League of Nations that they are entirely for the establishment of the rule of law. He cannot legitimately object to the extension of the same rule to the Indian States. As members of the Imperial Conference some of the Princes have strongly pleaded for a new constitutional charter for India and for the establishment of dominion self-Government. Permit me to recall to your mind the brilliant speech of the Maharajah of Alwar at the Imperial Conference in 1923. He said "Are we going to progress steadily and progressively yet too slowly towards our goal which other sister nations have been more fortunate in already achieving, the goal of having the power to govern our country as a loyal and integral part of the Empire? Are we going to be helped affectionately and with kindly feeling to the goal which has been pronounced publicly by the British Government and more than which we do not aspire to, of being a loyal and self-governing dominion within the Empire? Is everything going to be done to accelerate our progress or is our progress under various pretexts, to be restricted and delayed? Have we a long number of

years before us of the great furnace to pass through from which Ireland has only just emerged? The world was not built for academic or pious assurances spread over a number of years the fulfilment of which may well pass over a a life time." We see here two of the strongest advocates for Indian Home-rule and I could point out passages from the speeches of other Indian Princes at these conferences and other gatherings where their patriotic advocacy of the cause of India's freedom and her status in the sisterhood of nations attracted universal attention. The advocacy of self-governing institutions for British India and the continuance of unmitigated autocratic rule in their own states are not reconcilable courses of conduct. It has been said that the development of conflicting qualities and the most contradictory tendencies is the essence and symptom of greatness but I do not believe that our princes have any intentions of achieving greatness in this way. I hope, therefore, that they will themselves change their angle of vision and give practical proof of the high sentiments and the most admirable aspirations to which they have given expression in these world-gatherings.

SIR T. MADHAVRAO'S MEMORANDUM.

The best way in which the rulers of the States can inaugurate the new order is to accept in letter and spirit, the principle of responsibility of the administration to the people of the States. The remarkable memorandum prepared by the late Sir T. Madhavarao which was published a few months ago admirably summarises the essential changes required in the administrative methods and the government of Indian States and you will permit me to make a brief reference to it. The memorandum was drawn up about 30 years ago when the political leaders of British India did not formulate any theories about the establishment of responsible Government in India. Its chief value consists in showing what a statesman with an unrivalled experience of the administration of Indian States thought were the essential needs of the situation even at that time. The state of things in most of the Indian States is more or less the same to-day as it was in the days of Sir T. Madhava Rao. The Memorandum embodies a draft constitution for the Indian States and lays down as a fundamental principle of the constitution for the states that the paramount object of the Government of the States should be the happiness of the people. To lay down this in a constitution may appear trite, but Sir Madhavarao thought at the time, that the rulers not only forget this essential object of all Government but sometimes also controverted this proposition. The draft constitution also lays down that personal rule should be abolished, that some sort of ministerial responsibility should be enforced, that the princes should be prohibited from the exercise of

suspending and dispensing powers, that an impartial law-making body should come into existence, that the administration of justice should be in accordance with due process of law, that the Princes should have a fixed civil list for the maintenance of his personal dignity and of his household and that public revenues should be safeguarded against encroachments by the Princes. The whole document deserves the attention of al those interested in the reform of the states. One of the causes for great dissatisfaction prevailing at the present day is that several instances have occurred in recent years of the denial of the elementary rights of the subject, the right of freedom of speech and of property and the right of association and it must be your endeavour to secure these rights as an essential step in the reform of the States. The movement towards the establishment of constitutional responsible Government in the Indian States is gaining ground every day and the Princes cannot afford to ignore the forces of popular freedom without great risk to themselves and to the general well being of the people of India as a whole.

It is as much the right of the people of the Indian States as it is of the people of British India to advocate and demand such changes in the structure of their Government as they may deem proper and to enforce their demands in all constitutional ways.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PARAMOUNT POWER.

The responsibilities of the paramount power for the well-being of the subjects of the Indian States and the limitations now imposed under existing practice in the internal affairs of the States have been stated on a recent occasion by His Excellency Lord Leading. The British Government have not hitherto fulfilled these responsibilities in any adequate measure. If the paramount power is prepared to change the system of administration n British India in the interests of the people and if its objective is the establishment of responsible Government in British India it has equally the duty to see what changes are required from time to time in the internal administration of the States for safe-guarding the people against intolerable misrule and oppression and for giving them an effective voice in the administration. It cannot be assumed for one moment that treaties and engagements require the British Government to maintain the existing rule of the Princes whatever may be the standard of their administration.

THE NEED FOR AN ENQUIRY.

I have so far referred to some of the aspects of the problem of including the states in a federal constitution for the whole of India and also dwelt on

the urgent need for carrying out the necessary reforms in the internal administration of the states and for the establishment of constitutional Government therein. A comprehensive enquiry into the problems relating to Indian states and their future position in a self-governing India is urgently called for; such enquiry has never been undertaken hitherto and it was believed that as a consequence of the conference at Simla between the Indian Princes and the Government of India, the Secretary of State was seriously considering the method of holding an enquiry into the problems relating to the Indian States, their exact position in the future Indian constitution and the terms and conditions on which they should be associated in a constitutional way with British India. It was suggested that this enquiry should be made by the Royal Commission which has now been appointed for British India. Another proposal was that the problems relating to the Indian States which are even more complicated than those of British India should be investigated by a separate Royal Commission. The proposal for a separate Royal Commision was supported by my esteemed and distinguished friend the Right Hon'ble Mr V. S. Srinivasa Sastri whose unrivalled political experience and acknowledged authority in all matters pertaining to the development of the Indian constitution made the proposal all the more weighty. It was suggested that both the commissions should be appointed simultaneously and that their recommendations should afterwards be co-ordinated with a view to the creation of a federal constitution for the whole of India. Neither of these proposals has found favour with His Majesty's Government. The Royal Commission for British India has been appointed solely in terms of Section 84 (a) of the Government of India Act, in regard to the Indian states. H.E. the Viceroy has announced a few days ago at Rajkot the decision to appoint an expert committee (1) to report upon the relationship between the paramount power and the states with particular reference to the obligations arising from treaties, engagements, sunnads and usages; (2) to enquire into the wider problems of the States' financial and economical relations with British India and (3) to make new recommendations that they may consider desirable or necessary for their more satisfactory adjustment. The appointment of the Royal Commission has met with universal resentment in India and all political parties and every community in the country has set its face against it. The exclusion of Indians from the commission and the result thereby offered to us is not the only unsatisfactory feature about it. Apart from the personnel there is the fact that the resolutions of the central legislature in regard to the dominion status of India have been completely ignored and the enquiry to be made by the Royal Commission is confined

to the narrow issues raised by the terms of the Section 84 (a) of the Government of India Act. The personnel of the expert committee now announced by H. E. The Viceroy is not yet known but we may take it for granted that neither the people of the Indian states nor the Princes will be represented on the committee. The terms of reference are equally unsatisfactory and will not include the wider issues relating to the Indian States which you have been discussing year after year. From the terms of His Excellency's speech at Rajkot we gather that the expert committee has been appointed at the request of the Princes to examine certain practical questions relating to the financial and other adjustments between the States and British Indian authorities and it will have nothing to do with the question of the inclusion of the State, in a new constitution for the whole of India nor will it deal with the reforms in the internal administration which this conference has been pressing. It is clear to my mind that the machinery for investigating the whole series of problems for bringing the States into constitutional relations with British India has not been thought of as yet. It will be the duty of this conference to devise ways and means to secure this investigation as easy as possible by such means as may be agreed to in this Conference and to press for the appointment of a commission satisfactory regardto its personnel and terms of reference and also to press for a suitable representation on the same on behalf of the subjects of Indian States.

"OUR TRUSTEES."

I must now bring my remarks to a close. In a consideration of the whole problem we cannot forget our "British Trustees." They are not anxious to advance the cause of national freedom in British India and still less for the promotion of constitutional reforms in the Indian States. For a long time British Statesmen have sought moral justification for British rule in India and have repeatedly asserted that in governing 319 million people of India, Great Britain is discharging a solemn trust. They have asserted that British policy in India is not in any sense dictated by British interests and that the welfare of India alone is the determining factor in the formulation of their policy. They have frequently declared that as soon as the people of India are ready to undertake the burden of the Government of the country it will be willingly handed over to them. A very high authority has considerably modified the theory of trusteeship and has declared recently that the people of India are partners with Great Britain and appealed for mutual goodwill and co-operation in the working of this great partnership in India. Apparently India is the subject of partnership of an indefinite duration in which the people of Great Britain have an

equal or predominant part and there is no means of dissolving it. According to legal notions a trust is a trust and can never be converted into a partnership between the trustees and the beneficiaries of the trust. A third view about British responsibility in India has been very recently propounded by the Earl of Lytton in the British Press after his return to England. He states with brutal frankness that the doctrine of trusteeship has led to a great deal of cant and hypocrisy on the one side and a good deal of irritation on the other and true criterion of Britain's relationship to India is the attitude of India to Great Britain. He urges that the successful realisation of India's ideals would depend on the question as to whether they are compatible with British interests and suggests the possibility of India being hostile and unfriendly to British interests and also of India joining some day the enemies of Great Britain. In order to dispel their suspicions he demanded a common declaration of friendship by the statesmen of both countries to be followed by a sincere examination of the conditions which would enable the national interests of each to be secured. It is very surprising that doubts and suspicions of India's attitude to Great Britain should begin to be entertained only after a demand for the full recognition of her statushave been put forward. The causes of the Great War were unknown to India and yet India stood by her allegiance heart and soul from the first call to arms and her solid achievements and the general attitude of her people in that great crisis was the subject of many eloquent tributes from the Prime Minister downwards. Yet we are now told that India may join Britains' enemies. Lord Lytton's statement of the position is a frank negation of all moral responsibility for the Government of this country on which British statesmen have hitherto laid so much stress and it would look as if our claim for Swaraj for India depends upon the arrangements of a satisfactory bargain between British and Indian politicians. The exigencies of the situation has driven British statesmen to deviate from the high moral standpoint which they have hitherto taken. Another observation that I should like to make is that our "trustees" wish to discount our national movement every time the question of Indian reform is on the tapis. They do not wish to bring the trust to an end and believe in our perpetual tutelage and, in their opinion, we cannot even judge as to what is good for ourselves and the Royal Commission was constituted on this basis. During the recent debate in Parliament Lord Birkenhead again made a reference to the theory of trusteeship and as to how trust has been discharged during the 150 years of British occupation. He stated that when Britain approached India in a commercial guise which has frequently been its earliest approach to future dominion it found India "a welter of anar-

chy" and he confessed that the moment Parliament repudiated its responsibility "India would be involved in the same kind of chaos as that from which Britain had rescued her." If that statement is true it is hardly complimentary to our British trustees that they should have managed the affairs of India in such a manner as to leave us exactly where we were when they came to India. It is obvious, however, that in making this statement His Lordship is actuated by the desire to find reasons for the perpetuation of the trust. A second class of our trustees contend that India is a country fortropical storms which fiercely as they rage subside and pass away after clearing the atmosphere and after restoring fertility to the sunscorched soil. He asserts that the movement for Swaraj is a fierce storm of emotion rather than the all-absorbing pursuit of a long suffering people and he believes that this emotional cloud burst has passed away. A third class of our trustees have opened a campaign in the British Press and expressed the opinion that a new crisis in the chequered history of India is impending, that the Government of India is dominated by the Indian politicians and that the best way of safeguarding the treaty rights of the states will be to replace the existing Legislative Assembly by a strong advisory council to which the Indian Princes and the chiefs can send representatives. We see in this a deliberate attempt to set up the the states against the political aspirations of India. There is still another class of our trustees who wish to put off the evil day as far as possible and continually discuss the inherent and indefeasible superiortiy of occidental civilisations over the civilisations of the orient and they assert that the development of our political institutions in India should proceed on lines suitable to the genius of an eastern people.' They do not develop their theme fully and tell us frankly what this genius consists in but apparently they claim democracy as a peculiarly western institution. These and other critics have been busy for some time and Miss Mayo's has completed the picture by depicting the social conditions of India in the most odious light. In the pursuit of our political ideals we have to fight this periodical exhibition of ignorance, self-interest, misrepresentation, calumny and other kinds of interested criticism.

CONCLUSION.

Gentlemen,—The deliberations of your conference this year are of a peculiar significance and are particularly important for a variety of reasons. The National movement in British India for the establishment of Swaraj has gathered increased strength and momentum and we are now pressing for radical alterations in the present constitution. Our ideals for the future

Government of India have been sometime ago summarised by Lord Lytton in the following three propositions :—

(1) We desire to see India free from any foreign domination.

(2) We desire to see India defended by armed forces consisting of our own people and acting under the orders of our own Government.

(3) We desire to see India governed by an executive answerable to a Parliament elected by our people.

We are thankful to His Lordship for having so correctly and so unambiguously stated in the British press the three fundamental ideals of our political faith. I refuse to believe that there is anybody in the Indian States be he a Prince or a peasant, who will not wholeheartedly subscribe to these ideals and who will not do his best to realise them. A large vision of Indian political destiny has permeated all classes of people throughout India and that on this main question there is and there can be absolutely no differences between the people of British India and the Indian States. A free, strong, united, self-governing and self-supporting India is our aim and ideal. In familiarising the people of the State with our national ideals your services, are, therefore, invaluable and this conferences is doing its best to bring the States into general harmony with the political developments in British India. The Indian National Congress, the Muslim League, the National Liberal Federation, the Hindu Mahasabha and other political organisations in British India are now actively engaged in examining the question of a new constituion for India. The All India Congress Committee has charged the working Committee of the Congress to frame a scheme in consultation with the various political parties in the country. I sincerely hope that this committee and the other political organisations will not content themselves by framing proposals relating only to British India leaving the position of the Indian States in the new constitution undefined. This will be very unfortunate. It is, therefore, very desirable that the executive committee of this conference should secure the co-operation of the political organisations in British India without any delay and collaborate with them in devising a new constitutional character for the whole of India.

INDIAN STATES' PEOPLE'S CONFERENCE.

Saturday, 17th and Sunday, 18th December 1927.

RESOLUTIONS.

RESOLUTION No. 1.

This meeting of the representatives from several Indian States resolves to establish a permanent organisation for the Indian States' peoples to be styled the "Indian States' People's Conference" with its head-quarters at present in Bombay.

From the Chair.

RESOLUTION No. 2.

The chief aim and object of the Indian States' People's Conference is the attainment of responsible government for the people in the Indian States through representative institutions under the aegis of their rulers.

Proposed by—Mr. Purohit.
Seconded by—Mr. Amritlal L. Trivedi.
Supported by—Mr. D. V. Gokhale.
" Mr. Jayanarayan Vyas.
" Mr. Kanaiyalal Kalantri.

RESOLUTION No. 3.

This Conference resolves that an Executive Committee, consisting of the following 58 gentlemen with power to *co-opt* not more than seventeen members and elect the office-bearers, be appointed to organise and educate public opinion on the aims and objects of the Conference, to give effect to the resolutions passed by the same, to collect funds and frame a draft constitution in accordance with the aims and objects herewith defined and to be submitted to this

Conference at its next session for carrying out the work of the Conference and to co-operate with all the existing Indian States' political institutions.

Proposed by—Mr. Gordhandas Ladhabhai.

Seconded by—Mr. Manilal Kothari.

RESOLUTION No. 4.

This Conference declares that it is the inherent right of the people of the Indian States to determine the form and character of their Government and to bring about therein such changes as they deem proper.

Proposed by—Mr. Ramnarayan Chaudhary.

Seconded by—Mr. Raghavendra Rao.

RESOLUTION No. 5.

This Conference urges upon the rulers of the States :—

(*a*) that representative institutions be established in the States on an elective basis in the sphere of local self-government and also for the purpose of legislation, taxation and control of general administration ;

(*b*) that the budgets of the States should be submitted to the votes of popular assemblies ;

(*c*) that the revenues of the States should be separated from the personal expenditure of the Princes and that the civil list should also be submitted to the vote of the popular assemblies ; and

(*d*) that there should be an independent judiciary, that the judicial functions be separated entirely from the executive in every State and that the personal intervention of the Princes in the administration of justice should cease absolutely.

Proposed by—Mr. Pathik.

Seconded by—Mr. Niranjan Sharma.

Supported by—Mr. Mahasukhbhai.

" Mr. Sane.

" Mr. Dhorajiwala.

RESOLUTION No. 6.

This Conference of Indian States' People urges :—

That for a speedy attainment of Swarajya, for India as a whole the Indian States should be brought into constitutional relations with British India and the people of the Indian States should be assigned a definite place and an effective voice in all matters of common concern in any new constitution that may be devised for the whole of India.

Proposed by—Mr. Govindlal Shivlal.

Seconded by—Mr. Purohit.

RESOLUTION No. 7.

This Conference is of opinion that the plea put forward that the Indian Princes have treaty obligations to the British Crown wholly independent of the Government of India for the time being has no foundation whatever and is detrimental to the attainment of Swarajya for India as a whole.

Proposed by—Mr. Abhyankar.

Seconded by—Mr. Shivdas Champsy.

Supported by—Dr. Ghanshyamlal.

RESOLUTION No. 8.

This Conference records its emphatic opinion that the elementary rights of citizenship such as, the right of association and meeting, right of free speech, right of free press, and security of person and property have been hitherto denied to the people in a great many States, and that these rights should be publicly acknowledged by the Princes in a Proclamation duly promulgated and further secured by suitable laws.

Proposed by—Mrs. Atya Begum.

Seconded by—Mr. R. H. Thakar.

RESOLUTION No. 9.

This Conference declares its faith in self-reliant efforts as the most proper and effective means for the amelioration of the condition of the people and resolves that organisations may be started in the

States to do the constructive work of Khadi, temperance, the uplift of the backward classes and the establishment and reform of village Panchayats and local self-government institutions.

Proposed by—Mr. A. V. Thakkar.
Seconded by—Mr. Jamnalal Bajjaj.
Supported by—Mr. B. F. Bharucha.
" Mr. Manilal Kothari.

RESOLUTION No. 10.

That whereas the system of compulsory labour which prevails in the Indian States is inhuman and barbarous, this Conference calls upon the Indian Princes to abolish the same without delay and declare that no person shall be required to do compulsory labour and urges upon them to abolish the customs and practices analogous to slavery which exist in some States.

Proposed by—Mr. Jagjivan Ujamshi.
Seconded by—Mr. Mathur.
Supported by—Mr. Chandulal Sutar.
" Mr. Bhailal Jorabhai.
" Mr. N. J. Thakar.

RESOLUTION No. 11.

This Conference is of opinion that the system of education that is now imparted to the Kumars in the Rajakumar Colleges is both ill-conceived and ill-suited and has the effect of denationalising them.

Proposed by—Mr. Sutaria C. J.
Seconded by—Mr. Swami Brahmanand.
Supported by—Mr. Bhagwandas of Indore.

RESOLUTION No. 12.

This Conference urges:—

(*a*) that the present policy of intervention in the internal affairs of the Indian States is not based on any definite principles;

(*b*) that such intervention has not been generally exercised for the promotion and safeguarding of the rights of the people; and

(*c*) that the principles on which such intervention is made should be clearly defined, codified and published.

Proposed by—Mr. Popatlal L. Chudgar.
Seconded by—Mr. Manishanker Trivedi.
Supported by—Mr. Nandkishore Bhatt.

RESOLUTION No. 13.

In view of the fact that an Expert Committee has been appointed by the Secretary of State for India in Council at the request of the Indian Princes and without any reference to and representation of the people of the Indian States, this Conference is of opinion that any enquiry conducted by the Committee will seriously prejudice the rights and liberties of the people and unduly increase their burdens and therefore the conclusions arrived at by the committee under these circumstances will be wholly unacceptable to them.

Proposed by—Mr. Arjunlal Shethy.
Seconded by—Mr. B. S. Pathik.
Supparted by—Mr. G. B. Trivedi.

RESOLUTION No. 14.

This Conference views with grave concern and alarm the growing tendency of several Princes to spend a considerable period of their time every year outside their States entailing on their States and the people considerable expenditure from State revenues.

From the Chair.

RESOLUTION No. 15.

This Conference authorizes the Executive Committee to secure the co-operation of the political organisations in British India and collaborate with them in devising a new constitution for the whole of India including the Indian States.

From the Chair.

RESOTUTION No. 16.

This Conference expresses its cordial thanks to the Receptio Committee, the Volunteers, the Press, and the Trustees of t Madhav Baug for the assistance they have rendered in making it a success.

Proposed by—Mr. Sutaria C. J.

Seconded by—Mr. Pardhubhai Sharma.

Supported by—Mr. Kanji Bhudhdev.

RESOLUTION No. 17.

This Conference expresses its heartfelt gratitude to Dewa Bahadur M. Ramchandra Rao, the President, for coming over fron Ellore to preside over the Conference and for the skill and tact wit which he has conducted the proceedings of the Conference.

Proposed by—Mr. Beniprasad Dalmia.

Seconded by—Mr. Mohanlal Dalichand.

Supported by—Mr. Amritlal Sheth.

„ Mr Bhagwandas.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Chairman.

Dewan Bahadur M. Ramchandra Rao, Ellore,

Vice-Chairmen.

Govindlal Shivlal, Bombay.

B. S. Pathik, Ajmer,

General Secretary

Prof. G. R. Abhyankar, B.A., L.L.B., Sangli.

Joint Secretaries.

Manishanker Shamji Trivedi, Bombay.
(Bombay Central Office and non-grouped States).

Ramnarayan Choudhari, Rajasthan Seva Sangh, Ajmere.
(Rajputana, Central India and Punjab States).

Balvantray G. Mehta, Bhavnagar,
(Cutch, Kathiawar and Gujerat States).

S. G. Vaze,
Servants of India Society, Poona,
(SOUTHERN MARATHA STATES).

D. V. Gundappa, Basavangudi P. O,
Bangalore City.

(SOUTHERN INDIA STATES).

Treasurer.

Mansukhlal Chhaganlal,
Shri Ram Mansions, Sandhurst Road, Bombay.

Members.

RAJPUTANA, CENTRAL INDIA AND THE PUNJAB STATES.

Pt. Nayanu Ram Sharma.
Mr. Shankar Lal Varma.
Syt. Swami Rama Nand.
Ram Bax Arya.
Mr. Jayanarayan Byas.
Sardar Mahatab Sinhajee.
Beni Prasad Dalmiya.
Seth Gajraj Jhunjhunwala.
Sardar Diwan Sinha.
Kanhyaiya Lal Kalantri.
Ramdeo Poddar.
Balkrishna Lal Poddar.
Nirganjan Sharma.
Mr. Trelokchandra Mathur.
Ganesh Shankarjee Vidyarthi.
Siddhanath Madhava Loudhey.
Gulab Rai Nemani.
Madan Lal Jalan.

GUJERAT STATES.

Dr. Sumant Mehta.
Wamanrao Tamhankar.
Purohit D. L.
Mahasukhbhai Chunilal.
Sutaria C. J.
Manilal H. Mehta.
Amritlal L. Trivedi.
Fulsinghji.
Motilal Sharma.

RESOTUTION No. 16.

This Conference expresses its cordial thanks to the Reception Committee, the Volunteers, the Press, and the Trustees of the Madhav Baug for the assistance they have rendered in making its a success.

Proposed by—Mr. Sutaria C. J.

Seconded by—Mr. Pardhubhai Sharma.

Supported by—Mr. Kanji Bhudhdev.

RESOLUTION No. 17.

This Conference expresses its heartfelt gratitude to Dewan Bahadur M. Ramchandra Rao, the President, for coming over from Ellore to preside over the Conference and for the skill and tact with which he has conducted the proceedings of the Conference.

Proposed by—Mr. Beniprasad Dalmia.

Seconded by—Mr. Mohanlal Dalichand.

Supported by—Mr. Amritlal Sheth.

„ Mr Bhagwandas.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Chairman.

Dewan Bahadur M. Ramchandra Rao, Ellore,

Vice-Chairmen.

Govindlal Shivlal, Bombay.

B. S. Pathik, Ajmer,

General Secretary

Prof. G. R. Abhyankar, B.A., L.L.B., Sangli.

Joint Secretaries.

Manishanker Shamji Trivedi, Bombay.
(Bombay Central Office and non-grouped States).

Ramnarayan Choudhari, Rajasthan Seva Sangh, Ajmere.
(Rajputana, Central India and Punjab States).

Balvantray G. Mehta, Bhavnagar,
(Cutch, Kathiawar and Gujerat States).

S. G. Vaze,
Servants of India Society, Poona,
(SOUTHERN MARATHA STATES).

D. V. Gundappa, Basavangudi P. O.,
Bangalore City.

(SOUTHERN INDIA STATES).

Treasurer.

Mansukhlal Chhaganlal,
Shri Ram Mansions, Sandhurst Road, Bombay.

Members.

RAJPUTANA, CENTRAL INDIA AND THE PUNJAB STATES.

Pt. Nayanu Ram Sharma.
Mr. Shankar Lal Varma.
Syt. Swami Rama Nand.
Ram Bax Arya.
Mr. Jayanarayan Byas.
Sardar Mahatab Sinhajee.
Beni Prasad Dalmiya.
Seth Gajraj Jhunjhunwala.
Sardar Diwan Sinha.
Kanhyaiya Lal Kalantri.
Ramdeo Poddar.
Balkrishna Lal Poddar.
Nirganjan Sharma.
Mr. Trelokchandra Mathur.
Ganesh Shankarjee Vidyarthi.
Siddhanath Madhava Loudhey.
Gulab Rai Nemani.
Madan Lal Jalan.

GUJERAT STATES.

Dr. Sumant Mehta.
Wamanrao Tambankar.
Purohit D. L.
Mahasukhbhai Chunilal.
Sutaria C. J.
Manilal H. Mehta.
Amritlal L. Trivedi.
Fulsinghji.
Motilal Sharma.

Ochhavlal Modi.
Rangildas M. Kapadia.
Sunderlal Baxi.

KATHIAWAR STATES.

Jagjivandas Talsania.
Laxmichand Doshi.
Manilal Kothari.
Popatlal L. Chudgar.
Amritlal Sheth.
Hirachand V. Desai,

CUTCH STATE.

L. R Tairsee.
Mansingh Kacharabhai.

SOUTHERN MAHRATTA AND SOUTHERN INDIA STATES.

A. V. Patvardhan.
D. V. Gokhale.
N. C. Kelker.
Mr. Sane.
Sudarshanam.
K. T. Matthew.
Raghvendra Rao Sharma.
V. R. Naik Jagirdar.
R. S. Naik, M.A., Barrister-at-Law.
Mr. Hanmantrao, High Court Vakil.
Mr. Narsingrao, Editor, Rayat.
S. L. Silam, B.A., L.L.B.
S. S. Persha.
K. S. Vaidya, M.A., L.L.B., High Court Vakil.

B. V. PRESS.

APPENDIX A.

The following 70 States were represented in the Conference.

(1) Bhavnagar. (2) Gondal. (3) Rajkot. (4) Jamnagar. (5) Jaipur. (6) Cutch. (7) Baroda. (8) Kishangarh. (9) Muli. (10) Ratlma. (11) Bikaner. (12) Bharatpur. (13) Morvi. (14) Jetpur. (15) Limdi. (16) Balasinor. (17) Hyderabad. (18) Chuda. (19) Jamkhandi. (20) Mangrol. (21) Palitana. (22) Porbunder. (23) Radhanpur. (24) Khambat. (25) Dhrol. (26) Jesalmere. (27) Devgadh Baria. (28) Sangli. (29) Idar. (30) Janjira. (31) Dhrangadhara. (32) Lunavda. (33) Vansda. (34) Junagadh. (35) Lakhtar. (36) Rajpipla. (37) Indore. (38) Vadhwan. (39) Jodhpur. (40) Kapurthala. (41) Mysore. (42) Sayla. (43) Kotah. (44) Mansa. (45) Bagasara. (46) Loharu. (47) Bundi. (48) Nabha. (49) Savantwadi. (50) Udaipur. (51) Bhor. (52) Rampur. (53) Chamba. (54) Vadali. (55) Palanpur. (56) Danta. (57) Sirohi (58) Gwalior. (59) Dewas. (Senior) (60) Sardargadh. (61) Alwar. (62) Dewas (Junior). (63) Bhopal. (64) Kolhapur. (65) Ghodasar. (66) Vankaner. (67) Manavadar. (68) Javar. (69) Karauli. (70) Travancore.

APPENDIX B.

The Statement of Accounts.

RECEIPTS.					EXPENDITURE.				
		Rs.	a.	p.			Rs.	a.	p.
Fees of Reception Committee members	...	2,520	0	0	Post and Telegrams	...	178	13	0
					Travelling	...	311	5	3
					Printing ...	...	1,121	15	0
Donations ...	...	689	0	0	Propaganda	...	663	12	3
					Sundry ...	...	33	12	0
Fees of Delegates	...	970	0	0	Office ...	...	370	9	6
					Pandal ...	...	1,303	4	0
Fees of Visitors	...	241	0	0	Stationery ...	...	110	7	0
							4,093	14	0
					Balance	...	326	2	0
		4,420	0	0			4,420	0	0

APPENDIX C.

The Indian States People's Conference Bombay.

Proceedings of the first Meeting of the Executive Committee.

1. The first Meeting of the Executive Committee of this Conference was held on Monday, the 19th instant in the office of the Conference when the following elected Members were present and the President Dewan Bahadur Ramchandra Rao presided :—

Balvantrai G. Mehta, (Bhavnagar); Prof. G. R. Abhyanker, (Sangli); Motilal Samaldas Sharma, (Vadasinor); Occhavlal C. Modi, (Vadasinor); B. S. Pathik, (Udaipur); Sunderlal P. Bakshi, (Rajpipla); Gajraj Zhunzunwalla (Jaipur); Pt. Naiyanuram Sharma, (Kotah); Mansukhlal Chhaganlal, (Gujerat); Jagjivan Ujamshy, (Limbdi); Niranjan Sharma, (Bharatpur); Jay Narayan Vyas, (Jodhpur); Ram Narayan Choudhary, (Jaipur); A. L. Trivedi, (Iddar); Popatlal L. Chudgar, (Rajkot); K. L. Kalantri, (Bikaner); Manishanker S. Trivedi, (Bhavnagar); Mansinh Kacharabhai, (Cutch); Fulsinghji B. Dabhi, (Mahi Kanta); Wamanrao Tahmunker, (Baroda); C. J. Sutaria, Baroda; Sumant B. Mehta, (Baroda).

2. The following office-bearers were elected :—

D. B. M. Ramchandra Rao	*ex-officio Chairman.*
Seth Govindlal Shivlal. B. S. Pathikji.	*Vice-Chairmen.*
Prof. G. R. Abhyankar.	*General Secretary.*
Manishanker S. Trivedi.	*Secretary* for Bombay.
Ram Narayan Chaudhari.	*Prov. Secretary* for Rajputana Central India and Punjab States.
Popatlal L. Chudgar. Balvantrai G. Mehta.	*Prov. Secretaries* for Cutch, Kathiawar and Gujarat States.
S. G. Vaze.	*Prov. Secretary* for Southern Maharatta States.
D. V. Gundappa.	*Prov. Secretary* for South Indian States.
Mansukhlal Chaganlal.	*Treasurer.*

[*N. B.*—The Non-grouped States were connected with Bombay Office.]

3. A deputation of the following gentlemen was appointed to see the Office-Bearers of the Indian National Congress on behalf of this Committee; Messrs. B. S. Pathikjee, Manilal Kothari, Ram Narayan Chaudhari, D. V. Gundappa, Chhotalal Sutaria, Balvantrai G. Mehta, and the President of the Conference.

4. Rs. 2,500 were sanctioned for Office establishment in Bombay and Rs. 1,500 for Publicity Work.

5. Messrs. G. R. Abhyanker and P. L. Chudgar were authorised to conduct the Publicity Work.

6. The quorum of the Executive Committee was fixed at 10.

7. Messrs. Govindlal Shivlal, Sunderlal Baxi, Hirachand V. Desai, and Rangildas Kapadia were co-opted as Members of the Executive Committee by the President.

List of the Members elected by the Conference and Members co-opted at the First Meeting of the Executive Committee.

*Dewan Bahadur M. Ramchandra Rao, Ellore.
*Govindlal Shivlal, Hydrabad, (Bombay.)

RAJPUTANA, CENTRAL INDIA AND THE PUNJAB STATES.

Pt. Nayanu Ram Sharma, Kotah·
Shankar Lal Varma, Gwalior (Ajmer.)
Swami Rama Nand, Ujjain.
Ram Bax Arya, Gwaliar.
Jayanarayan Byas, Jodhpur.
Sardar Mahatab Sinhjee, Amritsar.
Beni Prasad Dalmiya, (Bombay.)
Seth Gajraj Jhunjhunwala, (Bombay.)
Sardar Diwan Sinha, Delhi.
Kanhaiya Lal Kalantri, Phalodi.
Ramdeo Poddar, Hyderabad, (Bombay,)
Balkrishna Lal Poddar, (Bombay.)
Nirganjan Sharma, Ajit, Bharatpur, (Bombay.)
Mr. Trilokchandra Mathur, Karauli, (Bombay.)
Ganesh Shankarjee Vidyarthi, Cawnpur.
Siddhanath Madhava Loudhey, Khandwa.
Gulab Rai Nemani, (Bombay.)
Madan Lal Jalan, „
*B. S. Pathikjee, Udaipur, (Ajmer.)
*Ram Naraya Chaudhary, Ajmer.

GUJERAT STATES.

Dr. Sumant B. Mehta, Baroda.
Wamanrao R. Tahmankar, Navsari.
Dayabhai L. Purohit, Baroda.
Mahasukhbhai Chunilal, Visnagar.

---

*These are office-bearers.

C. J. Sutaria, Baroda.
Manilal H. Mehta, Vadasinor, (Bombay).
Amritlal L. Trivedi, Iddar, (Bombay).
Fulsinghji B. Dabhi, Mahikantha.
Motilal Sharma, Baroda, (Bombay).
Ochhavlal C. Modi, Vadasinor, (Bombay).
Rangildas Kapadia, (Baroda), (Bombay).
Sunderlal Baxi, (Nandod.)

CUTCH.

L. R. Tairsee, Cutch, (Bombay.)
Mansingh Kacharabhai, Mandvi.

KATHIAWAR STATES.

Jagjivandas U. Talsania, Limbdi, (Bombay.)
Laxmicand Doshi, Limbdi.
Manilal Kothari, Rajkot, (Ahmedabad).
*Popatlal L. Chudgar, Rajkot.
Amritlal D. Sheth, Limbdi, (Ranpur).
Hirachand V. Desai, Morvi.
*Balvantray G. Mehta, Bhavnager.
*Manishanker S. Trivedi, Bhavnager, (Bombay.)
*Mansukhlal Chhaganlal, Limbdi, (Bombay.)

SOUTHERN MAHRATTA STATES.

*Prof. G. R. Abhyanker, Sangli (Poona).
A. V. Patverdhan, Sangli (Poona).
D. V. Gokhle, Poona.
N. C. Kelkar, Poona.
*S. G. Vaze, Kolhapur, (Poona).
Ganesh Bhaskar Sane, Bhor, (Baroda).

SOUTHERN INDIA STATES.

R. M. Sudesanam, Travancore, (Poona).
K. T. Matthew, (Madras).
Raghvendra Rao Sharma, Hydrabad, (Poona).
V. R. Naik, Jagirdar, Begampet..
R. S. Naik, Barrister, Hyderabad,
M. Hanumantrao, High Court Vakil, Hyderabad.
M. Narshingh Rao, Editor, Rayat, Hyderabad.
S. L. Silam, Hyderabad.
S. S. Persha, Aurangabad.
K. S. Vaidya, High Court Vakil, Hyderabad.
*D. V. Gundappa, Basavangudi, P. O., Banglore.

* These are office-bearers.

Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the Executive Committee

The Second Meeting of the Executive Committee was held on the 7th January 1928 at the Servants of India Society's Home. The following members were present :—

Messrs. B. S. Pathik; P. L. Chudgar; B. G. Mehta; M. S. Trivedi; Niranjan Sharma Ajit ; Trilokchand Mathur ; M. H. Mehta; G. R. Abhyankar; A. V. Patwardhan and Nainuram Sharma. Mr. B. S. Pathik (Vice Chairman) was in the Chair.

The Minutes of the last meeting were read and confirmed.

The following Resolutions were passed :—

(1) This meeting of the Executive Committee places on record its sense of deep sorrow at the sudden demise of Hakimji Ajmal Khan Saheb and the great loss which the country sustained by the absence of his lead at this critical juncture. This meeting further authorises the Secretary to send a letter of condolence to the family of the berieved. [Carried unanimously].

(2) This Committee resolves that those public bodies interested in the affairs of the Indian States, that accept the Aim and Object of the Conference and agree to work in the spirit of the Resolutions of the Conference, should be affiliated to this Conference on pay. ment of a fee of Rs. 10 per year as affiliation fee.

(3) This Committee resolves to start the Central Office Work immediately and request the Office-Bearers to collect the promised amount. This Committee further resolves to request the Provincial Secretaries to prepare schemes of the work within their jurisdiction on the basis that the Provincial Offices will get subventions during the year upto Rs. 500, funds permitting, provided the schemes of the Provincial Secretaries are approved by the following members of the Executive Committee, which shall be a Sub-Committee for the purpose and whose opinions should be obtained either personally or by corresponence—

The Chairman,
The Vice-Chairmen,
The General Secretary,
The Bombay Office Secretary.
Mr. M. H. Mehta.
Mr. A. V. Patwardhan and
Mr. Trilokchand Mathur.,

(4) The Provincial Secretaries are authorised to collect funds for the Conference and spend the same upto three-fourth of the collections under the supervision and control of the Members of the Executive Committee of the respective Provinces.

(5) The Executive Committee appoints the following members to form a Committee to organise public opinion on Indian States Questions within and without State limits in consonance with the Aim and Object of this Conference—

Messrs. Manilal Kothari ; B. S. Pathik and B. G. Mehta, with such gentlemen as they think proper

and sanctions a sum of Rs. 1,000 by the Central Office, funds permitting.

(6) The following gentmen are appointed to form a Committee to collect funds for the purposes of the Conference—

Mr. Kanji Gordhandas Budhdeo,
Mr. Govindlal Shivlal,
Mr. Jugjivan Ujjamsey Talsania,
Mr. P. L. Chudgar,
Mr. Amritlal D. Seth,
Mr. Manilal Kothari,
Mr. B. S. Pathik,
Mr. Beniprasad Dalmia,
Mr. Gujraj Zunzunwalla and
Mr. L. R. Tairsee

with powers to co-opt.

(7) The following gentlemen are appointed to work with the Congress Sub-Committee for the Draft Constitution when invited to do so—

Mr. B. S. Pathik,
Prof. K. T. Shah,
Prof. G. R. Abhyankar,
Mr. P. L. Chudgar,
Mr. Manilal Mehta and
Mr. Amritlal D. Seth.

Ashoka Building
Princess Street
BOMBAY (2). 19th May 1928.

The third Executive Committee meeting of the Indian States Peoples Conference met today at its premises in Ashoka building, Princess

street, BOMAY. 2. precisely at 1. P.M. (S. T.) under the presidency of Mr. B. S. Pathik to consider the situation created by the recent inquiry of the Indian States Committee known as the Butler Committee. After reading by the secretary of the minutes of the last meeting and its adoption, the letter of the president of the Executive Cemmittee and his reply to the Princes scheme were also read. The criticisms of the Sulter Committee by Mr. B. S. Pathik and Prof. Abhyanker were then placed before the committee for consideration and were approved. After co-opting Mr. A. V. Thakker as a member of the Executive Committee the meeting adjourned at 2. P.M. (S. T.) for the next day.

The following gentlemen of the Executive Committee were present:-

Messrs C. J. Sutaria., Rangildas. Kapadia., Amritlal Trivedi. S. G. Vaze., Amritlal D. Seth., Kannaiyalal Kalyantri; Balvantrai Mehta., Niranjan Sharma., Gulabrai Nemani., R. N. Chaudhary., Vaman R. Naik., Manilal Kothari., Prof. G. R. Abhyanker., B. S. Pathik., Raghavendra Sharma., T. C. Mathur., Manishanker S. Trivedi & A. V. Thakker.

Ashoka Building
Princess Street
20th May 1928.

The adjourned meeting of the Executive committee meeting of the Indian States People's Conference met today again at its premises in Ashoka building, Princess Street, Bombay, 2. at 1 P.M. and after a prolonged disscussion over the points raised the previous day, the fcllowing resolutions were passed :—

1. In view of the fact that the Butler Committee was appointed by the India Office without any reference to and represtation of the people of the Indian States, and that its terms of reference were very narrow and further illiberally construed and that the said committee refused to supply the questionnaire as well as other materials to the people of the states and record their oral evidence and that it has carried on its proceedings in camera, the Executive Committee of the Indian States Peoples Conference avers that any decision taken by the British Government on recommendations of the said Committee will be wholly unacceptable to the people of the Indian States.

2. The Committee hereby empowers the publicity committee of the Indian States Peoples Conference to issue a statement on behalf of the Committee showing how the Butler committee has gone about its business in practice and how extremely prejudicial its procedure has been to the interests of the people of the Indian States.

3. The Committee expresses its considered opinion that the proposals formulated by the Princes' Conference held in Bombay and the views of some of the members of the Chamber of Princes expressed to the representatives of the press and the scheme of Sir Leslie Scott prepared on behalf of the states and as published are highly detrimental to the interests of the people of the Indian States and also those of British India and to the cherished goal of SWARAJ of India as a whole.

4. This Committee appoints a sub-committee of the following members to critically examine the scheme of Sir Leslie Scott and publish the report.

1. Dewan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao
2. Prof. G. R. Abhyanker
3. S. G. Vaze

5. This Committee appoints a sub-committee of the following members to draft a tentative scheme regarding the future Government of the States, and the adjustment of the relations of the states, interse, and their relations to the Government of India and present it to the committee by 15th July 1928.

1. Dewan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao
2. Prof. G. R. Abhyanker
3. S. G. Vaze
4. Mr. D. V. Gundappa
5. Mr. B. S. Pathik
6. Mr. N. C. Kelker
7. Mr. Manilal V. Kothari

6. In view of the proposal made by the States' Subjects Conferences held at Madras and Bombay, it is resolved after hearing Messrs V. R. Naik and R. Sharma, delegates of Madras Conference, that both the conferences be amalgamated into one central organization to be styled the Indian States Peoples Conference, and henceforward meet in annual sessions jointly at one place and that for the time being the executives of both the conferences be amalgamated and work jointly as the Executive of the central Organisation.

The Committee dispersed after making allotments of money for the publicity and organisation departments of the Conference and provincial secretaries of the Indian States Peoples Conference to carry on their respective work.

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING.

The fourth meeting of the Executive Committee of the Indian States' people's Conference was held in its Office at Ashoka Building Princess Street, Bombay, on Wednesday the 11th July 1928 under the Presidency of Sjt. A. V. Thakker. The following members were present:-

Sjt. A. V. Thakker.
„ Manilal Kothari.
„ Amritlal D. Sheth.
„ Laxmichand Doshi.
„ Manishanker Trivedi.
„ L. R. Tairsee.
„ A. L. Trivedi.
„ Motilal Sharma.
„ Manilal Mehta.
„ Niranjan Sharma.
„ Balvantrai Mehta.
„ Kannaiylal Kalyantri.
„ Jagjivan Ujamshi.

After detailed discussions the following resolution was adopted, by a majority of votes.

"In view of the impending Constitutional changes in the Status of the Indian States and the activities of some of the leading Indian Princes in connection with the work of the Butler Committee, this Committee is of the opinion that it is absolutely necessary to send a deputation to England to place the case of the people of the Indian States before the British Public. It, therefore, authorises the President of the Conference to take all necessary steps for the proper presentation of the peoples' case before the authorities concerned, and resolves to send a deputation consisting of Dewan Bahadur M. Ramchandra Rao, the President, Prof. G. R. Abhyankar the General Secretary and Mr. Amritlal D. Sheth M. L. C. to England as soon as convenient."

Sjt. Manilal Kothari, Motilal Sharma and Kannaiyalal Kalayantri who opposed the above resolution were of opinion that either the President or the General Secretary of the Conference may go to England to place the views of the people of the Indian Stales before the British Public and the remaining two members should follow later on when advised. It was further resolved to collect necessary funds for the above purpose. The proceedings terminated after passing a vote of thanks to the Chair.

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING.

The fifth meeting of the Executive Committee of the Conference was held in its office on 16th September 1928 at 4 P.M. The following mambers were present :—

(1) A. V. Patwardhan, (2) G. R. Abhyankar, (3) M. S. Trivedi, (4) S. G. Vaze, (5) S. L. Shilam, (6) B. G. Metha, (7) Manilal Kothari, (8) Niranjan Sharma, (9) Ramanarayan Chaudhery, (10) T. C. Mathur, (11) Popatlal Chudgar, (12) M. H. Mehta, (13) K. L. Kalantri and (14) A. L. Trivedi.

1. Mr. A. V. Patwardhan was voted to the Chair.

2. The proceedings of the last meeting were read and approved by the Committee after a change was made by the President at the instance of Mr. Kothari.

3. Messrs. Abhyankar and Kothari narrated their experiences and impressions about our situation as they found it at Lucknow and Simla.

4. The following resolutions were passed in modification of the previous one as regards the sending of the Deputation. "That in view of the non-representative character of the Indian States Committee its narrow terms of reference barring the legitimate voice of the people of the States, and the attitude taken up as well as the procedure adopted by it so far, this Committee apprehends that the interests of the people of the Indian States will be seriously prejudiced; this Committee resolves that it is necessary to create public opinion both in India and England on vital problems affecting the interests of the people of the States.

This Committee therefore, appoints a deputation of the following three gentlemen to proceed to England at an early date to create opinion in England on the problems of the Indian States. The Deputation will be at liberty to lead evidences even before the Butler Committee provided they are invited to do so in recognition of the inherent right of the people of the States to be heard in a matter affecting both the Princes and the people which combined forms the States :—(1) D. B. M. Rumachandra Rao, (2) Prof. G. R. Abhyankar, and (3) Mr. A. D. Sheth."

The resolution was proposed by Mr. Manishanker Trivedi and seconded by Mr. B. G. Metha. It was passed, only Mr. Kalantri dissenting.

5. It was proposed by Mr. Manishanker Trivedi that Mr. P. L. Chudgar who was willing to go to England at his own expense should be co-opted as a member of the Deputation. Mr. A. L. Trivedi seconded it. The proposal was unanimously accepted by the meeting.

6. Mr. Balvantray Mehta suggested the giving of power of co-option to the Deputation. On being opposed from several quarters this proposal was dropped.

7. The Organisation Work Sub-Committee of this Committee was requested to commence its work in earnest for constructive programme.

8. The following resolutions proposed by Prof. Abhyankar and seconded by Mr. Kothari were passed unanimously.

" Any adult person, who is a subject of an Indian State or who is interested in the Indian States, and who accepts the aims and objects of the Conference, will be eligible to be a member of this Conference, on his paying the fees of annas eight annually. "

" This Committee recommends to all the Provincial secretaries to take up the work of enrolling members in their respective Provinces.

9. " The following members were appointed to form a sub-committee to supervise the publications of the Conference.

(1). Mr. Manilal Kothari.
(2). „ Manilal H. Mehta.
(3). „ A. V. Patwardhan.
(4). „ A. D. Seth.
(5). „ S. G. Vaze.
(6). „ R. N. Chaudhery.

The office-bearers will be the ex-offico members of this Committee."

10. " This Committee expresses its sense of gratitude to the Nehru Commmittee for its labours in connection with the problem of the Indian States and approves of its recommendations regarding the same. "

11. The Committee adjourned to meet again on the following day.

12. The adjourned meeting was held on 17-9-28 at 4 P.M. at the Saradargriha, where D. B. Ramachandra Rao presided.

13. The following members were present on this occasion :—

(1) D. B. M. Ramachrndra Rao, (2) Chudgar, (3) Abhyankar (4) Vaze, (5) Chaudhery, (6) Niranjan Sharma, (7) Mahur, (8) Manishankar (9) Kalantri, (10) Kothari and (11) Balavantray.

14. The Committee decided in consultation with the representatives from Ajmer where the next session was invited to be held, that the next session of the Conference should be held in Delhi in February 1929 and it appointed the following sub-committee with power to add to its number, to make all arrangements for the same.

(1) Pathikji, (2) Kothariji, (3) Chaudhery, (4) Niranjan Sharma and (5) Balavantray.

15. " The Deputation was authorised to prepare and issue a memorandum embodying the case of the people of the States. "

The Committee dispersed after a vote of thanks to the Chairmen of both days' sittings.