

The
Bombay Provincial Liberal
Conference.

Report of the proceedings of the
1st Session held at Bombay,
1922.

THE
Bombay Provincial
Conference.

Report of the Proceedings

OF THE

1st Session held at

Bombay on 6th and 7th May 1922.



BOMBAY.



1922.

The Bombay Provincial Liberal Conference.

RESOLUTIONS

Passed at its first Session held at Bombay at the Sir Cowasji Jehangir Public Hall on the 7th and 8th May 1922,

UNDER THE PRESIDENCY OF THE

Rt. Hon. Y. S. Srinivasa Sastri P. C.

Organisation of the Liberal Party.

1. (a) That it is essential that effective measures should be taken on behalf of the Liberal Party to organise and educate the electorate of this Presidency.

(b) That with a view to carrying out the work as early as possible in an efficient and practical manner this Conference hereby appoints a Standing Working Committee consisting of the following with power to add to their number.

Proposed by—Mr. Chunilal M. Gandhi, M.L.C. (Surat).

Seconded by—Mr. H. V. Chinmulgund (Poona).

Supported by—Mr. V. N. Barve (Dhulia).

“ “ Mr. N. S. Marulkar (Satara).

“ “ Mr. M. D. Altekar (Bombay).

(Carried unanimously).

Reform Proposals.

2. This Conference earnestly urges upon the Secretary of State for India and the British Parliament the necessity of accelerating the pace for the attainment of complete Self-Government and towards that end the taking of steps for the immediate introduction of—

- (i) full responsible Government in the Provinces and
- (ii) responsibility in the Central Government in all departments except the military, political and foreign.

Proposed by—Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas, M.L.A. (Bombay).

Seconded by—Mr. P. K. Telang (Benares).

(Carried unanimously).

Maintenance of Law and Order.

3. This Conference declares its staunch adherence to the policy of attaining Self-Government by constitutional means and is of opinion that towards that end it is essential that law and order and security of life and property should be maintained in the country by all legitimate means.

Proposed by—The Hon. Mr. Phiroz C. Sethna (Bombay).

Seconded by—Rao Bahadur Ramanbhai M. Nilkanth, M.L.C. (Ahmedabad).

Supported by—Prof. V. K. Jog (Poona).

Khan Bahadur Dr. Nanavati (Ahmedabad).

(*Carried unanimously*).

The Meston Award.

4. This Conference wishes to record its strong protest against the unfair treatment meted out to the Presidency of Bombay in the financial arrangement made under the Reforms with special reference to taking over as Imperial Revenues practically the whole of the growing income-tax revenue. To saddle a Province which contains two important industrial centres and two important sea-ports with the entire resultant cost of higher standards of efficiency in the direction of maintenance of law and order, improved sanitation, technical and other forms of education, etc., and to deprive it wholly of the sources of revenue which are largely fostered by such special expenditure, cannot but be regarded as wholly inequitable. This Conference is of opinion that it is necessary for a fair financial settlement that the Presidency of Bombay should have a substantial share of growing income-tax revenue.

Proposed by—Mr. N. M. Samarth, M.L.A. (Bombay).

Seconded by—The Hon. Mr. Chunilal V. Mehta (Bombay).

(*Carried unanimously*).

Indianisation of Services.

5. This Conference strongly urges that it is essential on the grounds both of progress and of economy, that the pace of Indianisation of the Services should be accelerated.

Proposed by—The Hon. Mr. R. P. Paranjpye (Poona).

Seconded by—Rao Bahadur R. R. Kale, M.L.C. (Satara).

Supported by—Mr. Kanji Dwarkadas, M.L.C. (Bombay).

(*Carried unanimously*).

Economy in Administration.

6. This Conference urges that the Government of Bombay will continue to make strenuous efforts to economise expenditure in the administration so that a financial equilibrium may be reached as early as possible and larger sums made available for nation-building departments.

Proposed by—Mr. G. C. Bhate, M.L.C. (Kolaba).

Seconded by—Mr. S. K. Bole, M.L.C. (Bombay).

(Carried unanimously).

Status of Indians Abroad.

7. The Conference accords full support to the Resolutions adopted by the Indian Legislative Assembly in February last with regard to the equal status of Indians in South and East Africa and emphatically disapproves of the unfair policy foreshadowed by the Colonial Secretary in reference to the future administration of Kenya Colony as far as the rights and privileges of Indian settlers are concerned.

(Put from the chair and carried unanimously).

Mr. Montagu's Services.

8. This Conference puts on record its deep appreciation of the great services rendered by Mr. Montagu to this country during the period of his official connection with it, as Secretary of State and regards his resignation as a misfortune to India. The Conference further expresses its conviction that any departure from his policy towards India will have dangerous political consequences.

(Put from the chair and carried unanimously).

Removal of untouchability.

9. This Conference trusts that all possible efforts will be made to remove the stigma of untouchability which at present attaches to the so-called Depressed Classes and urges on the Government to make strong efforts for providing special facilities for education and equal chances of employment both to them and the backward classes.

Proposed by—Mr. R. G. Pradhan (Nasik).

Seconded by—Mr. S. S. Dongre (Bombay).

Supported by—Mr. Karandikar (Chiplun).

(Carried unanimously).

Military Expenditure.

10. Viewing with the greatest alarm the enormous growth of military expenditure during the last three years, which has been the principal cause of the unprecedented deficits in the budgets of the Central Government, necessitating the intolerable burden of new and enhanced taxation of 30 crores, this Conference places on record its considered opinion that it is imperative to bring down that expenditure to the level of the pre-war period. Unless the Government of India makes strenuous efforts in this important direction there will be no escape from a condition of bankruptcy, wholly calamitous to the moral and material prosperity of the country and its people.

Proposed by—The Hon. Sir Dinshaw E. Wacha.

Seconded by—The Hon. Mr. Gulam Hussein Hidayatullah, M.L.C.

Supported by—Dr. P. N. Daroowala.

(Carried unanimously).

Turkish Peace Terms.

11. This Conference strongly supports the demands of the Indian Mussalmans in regard to the revision of the Peace Treaty with Turkey and urges upon Parliament the necessity of meeting the religious requirements of the Indian Moslem Community.

(Put from the chair and carried unanimously).

Spread of Primary and Technical Education.

12. This Conference urges on the attention of Government as also the public the great need for accelerating the process of nation-building and in particular emphasizes the need for adequate financial provision for the following:—

(a) The spread of primary education on a steadily widening basis so as to meet the requirements of all sections of the people specially the communities still backward in education and the depressed or untouchable classes, accompanied by facilities of hostels, scholarships and free studentships;

(b) Spread of industrial and technical instruction among the artisan classes;

(c) Systematic improvement of agriculture in this presidency by expediting the construction of the larger irrigation works now proceeding, and by undertaking similar works;

(d) Encouragement and stimulation of Cottage industries on co-operative lines which would supplement small agricultural incomes.

(e) The development of forests and the exploitation of their products for industrial and commercial purposes.

Proposed by—Mr. G. K. Devadhar (Poona).

Seconded by—Mr. T. A. Kulkarni (Bombay).

Supported by—Mr. Katkade (Bombay).

(Carried unanimously).

Vote of thanks to the President.

Proposed by Sir Gokuldas K. Parekh (Bombay).

Seconded by the Hon'ble Mr. Cowasji Jehangir (Junior)
(Bombay).

(Carried with acclamation).

The Bombay Provincial Liberal Conference.

FIRST DAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

The Bombay Provincial Liberal Conference assembled in Bombay on Saturday, the 6th May 1922 at the Sir Cowasji Jehangir Public Hall. The Hall was filled by the delegates from almost all parts of the presidency and the Visitors who occupied the gallery. Precisely at 1-30 p.m., the Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, P.C., the President-elect of the Conference, arrived and was received at the entrance by the Hon'ble Sir Dinshaw Edulji Wacha, Chairman of the Reception Committee and other office-bearers of the Conference. On his appearing on the platform he received a hearty ovation from the assembly.

Among those seated on the platform besides the Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri and the Hon'ble Sir Dinshaw E. Wacha, were the Hon. Sir Ibrahim Rahimtulla, the Hon. Sir Chimanlal H. Setalvad, the Hon. Mr. R. P. Paranjpye, the Hon. Mr. C. V. Mehta, the Hon. Mr. Gulam Hussein Hidayatulla, the Hon. Mr. Cowasji Jehangir, Sir Stanley Reed, Sir Goculdas K. Parekh, Dr. R. A. Hume, Mr. A. H. Byrt, the Hon. Mr. Lallubhai Samaldas, the Hon. Mr. Phiroze C. Sethna, Mr. Salebhoy C. Barodawala, Mr. N. M. Joshi, Mr. N. M. Samarth, Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas, Mr. Kanji Dwarkadas, Rao Bahadur R. M. Nilkanth, Mr. C. M. Gandhi, Rao Bahadur R. R. Kale, Mr. P. K. Telang, Mr. D. G. Dalvi, Mr. G. K. Devdhar, Mr. C. M. Cursetji, Mr. K. Natarajan, Dr. V. C. Gokhale, Mr. Rustom K. R. Cama, Mr. N. V. Gokhale, Mr. G. K. Gadgil, Mr. Mahomedbhoy Hajibhoy, Major C. Fernandes and others.

Besides the members of the Conference seated on the platform there were members of the Reception Committee and delegates from all parts of the Presidency who occupied the orchestra stalls of the Hall. The total number of those who attended the Conference as members thereof was computed to be more than 350. Among them were well-known representatives of the Hindu, Mahomedan, Parsi and Indian Christian communities and a notable feature of the Conference was the presence therein of the representatives of the "Depressed classes" who mustered very strong at the Conference.

Commencement of the Proceedings.

The Hon. Sir Dinshaw Edulji Wacha, Chairman of the Reception Committee, rose amidst loud applause. His address of welcome to the delegates assembled was read for him by Mr. N. M. Samarth.

Sir Dinshaw Wacha's Address.

BROTHER DELEGATES,

On behalf of the Reception Committee of the first Provincial Conference, initiated by the Western India National Liberal Association, let me offer you a hearty welcome and express their grateful thanks for your prompt and sympathetic response to their invitation. Your presence is proof positive of the keen interest you take in the burning problems of the day touching your Presidency and the earnest and patriotic spirit in which you are prepared to solve them. Political questions, of course, have naturally occupied for the moment greater attention owing to the country passing away from the old order of things to the new. But there are other problems of supreme, if not greater, moment involving the social and economic welfare of the people.

Financial Embarrassments and Ossas of Deficits.

2. It is indeed a most unfortunate circumstance that at the very threshold of the new reformed constitution, each Presidency and Province should have been confronted with formidable financial embarrassments, resulting in serious deficits and leading to animated discussions in their respective legislature, notably in Bengal, Bombay and the United Provinces. Independent of internal politics and the dismal factor of economic depression all over the world, it is needful to bear in mind that part of the grievous financial morass into which the Central Government has been plunged is of its own creation. It has not a little aggravated the difficulties created by the other internal and external factors. Its reflex influence on the finances of the Provinces was inevitable. The resultant consequence has been that the provincial administrations were unable to balance income and expenditure without divers shifts and stopgaps, every way undesirable. The Central Government, to my mind, and I have to say it with regret, has to a considerable extent reaped the bitter fruit of the sad lack of that strict vigilance and economy which were needed. It was owing to that want of argus-eyed watchfulness that expenditure, specially of an absolutely unproductive character, was allowed to run for years past at a considerably faster ratio than warranted by the slow growth of a somewhat inelastic revenue. I studiously refrain from

entering into particulars to conclusively demonstrate the correctness of my statement. I had, however, sufficiently diagnosed it in my observations in the Council of State on the occasion of the budget discussion a few short weeks ago. The colossal deficits of an unprecedented character have necessitated the intolerable burden of new and enhanced taxation of wellnigh 30 crores. Excessive taxation, accompanied by high tariff, is extremely undesirable in any Government purporting to administer its finances on sound principles. For such taxation and tariff can only spell financial suicide of a Government in the long run. For, it should be remembered that after all, apart from agricultural revenue, the bulk of revenue derived by a great and flourishing State depends on the prosperous condition of a people's commerce and industry. The greater the satisfactory development of those strong resources the greater in that proportion will be the revenue for purposes of defraying the expenses of administration on objects of the highest public utility and welfare. To seriously cripple and undermine those fountain sources by intolerable taxation and still more intolerable tariffs is, I repeat, equivalent to committing financial suicide. In short, to use a homely phrase, it signifies the killing of the goose that lays the golden eggs. It is, therefore, to be sincerely hoped that those who are vigorously urging the Central Government to impose high protective tariffs without an observant eye to the many conflicting surrounding circumstances and persistent world-competition and without any thought of the far-reaching evil consequences arising therefrom will moderate their enthusiasm. Their patriotism might be admired but it should be a reasoned patriotism rather than a blind one which spells the very negation of that estimable virtue. Till the end of the great war it was generally accepted as an economic maxim that expenditure depended on policy. But the debacle of the finances all over the world caused by that disastrous conflict has fully exploded its fallacy. It is now recognised by practical financiers and economists alike that after all the policy of a great State must depend on the expenditure which it can conveniently afford. Otherwise, the inevitable in the way of Ossas of deficit must mount up.

Heavy Taxation and Crippling of the Capital of Country.

3. You, gentlemen of this Provincial Conference, should seriously consider the difficult financial problem as to how your Presidency should balance its revenue with expenditure in the immediate future. No doubt the Government have, in the first instance, to rely on the income allocated

to them under the so-called transferred subjects. But these have, as you are aware, been already discovered to be inadequate to carry out the growing needs and requirements of the administration with the utmost efficiency combined with economy, beset as they have been, and will be, from all quarters by larger and larger demands for sanitation, extended education, industrial development, social welfare and those other objects of a productive character, morally and materially. Side by side each Presidency and Province has bitterly protested against the statutory mandate which obliges it to pay its respective quota as specially determined by the Meston Committee. The allocations were unfortunately based on erroneous data which were pointed out at the time but to no avail. It should be your duty, in the first instance, and of your representatives in the Bombay Legislative Council, next, to seriously consider these knotty questions of finance in all their diversified aspects with a view to assisting and co-operating with the Government in placing the presidential finances on a sound footing which will enable that authority to carry on their future administration with tolerable efficiency. In this connection it is a matter of satisfaction to learn that His Excellency the Viceroy with commendable promptitude and solicitude had very recently the advantage of learning the considered views of some of the highest officials and experts on the subject ; and it is to be reasonably presumed that the Committee of the Legislature will have the benefit of being acquainted with those views. Your representatives in the Legislative Council should act as watch dogs. Some sacrifices will, of course, have to be made as your provincial autonomy is perfected, demanding larger sources of revenue for the realisation of that efficiency. It has been now conclusively demonstrated that modern self-governing States of a progressive character must spend larger and larger sums for all purposes of better social and economic welfare. And sound finance, it is superfluous for me to say, is the backbone of all such States. There can be no good and efficient government with decrepit finance.

Sound Finance Means a Sound Government,

4. The finance of your country ought to be administered in the future with greater regard to the general good than to vested interests. As you know the welfare of all the nations of the world at present depends on the restoration of their economic stability and of the reopening of the channels of their international trade. As Mr. M'ckenna, an able Ex-chancellor, and at present the chairman of the gigantic

Midland Bank, observed only the other day in his speech that high State expenditure must be condemned. "The present scale of taxation is so high as to undermine our national business enterprise and to deprive us of an indispensable capital." I absolutely differ from those who airily assert that India is "lightly taxed." I emphatically say that compared to her annual national income it is heavily taxed. But gentlemen, remember also that mere reduction of taxation will not do. Reduction in taxation is *not* synonymous with adequate economy in expenditure and the production of a sound healthy budget. In this connection touching India's disordered finances, I would request you, gentlemen, to read, mark, and inwardly digest the exceedingly sound and sagacious article on the subject which appeared on the 27th April in the columns of the *Times of India* which has so ably rendered yeoman's service at this critical juncture to Indian Finance and Politics. But as we are in a transition stage, it is imperative on the Government and people alike to strive to build up sound finance with patience and prudence and in close friendly consultation with the Central Government, bearing always in mind the ability of the tax-payer. But a broad treatment of these several essential problems which agitate the public mind and which are not infrequently brought on the anvils of diverse legislative bodies properly falls within the scope of the address of your eloquent President, whom, I dare say, you will all congratulate on his elevation as a Privy Councillor. I feel confident that the Right Hon'ble Mr. Sastri will be able to do ample justice to some, if not all, of those burning provincial topics within the limit of the time at his command, fortified by his accumulated experience of the last seven years as a member of the Imperial Legislature. I shall, therefore, confine myself to rivetting your attention for only a few minutes on two matters only on which, I feel, I can appropriately hang my parable.

Initial Success of The Reform Act.

5. You are well aware how since the Reform Act of 1919 has come into active operation the various legislatures constituted under its provisions have been working in right earnest with fair success. From a pretty close study of their proceedings, I have come to the conclusion that the important work which immediately demands the greatest consideration and activity on the part of the Liberal Party generally is of a two-fold character. For it will be on the satisfactory accomplishment of that work will greatly depend the qualitative character of the diverse legislatures during the period of transition. Their average efficiency will

be the test by which they will be allowed larger powers and responsibilities in self-government.

Two Fundamental Questions.

6. The two fundamental questions in connection with the Councils on which I wish to draw your earnest attention for early practical action are these. Firstly, the expediency of instituting a full and complete system of organisation under the wise guidance and direction of earnest and enthusiastic workers, well experienced in the public life of the country. Secondly, a systematic method of educating the electorates the majority of whom are semi-illiterate or illiterate, on well-conceived, well defined and practical lines. This ignorant mass of voters under the reformed constitution need to be so instructed as to make them thoroughly conversant with the rights and privileges conferred on them by the new Charter of Self-government, and how to use them with a wise discretion so as to return such representatives to the Legislatures as shall faithfully echo their sentiments and feelings, and urge successfully for a redress of their legitimate grievances and disabilities. These representatives should also be men capable, from their knowledge and experience, to take soberly and constitutionally the initiative in bringing forward measures conducive to the substantial progress of the people socially and economically. Constructive, not nihilistic, measures are needed. For as the proverb goes :—“ *Ex nihilo nihil fit*”.

Causes which led to the disintegration of English Liberals and Conservatives.

7. As regards organisation and equipment, it would not be considered out of place, I believe, if I refer here to some cardinal faults which were found some 35 years ago in Great Britain with regard to the two great historical parties, namely, the Liberal and the Conservative. It was owing mainly to those faults that both the parties came to grief in turn one after the other. Older members of the Conference cannot be unaware of them, and if I specially recall them in this place it is with the sole view of giving an early warning to avoid falling into similar errors, more or less. The following were considered as the chief defects of party organisation at the time :—

- (1) Non-representative character of many an association affiliated.
- (2) Defective system of work at General Elections.
- (3) Dangerous practice of circulating mere machine-made opinions,

- (4) Indifference of the majority of the associations to the political and social condition of the rank and file of each party.
- (5) Lack of any methodical system of political education.
- (6) Want of organised method of appointing work and responsibility among individuals.

**Wanted the Very Best Men of Mature Experience
and Wide Knowledge.**

8. I have specified the chief defects that were found in party organisation in order that the Indian Liberal Party at least, which advocates steady progress on sober, sound and constitutional lines, may steer clear of identical faults which for a time had disintegrated both the great English parties. In order that Indian Liberals may become really helpful to the country and be a power and influence for good, it is essential that at this initial stage in self-Government, to form Committees of the very best men of mature experience and wide knowledge in public affairs who may be available to devise a system which shall aim at making the Liberal Party an instrument for the better progress of the country on the lines just indicated. On my part I would crave leave to submit for your consideration the following points which I deem greatly conducive to the fulfilment of the aims and objects of the Liberal Party :—

1. Full representation of the masses of the party, that is, the rank and file, by the body elected to control party affairs.
2. Simplification of machinery to be adopted at elections.
3. Ability to reach directly, with a minimum of trouble, the rank and file of the party, specially for eliciting genuine popular opinion.
4. Appointment of a large number of the party of definite duties and responsibilities. There should be a prevention of that indefinite allocation which signifies that everybody's business is nobody's business.
5. Definite ascertainment by all available means of the opinion of individual members of intelligence of the electorates.
6. Constant keeping alive of an intelligent interest in public questions among the bulk of the party.
7. Provision of simple but efficient machinery for practical education. This is above all *the* most important of all considerations.

I refrain from further discoursing on the aforesaid points. I am, however, not unmindful of the fact, from my long experience, that such work as just specified is uphill and almost new in some respects. But unless Indian Liberals are in earnest and keen on the ordered development and progress of political life in this country on the best model, all efforts, more or less of a desultory character, will be of no avail.

No Compromise of Liberal Principles.

9. Leading members of the party should put their shoulders to the wheel. Self-help, rightly directed, is bound to bring fair success in the long run. At this stage I hope you will permit me to recall to your memory what a majority of you have no doubt learnt about party principles. It has long been recognised in Great Britain that the fundamental principle for which a party stands must never be allowed to be cast to the winds. There may be groups under each party. These may entertain their individual opinions and interests. But it is understood that on crucial occasions, where principles are at stake, groups must subordinate their individual opinions, in order to support wholeheartedly the principles for which the party is pledged. Gambetta once shrewdly observed that parties represent principles based on great ideals, while groups only stand for interests. Again, while there can be compromise on matters of details there never can be any compromise of principles. This maxim has been most ably and lucidly demonstrated, as you are aware, by that accomplished statesman and seer, Viscount Morley.

Sir Courtney Ilbert's Opinion on the Outstanding Feature of Reform Act.

10. Again, I hope you will permit me to tarry a little on another feature of the British parties. It is essential to bear in mind that the British are a homogeneous nation. Not so the Indian people. The Act of 1919, which in a way is monumental of the genius of the Anglo-Saxon race for government, is the outcome of the practical sagacity and cautious conservatism of Parliament. A British Parliament *alone* could have solved, to however limited an extent, the difficult and complicated problem of welding the heterogeneous elements of which the Indian community is composed into a united whole for the purposes of advancing their common political welfare. In his very interesting and instructive lectures on the Reform Act of 1919, recently delivered to the students of the London University, that sterling friend of India and a high authority on Constitutions generally, Sir Courtney Ilbert, was careful enough to indicate

the most outstanding feature which is to be discerned under our new Constitution in the drafting of which he had no little share. It is "not rigid but very elastic, so that continuous progress can be made without frequent amendments demanding an appeal to Parliament". It would show a sad lack of political instinct and sagacity on the part of the Liberals to demand at the very threshold of the operation of the Constitution, tinkering and amendments of little or no consequence. Preceptancy in this matter is to be avoided at all hazards as it will only signify ultimate disaster. The Liberals should never allow themselves to play in the hands of those who wish it to be incontinently wrecked.

Indianisation Certain—But Slow and Sure.

11. The Act recognises that in future Indian political and economic development shall proceed on Indian lines. Indianisation of all branches of the Administration is bound to be accomplished. However the bureaucracy, who still cling to their vested interests, may do their best, as there are signs to be generally noticed, to retard its steady realisation, it is inevitable that it should be an accomplished fact. The popular tide in the direction is unmistakably rising and it is only a question of time when the firmness, tact and sober judgment on the part of the popular representatives, may bring it to a complete fruition. That an irreducible number of picked and most experienced Englishmen will have to be retained for a long time cannot be gainsaid. For, say what we will, there is no denying the fact that the help of the most brainy of British administrative experts will be essential till self-government has arrived at the stage of its vigorous manhood. But there is not the least doubt in my own mind that the Act, with all its imperfections (no human constitution has hitherto been known to be perfect) provides the machinery towards that end. It is so devised that in due course conditions will be created which will enable Indians to work out their own national salvation as a free and self-governing people. I am sure none would venture to deny this fact. I repeat I have not the least doubt in my own mind that the self-government to which Indians ardently aspire, in consequence of the national awakening that has been steadily going on since 1885, and notably since the introduction of the Morley-Minto Reforms, is bound to be realised, provided Indians are true to themselves and make every legitimate effort for the success of the Act. Care and caution, however, shall have to be taken that the change proceeds on lines of ordered progress. There should not be any sharp and sudden dislocation of machinery which in its consequences may prove

catastrophic. Just as in the economic world it has been recognised that a sudden deflation of currency needs to be avoided at all costs and hazard lest a financial crisis with panic may ensue, so, too, in the matter of political changes of a radical character.

**President Washington on the Danger of
Unintelligent Citizenship.**

12. It will be naturally asked when may the change be beneficially realised? I venture to reply not until every village and hamlet, every town and city, and every district and province is thoroughly educated to understand the fundamental object underlying the Statute. This, in reality, brings me to my second point, namely, the education of the illiterate mass of electors. It is needless to say, what is so well-known to you all, that the agencies at present directed towards the education of the uneducated are inadequate. We recognise that during the last five years and more, Government have been awakened to their solemn duty to widely spread elementary education, voluntary or compulsory, among the masses, and that they promise to do a great deal more in this direction as soon as their finances are put in order and in a sound condition. Illiteracy in voters signifies, at least in India, unintelligent citizenship. Years ago, President Washington was confronted, though in a lesser degree, with the same unintelligent citizenship in the United States. He was not slow to warn the country of the danger likely to arise from the exercise of political power by uninformed classes. He observed:—"In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened opinion". Such being the case it goes without saying that the paramount duty of the Liberals should be to devise all possible means of removing the illiteracy of masses of voters and so to instruct their intelligence that they can discriminate as to whom they should vote as representatives to the Legislatures.

Disraeli's Dictum "Educate your Masters."

13. You are no doubt familiar with the epigram of Benjamin Disraeli to educate the party, that is, the masters of the legislators. Liberals have need to bear in mind that saying of Disraeli at the present juncture. The masters of the legislators are the voters who send representatives to the Councils. But they are wholly illiterate or semi-illiterate and have to be patiently and perseveringly educated in order to

send representatives whom they can rely upon to faithfully echo their sentiments and feelings and to right their wrongs. You may depend upon it, gentlemen, that in the degree Liberals educate their rank and file to understand their rights and privileges and how to use them with wisdom and circumspection, they will succeed as a party and will be potent for good throughout the country.

Concluding Exhortation.

14. It is obvious therefore that the Liberal Party should bestir themselves from now to begin earnestly to organise themselves for that important fundamental purpose. I am at the end of my journey in this life after having devoted the best of my ability and light for well-nigh half a century to the service of my city and country. I feel I must now doff the armour I have worn so long. But I have deep and abiding faith in our Liberal creed, and that you, gentlemen, who have subscribed to that creed, will not disperse before placing on record your resolution on this subject. I am confident that in the Liberal ranks there are to be found at the present juncture "strong minds, great hearts, true faith and ready hands" to carry on this great national work. I now resume my seat only requesting you to firmly bear in mind those sterling lines of Tennyson :—

Men, my brothers, men the workers,
Ever reaping some thing new,
That which they have done but earnest
For the things they will do.

Mr. N. M. Joshi, one of the Hon. Secretaries then read telegrams and letters received from people who were unavoidably absent.

Formal Resolution requesting the President-elect to take the Chair.

The Hon. Sir Dinshaw Wacha then called upon the Hon. Sir Chimanlal Setalvad to move the formal resolution that the Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, P.C., do take the Presidential Chair of the Conference.

The Hon. Sir C. H. Setalvad in moving the election of the Right Hon. Mr. Sastri as President, said :—I have great pleasure in proposing that the Right Hon. Srinivas Sastri be asked to preside over the present Session of the Bombay Provincial Liberal Conference. You are well aware of the circumstances under which the Liberal Party was emerged

as a distinct and living political party in the country. When the Government of India Act of 1919 was passed, although the reforms thereby inaugurated did not come up to the demands made by the Liberal Party and were considered by them inadequate, they accepted them as a substantial step forward in the direction of full responsible Government and decided to work them in that spirit. They, therefore, entered the Councils and took upon themselves the responsibility and the heavy burden of doing the spade work and of putting the new constitution in working order. Having thus undertaken the task of making the new reforms a success and of leading the country to full responsible Government as early as possible by all constitutional methods, the Liberal Party had openly and unhesitatingly to part company with another party that came into existence and whose avowed object was and is to make Government impossible; and whose principles and programme were inevitably bound to lead to bloodshed, anarchy and confusion thus destroying all hope of orderly progress and early realisation of Dominion Status by this country.

Frantic Appeals.

Frantic appeals have been recently made to join all parties, but I venture to say that there is such a fundamental and radical difference of principles and methods between the two parties, that it is impossible for the Liberals to associate with any persons or party who are not prepared to adopt strictly constitutional methods and want to make Government impossible. Events have shown the wisdom of the Liberal Party in deciding to accept the new constitution as the first instalment and to work it loyally. You have only to look to the achievements of the various Provincial Councils and the Legislative Assembly and the Council of State during the short period of about a year and a half of their existence during which in spite of obloquy and abuse they have by hard work, tact and judgment persevered in doing their duty. They have insisted upon and succeeded in effecting retrenchment and the Central Legislatures have by exercise of their constitutional powers and pressure of healthy public opinion secured the repeal of obnoxious repressive laws like the Press Act, the Rowlatt Act and the like. And while speaking of the successful work of the Council, I must bear testimony to the fact that the members of the Civil Service have—certainly in this Province—played the game and have loyally assisted by their knowledge and experience the Council and the Ministers in the discharge of their difficult and responsible duties.

What Liberal Party Stands For.

And I venture to say that it is up to us and our representatives to see that while in power we behave in such a manner as will inspire confidence that we will treat the public services fairly and justly in every manner. The Liberal Party stands for early realisation of complete responsible Government by all constitutional means, for fiscal autonomy for this country, for the development of its trade, commerce and industries, recognition of equal status for Indians all over the Empire, for securing an early peace with Turkey on just and equitable terms such as would satisfy the Islamic sentiments in the matter, the uplifting and proper treatment and equal opportunities for the backward and depressed classes and for unity among all classes, Hindus, Mahomedans, Parsis, Christians, Brahmins and Non-Brahmins. The Liberal Party also stands for maintainance of law and order and security of property for it is convinced that the attainment of responsible Government can only be secured early by a rigorous maintainance of tranquility and security in the land. And I am sure that all members of the party whether in or out of office, whether in the Councils or outside, will maintain those principles. Ladies and gentlemen, we cannot choose a better person to preside over us to-day than my friend the Right Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri who has rendered such excellent services to the motherland in various capacities.

The Hon. Mr. Phiroze C. Sethna in seconding the proposition said :—

I have been called upon to second this resolution. I rise to do so with great gratification. I am sure there are many in this large gathering who have known the Rt. Hon. Srinivasa Sastri for a much longer period than I have. I made his acquaintance for the first time at a gathering similar to this four years ago at the Excelsior Theatre in this city on the occasion of the first All-India Moderate Conference. That acquaintance, I hope Mr. Sastri will not consider it presumptuous on my part to say, has ripened into friendship,—a friendship by which of course I am the richer. The choice of the Presidentship of this Conference could not have fallen upon anyone better equipped from considerations of personality, knowledge in affairs or ability as a speaker.

Mr. Sastri possesses a charming personality. All those who come in his contact cannot but admire him for to know him is to love him. From his youth upwards he has worked hard in the interests of the

Servants of India Society and he must have endeared himself very greatly to his colleagues both by his temperament and by his ability to have been elected by them as their leader in succession to the late lamented Mr. Gokhale. Mr. Gokhale's mantle could not have fallen upon worthier shoulders for like him, Mr. Sastri is simple in heart and life and a devoted and unselfish servant of the State. He has for years been a prominent figure in the political arena of this country and has always been found to maintain the cause of liberty of peace and of reasoned progress and he has most vigorously opposed all unconstitutional methods of agitation. He is one of that small group of stalwarts like our esteemed Chairman Sir D. E. Wacha on this side of India, like Sir Surendranath Banerjea in Bengal and others in the country to whom may be said to have been entrusted the saving—and after that saving has been effected, the safeguarding of the interests of the Liberal party. As a speaker he has few equals amongst us and his eloquence would do credit to anyone even in the hall of St. Stephen's. The most powerful weapon in his oratorical armoury is the lucidity with which he marshalls his facts and those who have had the privilege of working on the same Councils with him will bear testimony to the fact that some of the ablest officials have been known to quail under his powers of denunciation.

With an established reputation he went to England last year to represent India at the Imperial Conference and later on to Genoa and Washington. He did uncommonly well wherever he was deputed and if he enhanced his own reputation he was thereby the means of raising throughout the civilized world the reputation of India and Indians generally. In casting my eyes around me here I do not think I see anyone who was in the historic Guildhall of London on that morning towards the end of July of last year when the Freedom of the City of London was conferred on Mr. Sastri. As a personal witness I may inform you, ladies and gentlemen, that after he had finished his stirring address Mr. Sastri was cheered to the echo and the clapping of hands did not cease for full five minutes, and it made us the few Indians who were present on the occasion feel proud of our countryman for the respect in which he was held by the distinguished gathering of English people who had filled the hall to its utmost capacity to hear him. On another occasion at the Shakespeare Hut where also I was present and where Mr. Sastri addressed some hundreds of Indian students there were many young men who had come determined to hiss and hoot and who did so at first but were loudest in their appreciation after Mr. Sastri replied to all criticisms and it was certainly a case of those who came to scoff remained to pray.

As is not unusual, Mr. Sastri has been criticised severely but very unfairly by those who will not see eye to eye with us in politics. We may well say of him.

He who hath mingled in the fray
Of duty that the brave endure

Must have made foes. If he has none
Small is the work that he has done.

Because in the discharge of his duties his work has not been small but large, it is no wonder if his critics are many but unfortunately their criticisms are not honest and are the outcome of passion and prejudice. In this very morning's issue of a local English daily a correspondent calls Mr. Sastri's achievements in Europe as nothing more than "airy". In the same paper to-day in a leaderette in which is said that Mr. Sastri "waxes more and more eloquent about his own indispensibility. One would not mind the man's extraordinary vanity which has mesmerised him into the belief that he is a new Messiah." Those who know Mr. Sastri and the good work he has done cannot but characterise such statements as base calumny. All fair-minded people look upon Mr. Sastri as one of the greatest of living Indians and the Conference will be honouring itself in electing him to preside over its deliberations.

Rao Bahadur R. R. Kale of Satara and Rao Bahadur Ramanbhai M. Nilkanth of Ahmedabad supported the proposition, which was carried with acclamation and the Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri was inducted into the Presidential chair.

The Presidential Address.

The Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, who, on rising, received an ovation, said:—

SIR DINSHAW WACHA, BROTHER DELEGATES,

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—

It is a great privilege, for which I cannot be too thankful, to preside over the proceedings of this Conference. I am under a great debt to my friend Sir C. Setalvad for the generous terms in which he has referred to me and to my qualifications for this office. As to Mr. Pheroze Sethna, I really do not know what to say. I had never realised that to his many accomplishments he added the faculty of unmitigated adulation, and

I have no doubt an intelligent audience like you will know how to discount the praise, which he has so generously bestowed on me, as proceeding from the gross partiality of friendship.

Ladies and gentlemen, I must begin with a word of apology both to the Conference and to the press for the fact that I am unable to read a written address, not from lack of will, but altogether, believe me, from lack of time. It would have been so convenient to everybody. It would have saved you the strain of attention and to me it would have been much saving of time as well. But it has not been possible and no one can regret it more than I do.

Then I have a word to say about the subject on which I am about to address you. I could have wished that it were possible for me to speak to you on those various details of administration in Bombay upon which, doubtless, your deepest feelings are engaged. But in the first place I am not equipped sufficiently well with the necessary knowledge, and in the second place I am afraid I should render myself open to very serious criticism if I avoided deliberately the one topic which, I take it, is in the minds of the whole of the people of this country, namely, the present situation, and what to do in the immediate future to relieve it.

There is just another word of preliminary interest which I must utter. I have not had the time to consult friends of the Liberal party all over the country. I have not therefore the moral authority of the Liberal party in the views that I shall express and must ask you to remember that these views are my own and I do not commit you to them at all. On the contrary you will see perhaps that in more than one matter my views conflict with those that may result from your deliberations and it will be my pleasure, as it will be my duty to adjust myself to those views that come out of your deliberations so far as it is compatible with my conscience.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, it will not be an exaggerated way of putting the question if I ask you just to consider whether there is peace amongst us to-day, peace not from the circumstance of war, but peace from the circumstance of civil disturbance. Perhaps you will at once think of the distinction, natural enough, between outward and inward peace. And while some of you may think that there is the appearance of peace on the surface, there is in reality nothing like that peace of heart, that contentment, that satisfaction which we describe as really the inward peace of the soul. That there is not, but just one preliminary doubt. Is there really any full-blown outward peace amongst

us? I remember quite well, while coming on board, just before landing, in Bombay, being racked with anxiety as to what might be taking place in this country in consequence of the arrests that were proceeding. It was then a matter of as great relief as of surprise to be told that the peace of the country, had not been outwardly disturbed. The thankfulness of my heart at that time knew no bounds, and when I asked the people the reason, they felt equally surprised, in fact they were very divided as to the reason. With the actual reason we are not concerned, but we are all I think profoundly grateful that those days should have passed without adding to the great troubles with which we had been beset some time ago. But then, one hears now and then, although without much emphasis or conviction, of a possible resumption of a campaign of civil disobedience. I take it that, Liberals as we are, not knowing the secrets of the non-co-operation movement, we still believe that that talk need not be taken altogether seriously; that outward peace is really established is my conviction. And now, if outward peace is established, the next question is, how we of this party should co-operate with others in the country in order to convert this outward peace into an inward and lasting peace. I have no doubt that we have suffered enough by division and should stand to gain enormously if we could promise ourselves a decade or two in advance of perfect contentment and order and progress. Now, it seems to me that in order that we may consider that question with absolute freedom, we should, even at the risk of doing an unpleasant task, consider the nature of the movement of which the outward activity has now ceased and which may be said to lie down to-day under the exhaustion of a great effort. It is not my purpose at all to stir up dispute or to utter a word which might give rise to an embittered controversy, but certainly we Liberals have to make up our minds as to the character of the movement of which for the moment we see a suspension.

Now, the non-co-operation movement, let me say at the outset (and this word proceeds I need not tell you from my heart), has had the exceptional advantage of having from the very start functioned under the guidance of one whose character is above cavil and whose motives are beyond suspicion. (Cheers.) Such a movement naturally enjoyed a great advantage and I must now proceed to give here again an un-affected tribute to the way in which its great prestige and popularity were lent, although for the time being only, to the great social causes that we all have at heart, the question for example of the elevation of the depressed classes, the removal of untouchability, the question of temperance, including now-a-days that of prohibition, and the all-comprehensive

subject, no less dear to our hearts than to those of others, that of Swadeshi. May I yet again proceed to record in equally sincere terms my admiration of the way in which this movement has carried to the remotest parts of the country the gospel of Swaraj, the way in which it has evoked the patriotic sense of our young people and upheld to them the high duty of sacrifice on behalf of the motherland? But, now, ladies and gentlemen, I must mention over against this some of the harm that this movement has caused amidst us and I do it in sorrow rather than in anger or in a spirit of recrimination.

You will pardon me then if I mention these things *seriatim* without making much comment, but just enumerating them as I pass along. This movement has caused the destruction of much valuable property, public and private. It has caused the loss of many a life, it has indirectly been the means of the deprivation of the liberties of nearly 20,000 of our fellow-countrymen; it has strengthened the hands of the executive who now employ the forces of repression almost without restraint; it has increased, rather I would say it has given more than a decent excuse for, the maintenance (and an increase even) of the military burdens of our land; it has caused outbursts of ill-feeling as between races and as between communities almost unparalleled in the history of this sore-stricken land. Strange to say, so far as a part of my own Presidency is concerned, it has not merely imperilled as it might have in other parts of the country, it has torn up by the root such friendly understanding as existed between the Hindu and the Muslim. Then it has been the indirect occasion of manifesting to the world how some of our people, when excited by angry passions, can be guilty of acts of cruelty and barbarity, scarcely compatible with that character for spirituality which we wish to establish amongst the nations of the world, scarcely compatible with the contribution which so many patriotic sons of India desire to make to the story of human civilization. Then again, strange as it may appear, it has enormously increased such slave mentality as existed before it in this country. It has demonstrated that our common people are lacking in the practical sense and political instinct which might protect them against any crude and ill-balanced propaganda. Likewise it has manifested on a scale that I have never seen before the disparity between profession and practice (hear, hear) which one occasionally sees in political matters, but which became palpable in the non-co-operation programme for the first time; witness the boycott of schools and colleges and courts and councils, acclaimed by tens of thousands of people, which was followed, happily enough from my point of view, but unhappily from the point

of view of national character, by singularly little performance. Then it has produced amongst the people at large a curious psychology. You now have people, young and old, villagers and townsmen, men and women, falling into the habit of excessive pessimism in their estimate of things; and on every occasion when they wish to show their dissatisfaction they show it by saying that they must boycott, they must non-co-operate, they must do nothing, in fact a doctrine which cannot be described as anything else than a translation into our political life of the old Buddhist doctrine of perfect negation, to detach yourself from life by doing as little as possible, by doing nothing and getting away and further away from Karma. That is the spirit which is brought amongst us to-day, and I do not think it makes an addition to our national character of promises much vigorous effort for our future. Then it has spread a spirit of revolt and undermined those foundations, which wise people are careful to instil and foster, of obedience to law and order. Above my complaint against the movement is this that, starting with the idea of undeniable grievances from which the people suffered and for which the Government is responsible, professing to hit the Government and save the people, it has throughout and every time hit the people more and more (applause), much like an ignorant mother who finding her child beaten by her neighbours brings it home and belabours it still more saying, "Why did you move out of your place? Take this and this and this."

That, gentlemen, is putting the balance right, what the non-co-operation movement has brought the people to. If we are to progress safely and surely in the future, it is our duty apart from blaming anybody, it is our duty to see that nothing occurs in the political atmosphere of which the initiative may be with the Government or with you or me or anybody, that nothing occurs, that nothing is done in any quarter which may threaten the revival of an activity of this sort. Our duty then is to see, as I said before, how to deepen and confirm and fortify from all sides that outward peace which we see established, until it should become real and lasting peace.

Now anybody may see at once you cannot have peace in the country by any means so long as there is any acute grievance. Following the old principle of Bacon, to cure sedition you have to remove the matter of sedition. Now I am sorry to think that this simple prescription is by no means so easy of operation as it appears. I wish it were possible for you and for me by a resolution duly recorded here to dissipate these

grievances. But it is not. We are unhappily living in conditions when grievances have a way of fortifying themselves, when vested interests grow around them with the enormous facilities for propaganda for evil as well as for good, and you have the curious spectacle of generations of effort being required before a grievance acknowledged on all sides could be removed.

I will give you one or two instances. What could be a longer or a more real grievance than the exclusion of our capable young lads from office in the military ranks? In our previous history such a thing has not been known. In the history of other empires such a thing is not known but in the history of the British Empire it is a sore rankling, a fostering evil. How often have we protested against it? How often have authorities admitted that it was a grievance, that it was a grievance that must be removed and that it would sooner or later be removed? It is now five years since a solemn pronouncement was made by Imperial authorities that that grievance shall not be hereafter. Still the first serious step has to be taken towards the removal of it. The fact is, ladies and gentlemen, if you will permit me to remind you of a hard fact, however unpleasant it may be, that there are such things as vested interests and when they grow round an evil, whether it is in India or elsewhere, they take long to remove. They cause so much tribulation, they make us pass for long periods through the valley of humiliation and bitterness, but to lose heart is not the way of vigorous people. We believe at last that this great grievance is now really on the eve of removal. It will take time to accomplish; but surely, as I am speaking to you from this platform, even this grievance, which has baffled our efforts for a generation, is at last on the way to redress.

Then take such a simple matter in our own society as widow-remarriage. How much effort have we put into it? How many hearts have suffered and probably been broken? How many lives have been marred? How often have audiences been moved to tears and to solemn promises for removing it in the future and yet those enthusiastic audiences have gone back to their usual environments and felt that the callousness that was in the air overpowered them. The anguish of the heart for the moment is there, we feel it for the time and then forget even the great promises that we made; and yet we must admit that a great deal has been done even in this slow-moving country to remove the widow-remarriage grievance. True I know that enthusiastic advocates of this cause who will scarcely consent to be satisfied with the rate of progress. Nevertheless the apostles, whose advocacy has enshrined this cause in our hearts, have

not lost hope and they go on from year to year, toiling steadily upward maintained and upheld by the thought that good work in this direction as in any other will never be totally wasted.

I wish it were in our power to compel Government by the force of public opinion not merely to redress the grievances that lacerate our hearts already but to see that in the near future no new grievance, such as the Rowlatt Act, is manufactured afresh. The worst of this state of things is that when repression puts down a great movement like non-co-operation, it employs a weapon naturally called terrorism, makes use of all the repressive weapons in the innocent as well as guilty hearts, amongst honest and patriotic workers as amongst the reverse, it plants in hearts of every body, the feeling that the time is not opportune for good or well-sustained effort in the public cause. Public life falls below its usual level, everyone seems to be seized with a fit which looks like apathy but really amounts to complete and entire hatred of things as they are. The Government and its agents, having for the moment accomplished their task, are likely to mistake this apathy and indifference and to construe it into feelings of gratification or contentment or satisfaction. Too often have district officers and others, whose duty it is to watch things, reported that on such occasions the movement of rebellion has been got under, people are satisfied once more and that the district is on its even way of progress. The truth, however, is that there is no real satisfaction, people are embittered and soured, the memory of things, of wasted efforts, of bitter humiliation, of indignities undeservedly suffered, rankled in their hearts. For a year or five years or ten years it may be that nothing is visible above, but the undercurrent of dissatisfaction, of a brooding resentment against the powers that be, is constantly at work and when again there comes up such a national movement, it is bound to start at a very high level to draw upon all these, for the moment unobserved, forces of disorder or racial bitterness, until Government will find itself face to face with a task far greater than they ever had of a similar nature. I have never known such profound distrust of Government as there is to-day (hear, hear,) such absolute lack of faith in their sincerity, such a rooted tendency to put aside all their pledges and promises and declarations of intentions as of no value whatever. (A voice: "it is true".) So far as this feeling goes, I know it for a fact and I mention it with great grief, that very good people (by "good" I mean good-natured, goodhearted people) have gone so far as to say that he who takes tea with an Englishman is a traitor, (laughter) that he who maintains social amenities with the foreigner is one whose game is to betray

his country at a favourable opportunity. When such is the case and all that people want is proof, no more by word, no more by declaration or resolution on paper, but proof by action that Government really intend to use the Reform Act to the advantages of the people (hear, hear), that they mean to pay every farthing of the bill, when proof of that kind is wanted, a clear duty rests on all who wield authority, from the Viceroy downwards, that night and day they interpret the provisions of the Government of India Act generously and liberally, that they show that they are always moving forward, never keeping the country back, that, for example, if it is a matter of filling appointments, to mention one instance only, they lose no opportunity, for example, of appointing to such posts as Secretaries or Under-Secretaries—posts hitherto reserved mainly for Europeans, Indians of sufficient standing and good reputation. I know of nothing which will so effectively give an indication of the reality of Government's intentions, as for example, in some of the major provinces, the appointment of an Indian at the next vacancy to the office of Director of Public Instructions. We have a Minister for Education to-day in the person of Mr. Paranjpye here, if I could put him in the witness box (laughter) and ask him to tell me honestly whether he would not feel his hands strengthened by an Indian Director of Public Instructions of his own choice (applause), I know what answer he would give.

Now, I come to a question of the very greatest importance, the road to peace, that peace of the heart to which I referred, the road to peace is by no means easy. It is blocked by such a serious thing as the imprisonment, for various acts and for various terms, of something like 20,000 of our people. Several of them young and immature, led into the ways of disorder, doubtless under a mistaken sense of patriotism, but young people ardent, eager, animated by unselfish ideas. This is causing feelings of acute distress all over the country. No one realizes that more than I do. It is impossible to conceive of people falling into their normal ways in political and other matters, until something is done to reduce this great volume of distress in the whole country. And is it impossible? I do not think by any means. You of Bombay, I understand, have no great complaint to make of the way in which the rebellious forms of non-co-operation were dealt with in your province. I will not therefore ask you from personal experience to endorse the remark that I now make, but I can tell you from the experience of other provinces like the United Provinces and Bengal and, to some extent, of my own province of Madras. There, it would appear, I have heard such a funny thing as this has taken place that when certain samitis or volunteer associations had

their members marched to prison for belonging to them, others in batches came forward and did nothing but announce that they belonged to these proclaimed associations and without further ado, so I understand, they were put on the lists as belonging to those samitis and removed to jail. (Hear, hear.) Now that kind of thing need not be at all. It is a gratuitous addition to the sufferings of the people. And I think the sooner the people who were marched to gaol merely for technical offences of that kind, for offences which they committed, rather for the fun of it than for anything else, the sooner they are let off the better, I think, for society. And so, a little later, people whose offences might be a little more grave may have their cases considered and so on, until in no long course of time we can reduce very considerably the number of those who for activities of a disorderly nature against the community must continue to be deprived of their liberty.

But the mind of India will refuse to rest satisfied if nothing was done in the constitutional direction almost immediately. Now let me, ladies and gentlemen, beseech your patience a little if I dwell at rather wearisome length on this aspect of the question, namely, further advance of a constitutional character. That such an attempt should be made I am the last person to deny. I recognize the immediate necessity of some such grant of extended power, but, ladies and gentlemen, I lay great emphasis on the necessity of so conducting this effort of ours that we get all the chances in our favour and not leave any against us if possible. Above all things I dread the consequences in the present state of another disappointment, as India cannot have another big defeat in the constitutional direction; everything should be done to make the attempt successful so far as endeavours on this side can be made.

Now there are three ways in which further constitutional advance may be accomplished. They differ somewhat in character and it behoves me to put them to you one after another. The first that I have heard from a high authority indeed—I cannot, however, unfortunately be more particular—the first that I have heard is this, that without the people making a great demand either by deputation or by memorial or in other understood ways, that without the people making any demand the Imperial authorities of Great Britain must be persuaded on their own initiative to bring in a Bill for the grant to India of immediate provincial autonomy. In other words people of India should have an unsolicited boon. Now if such a thing could happen no one of us will rejoice—less than another—Let me put it that way! But, I ask, is that possible? You or I

ought to have no part or lot in the manipulation of it, we are only to wait while things are moving behind the screen, we have only to wait for the fruition of that attempt which is supposed to be made behind the screen, which you do not initiate or advance in any of its stages, but for which you have got to wait right through like a poor helpless young bird waiting for food from the beak of its mother. Is that possible for us? Is it an attitude which we can at all adopt? Now above all it strikes me that there is not within the British Isles any statesman of such a vast and unquestioned authority that if he were of his own accord to propose provincial autonomy or dominion status to India, he could really persuade either the Cabinet or the Imperial Parliament to sanction it. I know no one with so big a heart in the first place and assuming there was such a person, I do not know that he would command the almost divine authority which is necessary for him to follow it up. Such a superman democracy does not produce.

The next thing is this. Some people say, "Let us by our own efforts try and procure this further advance." I am not aware of anyone who asks for any further stages less advanced than provincial autonomy; all of us, I take it, including the most backward Liberals, are agreed that there should be only one further step in this direction and that we should get provincial autonomy at one stroke. People say, why should not India unite together and make one tremendous effort at once and straightway obtain this consummation? I think a proposal somewhat of that kind was brought forward and passed at the Allahabad meeting of the all-India Liberal Federation a few months ago. Many things have happened since the date of that resolution. I am not sure that a thing of that kind is practicable. Mind you, I do not say I am going to wait for further proof of our fitness. I am only asking you to consider the practicability of this proposal. Well, it appears to me that since we passed that resolution at Allahabad, the boycott of the Prince of Wales assumed a sinister aspect, to put it no more offensively, and I can tell you from personal knowledge that that unfortunate move on the part of our non-co-operationist friends has estranged the sympathies of a good section even of our friends in Great Britain. It is not a thing for which I am responsible, it is not a thing for which the Liberal Party is responsible. I am merely bringing you news of a state of things existing there. England herself is on the eve probably of a General Election, the trouble in Ireland seems to be more acute than ever, and Mr. Lloyd George finds Genoa a bigger morsel than he had thought it to be. If in the near future there should be a General Election, the chances of India's constitutional advance being

made an issue on the election platform, you know, are very remote. The time therefore is not particularly propitious for the success of a big effort such as we might perhaps be induced to make. It is none of our doing, even Providence can only deal with the material already before it, the forces are there and we can only manipulate them; and if it is not possible for us to attain success, no blame attaches to us, it only means a slight postponement of our effort.

And now I will mention what may be a somewhat more elaborate method of approaching this problem, a method compatible with the existing constitution, a method the success of which I should say is a little less uncertain (I will not put it higher) than the success of the alternative methods that I have just mentioned. That is the method of working the whole thing up through our electorates and through the legislatures which are the creatures of those electorates. The Englishman is a slave of his political constitution. He may wish to change it, he may wish even to revolutionise it, but his instinct always is to work the change or to bring about the revolution only through that constitution. He will not stand outside, as some of our friends would, and say he will bend, break or demolish it or he will send it to the very Satan from whom it had its origin. That is not his way of doing things. If he understands that we are attempting to use in the regular way the constitution with which the Government of India Act has endowed us, he will then see it is a movement to which he is bound to listen. What takes place when you want a tremendous upheaval of your constitution? You have got first of all to charge your legislatures with a mandate from the electorate. We are not very far from an election. The Councils are in the second year of their existence. Next year by this time the air will ring with the appeals of candidates to their electorates. Then I know nothing more sure than this, that the best way of educating your electorate (upon which our Chairman of the Reception Committee laid such just stress in his address) that there is no surer, no better way of educating your electorate than of going to them and talking about the necessity of our attaining provincial autonomy at one stroke. If people are returned on such a platform, if our legislatures in Bombay and in Madras and in Bengal and in the other provinces are filled with candidates whose election has been secured on promises of provincial autonomy, then the legislatures so brought into existence cannot turn their back on duties so solemnly assumed. The legislatures are bound to act so as to get provincial autonomy, and then my plan would be for each such legislature to elect a few people to choose men of ripest experience

and most sober judgment and not necessarily those who make the most attractive promises or who give utterance to the most unrestrained sentiments. A convention so formed from the legislatures to which the Imperial legislature also contributed its quota, could then be charged with the duty of framing a new constitution for India on the basis of the present one without the necessity of scrapping it, so that when it did produce a scheme it would represent the best wisdom and statesmanship available in India. That scheme would then be published for general information and criticism; perhaps the various legislatures will be seized of it and when it came out of this ordeal, it would really be a good scheme fitting in so admirably with the constitution that we already possess, that it would stand every chance of being accepted as practicable and proper and wise. Suppose further the Legislative Assembly and the Council of State acting together choose a deputation consisting, say, of six men or eight men or ten men, they should be men whose names might command influence in the English Parliament. Suppose they went with a scheme of that kind; I know of no statesman in England, I know of no political body of any importance in England who would treat their representation either lightly or contemptuously. And this process need not take such a long time as some people seem to think. The next Council will come into office in the beginning of 1924. By the end of that year nearly the whole of these arrangements may be completed and our deputation may wait on the Imperial Parliament in 1925. And supposing the bill took six or seven months to get through, as a bill generally does, still we should see our new constitution in 1926. Is that such a long time to wait?

Now, ladies and gentlemen, notwithstanding what I say, some of you may be thinking of some better way of reaching our goal, and if in the course of your deliberations to-day and to-morrow you should hit upon some plan which promises speedier success, be assured that I shall have no compunction whatever in abandoning mine and embracing yours.

Then I will refer to what people are sometimes fond of thrusting in our face, the great obstacle produced by the ten-year clause in the Government of India Act. Luckily it has been interpreted in a rather loose way and I have known people of authority maintain in the Imperial Parliament that that does not preclude us at all from taking a further step in the interval. I may tell you that in my various addresses and interviews in England I have pressed that view. I have begged them for the sake of India and for the sake of England not to dwell with pedantic

exactitude on that period of ten years. I have told them that to wait longer than is absolutely necessary would be to invite disaster in India, that the wise course would be to anticipate by as many years as possible the consummation of the constitution of which the Government of India Act is the first instalment, and if I may judge at all the signs I can give you hope that you will find a great deal of sympathy and support in your desire to hasten the attainment of the consummation.

Now this matter is not going to be pressed merely as a concession to the impatient people in India. If I understand things aright it is possible to reinforce our demand by many arguments from the side of administrative convenience. You may all remember that the principle of diarchy was accepted by us under a sense of necessity. The other day Lord Chelmsford actually described the circumstances which made him and Mr. Montagu adopt this device. He spoke the truth without doubt, but then we who represented the people of India before the Select Committee of Parliament took every care that the principle of diarchy should be acceptable only if it was watered down and filtered so much that the harshness of duality was not left, and the machinery would for most purposes function almost as if it was a unitary government. I quite remember the struggle we had. It is not necessary now to review it. But I will only point out that this system of diarchy worked best in those provinces of India—I am not sure that Bombay would be included amongst them—the system of diarchy worked best in those provinces of India where the safeguards and the correctives upon which we insisted were most scrupulously observed, where the Governor took care on all important matters to summon his executive councils and ministers together, where he took care that the resolutions of the Legislative Council on either reserved or transferred subjects were treated more or less on the same footing of respectful attention as where the Governor before taking action for instance of a drastic character in order to proclaim say a Samiti or an arrest of a person of importance—it is cases where the Governor summoned the two halves together and made the public understand that every important action was the action of a unified government and not of a Governor acting in two separate compartments—it is where that condition prevailed that diarchy worked with great success. In some places Governors, carried away by consciousness of their own abilities, did not bring the two halves of government together as often as they should have done. The result was, I think, a little discord.

Moreover there was one thing above all which drew the harsh character of this dual government out and exhibited it in most glaring

forms and that was the visit of the Prince of Wales. I do not think that there is anyone here who desired it most enthusiastically at the particular time—not certainly I—I counselled against the visit as long as I could—but the visit came and what happened? When the boycott of that visit was proclaimed by the non-co-operators, the result was that Government, in order to make it a success against this opposition, had to use all the arms in their control, they used all the repressive laws they could think of. I understand section 144 was being illegitimately used for this purpose, but whether or no that was the case, the fact came out that for the exercise of their repressive functions on this large and drastic and very disturbing scale, Government in several provinces relied not on the usual practice of bringing the two halves of government together and taking their consent, but acted on their own behalf, that is on behalf of the executive part of the administration, with the result that even the Liberal public, even the Moderate party, withheld its co-operation with Government in all that went to maintain law and order (hear, hear) for which they had previously pledged their word; they said “this is not a thing that we can support,” thus bringing into prominent relief that dual feature of diarchy against which from the very first we had strenuously protested. I am mentioning this rather elaborately for the purpose of showing that we have a good argument at our disposal that through the action of Government itself the bad nature of diarchy has been brought out and Government in that respect functioned in complete isolation from every section of opinion in India, co-operationists as well as non-co operationists. Again it is difficult for our legislatures to maintain two different attitudes, one attitude towards the reserved subjects and another attitude towards the transferred subjects, and I have heard from Ministers—not those that happen to sit here (laughter)—complaints about the imperfect control—to put it euphemistically—that they are able to exercise over their higher officers. Besides, there is one great danger in over-straining this system of diarchy. That danger is this. You all know how in English history the House of Commons obtained more and more power over regions at first kept from its jurisdiction by the exercise of its financial control. When anything not within its precise scope but still grossly repugnant to its sense of propriety occurred, the House of Commons used its financial power in order to extend its jurisdiction. So should we in India. That idea has not yet occurred to our people, but there could not long be many bitter complaints without there being a resort to the common expedient of denying supplies. The constitutional remedy is in our hands. It will produce, if the Government continues this system for a long time,

deadlocks—it will produce denial of budgetary supplies with a dislocation of administrative machinery, from which Government and people alike stand to suffer. Now, it appears to me that a case of that kind, reinforced from the side of those who have an inside knowledge of its working, from those who have taken pension after being Executive Councillors for example, from those who have held office for the full period of Ministers or have been driven out of them by the constitutional exercise of the legislatures' undoubted powers, it is when people of that kind throw in their wisdom and experience and enable us to construct a case, that that case will really be unanswerable. (Applause.) That takes a little time, we must wait till Mr. Paranjpye retires (laughter).

Now, I have got a word to say about the Central Government. I am afraid I have not much time in which to elaborate my views about the Central Government. The matter is so important and I happen to hold a certain view which I think I am in duty bound as a member of the Liberal Party to place before this assembled meeting of the Federation. May I have that indulgence? (Voices: Go on, go on) I was one of those who, when in England, pressed with the greatest insistence on the introduction of a certain element of responsibility, and I very much wished at that time that the Government had yielded to our wishes and placed both the Imperial and the Provincial governments on a more or less parallel footing. Do I press it now with equal persistency? I did until some time ago, and if I do not do so now, you are entitled to know why. It may be I am right, it may be I am wrong, I am still open to conviction in that matter and, as in several others, I will defer to your collective and wiser judgment if you should differ from me. My change of view is of very recent origin and one of its causes I shall presently explain. This responsibility is really what is called the power of the legislature to dismiss a Minister when that Minister forfeits its confidence. We have this element of responsibility in the provinces. Have we used it there? You may say, "We have been in existence only for a year and a half and you do not expect our efficient Ministers to incur displeasure to such an extent that we should dismiss them." (Laughter). I do not wish it by any means. But I have read of proceedings in which Ministers were defeated by the legislatures. Did they resign? Did the legislatures insist on their undoubted right of asking them to resign? They did not. Whether this took place in every Council or not, I do not know, but it did happen once or twice, at least, in the Madras council. The fact of the matter is that there is a wise instinct in our people—I applaud it—I do not regret it, I am only putting it as a poser just to perplex you for a

minute, to make you fall in with the suggestion I propose to make. People have a wise instinct. They know that the first Ministers have exceptional difficulties to contend with and the success of the Reform Scheme to which the Liberal Party is pledged above all things, depends on the Ministers having every opportunity with their support of doing a good stroke of work or two for their country. Therefore they sustained them in office and gave them extended opportunities, even though in one or two matters they might have incurred their displeasure, that is a healthy instinct with which I do not quarrel in the least, but there is one condition on which alone you can exercise this responsibility, and that is that parties in the legislatures should be well formed so that the Minister may know whom he can rely on at a juncture. Where the Minister does not know that he has a regular trustworthy following consisting of so and so, A, B, C, where the Minister does not feel an obligation to any section or any group in the legislature, the legislature is devoid of the moral authority of asking him to resign (hear, hear). But if it did not render him consistent uniform support it is no business of theirs to ask him to resign. How was he to know the mind of his legislature? So the argument would run backward and forward. I am only mentioning the argument, so that because we have responsibility in a legislature it is not as though we were going to use it in order to dismiss the Minister. It is therefore at present merely an academical question. But I have a further misgiving. At the time that this constitution was started you will please remember that one of the postulates was that while we had responsibility in the provinces, so far as the Central Government was concerned, it was still to be paramount, the wishes of the legislature were to count for little. They may be heeded, they may be respected, but they would not be followed. And the Select Committee, before whom we gave evidence, went the length of adding a special paragraph in which they said that they meant the extraordinary power of the Viceroy and the Governor-General and his council to be used for the purpose of every day administration to be kept in their hands not as reserve power which might come into operation some time but used for everyday purposes. Now in the actual working during these eighteen months, my friends Sir Dinshaw Wacha and others will endorse the remark, Government has not been using this as a weapon of every day administration. They have allowed it even in highly provocative conditions to lie dormant. More, the Viceroy made it known, I believe, that he would not use this weapon.

(The Honourable Mr. Lalubhai Samaldas : Except as regards non-votable items.)

That is a matter of legal opinion. The Viceroy has always exercised his discretion in favour of extending the power of the legislature. The system therefore of no responsibility in the Central Government has had this extraordinary result that instead of confining the power of the Legislative Assembly to one item or two as it would have been if we have had responsibility, our powers are the same over the whole range of the functions of the Central Government. Now if we have had a differentiation between certain spheres in which the legislature is supreme with a Minister to control and certain other spheres where the Minister is not to be supreme, then I am afraid we might not have full control except over a department or two. Now this is a development which I have not drawn from my ingenuity. This is an inference which has been drawn in very influential quarters in England where our constitution, young as it is, is being studied with attention and I may add with sympathy. I am not therefore, ladies and gentlemen, so very enthusiastic as I used to be about the demand for a certain element of responsibility in the Central Government. The reason is that I rather fear that we might lose more than we gain by this change. But whether this argument of mine appeals to you or not I am not sure. But for the moment I am only concerned with laying before you candidly my own view. I have already given you the promise at the outset that I should consider myself bound in ordinary cases by your superior wisdom at the end.

Now I am afraid I have kept you much too long. There are one or two matters which I intended to dwell upon, but I think it is not fair to tax your patience any further.

Now let me conclude with one word of earnest appeal. Ladies and gentlemen, we all belong to the Liberal party, or the Moderate, or if you may say so reasonable party in this country. (Hear, hear). We wish to act with the least disturbance anywhere. We want to push along the lines, if possible, of least resistance. We know—do not we?—that there are no angels under the sun—neither in India, nor in England. While we are keenly pursuing our interests compatibly with the interests of the rest of the world, so are they the people of England pursuing their interests compatibly with those of the rest of the world. I do not attribute to them any virtues intrinsically superior to those that we possess. I do not proceed in this matter of political emancipation of India in the faith that we have only to prove our case and our progress will be secured. I have no such faith. I always knew that we should have enormous difficulties from vested interests in England. That every step

of our progress will be contested, and contested hotly, and perhaps unfairly too. We are quite prepared for it. Otherwise we should not deserve the name of a party. If we believe that our path would be perfectly smooth and easy we should be like babes newly born into the world. Why do I mention this elementary fact? In order to ask your sympathetic attention to a phase of the relation between Englishmen and Indians which is apt sometimes to be laid aside in the heat of controversy. Englishmen have duties to us as we have duties to them. Rather let me put it this way. England in the abstract has duties to India in the abstract, as there are duties proceeding in the contrary direction. Now these duties sometimes cross each other and they have got to be adjusted, they have got to be reconciled. We always ask that our motives should be understood at their best and noblest and we are bound in return to understand the motives on the other side similarly. We ask for confidence and trust; we are bound to return the confidence and trust. We ask that our failings should be overlooked, we ask that our crudities and our inexperience may be tolerated with a sympathetic understanding and we should be enabled to surmount them, to correct them, to grow out of them. Englishmen are not so perfect that they have not similar crudities and selfishnesses and lower aspects of character out of which it is our duty to help them to grow. In some matters they are unwilling to relax their hold in time. They are not willing to let it go one moment sooner than may be absolutely necessary. Sometimes in the enthusiasm of righteousness, when some wave of humanitarian feeling carries them away, their best spokesmen indulge in the finest sentiments of international morality. Parliament, perhaps in the preamble and provisions of its Acts, employs language calculated to produce the impression that Englishmen are, from breakfast till dinner, nothing but angels. (Laughter). They answer to high impulse, to a noble impulse which comes to them in rare moments. Well it were for them and for us if these moments were more frequent, if between them instead of continual breaks there were one golden chain unbroken. Can we help in bringing about that state of things? I think we can. By patience, by strenuously fighting our cause, by employing every argument that experience and wisdom can urge, by continually appealing to their higher nature we can make these moments more frequent and more continuous and therefore more benevolently operative for the general benefit of the human race. Is it an impossible task for us? We who propose to teach the rest of the world all that there is in our spiritual treasures; we who propose to revivify the eastern morality and make it overspread the

whole earth : we, shall we give up the task ? In this we are quite prepared to take a lesson from the non-co-operationist for what is the gospel of non-co-operation ? What is the basis of its activity ? By suffering, by inflicting it on himself, by leaving the other side to trample on himself and to use him as chattel, by submitting to this with the divinity of resignation, the non-co-operator says he will convert the tyrant, first into a commiserator, then into a penitent and then into an ameliorator and finally into a loving brother. (Applause.) What is open to the non-co-operator is, I venture to think, also open to us, and this international contact between England and India should be made by conscious efforts on our part to subserve our purpose in the first instance but to subserve also other and more exalted purposes. (Loud applause.)

The President :—The names of members of the Subjects Committee will be presently given and the Subjects Committee will meet immediately after lunch this afternoon. The Conference will meet at 11 a.m., tomorrow.

The Conference then rose for the day.

THE SUBJECTS COMMITTEE.**Ex-Officio.****PRESIDENT:**

1. The Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri,
Chairman of the Reception Committee.
2. The Hon. Sir Dinshaw Edulji Wacha, Kt.,
Secretaries of the Reception Committee.
3. Mr. Rustom K. R. Cama.
4. Mr. J. R. B. Jeejeebhoy.
5. Mr. N. M. Joshi, M.L.A.
6. Mr. Ratansy D. Morarji.
7. Mr. Kanji Dwarkadas, M.L.C.
8. Mr. Shalebhoy C. Barodawalla, M.L.A.
9. Dr. D. A. D'Monte.
10. Mr. Hatim E. Attari.
11. Mr. M. D. Altekar.
12. Mr. A. S. Osborne.

MEMBERS.**BOMBAY.**

13. Sir G. K. Parekh, Kt.
14. The Hon. Mr. Phiroze C. Sethna.
15. Mr. N. V. Gokhale.
16. Mr. N. M. Samarth, M.L.A.
17. Mr. D. G. Dalvi.
18. Mr. J. R. Gharpure.
19. Mr. S. E. Warden.
20. Mr. C. M. Cursetji.
21. Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas, M.L.A.
22. Mr. N. F. Kanny.
23. Mr. P. K. Telang.
24. Mr. M. A. Kambli, M.L.C.
25. Mr. T. A. Kulkarni.
26. Mr. S. K. Bole, M.L.C.
27. Mr. K. Natarajan.

28. The Hon. Sir Chimanlal H. Setalvad.
29. The Hon. Mr. Cowasji Jehangir (Junior).
30. The Hon. Mr. R. P. Paranjpye.
31. The Hon. Mr. C. V. Mehta.
32. The Hon. Mr. Gulam Hussein Hidaytullah.

MOFUSSAL.

33. Rao Bahadur Ramanbhai M. Nilkanth, M.L.C., (Ahmedabad).
 34. Mr. C. M. Gandhi, M.L.C., (Surat).
 35. Mr. V. N. Bhave (Dhulia).
 36. Mr. D. S. Oak (Nasik).
 37. Mr. S. G. Vaze (Poona).
 38. Mr. G. G. Thakkar (Poona).
 39. Mr. G. K. Gadgil (Poona).
 40. Mr. G. K. Deodhar (Poona).
 41. Mr. V. H. Chinmulgund (Poona).
 42. Rao Bahadur R. R. Kale, M.L.C., (Satara).
 43. Mr. R. K. Karandikar (Chiplun).
 44. Mr. G. C. Bhate, M.L.C., (Roha-Kolaba).
 45. Mr. H. K. Patwardhan (Ahmednagar).
 46. Mr. R. S. Bhagvat (Thana).
 47. Mr. G. R. Abhyankar (Sangli).
 48. Rao Bahadur R. G. Mundle (Amraoti).
 49. The Hon. Mr. Keshav Rao (Hyderabad).
 50. Rev. Mr. R. A. Hume (Ahmednagar).
-

SECOND DAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

Sunday 7th May 1922.

The Conference resumed its sittings at the Sir Cowasji Jehangir Public Hall at 11-30 A. M. on Sunday, the Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri presiding.

There was a large number of delegates and visitors present.

Resolution No. 1.

The President :—I will now call upon Mr. Chunilal M. Gandhi, M.L.C., to move the first resolution.

Mr. Chunilal M. Gandhi, M.L.C.—Mr. President, Brother Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen,

The very first resolution which I have the honour to move runs as follows :—

1. (a) "That it is essential that effective measures should be taken on behalf of the Liberal Party to organise and educate the electorate of this Presidency.
- (b) That with a view to carrying out the work, as early as possible, in an efficient and practical manner, this Conference hereby appoints a Standing Working Committee consisting of the following with power to add to their number.

It does not define the words "Liberal Party," but I venture to think the words "Liberal Party" mean not only the members of the Western India National Liberal Association but it includes all national home-rulers, progressives, all India home-rulers and all the rest whose aim is gradual attainment of Swaraj by all constitutional means as opposed to those whose aim is to attain Swaraj by all legitimate blissful means including Non-violent Non-Co-operation. The resolution exhorts the Liberal Party to take effective measures to organise and educate the electorate of this presidency, and while on this point, may I, Sir, with the deference to my elders of the Liberal Party in all humility, say that the old way of educating the electorate from your comfortable homes in Bombay or elsewhere is found to be rather inadequate one. If the Liberal Party is to be galvanised, if the Party is to do that energetic and continuous work from years end to years end, which it is expected

to do, if it is to maintain its old tradition of good useful work nobly done, then the old veterans of the Liberal Party should tour from village to village, speak to them direct, should try to appreciate their feelings and aspirations, interpret their views to them and try to give them a correct lead, for, if the leaders fail to be with the people and lag behind them, it is not possible to lead them at all.

The resolution further asks that, effective measures should be taken to educate the electorate, and it is impossible to do so unless we have large party funds, and here it must be said to the credit of the N. C. O. Party that they at least can claim to have a subscription of a crore of rupees towards the Tilak Swaraj Fund. We must try to raise huge funds and carry on the work of propaganda year in and year out.

In order that the work may be done in an efficient and practical manner this resolution proposes to appoint a Standing Working Committee of members to be elected by the Conference. I think, Sir, that the Standing Working Committee should have at its head a gentleman of your outstanding personality. It is not possible to have a thoroughly representative committee in an off hand manner. It is desirable that the local Association should be asked to suggest the names of their representatives to serve on the Committee, and I hope you will have no objection to give a general power to the Secretaries of the Committee to add to their number.

With these words, ladies and gentlemen, I move the resolution which I hope will be carried by acclamations.

Mr. H. V. Chinmulgund (Poona), seconded the resolution. He said the education of the masses had to be carried out under great difficulties, as they had to remove from their minds the poison instilled into them by the N.-C.-O., creed which had taught them to believe that they could get swaraj in a month merely by expressions of dissatisfaction, abnegation and expectation without giving any sacrifice. He was prepared to say that the heart of India was moderate. If that was so, it would be asked, why there were so few people there. The reason was that the leaders of the Moderate party had not approached the people in the proper way and explained to them the futility of non-co-operation.

Mr. V. N. Barve (Dhulia), Mr. N. S. Marulkar (Satara) and Mr. M. D. Altekar (Bombay) further supported the resolution.

The resolution was then put to the vote and declared unanimously carried.

The President:—I now call upon Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas to move the second resolution.

Resolution II.

Reform Proposals.

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas, M. L. A. :—Mr. President, Brother Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen, I have great pleasure to move the following resolution :—

“ This Conference earnestly urges upon the Secretary of State for India and the British Parliament the necessity of accelerating the pace for the attainment of complete Self-Government and towards that end the taking of steps for the immediate introduction of—

- (i) Full responsible Government in the Provinces and
- (ii) Responsibility in the Central Government in all departments except the military, political and foreign.”

In moving the resolution Mr. Jamnadas said that it was not a difficult task at that moment in India to move a resolution of that character. For whatever might be the differences with regard to many political questions, the country was united more or less on one demand and about which it had expressed its opinion. It was the question of the attainment at the earliest possible moment of full responsible Government for India. Now, when in that Liberal Conference there they made the demand for full provincial autonomy and introduction of responsibility in the Central Government they were not doing anything new. It was not a new conviction that had dawned on the Liberals of the country that it was necessary in the interests of India that responsibility should be introduced in the Central Government and that full autonomy should be conferred on the provinces. If they remembered aright when the Montagu-Chelmsford Report was out, the one criticism that every party subjected that Report to was that in the Central Government, there must be an element of responsibility. If they remembered, when the various deputations went to England to forward their case before the Joint Select Committee, all those various deputations were unanimous in demanding that in the Central Government responsibility should be introduced. And if they made that demand now after the reforms had been brought into existence it was because the conviction that they had long advocated had been confirmed by the experience they had gained in the working of the Reforms. The conviction is growing that in order to give real power to the representatives

of the people and in order to make India take a real step towards progress it was essential that the British Parliament should very early consider the question of introducing responsibility in the Central Government. He could speak with first hand knowledge and experience more with regard to the working of the Reforms in the Central Government than in the Provincial Governments. Thus he did not for a moment meant, that belonging as he did to the Legislature in the Central Government, he considered himself out of touch with the provincial Governments as not to know the need of the Provinces. His own information confirmed the conviction that unless full responsibility was introduced in the provinces, they could not work successfully in the matter of Reforms. He wanted to assure them that that information had not been derived from any of the officials who were present there to help them in their deliberations. That had come entirely from non-official sources. He wanted to assure those who believed and declared in season and out of season that the help of Indian officials in co-operating on political questions should be rejected that he would not believe in that theory because those Indian officials were placed in the position of responsibility in answer to their own repeated request. The whole of the Liberal Party would not only invite such help from Indian officials but would also wholeheartedly welcome it. An Indian did not cease to be an Indian because he was an official. Many prominent Indian officials who had been working for making the Congress policy a success had accepted positions of officials at great sacrifice. He should think it a bad day for India when the help of those officials was rejected although they were no less ardent patriots. It seemed to him that diarchy had failed wherever it had been strictly adhered to. It was only in places where it had remained on paper, where Government called upon the Ministers and Executive Councillors to consider questions of importance that the system of diarchy had succeeded. If it was necessary for the successful working of the Reforms that Diarchy should remain only on paper then it was essential that the whole of the administration should be made responsible to the people and all the departments should be transferred to the control of representatives of the people although widespread powers had been vested in the members of the Indian Legislative Assembly. Although a good deal of solid substantial work had been achieved by the members of the Indian Legislative Assembly, yet he believed that there was room for a good deal more to be done which would be impossible unless the members of the Executive Councils were made responsible to representatives of the people. They were told when a similar resolution was moved in the Legislative Assembly that no member had pointed

out the flaws in the present Constitution which would enable them to convince the British Parliament that the absence of responsibility in the Central Government did not allow the members to work in a proper manner, that by the help of those powers a good deal had already been done, they could not, therefore, say that there were difficulties, and they all knew that India had been accepted as the original member of the League of Nations. Whenever there had been assembly of nations outside the Empire, and whenever any Imperial Conference met India had been given a status equal to that of any other Dominion and that just as other Dominions were asked to send their representatives India also had been asked to send hers. His reply to that was that while in the case of Dominions which enjoyed responsible government the men who represented them were real representatives elected by the people and appointed by the Government which was responsible to the people, in the case of India Government nominated the men who were the representatives of the Indian nation. Therefore they were always at the mercy of the Government who did not represent the people. While the Dominion Premiers could claim to represent the people and speak freely on any subject, India's representative could not feel as comfortable as the Premiers because he was appointed by the Government which was not responsible to the people. In the case of such appointments there was no constitutional procedure to make it necessary that these should be made by election. Unfortunately, without going into the motives of the Government members, the points of view of members of Government and those of the peoples' representatives were so different that the latter could not easily be satisfied. He had to say that it had been admitted by all that in the transition stage such difficulties were inevitable, and hence it was necessary that that transition stage might be curtailed and full responsible government given to India. There was a doubt, when the Constitution was brought into existence that that being a unique experiment quite new to India, whether the people of India had the sense of responsibility and whether they would rise equal to the occasion and shew by their deeds that they had a sense of responsibility in them. Was there any room for doubt now? Speaking recently, Lord Chelmsford himself said that the sense of responsibility displayed by the new legislature was a revelation and marvel to him. Mr. Montagu had realised that full Dominion status might be given to India much quicker than stipulated in order that the present difficulties might be removed. The uncertainty that prevailed at the time when the Reforms were introduced was no longer there. The Legislatures had done satisfactory work to show that the

people of India could wield any amount of responsibility and power. The difficulties that were experienced at present in the Central administration were clear. It was urged that there were three Indian members in the Central Government. But the absence of responsibility in the members of Legislature was at times responsible for their doing certain things which they would not have done if they had been conscious of the fact that they were responsible to the representatives of the people. At the time of the last budget, proposals were made including one to enhance the tax on salt, which was a heavy burden on the poor and which, he declared, would bring revolution into every Indian home. The Hon. Sir Malcolm Hailey said that it was not his own proposal but was one in which the Indian member of the Government also concerned. Now would that have been possible if the Indian members had been responsible to people's representatives? Then again, he quoted another instance, when it was proposed to enhance the $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. excise duty which was originally levied for the benefit of Lancashire and was opposed by all from Ranade downward to the youngest politician. Sir William Vincent once said that the electorate was not big enough for any further Reforms. To this the speaker said that the electorate in England was not even as big as it was in India to-day when the Reform Bill of 1832 was passed. Then again it had been said that there was no national ideal in India to-day. To say that at present there was no national ideal was not to know the people of India. That national ideal was in the course of time likely to grow too narrow. That would not be conducive to the benefit either of England or of India. The constitution that might arise hereafter should be such as to be conducive of benefit both of India and England.

If they had any point of difference with the non-co-operation this was one and that was that while they believed in constitutional institutions they, the non-co-operators, did not believe in them. If the non-co-operators now changed their minds and tried constitutional methods to secure the progress of the country then most of those their leaders would have to admit a defeat for themselves. It would ever be a triumph for those who stood by the constitution. They had stood by their principles against all odds and asserted that nothing but constitutional methods could win full responsible Government for their country. If now the non-co-operators admitted that they had been mistaken in not having entered the councils then it was a triumph not for them—it was only a defeat for them—but it was undoubtedly a triumph for those

who differed from them. Although non-co-operators might not admit that they had failed, yet in the judgment of their countrymen they had hopelessly failed.

“ Mr. D. G. Dalvi said—

Mr. President and brother-delegates,

In seconding this resolution, let me make one or two preliminary observations.

I am neither an M. L. A. nor an M. L. C., but I claim to have taken an humble and consistent interest in public affairs. You know the adage that those who are outside the game see more of it than those who are playing it.

This resolution represents the reasonable demands of the Liberal party. When the Reform Bill was before the Joint Parliamentary Committee, the representatives of our Party who formed the deputation urged these Reforms on the attention of the Committee. We accepted the Reform Act in the hope that it would be carried out in the spirit and letter in which it was framed. But viewing its working of 18 months, we are constrained to declare our opinion that nothing less than these demands will secure real power and freedom for the people of India. Hence in the last Christmas, our all-India Liberal Federation at Allahabad adopted a resolution, which was to the same effect as the present one, and I may add, that it was moved by a gentleman of high authority and keen sense of responsibility, viz., Sir Shivswamy Iyer, General Secretary of the Federation.

I may divide the subject into two parts (1) Provincial Governments and (2) Imperial Government.

In the Provincial Government, Dyarchy was not accepted by any of the political parties in India. It was forced upon them. You will remember the scheme put forward by five Provincial Governors who had proposed an alternative of an Unitary Government and Sir Guy Fleetwood Wilson described it as “ an absurd proposition ” only last week. Even one of its sponsors, Lord Chelmsford, recently explained in a half-apologetic tone, how, after exploring all other schemes, the joint-authors were compelled to accept Dyarchy as the only feasible alternative. Thus, our party resolved to work it with great hesitation. Our President told us yesterday how the solemn promise of the Government to working it substantially as an Unitary Government has been broken in most of the Provinces.

Has Dyarchy succeeded or failed, looking to our experience of the last 18 months? Our friend, Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas, just told us that it has failed. I would prefer to look at the other side of the shield and put forward my claim for further reforms on the basis that it had succeeded, in order to make our claim more acceptable to Parliament. Let me make myself clear. I say, that in matters in which it would have broken down at the first shock, our Legislatures have shown an extraordinary prudence, forbearance and sense of responsibility, in order to prevent a deadlock. Remember the situation regarding the last two budgets both in the Imperial and the Provincial legislatures, especially in our own Council. Under ordinary circumstance, any average council would have refused to pass them. Again, it became necessary for Government, as much owing to their repressive policy as to the raging and tearing propaganda of the Congress and the Khilafat movements, to adopt very stern measures almost subversive of true principles of law and justice. Yet, when the Government sought the support of its Legislatures, it was readily given, in spite of great terrorism practised by the N. C. O. movement. What legislative enactments were brought before them the Legislatures have passed without any radical modifications? Can responsibility go further? Is it necessary to wait for 10 years to make the test pucca?

In order to make provincial autonomy complete in the provinces, all that really remains to be done, so far as our province is concerned is to transfer the Departments of (1) Finance (2) Law, Justice and Police (3) and Land-Revenue, to Indian Ministers, with consequential changes in the Rules and perhaps in the Government of India Act. On this subject my reasoning is that (a) where an Indian Member of the Executive Council had to deal with them, he showed better results, at least, more acceptable to the people at large and (b) if this is so, the next step is to transfer them to an Indian Minister at once as it would not only satisfy popular aspirations but really conduce to a more harmonious and cheap working of the administration.

(1) AS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF LAW AND ORDER:—During the last 18 months of extraordinary political activity, we find that where this portfolio was in the hands of a non-official Indian Member of the Executive Council, things have been managed with such smoothness and tact that the particular Government became the least unpopular in that province and the country at large. Thus, in the Central Provinces, the Home Member, the Hon'ble Mr. M. V. Joshi, has tided over the difficult

situation with tact and forbearance and hence that province came out with the least trouble. I think Lord Willingdon recognised this advantage and only recently transferred this Department to the late Advocate General Mr. K. Shrinivas Iyengar, and since then, we have heard of little trouble from Madras. As to the Rajasaheb of Mahmudabad, the Home-Member in the U. P. Government, I would prefer to be silent. On the other hand, in Bengal, the Punjab, Behar and Assam, this portfolio was in the hands of an English Official and we find that the trouble was needlessly magnified out of all proportions. As to our province, it used to be our proud boast that our Government had shown great tact and forbearance, interfering where necessary and no more. But, if we look at the question as a whole now and include the position in Sind, I am afraid, I shall have to look up to the dictionary meaning of the expression "Repression" before definitely answering the question. It is permissible to argue that these English Officials bungled their work so much, that I feel quite confident, no Indian, however incompetent, could have done worse. Then, there is another consideration. It is believed, quite wrongly, that the English Official alone has interest in law and order and that an Indian would play fast and loose with it. I deny this charge in toto. There is a class of Indians who have, in several ways, such a heavy stake in the country that, they would make their best effort to keep the peace in their own interest and if an Indian Minister is placed in charge of this portfolio, he is bound to get a larger and a more spontaneous support from this class. But, there is this difference that, with an Indian Minister, such occasions would be less frequent and the men with a stake will know how to discriminate between the genuine troubles and those unwittingly engendered by some wrong-headed conduct of the bureaucracy.

(2) As to Finance, there is no actual experience because so far as I know, this portfolio has not been entrusted to any Indian in these 18 months. But when, at the India Office in London, the need of a financier was keenly felt, it was an Indian, viz., Mr. Dadiba Dalal who had to be imported. Nay, I go further. If this portfolio were entrusted to a really competent Indian, we would not have witnessed the sorry spectacle of the Finance Member at Delhi closing his last Budget speech with a severe threat and quietly swallowing a reduction of about 10 crores when the Legislative Assembly applied its axe promptly though mildly. Further, let us remember what happened in our own province this year. The Finance Member budgetted for a huge deficit and proposed high taxation to cover it. The Legislative Council was averse to dashing it and showed

its resentment by defeating the first Taxation Bill. On that evening there must have been great consternation at the Secretariat. I believe, even H. E. the Governor, was not available for consultation. It was, at this juncture, there rose to the occasion an Indian Executive Councillor, Hon'ble Sir Chimanlal Setalwad, who came to the rescue of the Finance Member, and persuaded the Government to take courage in their both hands and give a clean and huge cut of 60 lacs of rupees and for this purpose he had to take the place of the Finance Member in order to accomplish his object. This put a different complexion on the situation. In the detailed discussion and voting on the budget the Council responded by omitting to make further modifications and all the remaining Taxation-bills passed through the Council alright. Do you think that if a Civilian English Finance Member were again faced with such difficulty, an Indian would not fare better at the hands of the Council?

As to the portfolio of Land-Revenue, it would be readily conceded, that if a separation of Judicial and executive functions were effected, as contemplated in several provinces, there would hardly be any objection to its transfer to an Indian Minister. In fact, in our province, I believe, our Local Government should be easily persuaded in favour of the change.

This leads me to another argument in favour of complete provincial autonomy. You have seen that in almost every province we had deficit budgets and if the situation is not radically altered by complete autonomy and the transfer of all departments, I am afraid that our financial conditions would get worse. Remember that finance is the root of the administration and there is every reason for apprehending that it is on the rock of finance that the ship of Dyarchy will be soon wrecked.

Then again, is it, after all, a very great change that we are demanding? Our President told us yesterday that the joint working of the two halves of the Administration is the condition precedent to the successful working of Dyarchy. In their report, the Joint Parliamentary Committee state in Cl. 6 as follows :—

“But there will remain a *large* category of business of the character which would naturally be the subject of cabinet consultation. In regard to this category, the Committee conceive, that the habit should be carefully fostered of a joint deliberation between the members of the Executive Council and the Ministers, sitting under the chairmanship of the Governor.”

If this direction as to joint-deliberation on the cabinet-system were followed in all provinces (unfortunately it has not been), then our demand for full provincial autonomy is only a further step in the natural process for unifying the divided halves into a harmonious whole and this change would not be felt as violent but only as a logical sequence of the system enjoined by Joint Committee of Parliament.

(2) Then, as to the Imperial Government, I have not much time left to discuss this resolution in detail. Besides, the mover, Mr. Jamnadas, has dealt with that aspect of the case and I shall content myself with dealing with it in its broad aspects only.

After some experience as the President of the Legislative Assembly, Sir W. Whyte declared that "an elected Legislature and an irremovable executive cannot long stand together." I have heard it said that, even now, in the absence of responsibility, members of the Government of India are every time perplexed by the uncertainty as to what support each of their measures will receive from the Assembly. This want of co-ordination between the Executive and the Legislature and this precarious position of the Treasury Benches must lead to unsatisfactory results. Responsibility of the nature indicated in our resolution can be the only cure for this unhappy state of affairs. Otherwise, even the 18 months' experience is enough to show that this mutual forbearance between the Executive and the Legislature, this constant give and take, this very occasional interference of the Head of the Executive like the "Deus ex machina", cannot be expected every time and from every council.

This result was almost anticipated, when the Liberal Deputation while in London pressed for some responsibility in the Central Legislature. Comparing broadly, the Reform Act has given the Lionel Curtis Scheme in the provinces and the Congress-League Scheme in the Central Government. The Congress scheme had proposed an elected Legislature, an irremovable executive, binding character of the resolutions popular control over the Budget, and half the executive Council to consist of Indians. Now this has been granted by the Reform Act with several safeguards which I have no time to refer to. But, while doing so, the joint-authors of the Montagu Report have, in most seathing terms, condemned the Congress Scheme in Chapter VII of their report. May I now request the Government of India to read this chapter carefully and see, how much of this criticism they realise in their working of the last 18 months. I believe, they will: not only find a condemnation of

their Reform Act, but also realise that the half-way house, having been constructed, they can only remedy the defect by proceeding to devise some sort of responsible Government in the way proposed by our resolution. On page 108 of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report, it is observed :—

“But, whenever, as in Canada and Malta attempts have been made to set up an irremovable executive and a popular assembly, acute conflict has ensued, and has resulted in either “an advance to popular Government or a return to autocracy”.

The report further states, in relation to India :—

“We believe that, in India, where the two sides are divided by race, and also by differences of standpoint, the discord would be much more serious, than it has ever been in the Empire’s history. We can see no prospect whatever ahead along the road we are invited by the Congress-League to take, but embittered and dangerous deadlocks, to be resolved when it arose, only by a plunge forward into Parliamentary Government at once or by reversion to autocratic methods”.

So, the two alternatives before the Government are:—(1) Plunge forward into Parliamentary Government. This is partially demanded by us, as we realise, that, with regard to the departments excepted by our resolution, the Government should retain its control. I know this is Dyarchy which I have condemned above; but the reserved subjects in the provincial Government are quite different from those which we reserve in the Central Government. (2) If Government will not accomplish this soon, you know, gentlemen, things cannot long remain stationary, and they will have to relapse back into autocracy pure and simple. Why, as recently as last month, when the Legislative Assembly had the hardihood to make a cut of about 10 crores in the Budget, even such an influential and responsible journal as the London “Times” seriously threatened that Government should scrap the Reform Act and reappear in their old garb as undiluted autocracy.”

But we are told that the appointment of three Indians in the Imperial Executive Council more than compensates for want of responsibility. Well, is that so? What is our experience of the 18 months? Out of the three Indians, two are placed in charge of the portfolios of Agriculture &c., and Education, &c., some of which are not only provincialised but transferred. Hence, they cannot have necessarily any initiative in these matters, and as for supervision, they can only create work for themselves

by poaching upon the field of the Ministers and get odium and unpopularity. Besides, Indians being still in a minority in the Executive Council, their votes are thrown away on a crucial question, because the European majority can have things in their own way. So, in actual practice these three Indians are not a real source of power and strength. The Government know how to take away by the left hand what is given by the right. I may say in passing that at least on the ground of economy, the time has arrived for abolishing these two portfolios as being superfluous and needlessly costly and utilise the two Indian Members for more important portfolios like Home, Finance or Commerce. And if this is to be done why not straight away introduce responsibility because the difference between a patriotic Indian as an Executive Councillor and as a Minister is very small, if he is worth his job ?

Gentlemen, my time is over and I must conclude. The preamble to our resolution of the All-India Federation mentions three reasons for proposed changes. (1) Experience already gained. (2) Rise in national consciousness. (3) Growing demand for further control over their destinies by the people of India. Now these last two considerations are so potent that they require no comment from me. As to the methods, Mrs. Besant was once of opinion that the Government of India should adopt voluntary responsibility. Now this is too much to expect from human nature as it is constituted. Even she has now changed and started the proposal of giving a mandate to the next council which was approvingly referred to by our President yesterday. I am not here discussing the *modus operandi* as it is outside the resolution.

Finally, we are told that we are too impatient and ought to wait till the statutory commission arrives after eight years. Well, after the acceptance of the resolution of Mr. Mazumdar in the Assembly by the Government of India in a modified form, let nobody speak of the statutory time-limit. This is gone. Why, even Mr. Montagu had given an assurance to that effect in the debate on the Government of India Bill, when he solemnly stated, that "if there is a remarkable and unforeseen development in Indian conditions in the space of 10 years, why, it does not tie the hands of Parliament. There can always be a commission appointed *in the interim*." Who, that knows the real history of the last three years, can deny that "unforeseen and remarkable development in Indian conditions" has occurred though in a way different from what Mr. Montagu contemplated? The Indian Bureaucracy think that we have just passed the Matriculation and are keeping terms for the Intermediate,

The Bachelor's degree examination is still far away. We deny it. We say we were fit already to go up to the Bachelors if not the Master's degree well, we got experience for 18 months and during that interval, this precocious Indian boy has shown such wonderful capacity that he has passed all examinations already and claims his right to be admitted to the Bachelor's, if not, the Master's degree. He is still docile and tractable; let him be admitted to the degree as early as you can. Otherwise, he will soon grow into such a mood as to disdain all your examinations and claim to be in the "sanctum sanctorum" all at once.

Prof. P. K. Telang (Benares) supported the resolution.

The President :—You have heard the resolution, gentlemen, duly proposed, seconded and supported. I take it that it is the unanimous wish of this Conference that this resolution be passed.

The resolution was then put to the vote and declared carried unanimously.

Resolution III.

Maintenance of Law and Order.

The Hon. Mr. Phiroz C. Sethna (Bombay) then moved the following resolution :—

"This Conference declares its staunch adherence to the policy of attaining self-Government by constitutional means and is of opinion that towards that end it is essential that law and order and security of life and property should be maintained in the country by all legitimate means."

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen—In the life of a nation we full well recognise that self-Government is the highest good and consequently it has throughout been the first article in our creed ever since we have aspired to political advancement. The Indian National Congress held its first sitting in this very city 37 years ago and its founders proclaimed from the house-tops and preached what they practised that we could adopt all constitutional modes of agitation and not rest content until we had secured for ourselves a full measure of self-Government as an integral part of the British Empire. Latterly, however, resort has been had to methods which we of the Liberal party cannot approve and must severely condemn. Some of the speakers who have preceded me in referring to the non-co-operation movement—notably the President, Mr. Kale, Mr. Chinmunmuld and Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas—have

condemned it in no unmeasured terms and have practically taken the wind out of my sail. I endorse all that they have said and would urge that constitutional means of agitation as taught us by our political leaders of the last generation are bringing us every day nearer to our goal.

To take only the last few years you will remember, ladies and gentlemen, that when the Morley-Minto Reforms came into existence in 1909 the most far-sighted Indian politicians looked upon that instalment as good enough for our requirements for perhaps a generation. The country however has moved much faster during recent years so that within 12 years we have in the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms received a further and a more solid and substantial instalment. When introducing these reforms a statement was made that 10 years later in 1931 a Parliamentary commission would be appointed to advise on a further instalment. This statement is differently interpreted. Those who do not like India to advance any faster than it is doing say that on no account is there to be any modification or improvement till 1931. Others and amongst them our President himself according to what he observed yesterday are clearly of opinion that the present Reforms are in the nature of an experiment and there is nothing to prevent us from making suggestions for improvement or asking for more and we must do so by all proper means.

Unconstitutional methods instead of hastening certainly retard our progress, and we have not to look to our political advancement alone. If we are to retain our place in the committee of nations there must be both political and material advancement. They must be like two steeds running abreast, nor tandemwise one ahead of the other. The non-co-operation movement devotes itself to politics exclusively and its sinister influence has checked our material prosperity very considerably. Have we not instances before us in modern and ancient history to show that unconstitutional methods set back the hands of the clock? There is the example of Russia before us to-day and within the Empire itself there is the case of Ireland. Although Ireland has received what it asked for yet owing to the methods it has adopted, it has not been able to evolve order out of chaos and there is in that country to-day, confusion worse confounded.

For the last few years a great change has been coming over the entire East and notably so in India. This period constitutes an epoch in our history which has the same significance with us as had perhaps the period of the French Revolution in the history of Europe. Warned by

their experience we must do all in our power to escape the horrors and the sufferings which befel the birth of political liberty in Europe. Non-violent non-co-operation is but a myth and we have before us the instances of Bombay, Calcutta, Chauri Chaura and, of course, Malabar. Non-co-operation, it cannot be denied, has brought in its train murder, bloodshed, rapine. Revolution and anarchy may follow and bring in their train their many concomitant evils.

If we pause to think seriously over the situation we will find that there is no necessity to adopt methods other than perfectly legitimate. Extremists and Moderates have but one aim in view, the attainment of self-government. We have already climbed several rungs of the ladder. There remain but the last one or two or three steps. The Extremists are inordinately impatient and want to reach the top immediately and at any price. Therein lies the difference with us. After the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms the Moderates believe that the longest they may have to wait will be another 10 years—perhaps 20. Even if it be the latter period, what is 20 years in the life of a nation if a delay of 10 to 20 years will assure the positive attainment of our cherished hopes side by side with the furtherance of our material prosperity.

I do not say for one moment that the British have not made mistakes. Their two most serious faults to my mind are that in the past they hardly ever lived up to their professions in the matter of political rights and the granting of equal status to the Indians. In fact these professions were more honoured in the breach than in the observance. Then they always branded Indians with the stamp of inferiority. Indians have rankled under these indignities and they are now determined to come into their own. The British recognise their mistakes and are now trying to make amends, of course somewhat late in the day. For one thing, the Services are now to be gradually Indianised. My own view is that so far as the Civil Administration is concerned the Services will be Indianised even earlier than we expect or earlier than some of us would like. I for one favour the continuance of Britishers in the Services during the transition period till we are on our legs. It is said of the English that they do make mistakes but that they muddle through all right in the end. If we are suddenly left to ourselves we too will blunder at first, but we will also muddle through all right, but we would certainly like to avoid the muddling stage if possible. The reason why I contend that on the Civil side the Indianisation will come faster than expected is that whilst at present in every district there are half a dozen or more British

Officials, the time is not distant when their number will dwindle down to one or two and no matter whatever the emoluments or the glamour of office such complete isolation from their kith and kin will become unbearable and they will resign sooner than otherwise. Whilst this may prove so on the Civil side, I am afraid the case is different in regard to the military. As the President told us yesterday although it is five years since we were promised a substantial number of commissions to Indians, what has been done so far is almost negligible and our efforts must be in the direction of getting the Government to Indianise the higher ranks of the army without more loss of time. This is urgently necessary.

Whilst we are ready to blame the British for their sins of omission and commission, in all fairness we must not fail to give them their due. The East India Company, a purely commercial organisation, which has developed into a great empire, has brought to this country real unity and a strong central government. We owe to this Government the security of our lives and the protection of our hearths and homes. Not many years back a Punjabi from the North could not possibly make himself understood to a Madrasi from the South and a Gujrati or a Maratha from the West could not possibly enthuse his Bengali or Ooriya brother in the East with his views on political advancement. The English language has been the means of bringing about this result and to help to foster a national spirit. By opening to us the doors of Western learning England has awakened India from its lethargy and now that we are awake and are demanding self-government there can be no going back, but in our turn every effort that we make in the direction of further political advancement must be by means of constitutional methods and no other, and that alone will help the country.

The charge is often laid down at our door that the great mass of well-disposed Indians are loath to intervene and too afraid of extremist abuse to lend much active support to the cause of law and order. It must rest with us to disprove such a charge. There may be ground of complaint on the score of repression in some of the other provinces but so far as the Bombay Presidency is concerned and whether our Ministers are consulted by the Executive Government or not we realise that there is no repression in this province and we must therefore be forward in trying to assure the Bombay Government and the country at large that we Liberals are always ready to uphold everything that makes for law and order and that whilst we will continue to fight for our political

rights we will take care not to depart from constitutional methods of agitation in all that we do.

Rao Bahadur Ramanbhai M. Nilkanth, M.L.C., (Ahmedabad), in seconding the resolution, said:—"Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen—

Ever since the birth of political life in this country in the last century, political movement had been conducted on the method of constitutional agitation and, the achievements of that method have not been small. It has been right after right culminating in the present reforms. Our faith in constitutional agitation remains, therefore, undiminished and unabated. We have every confidence that working by constitutional means we shall reach the goal of self-Government. The propaganda of defiance of law and disobedience of vested authority which has been set up in the country has led to the inevitable consequence of lawlessness, murder, arson, rapine and race-hatred. When the people are incessantly told that laws must be held in contempt, social order gets unhinged, men are seized with fury, and lawless classes come to believe that they can kill, outrage and plunder with impunity. In the Ahmedabad District from which I come the country-side is infested with robbers and dacoits. Every now and then we hear of villages being raided and shocking brutalities committed. People from the villages are flying to town for the very protection of life. They are afraid to take their goods to markets. Besides, people who refuse to abandon constitutional methods are held up to vituperation and terrorism is practised towards them. Such anarchy, such chaos, such hatred cannot possibly lead to moral or political uplift of the nation. Unwavering adherence to constitutional means alone will enable the country to win self-government."

Prof. V. K. Jog supported the resolution.

The president then put the resolution to the vote and declared it carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 4.

The Meston Award.

Mr. N. M. Samarth, M.L.A.—"Mr. President, Brother delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen,—

I come before you to move, for your acceptance, Resolution No. 4 on the printed agenda.

It deals, as you will see, with the Meston Committee's adjustment which has done a grievous wrong to the Bombay Presidency. It has

crippled its financial resources by taking away from it what, under a genuinely federal system of government, cannot, I submit, be legitimately claimed by the Central Government for itself but should form an item of revenue rightly belonging to the Province from whose people it is raised by direct taxation. The very basis on which the Meston Committee proceeded to apportion the Provincial contributions to the Central Government and the lines on which it was asked to proceed in allotting the sources of revenue to the Central Government and the Provincial Governments respectively are, I venture to think, unsound in principle and scarcely compatible with the trend, the goal, the basic idea of the Reform Scheme, namely, provincial autonomy for the Provinces. Provincial autonomy surely postulates such financial arrangements guaranteed to the Province from its own resources as may be necessary for the due performance of the services and duties which its geographical position, industrial requirements and administrative needs may entail upon it. I concede that the idea of provincial autonomy for a Province under a central federal Government carries with it in theory the necessary corollary of a clean cut between the revenue resources of the Province and of the federal Government. But I submit that constitutionally the clean cut should be based on direct and indirect taxation, giving to the Province the whole of the revenue directly derived in its area and to the federal Government the whole of the revenue levied by indirect taxation. If I remember aright, that is the principle adopted in the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act, by which the Commonwealth Parliament, that is to say, the federal legislature as distinguished from the legislatures of the States, has exclusive power over customs, excise, bounties and railway rates. That is all. However, apart from this theoretical consideration of the right basic principle which should have been adopted in determining the complete separation of revenues and a proper adjustment of financial relations between the central and provincial Governments, let me draw your attention to the parlous plight in which our Province has been placed by the arrangements now in force whereby we are deprived of practically the whole of the growing income-tax revenue in spite of the alteration made by the Joint Parliamentary Committee in the original proposal of the Meston Committee to sequester the whole of the Income-tax for Imperial purposes. As you are aware, that was the original proposal, against which the public of Bombay as well as the Government of Bombay protested in strong terms as involving grave injustice to this Province. On the 12th of July 1920,

when I was in London, I received a cablegram from the venerable Chairman of the Reception Committee of this Conference, the Hon'ble Sir Dinsha Wacha, in his capacity as President of the Western India National Liberal Association, in which he said :—

“The Western India Liberal Association consider that the Meston Committee failed to understand the true revenue position of Bombay. They sweep into the Imperial Treasury all the Income Tax, the largest source of a yearly growing revenue, and this will inevitably starve the larger annual provincial expenditure, so vitally essential to the greater moral and material progress of the Presidency. Kindly point out this grievous injustice as emphatically as you can to the Joint Select Committee and the Secretary of State for India, with a view to redressing prior to finally passing the Rules.”

On receipt of this cablegram, I communicated it at once to Mr. W. Douglas Hall, the Secretary of the Indian Reforms Committee, which, as you are aware, is an organisation started in London on behalf of our Party and has been doing quiet but solid work in furtherance of our movement and our views there in influential quarters. The Honorary Secretary of that Committee, Mr. H. E. A. Cotton, was at that time a member of the Committee which Mr. Montagu had appointed at the India Office to consider the Rules to be framed under the Reforms Act for the deliberation and final decision of the Joint Parliamentary Committee. Mr. Hall sent the cablegram to him as also to the Joint Parliamentary Committee. I saw the Under Secretary of State for India, Lord Sinha, in connection therewith and explained to him how unfair it was, particularly to Bombay and Bengal, who contributed by far the larger portion of the Income Tax collected in the whole of India, to be deprived of this fruit of the labour and enterprise of its mercantile population and be driven to finance their provincial administration, without sacrifice of efficiency and much-needed growth and improvement of its nation-building side, on such attenuated and emasculated remnants of revenue as were left to them under the proposed adjustment. While conceding the force of my contention, the objection which the Under Secretary of State put forward was that the Joint Parliamentary Committee was not in a position to reconsider the whole basis of the Meston Committee's adjustment and overhaul it on a new plan altogether without sending another Committee to India to reinvestigate the question or without, at any rate, calling for the reports of the Provincial Governments and of the Government of India on any new set of proposals, which, in either case, meant considerable delay in inaugurating the

Reform Scheme and any such delay would be highly undesirable. I confess I found there was considerable force in this objection. I suggested, however, a *via media* to get over that objection. I urged that the whole thing need not be sent back to India and suggested that the Joint Parliamentary Committee may lay it down in the Rules that the Central Government will be entitled to that amount from each Provincial Government every year which represents the average of the Income Tax collected from each Province during the ten years from 1911 to 1920, so as to include, in the average to be calculated, the whole of the war-period, during which huge profits were made by the mercantile classes in India and large receipts from the Income Tax and Super Tax flowed into the Treasury. It seemed at one time that there was some likelihood of this proposal receiving favourable consideration at the hands of the Joint Parliamentary Committee. But the Committee found another way of meeting to some extent the strong opposition which the proposal for the sequestration of the whole of the Income Tax to the central revenues had encountered from Bombay and Bengal. In their report on the Rules, the Committee mentioned the fact that the Bombay Government contested not only the amount of their contribution of 56 lakhs of rupees to the Government of India but also the allocation of the heads of revenue on which the whole scheme was based but they saw no reason to differ from the fundamental features of the proposals and pronounced their opinion that they were definitely opposed to provincialising the Income Tax. On grounds of policy, however, they recommended a share of 3 pies in the rupee to all the Provinces in the growth of revenue from the Income Tax so far as that growth was attributable to an increase in the amount of income over that which would have accrued to the Provincial Government in the year 1920-21,—the said share of 3 pies, however, to be calculated on the Income Tax collected under the Indian Income Tax Act of 1918, that is to say, not any subsequent Act by which the taxation on incomes may be enhanced by an Act of the Indian Legislature. They also laid down that the cost of special Income Tax establishments employed within a Province shall be borne by the Provincial Government and the Government of India in the proportions of 25 per cent and 75 per cent. respectively. The precise recommendations of the Joint Parliamentary Committee on the subject are embodied in Rule 15 of the Devolution Rules framed under Section 1 of the Government of India Act, 1919. The main provisions of that Rule are what I have already mentioned to you. Now, what has been the net result in practice of this so-called relief granted to

us grudgingly and in a niggardly fashion? Well, so far as Bombay is concerned, it means practically no gain to us. The relief has proved absolutely illusory. As I have already told you, the Rule in question, in accordance with which our share of 3 pies in the rupee in the growth of the Income Tax revenue is to be calculated, takes the year 1920-21 as the datum line,—a year which, on account of favourable exchange, continuance of war-profits and prosperity of the previous year, brought into the coffers of the State such a large amount of Income Tax collected in our Province as cannot, by any chance, be realised in any future years as calculated under the provisions of the Indian Income Tax Act of 1918. Bombay has thus suffered and will continue to suffer in this respect as long as the basis of this unjust adjustment is not satisfactorily revised. This is a demand which is quite apart from the other demand, which other Provinces have also been making, namely, the immediate reduction, and eventual abolition at an early date, of the provincial contributions which the Government of India now gets from each Province. As you know, our contribution has been fixed at 56 lakhs per annum. The Meston Committee, in fixing this amount, took for granted, what experience has proved to be a myth, namely, certainty of a surplus of revenue remaining at the disposal of the Bombay Government after the payment of this contribution and making due provision for its necessary expenditure. Their calculations were based on an assumption of the growth and elasticity of the revenues from the main sources left to the Bombay Government as provincial heads of revenue. How wrong that assumption was in regard to, say, land-revenue and revenue from excise needs hardly any exposition. Even on *prima facie* grounds, the growth and elasticity of the land-revenue in the Bombay Presidency, notoriously liable to acute scarcity and famine, necessitating suspensions and remissions, and taxed comparatively much higher than most Provinces in this respect, could not be certainly assumed to be what the Meston Committee based their calculations on. So also, in regard to the precarious excise revenue bound not to increase but to dwindle under the increasing pressure of public opinion reflected in a Legislative Council containing an overwhelming elected majority. But if you analyse the actual figures, you will find that the basis on which the contribution was calculated has been falsified by experience and that the increase and elasticity of revenue which the Meston Committee had anticipated for the Bombay Presidency had not materialised. And as for the expected surplus, you all know that our Presidency had to face a heavy enough deficit. And so also had Bengal. But Bengal was fortunate enough to get from the

Government of India a remission of the whole of her contribution of 63 lakhs for a period of 3 years with effect from the year 1922-23. When at the Simla session last September, the Hon'ble the Finance Member brought forward this motion before the Legislative Assembly, he justified the necessity of the relief to Bengal but, in doing so, questioned the necessity or justice of granting a similar relief to any other Province. My friend Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas promptly joined issue with him, and when I had the opportunity to speak on the motion before the House, I too questioned the correctness of the Finance Member's position that Bengal alone stood in need of this relief and that no other Province stood in such need. Perhaps it may interest you to know what I then said in making a fight for Bombay. I have been described by the special correspondent of a local daily as a "fierce fighter." Well, I confess, I am a bit of a fighter, whether fierce or not, when observations are made by any one in the Assembly which challenge contradiction. The Finance Member's observations in that debate were of that description and I would not allow them to pass unchallenged. This is what I said, as reported in the official proceedings of the Legislative Assembly :—

"Surely the Honourable the Finance Member must know that Bombay also is in the same boat with Bengal. We had a deficit of something like a crore and a half last year, which in Bombay we managed to tide over by drawing upon our reserve balance. Surely this state of things cannot go on long, without bringing the Bombay Government to the brink of bankruptcy. But if I am here, and so long as I am here, it will be my constant endeavour to see that the Central Government adjusts its resources in such a way that its normal expenditure is met from its own revenues without having anything to do with provincial contributions, which, under the injunctions of the Joint Parliamentary Committee, the Government of India are bound as speedily as possible to do away with."

Bombay has a good case,—surely as good a case as that of Bengal,—for better treatment than has been accorded to her by the Government of India in this respect. And as Bombay's case can be met without doing any injustice to other Provinces, which it is far from my desire to inflict on any of them, I feel sure that I would get the support of the non-official members of the other Provinces in the Legislative Assembly when I bring this matter before it. The only objection, worth notice, which the Government of India could take to our demand for a substantial share of the Income Tax is that the Income Tax collected in the Provinces of Bombay

is not necessarily the Income Tax collected from people living in our Presidency as a part of it is paid by joint stock companies whose shareholders are not all residents of the Bombay Presidency or by firms all whose partners are not such residents and consequently it would be right that Income Tax should be considered entirely as a source of revenue of the Government of India. The answer to that objection is that the Income Tax paid by the two different sets of people could be separately ascertained and a fair share of the Tax paid by the Bombay people might be allotted to this Presidency. As to allotting a share of a central source of revenue being inconsistent with the theory of the clean cut, the obvious answer is that already a share has been allotted under Rule 15 of the Devolution Rules, so that the allotting of a larger share to the Provinces involves no departure in principle from what already obtains under the present arrangements. One more point which has been put forward in the discussion of this subject is that the Income Tax must be a uniform tax throughout the country and must therefore be under the exclusive control of the Central Government. Nobody has ever urged that every Province should have its own Income Tax Act. Let the tax on Incomes be exclusively within the purview and competence of the Central Government and the Indian Legislature. That being conceded, the real point is, why should not the Provinces benefit by any increase in the Income Tax which may be made in any year by the Finance Act as passed by the Indian Legislature? Why should the share of the Provinces in the Income Tax be determined by the amount levied under the Act of 1918 and on the basis of the datum line of 1920-21? Why should they not have a share—and it must be a fair share—of the growing Income Tax revenue, or, to put it in another way, why should they not participate equitably in the growth of that revenue as it may occur year by year?

It seems to me, Sir, that a combined and determined effort should be made without delay by all the Provincial Governments and by all the non-official representatives of the different Provinces in the Indian Legislature to bring pressure to bear on the Government of India in order that they may represent to the Secretary of State for India the necessity and urgency of appointing another Committee to go into the question of the financial relations between the Provincial Governments and the Government of India over again in the light of the experience they have had of the working of the present arrangements. That appears to me to be the only immediate move upon which we must combine and to which we must direct our energies in order that our grievance on this subject may be redressed as early as possible.

I am afraid I have already detained you so long on the subject-matter of this resolution that I will leave my friend, the Hon'ble Mr. Chunilal Mehta, one of our esteemed Ministers, to deal with the other aspects of it which I have left untouched. His inside knowledge of the difficulties under which the transferred departments are labouring on account of the financial handicap which the Meston adjustment has imposed on our Government will enable him to expound with clearness and emphasis the grievance to which this resolution gives expression. After hearing him, I have no doubt you will accord your unanimous approval to the resolution. (Loud Applause).

The Hon. Mr. C. V. Mehta, (Bombay), seconded the resolution. He said if this Presidency failed to get the revenue to which it was entitled, then the people had no right to expect any improvement on the part of the Ministers, or even of the whole Bombay Government. When the basis for the present adjustment was arrived at it was recognised that Bombay was an industrial province. Nevertheless for the purpose of a theatrical formula a rising source of revenue, which rose from Rs. 47 lakhs ten years ago to over six crores in the current year, was sequestered by the Government of India, and in return for it the Presidency was given land revenue, which according to the Meston Committee was not expected to rise by more than four per cent every year. That was a grave injustice to an industrial province, a province which, because it was industrial, had to undertake an expensive form of administration. It was to the interest of the Presidency as a whole to take up this question even more strenuously than the late Legislative Council had done than their Government was doing all along, and than even the Legislative Assembly was going to do under the able guidance of their representatives from Bombay. Mr. Mehta urged that Bombay's share should be at least one-third of the total income-tax which was collected from the industry and labour of this Presidency.

The resolution was carried with acclamation.

RESOLUTION V. **INDIANISATION OF SERVICES.**

The Hon. Mr. R. P. Paranjpye (Poona) moved:—"This Conference strongly urges that it is essential on the grounds both of progress and of economy that the pace of Indianisation of the Services should be accelerated".

Mr. Paranjpye said the principle underlying the resolution had been accepted for nearly a century. When the charter of the East India

Company was renewed in 1833, it was made a deliberate condition that no disqualification was attached to anybody so far as service under Government was concerned on the ground of race, creed or colour. The point of all Indians had been that in their own country the public services should be manned by the people of the land. When they talked of swaraj it was essentially understood that the people who were to run it should be children of the soil, and it was most unfair and it was almost a negation of the principle of self-government that the administration should be carried on by people who had not made their home in the country. The resolution recommended the Indianisation of the Services on the grounds of progress and economy. Under the present system, when a European Civil Servant retired he left this country, and the result was that his experience was lost to them. They could imagine what that loss to progress was if they considered what would have happened if men like Sir Dinsha Wacha and Sir Ramkrishna Bhandarkar had retired to England after the age of 55 years. Then Indianisation was necessary on the ground of economy. Indians had a low standard of living so far as material things were concerned, and it was obvious that when the services were Indianised they would have to pay less. It was at one time thought that there should be no distinction between the English and Indian members of the Civil Service in regard to pay. This argument held good when the number of Indian Civil Servants was comparatively small, but now when it was decided that the percentage of Indian members of the Civil Service should be raised to 48 at the end of ten years, he thought the old principle would have to be given a go-by if their administration was to be managed with economy.

Rao Bahadur R. R. Kale, M.L.C., (Satara), in seconding the resolution, said:—

MR. PRESIDENT, BROTHER DELEGATES, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—

The Resolution which I have the honour to second deals with first, progress, and secondly economy. With regard to the first point the complaint is as old as the hills. The late Dr. Dadabhoy Nowroji was never tired of pressing the need of Indianization of the Services on the ground that foreign agency was very costly, that the money paid to foreigners went out of the country and further the experience and knowledge gained by men during the course of their long service in the country was lost to India. In the early seventies there was what was called the statutory Civil Service when men belonging to the

aristocracy where selected to fill a few posts in the higher services. This went on till 1887 when a Public Services Commission was appointed which resulted in the abolition of the statutory services and in its place was substituted what is now called the Provincial Service. This however has not made a change for the better. What we perhaps gained in efficiency was lost in uncertainty. Then came the changes introduced by the Morley-Minto Reforms, the underlying idea of which was the association of the people with the Government in the decision of public questions. Thus a seat was allotted to an Indian member on the Executive Council of the Governor General and also another on the Executive Council of the Local Government. The Decentralization Commission which sat about the same time did not take into consideration the question of introducing the Indian element in the higher offices but only resulted in creating a few minor posts such as those of Deputy Superintendent of Police. In 1911, Their Majesties visited India. The visit and its reception proved the deep loyalty of the masses and the despatch which announced the two most important changes viz. the modification of the partition of Bengal, and the removal of the Capital of India to Delhi, observed that it was necessary in due course to give Indians a larger share in the Government of their country. In 1912 there came the Public Services Commission appointed by Lord Hardinge's Government with a view to admit Indians as largely as possible in the Public Services, consistently, however, with the best interest of the country. The report of this Commission though ready in 1915 was held over owing to war and came to be published in 1917. Its effect was rather to irritate than satisfy Indian aspirations. It assumed that British responsibility in India requires a preponderating proportion of British offices. This report besides sacrificed economy to so-called efficiency and instead of curtailing the number of European Officers only added a few places for Indians here and there. The war which supervened this Report, having changed the angle of vision, there came that famous declaration of August, 20 1917, by His Imperial Majesty which laid down most emphatically the policy of the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration in the country in the forefront of the Reforms. The Mount-Ford Report of 1918 says "We regard it as necessary that recruitment of a largely increased proportion of Indians would be at once begun and no time should be lost in increasing the proportion of Indian recruits." When we come to the Government of India Act of 1919 it is significant to note that that Act in the first instance omitted the preamble dealing with the increased association

of Indians in the administration but the joint Parliamentary Committee got it embodied in the enactment. But strange to say that although this was finally embodied in the preamble it finds no place in the authorized Government publication of the Government of India Act. In the body of the Act itself we find no explicit provision enabling the Government of India to make the association of Indians more and more complete.

The whole power is placed in the hands of the Secretary of State in Council for Sec. 96 (C) provides that a Public Services Commission shall be established in India which shall discharge in regard to recruitment and control of the public services in India such functions as may be assigned thereto by Rules made by the Secretary of State in Council. It will be seen that this commission has not yet been appointed nor have the rules contemplated by the section framed. This therefore is the most vital point in the working of the Reforms and we ought to concentrate our attention on this question of all questions and carry on an agitation in the press and from the platform in this respect instead of wasting our time and energy in fruitless campaigns of visionary dreams of Swaraja. If the Indianization of the Services is to take place on a large scale, the rules to be framed must provide for a higher percentage than that laid down in the public Services Commission Report. The recommendations of the Public Services Commission Report with regard to percentage are out of date and ought no longer to govern the consideration of the question as they related to pre-war time and that document ought not to be quoted in support of any step that has to be taken. Secondly with regard to the emoluments also the question must be looked at from a different point of view.

And this brings me to the next question of economy. Standard scales should be fixed for all services with reference to Indians recruited in India at Indian rates sufficient to attract good men and extra allowances should be given to Europeans but the pays of Indians and Europeans should be the same. This in fact is the principle inunciated in the Montford Report and the sooner this standard is adopted the better. It will be seen that although the question of the Indianization of the Services has been discussed from olden times and its need has been admitted in theory, the progress so far achieved has been very small. Time has therefore now come when under the reformed Government we must try to give practical effect to this matter and the only way in which this can be done is by employing the Indian agency in the various branches of the administration which would necessarily be cheaper and perhaps better

qualified owing to the officers being conversant with the language and customs of the people. For example the judicial Branch of the Civil Service can entirely be manned by Indians. So also in other Services the employment of Europeans should be confined to posts where expert knowledge is necessary and for that purpose foreign experts at whatever cost it may be may well be employed but on terms of agreements which may extend over a fixed period of 5 or 10 years. In the executive and some other Services perhaps the European element may have to be retained to a certain extent.

Lastly while in the Civil Services a beginning can be said to have been made to admit Indians in the higher services what do we find with regard to Military Services? At present we do not find any higher offices filled by Indians in this branch of the Service. We must get more and more men trained in this Service and Indian soldiers must be admitted to the higher offices in the Army. With compulsory primary education we shall get a sufficient number of literate persons as recruits for the fighting races, while the free admission into Territorial Force should be encouraged. This will result in enormous saving in the large military expenditure.

In conclusion, I must congratulate the minister for education on the views he has expressed in regard to the payment of Indians on a lower scale and I trust that he will himself give effect to this principle, albeit partially and so far as lies in hands and thus lighten the burden that falls ultimately on the poor taxpayer in this country. With these words I heartily second the resolution and hope it will be carried unanimously.

Mr. Kanji Dwarkadas, M.L.C., (Bombay), supported the resolution which, when being put to the vote, was declared carried unanimously.

Resolution VI.

ECONOMY IN ADMINISTRATION.

Mr. G. C. Bhate, M.L.C., (Kolaba), then moved: This Conference urges that the Government of Bombay will continue to make strenuous efforts to economise expenditure in the administration so that a financial equilibrium may be reached as early as possible and larger sums made available for nation-building departments.

Mr. Bhate urged that strict retrenchment was necessary to maintain an equilibrium in their provincial finance. He said their administration was top-heavy and unless this top-heaviness was removed it would be difficult to bring about this equilibrium.

Mr. S. K. Bole, M.L.C., (Bombay), seconding the resolution, said :—

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I have been asked to second this resolution. All over the world they are talking of economy and re-trenchment. In England they are going to apply the Geddes Axe. But we don't ask the Government to take such drastic measure but only to make use of a pruning knife, and I am sure if they use it in right earnest they will be able to make a good deal of saving. There is no doubt that the administration has become top-heavy and if we ask for retrenchment a clerk here or a peon there is dismissed and for doing that also the services of a highly paid extra officer are engaged. This is not the real way of effecting retrenchment. Instead of making a beginning from the bottom, a beginning should be made from the top. The Governor of Bombay used to manage the affairs of the Presidency with the assistance of only two Executive Councillors in previous years. But now there are four Executive Councillors and three Ministers all of whom get fat salaries. The Ministers are not in any way inferior to the Indian or European members of the Executive Council. They are able men but they will be prepared to accept less pay for the sake of their country provided the salaries of the Executive Councillors are equally reduced. This will also lead to much saving. There are many superfluous highly paid officers in various departments and a good deal of saving will be made if some of these posts are done away with. In the Secretariat, for instance, there are besides Secretaries in various Departments several Deputy Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries. The real work is done by the clerks under them who are working late hours. Some of these higher officers have simply to sign and pass on letters and do the work of Post Offices. In this way many instances can be cited. There are the posts of the Commissioners of the Divisions as told by the proposer of the resolution. There are the newly created posts of Deputy Excise Commissioners. All these posts are not necessary. In the Public Works Department all the work is done by the overseers but over and above them are Assistant Engineers, Deputy Engineers and Engineers, some of whom are only nominal. Besides these some

pensioners are provided for in the temporary establishments and they get their salaries besides pension. Many of the Officers get allowances besides their high salaries. There are house allowances, hill allowances, war allowances, travelling allowances, tobacco allowances, duty allowances. In fact there are so many allowances that I cannot remember them all. A large amount of our income is thus swallowed up by highly paid services and the nation-building departments are made to starve. Many of these departments are under the ministers who are all able men and they might have got various schemes ready with them but for want of funds all their schemes remain in their heads. If they are provided with the sinews of war adequate funds they will be able to do much good work. I therefore hope that Government will be pleased to take proper steps in proper directions for effecting economy and retrenchment and provide the nation-building departments with sufficient funds. With these words I second the resolution and resume my seat.

The resolution was put to the vote and declared unanimously carried.

The Conference at this stage adjourned for tea. On re-assembling, the President referred to the death of H. H. the Maharaja of Kolhapur and said that it was the general desire of the Conference that he should state that they had heard the news with sincere sorrow.

The following two resolutions were put from the chair and declared carried unanimously.

Resolution VII.

POSITION OF INDIANS ABROAD.

7. "This Conference accords full supports to the resolutions adopted by the Indian Legislative Assembly in February last with regard to the equal status of Indians in South and East Africa and emphatically disapproves of the unfair policy foreshadowed by the Colonial Secretary in reference to the future administration of Kenya Colony as far as the rights and privileges of Indian settlers are concerned".

Resolution VIII.

Mr. MONTAGU'S SERVICES.

8. "This Conference puts on record its deep appreciation of the great services rendered by Mr. Montagu to this country during the period

of his official connection with it, as Secretary of State, and regards his resignation as a misfortune to India. This Conference further expresses its conviction that any departure from his policy towards India will have dangerous political consequences”.

Resolution IX.

REMOVAL OF UNTOUCHABILITY.

Mr. R. G. Pradhan moved:—“This Conference trusts that all possible efforts will be made to remove the stigma of untouchability which at present attaches to the so-called depressed classes and urges on the Government to make strong efforts for providing special facilities for education and equal chances of employment both to them and the backward classes.”

Mr. Pradhan said nobody had written and spoken so strongly on the question of untouchability as Mr. Gandhi, who said that without the removal of untouchability there would be no Swaraj in a year or even in a hundred years. Whether they agreed with that view or not, Mr. Pradhan thought that the manner in which the depressed classes were treated for centuries past in this country was a serious stigma upon the Hindu culture. They had six crores in the country, who were treated as less than human.

Mr. S. S. Dongre and Mr. Karandiker seconded and supported the resolution and it was carried.

Resolution X.

THE KHILAFAT.

The following resolution was moved from the chair and carried unanimously:—This Conference strongly supports the demands of the Indian Musselmans in regard to the revision of the Peace Treaty with Turkey and urges upon Parliament the necessity of meeting the religious requirements of the Indian Moslem Community.

RESOLUTION XI.**Military Expenditure.**

The Hon. Sir Dinshaw E. Wacha (Bombay) moved:—

“Viewing with the greatest alarm the enormous growth of military expenditure during the last three years, which has been the principal cause of the unprecedented deficits in the budgets of the Central Government, necessitating the intolerable burden of new and enhanced taxation of 30 crores, this Conference places on record its considered opinion that it is imperative to bring down that expenditure to the level of the pre-war period. Unless the Government of India makes strenuous efforts in this important direction there will be no escape from a condition of bankruptcy, wholly calamitous to the moral and material prosperity of the country and its people”.

Ladies and Gentlemen, you may not be unaware that well-informed criticism on the burdensome character of the Indian Military Expenditure was first crystallised as back as 1880, soon after the conclusion of the second Afgan War of disagreeable memory. It was waged at a time when a severe famine, almost equal in intensity to the one which overwhelmed the country in 1896-97, was literally decimating the population in various Presidencies and Provinces, notably in Madras. It was notorious that the fund set apart for famine relief needed for the starving and hungry was seriously diverted towards the war expenditure on the War which has since been admitted as having been unjustly provoked by the Government. But if the criticism at first was not sufficiently articulate and crystallised, there is no denying of the fact of its having been searchingly analysed at the very first Indian National Congress which was held in Bombay in December 1885. But I will not take up your time by relating even cursorily the steady growth of the charges on account of the army services from that year forward, stage by stage, to date. Suffice it to say that on the invitation of the Legislative Committee which was appointed in 1921, soon after the Council Session of March of that year, I prepared and submitted for their consideration a memorandum, copies of which were distributed to each and every member of the Imperial Legislature. I gave, in as brief a compass as possible, a history of the growth of this expenditure. I also tabulated and analysed the budgetted estimates for 1921-22 as succinctly as I could. That memorandum will fully enlighten you as to the appalling nature of the expenditure demanded by the Military Department,

But let me inform you here in a single sentence the broad fact, namely, that whereas, after the mutiny and the consolidation of the country in 1860, the army charges cost $14\frac{1}{2}$ crores, they rose to 30 crores at the close of 1913-14 and now stand at 62 crores for the current financial year, exclusive of exchange which was 6 crores as elicited by the Hon'ble Mr. P. C. Sethna in the Council of State. Of course, the country has had to pay more for dearness of provisions, munitions, additional pensions and so forth as demanded. The demands of the War Office are always crushing. As you may be aware, it is supreme in matters of ordnance, depot charges and British Officers' and soldiers' pay and pensions. The Government of India has no voice thereon. That Government might protest and protest and write weighty dispatches, full of unimpeachable facts and arguments, as they have actually done times out of number in the past, against the unjust exactions of the War Office, but they might protest in vain till the end of time. They appeal to ears that will not hear and to eyes that will not see. I am not speaking without the book. The dispatches of the Government of India, let alone all other authoritative publications on the subject, are public property and he who runs may read them. They are voluminous, apart from their ponderosity as contained in the report of the Simla Army Commission, a *Vade Mecum*, by itself, and the reports of half a dozen Committees specially appointed at various times to arbitrate on the disputes arising from the extravagant and unjustifiable charges of the War Office. To study and digest them would take many months without interruption. I cannot give you the substance of a hundredth part of them for your enlightenment even if I stand here before you for a working day of seven hours. Such is the gruesome story of the Military Octopus. They of the Army seem to burn candle at both ends, at Westminster and Delhi.

But to come to the intolerable burden of the taxpayer entailed by the Military Budgets of 1921-22 and 1922-23. Briefly, they are to a large extent hardly warranted. Of course, we may admit at once the plea of the apologists touching the increase caused by the dearness of provisions and clothing, ordnance, soldiers' and officers' pay and pensions and so forth. All these, however, must *automatically* cease as price levels reach normality and the war pensions come to an end in a few years. So far there is certain to be a decrease without the clutches of any committee of a Geddes or an Inchcape. But even after making every allowance for them there is a residue of expenditure of a character which is unaccountable. It is owing to the top-heaviness of the highly paid army staff and the dropsical condition of others of a kindred

character. The explanatory memoranda of the Financial Secretary are no doubt good in their way touching increases and decreases. But in the absence of independent expert testimony, like that of a Geddes Committee who could minutely investigate into the why and the wherefor of scores and scores of changes under the head of the Army charges, we are not in a position to see what is reasonable and fair and what is unreasonable and exorbitant. Again, there is that staggering expenditure of over 8 crores on the fruitless Waziristan Campaign. Heaven only knows to what figures the charges may ultimately reach. I suspect that they may be almost double but it will be so difficult to correct these, prepared as these Military Accounts generally are, by the witches who preside over the book-keeping department. In the past 30 years, nearly 100 crores at the very least, if not more, have been wasted in the pursuit of those scientific frontiers which are like willo-the-wisp. In the pursuit of it, many millions have been wasted.

And what is the result in the end?—This. That the last two years' budgetary provisions have saddled the far from prosperous taxpayer with a burden of enhanced and new taxation of 30 crores, a taxation unprecedented and unparalleled in the annals of British Indian finance since the days of Plassey. That is the gruesome story. This military harpy swallows not only the whole of our taxation old and new, but something more as I have proved in my memorandum. How long is this to last? That is the question of questions. It is impossible that the Imperial Legislature will tolerate any such colossal estimates for 1923-24. The consequences, one can anticipate, will be nothing short of the bankruptcy of the Government of India. Of course, they will not get a discharge from the Bankruptcy Court were they to be put in the witness-box for a searching cross examination. Only they being self-sufficient and uncontrolled, will discharge these staggering liabilities by means of some cheap agency now in operation in bankrupt Europe, namely, the printing press which will issue unlimited fiduciary notes of an inconvertible character. The net result of that condition would be further depreciation of currency, higher cost of living, leading to higher wages,—indeed all the rest moving in a vicious circle.

It remains to be seen what miracles the mighty Inchcape Committee will achieve. How far will their axe go to the very root of the overgrown Military expenditure. Meanwhile, when all is said and done, I would entreat you to bear firmly in mind that unless that Committee emphatically recommends the abolition of the fatal Army Amalgamation Scheme of 1859, there never will be any substantial relief to Indian finance

so far as Army charges are concerned. That scheme, passed by Parliament, in teeth of strenuous opposition of the Indian Military Officers of renown and experience, has been all through these 60 years and more the direful spring of financial woes unnumbered. Many of you may be almost innocent of its character. I can only briefly explain it to you in a few words. The scheme is in the nature of an unjust and unequal partnership between the War Office in England and the Government of India. England is the rich senior partner, having a dominant, nay, absolutely commanding, voice and the Indian Government, the most impecunious junior, with no voice at all. The iniquity of the partnership lies in this. That whatever bills the War Office may present at the point of the bayonet must be footed by the Government of India without one If or But! The War Office is the chartered libertine who calls for the tune and the Government of India is the mute slave who pays the piper. That is the long and short of this precious Army Amalgamation scheme of 1859, a scheme against which the late Professor Fawcett, that true friend of India, inveighed and inveighed in the strongest terms in the House of Commons from 1874 to his death in 1885. But that fatal system not only survives to this very hour but flourishes like the greenbay tree because as the late Samuel Laing, once India's Finance Minister, said, "India is the milch cow of England!"

I wish you, delegates of this Liberal Conference, to bear in mind that unless this unequal and improvident partnership is dissolved, and for ever, there is no hope of the Indian Military expenditure being reduced to a proportion compatible with the ability of the Indian taxpayer and commensurate with India's proper necessities. For years together British Estimates have been annually saved hundreds of thousand pounds by this fatal arrangement. So, I repeat, let us wait and see what the mighty axe of the Inchcape Committee is going to do. It is on its exploitation of this unprofitable Sahara of Indian Military Expenditure that will depend its reputation as expert axemen.

The Hon. Mr. Gulam Hussein Hidayatullah, in seconding the resolution, said :—Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen,

This question is of vital importance to the country and of special interest to me, coming as I do from Sind, which is very near to the frontier and intimately connected with it.

It is an indisputable fact that our military expenditure is excessively heavy. However, I should like to quote a few figures in support of this contention.

Our military expenditure before the war was about 20 crores, 53 lakhs; in 1921-22, it was 35 crores; and this year it is estimated at 62 crores. That is, the excess over the prewar expenditure is above 40 crores, and the present expenditure is about three times the previous amounts.

The total revenue of the Central Government in 1921-22 was, approximately, 130 crores, and the military expenditure was about half the total revenue. It may be contended that the army is maintained for the whole of British India, and that the revenue of the whole of British India, including the Provincial revenues should, therefore, be taken into account. The total revenue of the Imperial and Provincial Governments is, I understand, about 200 crores. Even then, the military expenditure is about one third of the total revenue of British India.

A COMPARISON.

For comparison, let us take the British budget of 1921-22. I understand the expenditure on the army in England was about 125 millions out of a total revenue of about 1,200 million sterling. That is, the military expenditure in England was about 10 per cent. of the total revenue.

It is thus clear that the military expenditure in India is most extravagant. This expenditure cannot be viewed with equanimity. Finance is the key-note of all reforms, and the financial consideration is always the paramount consideration. The Imperial budgets have of late been deficit budgets. This is largely due to the heavy military expenditure.

This deficit can be met only in three ways, namely, by borrowing, by increasing existing taxes or imposing fresh ones, or by economy.

Continuous borrowing for the purpose of meeting recurring expenditure with no certainty of repayment will precipitate disaster, and is, therefore, out of the question.

The next means is either to increase the existing taxes or to impose fresh ones. India is an agricultural country, and the principal source of income is agriculture. Agriculture depends upon natural conditions, and can, therefore, not provide an assured income. Though the public burdens in India are no doubt, light in comparison to those in other countries yet the average income of an individual in this country is comparatively meagre. I, therefore, do not think that the people can bear the strain of additional taxation. Hence, this means, too, is outside the region of practical politics.

MEANS OF STRICT ECONOMY.

There then remains the means of strict economy in military expenditure. The expenditure before the war was about 20 crores, 53 lakhs. No doubt, of late, the value of the rupee has declined, and the salaries and the comforts of the military department have been enhanced. However, at the time of the Meston Committee's Report, the military expenditure was estimated not to exceed 45 crores. Hence, even allowing for the necessary improvements in the pay and amenities of the military service, the military expenditure of 65 crores is excessive.

Let us consider the military situation and its requirements. There is danger from the mari-time frontier of India because of the formidable British navy. There is also no danger from the North-East frontier owing to the stupendous barriers of the Himalayas, never known to have been crossed in history by an invading army. The only danger then, is from the North West frontier. In the pre-war days, there was the bogey of Russian aggression from this side. Now, Russia has been shattered to pieces, and there is no fear of any general organised attempt at aggression on the part of that nation. Besides, the relations with Afghanistan are as friendly as before. Thus, there is no fear from that side.

There, then, remains a borderland between our territory and that of Afghanistan infested by predatory tribes, against whose raids we have to defend ourselves. But we have now adequate railway and telegraph communication between Karachi, Sukkur, Sibi, Quetta, Chaman, Bolan, Harnai, Pishin, and other places, and we have also fortifications in those parts. Hence, the danger from this quarter, too, is not considerable.

It will thus be seen that there is no necessity for any heavy expenditure for defence against foreign aggression.

INTERNAL CONTROL.

We next come to the question of internal control. For this purpose, too, there is no need of heavy expenditure. On the whole, there is peace and order in the country, and, though of late there have been occasional disorders, a large force is not required for the purpose.

Besides, it must be borne in mind that the power of every army has been immensely increased by new forms of armament and equipment. It is obvious that soldiers equipped with machine guns, armoured cars, tanks, aeroplanes, and the like, are more effective than soldiers armed with rifles

only. So also, soldiers moved about in motor lorries are more effective than soldiers on foot or in bullock transport. It stands to reason, therefore, that if we keep up, as is at present proposed, an army of the same size as before, that army is many times more powerful a military machine than before. We have seen, however, that there is not much fear of foreign aggression or of internal disturbance, and owing to modern equipment, it is not necessary to maintain the same force as before, especially when we cannot afford it.

The figures of military expenditure in England and in India which I have quoted clearly show that, while the civil authorities in England have kept the army well under control, in India the civil authorities have failed to exercise proper control over the army. It is, therefore, our duty to strengthen their hands by a clear and emphatic pronouncement of public opinion on this vital point. In this connection, it may be observed that there had recently been a difference of opinion between the Home Government and the Government of India as to the defence of the Ladha line in South Waziristan. The Home Government insists that this line should be defended by regulars, though the financial difficulty has been pressed on their attention. In these circumstances, I think it is for this Conference to enter an emphatic protest against the dictatorial attitude of the Home Government. As a rule, the man on the spot is trusted, and I fail to see why in this matter the opinion of His Excellency the Viceroy, who paid a personal visit to the frontier, should be ignored. The hill men on the frontier can be utilised, within certain limits, as an effective militia supported by regulars. The local levies are conversant with the country and the people, would be of special service on the principle of setting thieves to catch thieves, and are less costly. I do not propose that the defence of the frontier should be entirely left in the hands of these hill men, but I only suggest that these men might be employed, supported by regulars stationed at various centres within convenient distance.

Before I conclude, I should like to make a few suggestions on this subject. I am not a military expert, and can, therefore, only proceed on general lines.

LESSONS OF WAR MISAPPLIED.

First, the military authorities in India have gravely misapplied the lessons of the war, and have succumbed to a mania of extreme efficiency. The campaigns in Mesopotamia and other places showed the speed with which raw recruits could be converted into a disciplined army. Thus, at the outbreak of the war, the combatant strength of the Indian army,

including Reservists, was 1,94,000. Enlistments during the war amounted to 7,91,000, making a total combatant strength of 9,85,000. Of this number, 5,52,000 were sent overseas, and fought with success and distinction. Thus, the strength of the regular army could well be reduced, and be supplemented by recruits when the need arises. A fortiori, the regular army could still further be reduced and supplemented by a larger number of Reservists. A great deal of economy could thus be effected.

I would next suggest that Indian regiments should be officered entirely by Indians. In this suggestion, I am fortified by the opinion of Colonel Repington, who expressed the same view to Mr. Montagu. The suggestion is also supported by a similar practice in Egypt. Great economy would result as service obtained locally would be much cheaper than service procured from abroad.

Further, considerable sums are spent on equipment, such as arms, machine guns, armoured cars, tanks and the like, which are procured from England. Why should arrangements not be made for the manufacture of these requirements in India? It is largely a question of capital, and the money could be raised for the purpose by loans. The measure would result in great economy, and promote the development of Indian industry.

Again, the war has taught the important lesson that every civil factory could be converted into a factory for the manufacture of war material. This would render unnecessary any large amount of military stores, which could be turned out as occasion arose.

CIVILIAN CONTROL OF SUPPLIES.

Then, I would suggest that effect be given to the proposal of the Esher Committee that there should be a civil officer in charge of supply. The appointment of such an officer, preferably an Indian, if available, would result in an effort to effect economy and to promote the industrial development of the country.

I have only proceeded on general lines as I am not a military expert. However, I would suggest that, with a view to securing expert advice, a fund be raised for the awarding of prizes to those who offer the best constructive suggestions for economy in the various details of military expenditure. This would supply the defect of expert information in regard to the minutia of a technical matter.

With these remarks, I reiterate my hearty support to the resolution.

Resolution XII.

Mr. G. K. Devadhar, (Bombay) moved :—

“ This Conference urges on the attention of Government as also the public the great need for accelerating the process of nation-building and in particular emphasizes the need for adequate financial provision for the following :—

(a) The spread of primary education on a steadily widening basis so as to meet the requirements of all sections of the people specially the communities still backward in education and the depressed or untouchable classes, accompanied by facilities of hostels, scholarships and free studentships ;

(b) Spread of industrial and technical instruction among the artisan classes ;

(c) Systematic improvement of agriculture in this presidency by expediting the construction of the larger irrigation works now proceeding, and by undertaking similar works ;

(d) Encouragement and stimulation of Cottage industries on co-operative lines which would supplement small agricultural incomes.

(e) The development of forests and the exploitation of their products for industrial and commercial purposes.”

In moving the resolution, Mr. Devadhar said :—“ Fellow Delegates, Ladies, and Gentlemen, none can be indifferent to the great task of *Nation-Building*. All parties were united in this ideal ; what they differed in was not the ideals or the principles but the methods. This resolution sets forth in an eminently practical form the various directions in which the moral and the material well-being of our vast masses had to be promoted. The various reforms advocated in this resolution touched more than three-fourths of our people and as such, though last on the list, it could not be considered least important. It, therefore, behoves us as leaders of public opinion to educate the popular minds on this question and Government should not delay vigorous action in bringing about the reforms. The great strength of a Nation is its average man. If the average man were poor, ignorant, backward and socially low and neglected, the Nation can never hope to be strong. Both Government and the people, therefore, must take united efforts to raise the average man, morally and materially. They must put their shoulders to the wheel. It was no use saying that there were no funds available. To undertake this

work in right earnest, was to lay the foundation-stone of the edifice of Nation-building. Let, therefore, our Councils and Government try all manner of means to procure the funds; and if retrenchment or curtailment would not bring forth the necessary funds, let Government raise a big provincial loan for all these reforms. There will be, it is true, a very heavy burden of interest on taxation. But such investment was very justifiable and also profitable in the end. I, therefore, strongly urge and appeal to Government to find funds to carry out the different objects mentioned in this resolution. With these observations I recommend this proposition to your acceptance." (Cheers).

Mr. T. A. Kulkarni, (Bombay) seconded the resolution. He referred to the struggle that had been going on in certain parts of Kolaba district between landlords and cultivators and said the latter were non-co-operating with the former, and had brought about a serious crisis. The reasons of that situation were manifold. Some of them were economic, but there were also social reasons at work. The advanced and educated classes in these places had long neglected to ameliorate the condition of the ignorant cultivating classes and the result was the present situation. He was afraid the matter had come to such a pass that the conflagration would spread to all the districts in the Deccan.

Mr. Katkade (Bombay) supported the resolution and it was carried.

Rao Bahadur R. R. Kale, M.L.C., then invited the Conference to meet next year at Satara.

Sir Gokūldas K. Parekh, in proposing a hearty vote of thanks to the President, said doubts had been expressed in some quarters as to the success of that Conference, and if those doubts had been dispelled it was owing to the high qualities of their President.

The Hon. Mr. Cowasji Jehangir, seconding the vote of thanks, said if he had believed everything that he had read during the last fortnight, he would have expected Mr. Sastri to be a pompous, bouncing President, ready to rule every body out of order, but he was surprised to find him modesty personified. The moral to be learnt from this was not to believe all they read, but to judge from their own experience. Mr. Sastri had shown England that India was capable of producing men equal to any that she could produce, and now he was going to show to the Colonies that India was capable of sending a man equal to any they could send to the mother country. (Applause).

The motion was carried with acclamation.

MODERATION AND COMPROMISE.

The President, in acknowledging the vote of thanks, addressed a few words as to the necessity of organising the Liberal Party. It was said by some that, that party was bound to meet with comparative ill-success so long as it eschewed attractive aims, shrank from great ideals and did not discover watchwords and battle-cries which would draw the hearts of young men to them. There might be a good deal in that suggestion, if their sole wish was to attain success at any cost—even at the cost of its principles. (Hear, hear.) There was a very serious mistake in the minds of most people as to the nature of moderation and compromise. In human affairs he knew no one—not the greatest saint they had yet produced, who did not in actual practice bend his knee to the diety of moderation and compromise. Nevertheless there was a fashion about of decrying these words and scorning the ideas that they imported, as if they were something mean which clean-minded persons should not touch and an adherence to which was bound to cast any party, any body or association into the cloud of infamy. Compromise, the President maintained, was the one condition on which any society could function to advantage. If it discarded compromise it fell to pieces. He asked those of them who had studied the proceedings of the Congress to give attention to one single feature. The party which ran the Congress to-day prided itself on standing for principle and on discarding compromise and accommodation as unworthy and dishonourable, and in calling the moderates men who had a weak creed and who abandoned their principle the moment there was opposition. But if some of those present had followed the proceedings of the Subjects' Committee of the Congress and if the secret history of these proceedings could be written, they would probably find that even the great man, who was upheld by an iron will, who subdued men and matters to his will and who enjoyed for a time the position of a dictator, had felt the impact of outside opinion many a time and abandoned the position which but for that opposition he would have maintained at all costs. He too had bowed his knee to compromise. Let them not be ashamed of compromise. Compromise was shameful when it meant an abandonment of their principle, going back on a cherished doctrine, or trafficking with evil, wrong and injustice. But when it meant a partial fulfilment where an absolute fulfilment was impossible, when it meant something gained to their advantage,—something in forward direction, the man who refused to take advantage of the position, did no service to the cause which he professed to serve, but, on the contrary, he was an enemy who must be swept off before the cause. On the other

hand, their friends on the other side had, after twenty months of feverish activity and after twenty thousand men had been put in jail as a result of that activity, laid down their arms and now expressed their surprise at the result of their operations. The President then proceeded to indicate the directions in which the moderate party should organise themselves both in the Councils and outside.

The Conference was then dissolved.

MEMBERS OF THE RECEPTION COMMITTEE.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>1. The Hon'ble Sir Dinshaw,
E. Wacha Kt.,
Jiji House, Ravelin Street,
Fort, Bombay.</p> <p>2. Sir Gokuldas K. Parekh, Kt.,
New Queens Road, Bombay.</p> <p>3. The Hon'ble Mr. Phiroze
C. Sethna, O. B. E.
Canada Building,
Fort, Bombay.</p> <p>4. D. G. Dalvi Esq., B.A., LL. B.,
Charni Road, Girgaum,
Bombay.</p> <p>5. J. R. B. Jeejeebhoy Esq.,
Alice Building, Hornby Road,
Fort Bombay.</p> <p>6. Kanji Dwarkadas Esq. M. L. C.,
Chartered Bank Buildings,
Esplanade Road, Fort.</p> <p>7. C. S. Deole Esq., B.A.,
Servants of India Society,
Bombay 4.</p> <p>8. Vasantrao S. Ravut Esq.,
French Bridge, Chaupaty.</p> <p>9. Ahmed S. Vasi Esq.,
43, Apollo Street,
Fort, Bombay.</p> <p>10. Hatim E. Attari, Esq.,
Nagdevi Street, Bombay.</p> <p>11. Major C. Fernandes, M. D.,
" Fernville " Girgaum Back
Road, Bombay 4.</p> <p>12. M. D. Altekar Esq., M. A.,
Hajee Cassum's Blocks,
French Bridge,
Bombay No. 7.</p> <p>13. N. M. Samarth Esq., M.L.A.,
Girgaum Back Road, Bombay.</p> | <p>14. V. N. Naik Esq., M A ,
5, Benham Hall Lane,
Bombay 4.</p> <p>15. G. K. Devadhar Esq., M.A.,
Servants of India Society,
Bombay 4.</p> <p>16. Dr. R. N. Ranina, M. D.,
Chaupaty Sea Face, Bombay.</p> <p>17. T. A. Kulkarni Esq., B.A.,
Girgaum Back Road,
Bombay.</p> <p>18. N. M. Joshi Esq., M. L. A.,
Servants of India Society,
Bombay 4.</p> <p>19. N. V. Gokhale Esq., B.A., LL.B.,
Girgaum Road, Bombay 4.</p> <p>20. S. S. Dongre Esq.,
195, New Foras Road,
Bombay 7.</p> <p>21. Dadyba H. Billimoria Esq.,
Rusi Mansion, Cumballa Hill.</p> <p>22. J. A. Bottlewalla Esq.,
2, Gowalia Tank Road,
Bombay.</p> <p>23. K. P. Kothare, Esq.,
73, Apollo Street,
Fort, Bombay.</p> <p>24. Sorabji E. Warden, Esq.,
Opp. Post Office, Colaba.</p> <p>25. G. B. Trivedi, Esq., M.L.C.,
201, Hornby Road,
Fort, Bombay.</p> <p>26. Gopaldas V. Desai, Esq.,
B.A., LL.B.,
Rasul Bhuvan, Nadiad.</p> <p>27. Sir Hormusji A. Wadia, Kt.,
37, Marine Lines, Fort.</p> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

28. Dr. D. A. D'Monte, M. D.,
Bandra Hill, Bandra.
29. Ratansy D. Morarji Esq.,
Mount Pleasant Road,
Malabar Hill.
30. Purshottamdas Thakurdas Esq.,
C. I. E.,
111, Esplanade Road, Fort.
31. A. B. Kamat Esq.,
41, Humam Street, Fort.
32. Sir Vithaldas D. Thakersey, K.T.,
2, Rampart Row, Bombay.
33. Rao Bahadur Ramanbhai,
M. Nilkanth, M. L. C.,
Oliphant Road, Ahmedabad.
34. B. S. Kamat, Esq., M. L. A.,
Ganeshkhind Road, Poona.
35. M. A. Dabholkar Esq., B.A.,
"Anand Mahal," Chaupaty.
36. Ramrao B. Amönkar Esq.,
Laburnum Road, Gamdevi.
37. V. R. Gupte Esq., M. L. C.,
364, Sadashiv Peth,
Poona City.
38. R. V. Vandekar, Esq.,
Nowroji Hill, Dongri,
Bombay.
39. A. B. Pochaji, Esq.,
1, Mount Villa, Bandra.
40. R. R. Nabar, Esq.,
Dr. Purandare's Hospital
Building, Sandhurst Road,
Girgaum.
41. Jehangir P. Mehta, Esq.,
B. A., LL.B.,
Forjett Street,
Bombay, No. 7.
42. N. V. Sarma, Esq., B. A.,
Ramchandra Mansion,
Sandhurst Road,
Girgaum.
43. Narayan Das, Esq.,
Y. M. C. A., Wodehouse
Road, Colaba.
44. N. F. Kanny, Esq.,
Tehmina Lodge, Central
Road Colaba.
45. Rao Bahadur Thakorram
Kapilram, B. A., LL. B.,
Athwa Lines, Surat.
46. Damodar H. Mitra Esq.,
Manoranjan Office,
Bombay 4.
47. Chunilal D. Mehta, Esq.,
Cathedral Street, near
Bhuleshwar, Bombay.
48. Rao Bahadur R. R. Kale, Esq.,
B.A., LL.B.,
Pleader Satara.
49. K. Eapen Verges, Esq.,
Y. M. C. A., Lamington Road,
Bombay 4.
50. Morarji A. Tana, Esq.,
B. A., LL.B.,
Govardhan Mansion,
New Bhatwadi,
Bombay 4.
51. Dr. B. V. Rayaker,
L. M. & S.,
Bhai Jeevanji Lane,
Thakurdwar, Bombay 2.
52. Rahimtoolah M. Chinoy Esq.,
1/3 Warden Road,
Mahaluxmi.
53. H. J. Bhabha, Esq., M.A.,
Pedder Road,
Malabar Hill.
54. A. S. Vasi, Esq.,
43-B. Apollo Street, Fort.
55. Hatim E. Shamsh, Esq.,
194-96, Nagdevi Street,
Bombay.

56. R. H. Amedbhai, Esq.,
44, Tamarind Lane, Fort.
57. Sheikally Gulamhussein Esq.,
119-1921, Nagdevi Street,
Bombay 3.
58. Rustom K. R. Cama, Esq.,
c/o Ripon Club, Esplanade
Road, Fort, Bombay.
59. M. A. J. Noble, Esq.,
Parsee Bazaar Street,
Fort, Bombay.
60. K. R. Dadachanji, Esq.,
B. A., LLB.,
Joshi House,
Cumballa Hill,
Bombay.
61. V. S. Phadnis, Esq.,
Khanapur, District Belgaum.
62. V. P. Vaidya, Esq.,
B.A., Bar-at-Law,
Homji Street,
Fort, Bombay.
63. M. W. Pradhan, Esq., M.L.C.,
Sai Pradhan Baug,
Santa Cruz.
64. Khan Bahadur,
Dr. N. H. Choksey, C. I. E.,
Sheridan House,
Gowalia Tank, Road,
Bombay.
65. Kashinath D. Khote, Esq., J.P.,
Laburnum Road, Bombay 7.
66. D. S. Oak, Esq., B.A., LL.B.,
Nasik.
67. Chintaman G. Bhanu, Esq.,
Amalner.
68. G. M. Gupte, Esq.,
B.A., Advocate,
Turner Road, Bandra.
69. Sir M. B. Chaubal, K.C.I.E.,
6, Finance Office Road, Poona.
70. S. H. Khasukhan, Esq.-
Nanpura, Surat.
71. B. R. Kolhapurwalla, Esq.,
Gazdar Mansion,
Princess Street,
Bombay No. 2.
72. Sir Jamshetji Jeejibhoy,
"Mazagaon Castle"
Mazagaon.
73. B. D. Prabhu, Esq.,
E. Block, Ambewadi,
Girgaum.
74. Madhavji Virji, Esq. (Solicitor).
103, Medows Street,
Fort, Bombay.
75. Dr. S. S. Batliwalla,
L. M & S.,
Suparibaug Road, Parel.
76. Mahomed Ismail Curtay, Esq.,
139, Ali Umer Street, Bombay.
77. K. S. Dhondy, Esq.,
Khambatta Lane, Opp.
Byculla Station, Parel Road,
Byculla.
78. Dr. K. E. Dadachanji, M.L.C.,
Khetwadi, Bombay 4.
79. S. K. Bole, Esq., M.L.C.,
"Keshavlaya," Dadar, Bombay.
80. Shalebhoy C. Barodawalla,
Esq., M.L.A.,
Altamont Road,
Cumballa Hill,
Bombay.
81. A. S. Osborne, Esq.,
Colaba Chamber, Bombay.
82. M. A. Haveliwalla, Esq., M.L.C.
Cama Building, Medows
Street, Fort, Bombay.
83. Dr. A. G. Viegas, L. M. & S.
Chaupaty Sea Face.

84. R. K. Dadachanji, Esq., B.A.L.L.B.,
Old Small Cause Court,
Princess Street,
Bombay 2.
85. N. M. Dumasia, Esq., M.L.C.,
"Times of India" Office,
Hornby Road,
Fort, Bombay.
86. S. K. Phanse, Esq.,
Pen, Distt. Colaba.
87. Dr. P. N. Daruwalla, LL. D.,
14, Hummam Street,
Fort, Bombay.
88. C. M. Gandhi Esq. M.L.C.,
Nanpura, Surat.
89. S. S. Mehta, Esq., B.A.,
Patkar Building,
Sandhurst Road,
Girgaum.
90. J. Krishnanand, Esq.,
Multani Malla House No. 31,
C. P. Tank Road, Bombay 4.
91. Sir Jagmohandas Vurjeevandas,
K.T.,
Jairam Dani's Bungalow,
Walkeshwar Road, Bombay.
92. Rao Saheb Manaji Rajooji,
Kamatipura, 3rd Street,
Bombay.
93. Surendranath V. Mulgaonkar,
Esq.,
"Ridge View,"
Vachaghandy Road,
Gamdevi, Bombay 7.
94. J. D. Mahaluxmiwalla, Esq.,
c/o "Times of India,"
Fort, Bombay.
95. Nadir F. M. Garda Esq., }
96. Mrs. Nadir F. M. Garda, }
Colaba, Causeway.
97. Jamnadas Dwarkadas, Esq.,
M.L.A.,
Chartered Bank Buildings,
Esplanade Road,
Fort Bombay.
98. Govind N. Paranjpe, Esq.,
"Vrindavan," Santa Cruz.
99. Cooverji H. Plumber, Esq.,
125, Cheera Bazar,
Opp. Wadia Fire Temple,
Bombay 2.
100. S. R. Gokhale, Esq.,
Hill Road, Bandra.
101. B. P. Madon, Esq.,
"Health Home," Santa Cruz.
102. J. H. Billimoria, Esq.,
105, Apollo Street,
Fort, Bombay.
103. Ranjildas J. Lala, Esq.,
14, Girgaum Back Road,
Bombay 4.
104. Rao Bahadur A. K. Pai,
Hughes Road, Chaupaty.
105. S. D. Sakalatwalla Esq.,
Hornby Road, Fort.
106. Shapurji Nowroji Gazdar, Esq.,
No. 5, New Queen's Road.
107. B. M. Anandrao, Esq., B.A.,
Secretary, David &
Standard Mills,
York Buildings, Fort.
108. Rao Bahadur G. K. Sathe, C.I.E.,
Sholapur.
109. D. G. Juvekar, Esq., M.L.C.,
Pleader, Jalgaon.
110. Rao Bahadur G. K. Chitale,
B.A., LL.B.,
Ahmednagar.
111. D. G. Vaidya, Esq.,
.Prarthana Samaj, Girgaum.

112. Jivanlal C. Setalwad, Esq.,
64, Napean Sea Road,
Malabar Hill.
113. Sayaji Naguji, Esq.,
Clare Road, Byculla.
114. Cassinath D. Dhuru, Esq.,
Lower Mahim, Bombay 16.
115. Kaikusroo J. Dubhash, Esq.,
Solicitor.
53, Medows Street, Fort.
116. Govind K. Gadgil, Esq., B.A.,
580, Sadashiv Petha,
Poona City.
117. C. M. Cursetjee, Esq.,
5, Altamont Road, Bombay.
118. N. R. Phatak, Esq.,
C/o Indu-Prakash Press.
388, Thakurdwar, Bombay.
119. Miss Kashibai Nowrange,
10, Atmaram Mansions,
Girgaum.
120. Behman Sorabji Banaji, Esq.,
"Dina Lodge", Gowalia
Tank Road, Bombay.
121. Mahomed Hajibhoy, Esq., M.L.A.,
Akbar Buildings,
Hornby Road, Fort.
122. V. A. Dabholkar, Esq.,
Anand Mahal, Chaupaty.
123. Gopal C. Bhate, Esq.,
Pleader, Roha.
124. Pherozshah J. Marzban, Esq.,
Jam-i-Jamshed Office,
Ballard House, Fort.
125. Mavji Govindji Sheth, Esq., B.A.,
"Vrindavan", Santa Cruz.
126. Mrs. Sakarbai Mavji Govindji,
"Vrindavan", Santa Cruz.
127. J. R. Gharpure, Esq., B.A., LL.B.,
Angre's Wadi, Girgaum.
128. Khan Bahadur Jamshedji
A. Dalal,
105, Cumballa Hill,
Bombay 6.
129. Dr. V. S. Trilokekar, L.M. & S.
"Star House" Navroji Street,
Bombay 2.
130. Bhogilal Virchand Deepchand,
Esq., Peddar Road, Bombay.
131. Behramji S. Lalkaka, Esq.,
Land's End, Bandra.
132. Edulji K. Palia, Esq.,
Opp. Railway Station,
Navsari.
133. M. M. Bhesania, Esq.,
Wadia Building,
Govt. Gate Road,
Parel.
134. K. N. Mahale, Esq.,
145, Bazar Road, Mahim,
Bombay.
135. Mahadeo Vittal Rege, Esq.,
Pleader, Dahanu,
District, Thana.
136. D. A. Darukhanwalla, Esq.,
Messrs. Saher Daru-
khanwalla & Co.,
Nagdevi Street.
Bombay 3.
137. P. M. Madon, Esq.,
Editor, Prajmitra & Parsi,
Girgaum.
138. R. S. Roopchand Motiram,
M. L. C.,
Jalgaon, East Khandesh.
139. K. Natarajan, Esq., B.A.,
Empire Building,
Fort, Bombay.
140. Barjorji C. Apyakhtar, Esq.,
Editor, "Hindi Punch".
305, Chaupaty,
Sea Face, Bombay.

141. B. R. B. Jijibhoy, Esq.,
"The Cliff," Malabar Hill.
142. The Hon'ble Dr. R. P.,
Paranjpye, M.A., D.Sc.,
Mahableshtar.
143. N. B. Sakalatwalla, Esq.,
Navasari Buildings,
Fort, Bombay.
144. Kaikobad C. Dinshaw, Esq.,
Cowasji Dinshaw & Co.,
Meadows Street, Fort,
Bombay.
145. K. R. Shroff, Esq.,
56, Esplanade Road, Fort,
146. P. R. Shroff, Esq.,
56, Esplanade Road, Fort.
147. Amirudin S. Tyebji Esq.,
Shale Building,
Bank Street,
Bombay.
148. Y. N. Tipnis, Esq.,
Progressive Printing Press,
Tribhuvan Road,
Girgaum.
149. D. R. Gandhi, Esq.,
Shri Datta Law Office,
Nalabazar, Bombay 9.
150. A. K. Bawa, Esq.,
Zohra Lodge, Mazonabad
Road, Andheri
151. Ishwardas Laxmidas Esq.,
Hughes Road,
Chaupaty.
152. K. P. Dalai Esq.,
Contractor Building, Opp.
Victoria Gardens,
Byculla.
153. N. A. F. Moos, Esq.,
Gowallia Tank Road, Bombay.
154. Burjorji S. N. Cooper, Esq.,
"Banoo Mansion",
Cumballa Hill.
155. N. R. Wadia, Esq.,
No. 10, Middle Colaba.
156. B. A. Billimoria, Esq.,
Central Bank, Bombay.
157. Ruttonchand Master,
Messrs. Master Sons & Co.,
23, Meadows Street, Fort.
158. N. G. Sakrikar Esq.,
410, Rawivar Peth, Poona.
159. M. B. Kolaskar, Esq.,
574, Girgaum Road.
160. Mirza Ali Mohamad Khan, Esq.,
129, Esplanade Road, Fort.
161. H. K. Patwardhan, Esq., B.A.,
LL.B.,
Ahmednagar.
162. K. Subramani Aiyer, Esq.,
65, Apollo Street, Bombay.

DELEGATES.

1. N. C. Bhesania Esq.,
65, Esplanade Road, Fort.
2. S. K. Nique Esq.,
Laxmi Building, Girgaum.
3. Dr. P. N. Daruwalla, LL.D.,
Bar-at-Law,
New Queens Road, Chaupaty.
4. V. V. Sanzgiri Esq., B.A.,
Contractor's Building,
Opp. Prarthana Samaj,
Bombay 4.
5. G. V. Gadgil Esq., B.A.,
39, Mohan Building, Girgaum.
6. Rajah V. Iyer Esq.,
Hanuman Building No. 2,
Grant Road.
7. Raghunath Roop Rai Esq.,
Jamnabai Mansions,
Sandhurst Road,
Bombay 4.
8. Bhagat Ram Kumar Esq.,
National College,
Hyderabad (Sindh).
9. Sunder P. Kabadi Esq.,
Kelewadi, Girgaum.
10. Eknath N. Dandekar Esq.,
65, Khota's Wadi,
Girgaum.
11. Harjivan K. Mehta Esq.,
Morarji Gokuldas Market
Hall Chawl, Bombay 2
12. P. G. Wagle Esq.,
Kelewadi, Bombay 4.
13. Hiranath G. Wagle Esq.,
Kelewadi, Bombay 4.
14. Jagannath N. Dandekar, Esq.,
31, Tara Building,
Badam Lane, Bombay 4.
15. Shapurji N. Guzdar Esq.,
5, New Queens Road,
Bombay 6.
16. (Miss) Champubai,
B. Shringarpure, B.A.,
Dongre Building,
New Foras Road,
Bombay 7.
17. Bai Kamalabai Rajadhyaksha,
Narayan Mansion,
Girgaum Back Road.
18. G. M. Sheikh Esq.,
125, Bhoiwada, Parel.
19. Dr. Mrs. Chandubai Kulkarni,
M. B., B. S.,
Girgaum Baek Road.
20. Raghunath G. Wagle Esq.,
Kelewadi, Girgaum.
21. Razak Mahomed Sheikh Esq.,
125, Bhoiwada, Parel.
22. Govind B. Hegde Esq.,
75, Khotachi Wadi,
Girgaum.
23. Narayen Y. Vethe Esq.,
44, Mohan Building,
Girgaum.
24. Shripad M. Varde Esq.,
B.A., LL.B.,
Girgaum Back Road,
Bombay 4.
25. V. S. Javere Esq.,
Navyug Office, Girgaum.
26. B. S. Banaji Esq.,
"Dina Lodge", Gowalia
Tank Road, Bombay 7.
27. R. S. Navalkar Esq., B.A., LL. B.,
4-A, Bhai Jeevanji Lane,
Bombay 2.

28. Bhogilal Virchand
Deepchand Esq.,
72, Apollo Street,
Fort Bombay.
29. B. N. Italis Esq.,
Lamington Road, Bombay 4.
30. Phirozshah R. Green Esq.,
Princess Building,
Princess Street,
Bombay 4.
31. Syed Munawar Esq., B.A.,
Ghelabhoy Street,
Byculla.
32. A. S. Dholekar Esq.,
92, Benham Hall Lane,
Bombay 4.
33. R. M. Alpaiwalla Esq.,
1, Foras Road, Bombay 7.
34. M. M. Bhesania Esq.,
Wadia Building,
Government Gate Road,
Parel.
35. D. G. Kale Esq.,
Mahim, Bombay 16.
36. N. G. Paranjpye Esq.,
" Vrindavan, " Santa Cruz.
37. M. B. Kolatkar Esq.,
" Vrindavan ", Santa Cruz.
38. H. Sakharam Rau,
Bank Road, Sholapur.
39. R. S. Bhagvat Esq., B.A., LL.B.,
Ghat Ali, Thana.
40. N. K. Paranjpye Esq.,
Kelshi, Bassein
41. K. V. Chitre Esq.,
Shinde Ashram, Arthur Road,
Bombay 12.
42. V. A. Tambane Esq.,
Abdulla Building No. 3,
Room No. 15, Poibawadi,
Parel, Bombay 12.
43. B. R. Bhise Esq.,
15, Abdulla Building,
Parel, Bombay 12.
44. B. K. Divekar Esq.,
34, Mohan Building, Girgaum.
45. H. P. Chahewalla Esq.,
B.A., LL.B.
Vakil High Court,
Ahmedabad.
46. V. N. Kusumgar Esq.,
Opp. Chang Pole,
Ahmedabad.
47. Liladhar Champsi Esq.,
Shahapur, Ahmedabad.
48. Harilal K. Bhat Esq.,
Nava Durwaja,
Sidiqul Pole,
Ahmedabad.
49. J. R. Gilder Esq.,
Bazar Gate Street, Fort.
50. D. F. Romer Esq.,
Sleater Road, Bombay 7.
51. V. N. Kumbhare Esq., M.A.,
207, Bhavani Peth, Satara.
52. D. V. Kelkar Esq.,
160, Shanwar Peth, Satara.
53. P. R. Javere Esq.,
Navyug Office, Girgaum.
54. Prof. P. K. Telang M.A.,
Central Hindu College,
Benares.
55. A. K. Divekar Esq.,
19-E, Ambewadi, Girgaum.
56. R. N. Rajdnya Esq.,
Aitawade Budruk, Satara.
57. Sorabji N. Pochkhanawalla Esq.,
c/o Central Bank of India, Ltd.,
Hornby Road, Fort.
58. B. M. Gamadia Esq.,
Bombay 6,

59. B. A. Billimoria Esq.,
Central Bank Building,
Hornby Road, Fort, Bombay.
60. V. R. Bhende Esq.,
c/o Servants of India Society,
Bombay No. 4.
61. S. R. Kakirde Esq., do.
62. V. R. Sawant Esq., do.
63. K. M. Kurlekar Esq.,
789, Sadashiv Peth,
Poona city.
64. G. K. Manolkar Esq.,
c/o Servants of India Society,
Bombay No. 4.
65. R. R. Bakhale Esq., do.
66. Vithal J. Nadkarni Esq.,
Mohan Buildings, Girgaum.
67. H. V. Harite, Esq.,
"Panditalaya", Chunam Lane,
Grant Road.
68. Mrs. Ramabai N. Paranjpye,
"Vrindavan", Santa Cruz.
69. M. B. Wagle Esq.,
C/o Theosophical Society,
Benares City.
70. S. B. Ginwalla Esq.,
Civil Lines, Broach.
71. Mrs. Mani Jehangir Gilder,
Bazar Gate Street,
Fort Bombay.
72. Mrs. Meherbai J. Billimoria,
Opp. Churni Road,
Railway Station,
Queens Road,
Bombay No. 6.
73. B. R. Jatar Esq., B.A.,
Teacher, H. D'Silva
High School, Dadar.
74. Dr. V. C. Gokhale, M.D.,
922, Sadashiv Peth,
Poona city.
75. G. B. Reporter Esq.,
Empress Iron & Brass
Works, Connaught Road,
Parel.
76. A. V. Chitre Esq., B.A.,
Social Service League,
Bombay 4.
77. N. A. Dravid Esq., M.A.,
Craddock Town, Nagpur.
78. R. K. Karandikar Esq.,
Chiplun, Ratnagiri District.
79. D. R. Toddywalla Esq.,
Bombay.
80. Morarji M. Khatao Esq.,
Morar Building,
Malabar Hill.
81. G. N. Sahasrabuddhe Esq., B.A.,
17, Javere Building,
Bombay 12.
82. A. K. Sethna Esq.,
Ahmedabad.
83. N. A. Pathan Esq.,
Lalkaka Lodge,
Ahmedabad.
84. N. G. Sakrikar Esq., B.A., LL.B.
410, Ravivar Peth,
Poona city.
85. V. N. Barve Esq., B.A., LL.B.,
Pleader, Dhulia.
86. P. S. Gazdar Esq.,
249, Hornby Road,
Fort Bombay.
87. Rattonchand Master Esq.,
Bombay 1.
88. J. R. Aria Esq.,
Theosophical Society,
Adyar, Madras.
89. Karsondas J. Chitalia Esq.,
c/o Servants of India Society,
Bombay 4.
90. K. G. Warty Esq., B.A.,
Bombay 4.

91. R. K. Vaidya Esq.,
665, Lady Jamshedji Road,
Dadar.
92. N. S. Marulkar Esq.,
Satara.
93. S. G. Vaze Esq., B.A.,
c/o Servants of India Society,
Poona city.
94. W. L. Chiplunkar Esq.,
B.A., LL. B.,
Akola.
95. H. G. Parkhe Esq.,
Zendingate, Ahmednagar.
96. R. G. Tilak Esq.,
c/o H. K. Patwardhan Esq.,
B.A., LL.B.,
Ahmednagar.
97. S. B. Gatne Esq.,
Anandi Bazar,
Ahmednagar.
98. M. G. Mandre Esq.,
Bagde Lane, Ahmednagar.
99. K. R. Waishampayan Esq.,
Aditwar Peth, Nasik.
100. Rao Saheb B. V. Dravid,
Yeotmal, (Berar).
101. R. B. R. G. Mundle, B.A., L. L. B.,
Yeotmal (Berar).
102. V. K. Mainkar Esq.,
Sangli.
103. W. V. Pradhan Esq., B.A., LL.B.,
Girgaum.
104. Rao Saheb H. V. Chinmulgund,
B.A.,
377, Shanwar Peth,
Poona city.
105. D. H. Bhatt Esq.,
Sadashiv Peth,
Poona city.
106. S. B. Dave Esq.,
Kandewadi, Girgaum.
107. Mrs. Nalinibai Paranjpye,
" Vrindavan ", Santa Cruz.
108. R. K. Tatnis Esq.,
402, Thakurdwar,
Bombay 2.
109. G. R. Abhyankar Esq.,
B.A., LL. B.,
Pleader, Sangli, (S.M.C.)
110. R. R. Jayavant, Esq.,
B.A., LL. B.,
Craddock Town,
Nagpur.
111. V. G. Pitale Esq.,
250, Princess Street,
Bombay 2.
112. Prof. V. K. Jog M.A.,
Fergusson College, Poona.
113. Prof. K. M. Khadye, M.A.,
Fergusson College, Poona.
114. K. G. Limaye Esq., M.A., LL.B.,
Servants of India Society,
Poona.
115. Dr. H. C. E. Zacarias, P. H. D.
Servants of India Society,
Poona city.
116. P. Kodanda Rao Esq., M.A.,
Roypetta, Madras.
117. The Hon'ble Mr. Keshav Rao,
Hyderabad (Deccan).
118. B. Joseph Esq.,
Jhanjaria Building,
Ghelabhai Street, Bombay.
119. Khan Bahadur B. H. Nanavati,
Ahmedabad.
120. R. G. Pradhan Esq.,
B.A., LL.B.,
Nasik.
121. S. N. Bhalchandra Esq.,
B.A., LL.B.,
Yeotmal (Berar).

(N.B.—Besides there were 50 free delegates belonging to the Depressed classes).

STANDING WORKING COMMITTEE.

Ex-Officio.

The Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri. | The Hon. Sir D. E. Wacha.

Secretaries.

Mr. Rustom K. R. Cama.	Mr. Hatim E. Attari.
Mr. Shalbhoj C. Barodawala.	Mr. Kanji Dwarkadas.
Dr. D. A. D'Monte.	Mr. Ratansy D. Morarji.
Mr. J. R. B. Jeejeebhoy.	Mr. M. D. Altekar.
Mr. N. M. Joshi.	Mr. A. S. Osborne.

Members.

The Hon. Sir Chimanlal H. Setalvad.	Mr. C. M. Cursetji.
The Hon. Mr. Cowasji Jehangir.	Mr. Purshottamdas Thakurdas.
The Hon. Mr. R. P. Paranjpe.	Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas.
The Hon. M. C. V. Mehta.	Mr. N. F. Kanny.
The Hon. Mr. G. M. Hidaytullah.	Prof P. K. Telang.
Sir G. K. Parekh.	Mr. T. A. Kulkarni.
The Hon. Mr. P. C. Sethna.	Mr. K. R. Dadachanji.
Mr. N. M. Samarth.	Mr. V. S. Ravoot.
Mr. N. V. Gokhale.	Mr. K. Natarajan.
Mr. D. G. Dalvi.	Mr. S. K. Bole.
Mr. J. R. Gharpure.	Mr. S. S. Dongre.
	Mr. M. A. Kamble.

Moffusal.

Rao Bahadur Ramanbhai M. Nilkanth, Ahmedabad.	Mr. B. S. Kamat, Poona.
Mr. C. M. Gandhi, M. L. C., Surat.	Rao Bahadur R. R. Kale, Satara.
Mr. V. N. Barve, Dhulia.	Rao Bahadur G. K. Sathe, Sholapur.
Mr. D. S. Oak, Nasik.	Mr. M. B. Marathe, Belgaum.
Mr. S. G. Vaze, Poona.	Mr. P. R. Chikodi, Belgaum.
Mr. G. G. Thakar, Poona.	Mr. Karandikar, Chiplun.
Mr. G. N. Gadgil, Poona.	Mr. G. C. Bhate, M. L. C., Kolaba.
Prof. V. K. Jog, Poona.	Mr. H. K. Patwardhan, Ahmednagar.
Rao Saheb H. V. Chinmulgund, Poona.	Rao Bahadur G. K. Chitale, Ahmednagar.
	Mr. R. S. Bhagvat, Thana.

Printed by C. S. Deole at the "Bombay Vaibhav Press," Servants of
India Society's Home, Sandhurst Road, Girgaum, Bombay.

Published by Narayan Malhar Joshi, Secretary, Bombay Provincial
Liberal Conference, Sandhurst Road, Bombay.
