

FOREWORD

At the twelfth sessions of the Liberal Federation held at Madras during the Christmas of 1929, it was decided "to leave the selection of the place of the next Conference to the decision of the Council" of the Federation. As several leading members of the Indian Liberal Party were attending the First Indian Round Table Conference in London, the next sessions of the Federation was not held during the Christmas of 1930, but the Council decided at their meeting in 19th April 1931, to organise it at Poona during the current year. As Poona was not in a position to give effect to the decision of the Council, the Western India National Liberal Association at their meeting held on 4th June 1931 undertook to arrange for the Thirteenth sessions of the Federation at Bombay some time in July. During the short interval at their disposal, the Association organised the Reception Committee consisting of about 250 members and there was good response from the members of the Liberal Party, the total number of delegates being 400. As regards the finances also, the Association is grateful to the members and friends of the Liberal Party for the generous assistance they rendered.

When His Excellency the Viceroy announced the plan of the Round Table Conference on 31st October 1929 virtually superseding the Simon Commission, the Liberal Federation welcomed it and by a resolution adopted at its previous sessions, authorised its members to participate in its deliberations. The first Round Table Conference was successful in laying the foundation of the future Constitution for India. Being held on the eve of the second Round Table Conference, the main purpose of this sessions of the Liberal Federation was, to review the work of the first Conference, the reports of its several Committees and the Declaration of the Premier on 19th January 1931, and to arrive at its own conclusions, embodying constructive proposals for building up the constitutional structure of India so as to give a practical lead to the country in formulating its demands and for the benefit of the members of the Liberal Party at the next R. T. Conference. I trust the resolutions and proceedings of the Federation, as embodied in this Report, will show that, under the able and sagacious guidance of its President, Mr. C. Y. Chintamani, the object of this sessions of the Federation has, to some extent, been fulfilled.

Bombay, 1st November 1931.

D. G. DALVI
Secretary, Reception Committee.

Table of Contents.

—x—		PAGES.
1.	Foreword
2.	Text of Resolutions	1-14
3.	Speech of Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Jr.)... ..	15-24
4.	Messages of Sympathy	24-26
5.	Election of the President	27-29
6.	Presidential Address	29-76
7.	Resolutions	77
	I Sympthy & Condolence	77
	II Condemnation of Outrages	77
	III Lord Irwin	77
	IV The New Viceroy	77-78
	V The Round Table Conference	78-85
	VI The Scheme of Federal Government	85-94
	VII Residuary Powers	94-95
	VIII Government of States	96
	IX Defence	96-104
	X Safeguards	104-110
	XI Trading Rights	110-113
	XII The Indian Debt Question	113-118
	XIII Provincial Constitution	119-125
	XIV I. C. S. Governors	125-127
	XV Burma	127 A
	XVI The Services	127-129
	XVII Franchise	129
	XVIII The Minorities Problem	129-147
	XIX The "Depressed" Classes	147
	XX Council & Office-bearers	148
	XXI Meeting Place of the Next Session	148-149
8.	Vote of thanks to the Chair	149-151
9.	Concluding Speech of the President	151-158
10.	Appendices A & B, List of the members of the Reception Committee and Delegates	159-168

The National Liberal Federation of India.

[THIRTEENTH SESSION.]



A few of the delegates with the President.

The National Liberal Federation of India.

THIRTEENTH ANNUAL SESSION.

BOMBAY

JULY 31 AND AUGUST 2, 1931

The following is the full text of the Resolutions passed at the thirteenth session of the National Liberal Federation of India held at Bombay on July 31 and August 2, 1931.

SYMPATHY AND CONDOLENCE.

The National Liberal Federation of India places on record its sense of the loss the country has sustained by the death of Pandit Motilal Nehru, Maulana Mahomad Ali, the Maharaja of Mahmudabad, Mr. K. T. Paul and Mr. Eardley Norton, and the country and the Liberal Party in particular have sustained by the death of Sir Shankar Rao Chitnavis, Rao Bahadur K. G. Damle and Principal B. G. Sapre, all of them patriots who rendered meritorious services in the furtherance of India's achievement of self-government; and the Federation offers its sympathy and condolence to the families of the distinguished and lamented deceased in their great sorrow.

**(Put from the chair and carried unanimously and in silence,
the whole audience standing.)**

2. CONDEMNATION OF OUTRAGES.

The National Liberal Federation of India records its strong condemnation of and abhorrence at the dastardly attempt on the life of his Excellency Sir Ernest Hotson, Acting Governor of Bombay, and the

assassination of Mr. Garlick, sessions judge of Alipore. The Federation considers such acts highly detrimental to the best interests of the country.

(Put from the chair and carried unanimously.)

3. LORD IRWIN.

The National Liberal Federation of India records its sense of high and grateful appreciation of the distinguished services rendered to India and England by the right hon. Lord Irwin as Viceroy and Governor-General and of the services he is continuing to render for the recognition of India's status and her claims as an equal partner in the British Commonwealth.

(Put from the chair and carried unanimously.)

4. THE NEW VICEROY.

The National Liberal Federation of India accords a cordial and respectful welcome to their Excellencies Lord and Lady Willingdon and earnestly hopes that his Excellency's Viceroyalty will be signalized by the establishment of Responsible Government in India and by her achievement of Dominion Status.

(Put from the chair and carried unanimously.)

5. THE ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE.

(a) The National Liberal Federation of India records its sense of appreciation of the useful preliminary work done by the last session of the Indian Round Table Conference, especially in getting the principles of a Federated India and Responsibility at the Centre accepted.

(b) This Federation greatly appreciates the services rendered to India and England by the Prime Minister, the Lord High Chancellor and the Secretary of State for India, among other members of his Majesty's Government, by their assiduous labours in connection with the Conference.

(c) This Federation welcomes the Prime Minister's statement on behalf of his Majesty's Government that "responsibility for the government of India should be placed upon legislatures, central and provincial,"

and expressions of the willingness of Ruling Princes that the Indian States and British Indian Provinces should form component parts of a Federated India. The Federation trusts that the next session of the Conference will succeed in producing a workable and satisfactory constitution for securing genuine responsible government for India as an equal partner in the British Commonwealth of Nations.

(d) While the Federation is gratified that the Indian National Congress will be represented at the next session of the Conference, it most earnestly appeals to his Excellency the Viceroy and his Majesty's Government to remove instead of increasing the inequalities of representation in the Conference by inviting to its next session an adequate number of Nationalist Musalmans, of representatives of Burma opposed to separation from India, and of Indians representing labour and the agricultural classes.

Proposed by the hon. Sir Phiroze C. Sethna (Bombay)

Seconded by the hon. Rao Bahadur G. A. Natesan (Madras)

(Carried unanimously.)

6. THE SCHEME OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

The National Liberal Federation of India, while cordially approving of a scheme of Indian Federation constituted of States and Provinces, is of opinion that—

1. The Federal Executive should be made responsible to the popular Chamber of the Legislature. [The Federation is in favour of preventing a vexatious use of motions of no-confidence and securing the stability of the Executive by means of reasonable provisions. It recommends in particular that procedure similar to that applicable to motions of no-confidence obtaining at present in legislatures in India and in certain other countries should be adopted in the future constitution. Members of the Federal Assembly belonging to the States excepting Ministers should have no right of speech or vote on motions of no-confidence arising out of matters affecting only British India.]
2. There should be no nomination of British Indian representatives and the States should allow their representatives to

be chosen by some form of election which should, after a fixed transitional period be uniform with the system obtaining in British India although in the beginning all of them may not be elected.

3. The Provinces should return their representatives to the Lower House by direct election.
4. The Federation is of opinion that in the popular Chamber of the Federal Assembly, the distribution of seats should be made strictly on the basis of population.

Proposed by Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru (Allahabad) .

Seconded by Mr. C. M. Gandhi (Surat)

Supported by Mr. S. M. Bose (Calcutta)

(Carried unanimously.)

7. RESIDUARY POWERS.

The Federation is of opinion that exhaustive lists (as far as possible) of central and provincial subjects be made and the central government be vested with power to deal with any matter affecting the whole country that may not have been anticipated and put in the central list.

Proposed by Mr. G. M. Gupte, (Bombay)

Seconded by Mr. R. S. Navalkar, (Bombay)

(Carried unanimously.)

8. GOVERNMENT OF STATES.

The National Liberal Federation, while recognising the maintenance of internal autonomy and sovereignty of States, hopes and trusts that the rulers of States will seriously consider the desirability of gradually making their administrations approximate to the system of administration in British India.

(Put from the chair and carried unanimously.)

9. DEFENCE.

The National Liberal Federation is of opinion that Defence should be a reserved subject under the Governor-General during a transitional period the duration of which should be fixed by statute, and provision should be made on the following lines during such period:—

1. The expenditure should be fixed for five years and revised every five years by a committee of an equal number of

experts nominated by the Governor-General and of members elected by the Legislature.

2. The amount so fixed should be at the disposal of the Governor-General without a vote of the Legislative Assembly in this behalf but without prejudice to its right of discussion.
3. Any excess over that amount should be the subject of a demand for grant which will have to be voted by the Assembly.
4. The Governor-General should, in the event of hostilities on the Frontier, have the further power of declaring an emergency and appropriating supply to meet it without prior reference to the Legislature. But he should report his action to it and it should have the right of discussion.
5. A definite scheme for the Indianisation of the Defence Forces including officers and men within a specified time as far as practicable should be immediately propounded and the provision of facilities for the training of Indians for service in all arms of defence so as to complete the process within a specified period should be in charge of a Minister responsible to the Legislature.

Proposed by: Mr. J. N. Basu (Calcutta)

Seconded by: Mr. A. D. Shroff (Bombay)

Supported by: Mr. Surendra Nath Varma (Allahabad)

(Carried unanimously.)

10. SAFEGUARDS.

(a) The National Liberal Federation is of opinion that the "Governor-General's special powers" should be limited to cases where there is a breakdown of the constitution by reason of serious disturbance of the peace likely to involve the country as a whole.

(b) The Federation is of opinion that while the "service of loans and the salaries and pensions of persons appointed on guarantees by the Secretary of State, should be secured along with the supply required for the reserved departments (subject in respect of defence in the foregoing resolution) "as Consolidated fund charges," no power with regard to finance should be vested in the Governor-General except that as regards external loans, provisions similar to those contained in other dominion constitutions may be embodied in the Indian constitution.

(c) The Federation disapproves of the "Safeguards" proposed at the Round Table Conference vesting power in the Governor-General to

override the Finance minister in the matter of Exchange and Currency, borrowing and budgetary arrangements and is of opinion that the necessary safeguards in this behalf for the transitional period may be secured, if necessary, by the creation of a Statutory Financial Council till a Reserve Bank is established.

(d) The National Liberal Federation regrets that the policy pursued by the Government of India with regard to Exchange resulting in frittering away the gold resources of the country is calculated indefinitely to postpone the establishment of a Reserve Bank.

Proposed by the hon. Sir Phiroze Sethna (Bombay)

Seconded by Prof. V. K. Jog (Poona)

Supported by Mr. B. S. Dabke (Bombay)

(Carried unanimously.)

11 TRADING RIGHTS.

The National Liberal Federation is unable to accept the proposal embodied in clause 14 of the Minorities Committee's Report unless it is made clear that the future Government of India will have complete freedom to adopt measures for promotion of basic trades and industries.

Proposed by Mr. B. S. Kamat (Poona)

Seconded by Mr. G. B. Trivedi (Bombay)

(Carried unanimously.)

12. THE INDIAN DEBT QUESTION.

The National Liberal Federation, whilst unreservedly denouncing all suggestions for repudiation of India's public debt by any future Government of the country, is of opinion that, in view of the various financial obligations imposed hitherto on India, an impartial and independent tribunal be appointed to investigate and decide the nature and extent of adjustment between Great Britain and India on the eve of the transference of power from the British Parliament to a responsible Indian government.

Proposed by Mr. A. D. Shroff (Bombay)

Seconded by Mr. M. D. Altekari (Bombay)

(Carried unanimously.)

13. PROVINCIAL CONSTITUTION.

(a) The National Liberal Federation of India, while generally approving of the recommendations of the Conference Sub-Committee on

Provincial Constitution, is strongly opposed to the following majority recommendations, viz. —

- (1) that the Governor should be endowed with special powers, legislative and financial, for the maintenance of peace and tranquillity, except that he may have emergency power to deal with a serious disturbance of peace, and
- (2) that second chambers should be established in some and may be established in other provinces.

(b) It is this Federation's deliberate conviction that these two recommendations, if carried into effect, will materially detract from the autonomy of provinces and should be reconsidered.

Proposed by Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Jr.) (Bombay)

Seconded by Rao Bahadur R. R. Kale (Satara)

Supported by Mr. B. N. Gokhale (Bombay)

(Carried unanimously.)

14. I.C.S. GOVERNORS.

The National Liberal Federation is strongly of opinion that no member of the Indian Civil Service be hereafter be appointed as Governor of any province.

Proposed by Mr. S. P. Andrews-Dube (Lucknow)

Seconded by Dr. P. N. Daruwala (Bombay.)

(Carried unanimously.)

15. BURMA.

The National Liberal Federation of India is of opinion that the Secretary of State for India's declaration in Parliament upon the separation of Burma from India was premature as the proceedings of the Round Table Conference show that the issue was left open for further consideration. The Federation urges that the question should be decided on the merits after the fullest opportunity has been given to that section of opinion in Burma which is opposed to such separation, to state its case.

(Put from the chair and carried unanimously.)

16. THE SERVICES.

The National Liberal Federation is of opinion that Judicial services throughout should be recruited entirely from the members of the Bar as in England and that members of the Indian Civil Service should not be eligible for the same; that provincial governments should have the same freedom in respect of the recruitment of their medical services as in respect of other services under their control, and that their control over the police in their respective provinces, both legislative and administrative, should not be less complete than over any other departments.

Proposed by Mr. G. M. Gupte (Bombay)

Seconded by Rao Bahadur R. G. Mundle (Berar)

(Carried unanimously.)

17 FRANCHISE

The National Liberal Federation approves of the extension of the franchise for men and women alike and strongly supports the recommendations of the Franchise Sub-Committee of the Conference.

(Put from the chair and carried unanimously.)

18 THE MINORITIES PROBLEM.

While the National Liberal Federation regrets that until now no solution of the problem of minorities acceptable to all could be reached and while it is deeply concerned that every possible attempt should be made by all the parties to arrive at an agreement generous to minorities and fair to all, this Federation is of opinion that in any arrangement, the following points should be borne in mind as being essential to its durability and acceptability and as conforming to the requirements of responsible government :—

- 1 Separate electorates should be done away with and there should be joint electorates with reservation of seats for minorities.
- 2 There should be no statutory fixation of a majority.
- 3 The position of all important minorities should be equitably considered in the determination of weightage.
- 4 There should be no statutory recognition of communal representation in the All-India or the Provincial Executive

or in the services, but by a convention, a fair and adequate representation should be secured to the various communities consistently with considerations of efficiency and the possession of the necessary qualifications.

- 5 All necessary, reasonable and practicable guarantees should be given to all communities with regard to their religion, culture, language and special laws.

Proposed by Sir Chimanlal Setalvad

Seconded by Mr. N. B. Karnekar

(This was the resolution as amended by the Conference by a large majority.)

(**Resolution carried *nem con.***)

19. THE "DEPRESSED" CLASSES.

The National Liberal Federation has the strongest sympathy with the most legitimate and laudable aspirations of the classes called "depressed" to ameliorate their condition in all the spheres of national life and heartily commends all suitable measures for achieving this end.

(**Put from the chair and carried unanimously.**)

20. COUNCIL & OFFICE-BEARERS.

(a) This Federation elects Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Jr.), K.C.I.E., M.L.A., and Mr. D. G. Dalvi to be the honorary General Secretaries of the National Liberal Federation of India until the next session.

(b) The Federation elects the following Council* to function until the election of another Council by its next session.

[* See next page.]

(**Put from the chair and carried unanimously.**)

21. MEETING PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION.

Resolved that the fourteenth annual session of the National Liberal Federation of India be held at Calcutta on such dates as may be fixed by the Council in consultation with the Reception Committee.

Proposed by Mr. J. N. Basu (Calcutta)

Seconded by Mr. S. N. Bose (Calcutta)

(**Carried unanimously.**)



The Indian National Liberal Council

FOR 1931-32.

CHAIRMAN

- 1 Mr. C. Y. Chintamani, M. L. C.

VICE-CHAIRMEN

- 2 Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., LL.D.
- 3 Diwan Bahadur L. A. Govindaraghava Aiyar
- 4 The Right Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, P.C., C.H.
- 5 Sir Moropant Joshi, K.C.I.E.
- 6 Sir Chimanlal Setalvad, K.C.I.E., LL.D.
- 7 The Hon'ble Sir Phiroze Sethna, Kt., O.B.E.

JOINT GENERAL SECRETARIES

- 8 Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Jr.), K.C.I.E., M.L.A.
- 9 Mr. D. G. Dalvi, M.A., LL.B.

NOMINATED BY THE PRESIDENT

- 10 Mr. N. Subbarau Pantulu
- 11 „ B. S. Kamat, M.L.C.
- 12 „ J. N. Basu, M.L.C.
- 13 „ A. P. Sen, Advocate
- 14 Rao Bahadur R. G. Mundle.

ELECTED

MADRAS.

- 15 Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, K.C.I.E.
- 16 Dr. Annie Besant, D.L.
- 17 Rajah Sir Vasudev Rajah of Kollengode
- 18 The Hon'ble Raja Sir Annamalai Chettiar
- 19 The Hon'ble Rao Bahadur G. A. Natesan, M.C.S.
- 20 Dewan Bahadur T. Rangachariar, M.L.A.
- 21 Dewan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao
- 22 Dewan Bahadur N. Pattabhirama Rau
- 23 Mr. T. R. Venkatarama Sastri, C.I.E.
- 24 Dr. C. B. Rama Rau
- 25 Rao Bahadur C. S. Subramanyam
- 26 Mr. M. C. Mukunda Raja Aiyangar
- 27 „ R. N. Iyengar, Bar-at-law
- 28 „ M. Kolandavelu Mudaliar

- 29 Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Aiyar
 30 Dr. P. Rama Rau
 31 Mr. Ati Narayana Pantulu
 32 „ Janab C. Abdul Hakim
 33 „ V. Venkatasubbaiya
 34 „ T. V. Rangachariar, Advocate
 35 „ M. Subbara Aiyar
 36 „ E. Vinayaka Rau
 37 Rao Bahadur, S. V. Narasimha Rau
 38 Dewan Bahadur Kesava Pillai
 39 Mr. B. Venkatapathi Razu

BOMBAY

- 40 Mr. J. R. B. Jeejeebhoy
 41 „ V. N. Chandavarkar, Bar-at-law
 42 „ V. S. Ravut
 43 „ N. R. Wadia
 44 „ Khan Bahadur H. P. Chahewalla
 45 „ Manu Subedar
 46 „ J. R. Gharpure
 47 „ H. G. Gharpuray, I.C.S. (Rtd.)
 48 „ G. M. Gupte, Advocate
 49 „ Chunilal M. Gandhi, Advocate
 50 „ N. M. Joshi, M.L.A.
 51 „ G. K. Devadhar, M.A., C.I.E.
 52 „ K. S. Jatar, C.I.E.
 53 Rao Bahadur R. R. Kale, M.L.C.
 54 Sir Byramjee Jeejeebhoy, Kt.
 55 Mr. Kazi Kabiruddin, Bar-at-law
 56 „ K. J. Dubash, (Solicitor)
 57 Dr. P. N. Daruvala, LL.D. Bar-at-law
 58 Mr. A. D. Shroff, B.Sc. (Lond.)
 59 Prof. V. K. Jog, M.A.
 60 Mr. B. N. Gokhale
 61 „ B. S. Dabke
 62 „ M. S. Hussein
 63 „ V. N. Deshpande
 64 „ G. K. Gadgil, Bar-at-law

BENGAL

- 65 Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikari, C.I.E., C.B.E., LL.D.
 66 Principal Heramba Chandra Maitra
 67 Mr. Babu Krishna Kumar Mitter
 68 „ Babu Satya Kumar Sahana, M.L.C.

- 69 Mr. S. M. Bose
- 70 „ R. C. Ghose
- 71 Rai Fanindralal De Bahadur
- 72 Babu Sachindra Prasad Basu
- 73 Babu Suresh Chandra Basu
- 74 Babu Manmathanath Sen
- 75 Mr. C. C. Biswas, M.L.A.
- 76 Khan Bahadur Moulvi Azizul Haque, M.L.C.
- 77 Prof. Nidaran Chandra Roy
- 78 Mr. H. M. Bose
- 79 The Rev. B. A. Nag
- 80 Babu Satinath Roy
- 81 Prof. B. B. Roy
- 82 Mr. Ramani Mohan Sen
- 83 „ B. K. Chaudhuri
- 84 The Hon'ble Mr. B. K. Basu
- 85 Pandit Shankarlal Chaube
- 86 Rai Bahadur Dr. Haribhan Dutt, M.L.C.
- 87 Rai Manoranjan Mullick Bahadur
- 88 Mr. Prafulla Nath Tagore
- 89 Kumar Sarat Kumar Roy

UNITED PROVINCES.

- 90 Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru.
- 91 The Hon. Munshi Narayan Prasad Asthana
- 92 Rai Bahadur Thakur Hanuman Singh, M.L.C.
- 93 Mehta Krishna Ram
- 94 Kumar Rajendra Singh
- 95 Rai Krishnaji
- 96 Mr. Surendranath Varma
- 97 Rai Bahadur Lala Mathura Prasad Mehrotra
- 98 Babu Gauri Shankar Prasad
- 99 Rao Krishna Pal Singh
- 100 Mr. Prakash Narayan Sapru
- 101 Pandit Krishna Prasad Kaul
- 102 Pandit Iqbal Narain Gurtu
- 103 Pandit Rajnath Kunzru
- 104 Pandit Parmeshwar Nath Sapru
- 105 Babu Vishwanath Prasad
- 106 Mr. S. P. Andrews Dube
- 107 Babu Brijendra Swarup
- 108 Mr. Ayodhyadas
- 109 Rai Bahadur Lala Bihari Lal, M.L.C.
- 110 Babu Bodh Raj Sahnoj

- 111 Rai Bahadur Pandit Badri Datt Joshi
 112 Khan Bahadur Munshi Muhammad Ismail
 113 Rai Saheb S. P. Sanyal
 114 The Hon'ble Rai Bahadur Lala Jagdish Prasad

PUNJAB.

- 115 Pandit Hardatta Sharma
 116 Mian Abdul Aziz
 117 Pandit K. N. Agnihotri
 118 Rai Bahadur B. L. Rallia Ram
 119 Mr. Manoharlal, Bar-at-law
 120 Moulvi Mahbub Alum
 121 L. Jagan Nath Ajarwala, M.L.A.
 122 Rao Bahadur Lala Kesheo Ram, M.L.C.
 123 Lala Faqir Chand
 124 Lala Durgadas
 125 Khansaheb Gul Mahomed
 126 Chandhari Ata Mohiuddin
 127 Khan Bahadur Shaik Amir Ali
 128 Mr. Chunilal Mathur
 129 Lala Harkishanlal
 130 Rai Bahadur Lala Dhanpat Rai

BEHAR AND ORISSA.

- 131 Babu Bhagvati Saran Singh M.L.C.
 132 Babu Lakshmi Narayan Sahu

CENTRAL PROVINCES AND BERAR.

- 133 Sir Sorabji Mehta, C.I.E.
 134 Sir Bisheshwar Das Daga
 135 Rao Bahadur A. R. Bambewalla
 136 Rao Bahadur V. M. Kelkar
 137 Rai Saheb Tarapore
 138 Pandit Sita Charan Dube
 139 Rai Bahadur N. G. Bose
 140 Mr. Sridhar Rao Gokhale
 141 Rao Bahadur M. G. Deshpande
 142 Mr. N. A. Dravid
 143 „ M. E. R. Malak
 144 Rao Bahadur B. R. Angal
 145 Rao Bahadur Dr. W. R. Bhat
 146 Rao Bahadur R. V. Mahajani
 147 Rao Bahadur K. V. Brahma, C.I.E.
 148 Rao Bahadur D. V. Bhagavat

- 149 Mr. Shankar Rao M. Bhalchandra
150 Rao Bahadur R. M. Khare
151 Mr. V. K. Rajwade
152 „ V. T. Deshpande
153 Rao Bahadur B. V. Dravid
154 Mr. Janrao Bajirao Deshmukh
155 „ T. R. Gadre
156 „ R. K. Thombre
157 Rai Bahadur Seth Ganesh Dao
158 Rao Saheb M. D. Deshmukh

ASSAM

- 159 Mr. Chandradhar Barua



The National Liberal Federation of India.

THE THIRTEENTH ANNUAL SESSION.

Friday 31st July 1931.

The thirteenth annual session of the National Liberal Federation of India assembled at the Sir Cowasji Jehangir Hall, Bombay, at 5-30 p. m. on Friday, July 31, 1931. There was a very large and representative gathering of delegates, members and visitors prominent among those present being Lady Cowasji Jehangir, Mrs. Naidu, Sir Chimanlal Setalvad, Sir Chunilal Mehta, Sir Purshotamdas Thakordas, Sir Pheroze C. Sethna, Mr. J. N. Basu, Pandit Hirdaynath Kunzru, Mr. K. Natarajan, Dr. G. V. Deshmukh, the Hon. Munshi Narain Prasad Asthana, the Hon. Mr. G. A. Natesan, Mr. J. B. Boman-Behram, Dr. D. A. DeMonte, Sir Lallubhai Samaldas, Mr. V. N. Chandavarkar, Mr. Vithaldas Govindji, Mr. B. N. Karanjia, Mr. B. S. Kamat, Mr. S. D. Saklatvala, Mr. Huseinbhai Lalji, Mr. Lalji Naranji, Khan Bahadur A. R. Baakza, Mr. Huseinally Rahimtoola, Rao Bahadur R. R. Kale, Mr. D. G. Dalvi, Mr. S. M. Bose, Pandit Hardatta Sharma, Mr. A. R. Dalal, Mr. R. P. Karandikar, Rao Bahadur Phophale, Mr. H. G. Gharpure, Mr. K. S. Jatar, Mr. N. M. Joshi, Rao Bahadur K. G. Joshi, Mr. G. K. Gadgil, Prof. V. K. Jog, Mr. Surendranath Varma, Mr. Krishna Ram Mehta and Rao Bahadur Mundle.

After a musical prayer sung by a group of girls from Professor Devdhar's School of Indian Music Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Junior), Chairman of the Reception Committee opened the proceedings by welcoming the delegates. He said :

FELLOW DELEGATES, LADIES and GENTLEMEN,

On behalf of the Reception Committee of this Conference I offer you a most cordial welcome to our City of Bombay.

We have been greatly encouraged by the response we have received from all parts of India, proving that our Liberal creed and principles continue to have considerable following. It is indeed a fact that there are large numbers in the country who agree generally with our principles and policy but who have not officially joined our party.

Welcome speech.
Sir Cowasji
Jehangir (Jr.)

Welcome speech.
Sir Owasji
Jehangir (Jr.)

You must have all been shocked at the dastardly attempt made upon the life of His Excellency the Acting Governor of Bombay. Such acts deserve our strongest condemnation. They politically tend to set back the hands of the clock and loose our cause the sympathy of foreign countries.

Thirteen years ago in this very city was inaugurated the first Session of the National Liberal Federation by some of the foremost public men of the country who in their time had laid the foundations and who were the zealous and devoted architects of the Indian National Congress. These were men with no axe to grind. They were compelled to proclaim a parting of the ways to uphold their life-long principles on a new political platform. A worthy citizen of Bombay and one of the soundest pillars of the old Congress, who is happily still amongst us, Sir Dinshaw Wacha, became the Chairman of the first Reception Committee. Another towering personality, Sir Surendranath Banerjee, who infused vigour and strength into the infant Congress, assumed the responsibility of guiding the deliberations of the Liberal Federation as its first President. Many other zealous workers in the cause of national freedom were present. We have to mourn the loss of one of them during the last year. Sir Shanker Rao Chitnavis was a tower of strength to the Central Provinces. Alas! in him passes away one more of the old brigade.

Painful as must have been the process of severing connections with a political organisation to which the most useful years of their lives were devoted, these eminent men had the foresight to observe that the parting was inevitable, a mere phase in the evolution of political thought, and that the wider interests of the country required subordination of sentiments to a sense of duty. They performed that duty truly and faithfully, and when we look back retrospectively on these thirteen years, pregnant with significant events, each a landmark of no mean importance in the history of India, the conclusion becomes inevitable that the action of those stalwarts will be amply vindicated by the judgment of history.

At the first Session, the most important question for consideration was the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms. They have had their day, and we have come, let us hope, to the final stage. The outstanding event of the past year was the Round Table Conference, an event which will go down in the Constitutional history of the country as an epoch-making event, and

which will effectively terminate the old regime of irresponsible government and open up a vista full of the promise of a re-born State, with the ruled as the rulers in their own home and architects of their own destiny. This marks a definite departure from the old order of affairs and means the re-baptism of Mother India as a Dominion, holding her head high as an equal partner amongst the other Dominions of the British Common-wealth of Nations. There was a school of political thought in our country which during periods of doubt and pessimism never ceased to proclaim to an expectant world that no good could ever come from an assembly of persons who talked of winning political independence across a table and that those of us who dared to hold views different from theirs could not but be traitors to the country, out to barter away the political freedom of one fifth of the human race for a mess of pottage. We now have tangible proof that the Conference met with a considerable measure of success. I have particularly in mind the co-operation of the school of thought now represented by the Congress and its distinguished leader, Mr. Gandhi, who will most probably be proceeding to London within a fortnight. If any testimony were needed to prove the obvious success of the London negotiations, I believe Mr. Gandhi's pledge of co-operation must certainly be regarded as one. That a statesman of his ability and foresight, who but a year ago insisted upon a definite assurance of transfer of power as a condition precedent to attendance, should now deem it expedient to look to this Conference for his search after the substance of independence appears to be a healthy change in the outlook of the Congress and rehabilitation of the confidence of nearly the whole country in the Round Table Conference and especially in His Majesty's Government.

Welcome speech.
Sir Cowaaji
Jehangir (Jr.)

Although considerable satisfaction has been expressed at the results achieved by the Conference, you are aware that all the general principles enunciated either in the Sub-Committees or at the Plenary Sessions have not received the unstinted support of the Indian Delegation. The rich complexities of human thought and sentiment, the diverse conflicting interests of a number of political and economic entities alone would make such absolute agreement an impossibility. There was, however, practical agreement on two main principles—an All-India Federation and a transfer of power at the Centre with certain safeguards. The acceptance of these two principles was, in my opinion, sufficient justification for holding the

Welcome speech.
Sir Cowaji
Jehangir (Jr.)

Conference. The first was made possible by the patriotism and foresight of the Indian Princes. The country owes them a debt of gratitude for their statesmanlike attitude throughout the Conference. None will be so foolish as to believe that the framing of a Federal Constitution for India will be an easy task. The peculiarities of our country, our outlook on life, our peculiar communal problems, and a host of other differing and varying conditions strictly forbid a slavish imitation of any Federal Constitution on the face of the earth. A Constitution has to be evolved to meet our own means and requirements, a Constitution which will suit the genius of our people, a Constitution which will preserve the languages, cultures and religions found in existence between Pindi and Comorin, a Constitution which will permit the political evolution of its component parts to the extent of their natural growth, a Constitution which will be acceptable to the minorities and yet be workable in practice, and, above all, a Constitution which will carry within it powers to bulge forth at no distant future into a full-fledged United States of India. We have to face the arduous task of reconciling the fiscal and economic interests of the Indian States with those of British India. We have to engender in the Princes a sense of self-security that their internal Sovereignty will not suffer by their advent in the Federation, except in so far as may be absolutely necessary for administration and legislation of subjects classed as federal. I recapitulate our difficulties in no mood of pessimism. It is only to strongly urge that the greatest desideratum to-day in all schools of political thought is patience and moderation. Some of our public men, from their speeches, seem to believe that His Majesty's Government and the principal political parties in England have only to agree to our demands and the millennium will have arrived. Alas ! it is not so easy. Many of the knotty and difficult problems facing us will have to be solved by ourselves alone. Ours is the responsibility. To shirk it will bring us no nearer the goal. The greatest of all problems, of immediate importance, is the communal problem. You may take it for certain that no constitution can work without creeks and jolts, not to say without danger of breakdown, which does not impart in the minorities a sense of safety. Both equity and expediency dictate that the minorities must be safeguarded. The Muslims are the largest and most important minority. At one stage of the informal conversations in England the problem of Joint versus Separate Electorates was almost solved. Unfortunately for the country the negotiations.

fell through at the eleventh hour. Viewing, as I do, this communal problem as one of the main difficulties to be combated before the ideal of Federation can materialise, may I request you to cast your minds back over the last couple of years. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru made valiant attempts at reconciling the two communities, but in vain. The necessary spirit of give and take which alone can be the basic formula for the solution of such a question was conspicuous by its absence. The contending parties drifted apart, and still further apart at each attempted settlement. While the cry of the want of a change of atmosphere escaped from the lips of some, it did not seem to be realised that a changed atmosphere could not generate a peaceful atmosphere unless either side was prepared to make a sacrifice of some cherished principles in the wider interests of the political independence of a vast sub-continent. No really great ideal was ever achieved except at a price and a sacrifice. Communal unity is surely one such great ideal, worthy of the temporary surrender of a political principle. Either we make the sacrifice or we are not very strong in our conviction that the future advancement of our country lies in our political liberty. Without the solution of the Communal question, political freedom would not be worth the trouble of its acquisition. Political freedom is a means to an end, and not an end in itself ; that end is the realisation of the highest and the best in every citizen and by every citizen. But when internecine disagreement rends our country in twain, what prospect can there be of the fulfilment of a noble cause for which all Society must exist. Let us not forget that we have to solve this problem ourselves. No third party will do it with any real satisfaction to either side.

Welcome speech
Sir Gowaasji
Jehangir (Jr.)

The Federal Structure Sub-Committee accepted in main the principle that "subject to certain special provisions more particularly specified hereafter, the responsibility for the Government of India will in future rest upon Indians themselves". Once the main issue of responsibility at the Centre is accepted, we have to carefully consider the reservations which qualify that general statement or, rather, the safeguards as they have been called. Considerable distrust and apprehension of the financial safeguards was expressed by several members of the Indian Delegation, and I shall add, perhaps looking to the wording of paragraphs 18 and 20 of the Report, not without considerable justification, as they are undoubtedly vague and suspiciously wide. Consider for instance the

Welcome speech.
Sir Cowasji
Jehangir (Jr.)

recommendation which states: "It would therefore be necessary to reserve to the Governor-General in regard to the budgetary arrangements and borrowing such essential powers as would enable him to intervene if methods were being pursued which would in his opinion seriously prejudice the credit of India in the money markets of the world." This reservation appears to strike at the very root of financial autonomy and no wonder the Sub-Committee was constrained to record a statement that "on the question of finance Indian opinion was that even the safeguards set out in the report went too far, specially those giving special powers to the Governor-General". Fortunately the debate that followed on the subject in the Conference made the situation clearer, thanks to the lucid exposition of Lord Reading who answered a number of questions put to him. In the light of the explanation offered by Lord Reading the financial safeguard means—I cannot do better than quote his words—"That it would be necessary to have some such provision when you are making a change in order that it should not be thought here that internal loans might be raised in such a manner as to prejudice India's credit, which of course would affect her here as it would elsewhere in the world. That is the sole purpose of it." Lord Reading thus assigns a more precise and narrower connotation to the safeguard than what might be gathered from the vague language. It means, for instance, if India seeks to borrow money internally at unjustifiably high rates of interest, not for a productive purpose or capital expenditure but to meet recurring budget deficits for five or six years, that is to say if India floats an internal loan so injudiciously as to prejudice seriously her financial credit and stability, the power reserved to the Governor-General would be put into operation. To use Lord Reading's phrase again by way of emphasis "that is the sole purpose of it." The evident answer to Lord Reading is that public opinion and the Indian Legislature will be a far better check upon financial mismanagement of the kind explained than the interference of the most capable Viceroy. At the same time it must not be forgotten that millions of sterling have been raised in England on behalf of India on the moral, if not legal, support of the British Government. They have therefore, a claim to include such provisions in the Constitution as will enable them to carry out their moral obligation and responsibility.

The Federal Structure Sub-Committee has accepted the main principle that on the Constitution of a Reserve Bank,

free from political influence, the future Government of India should be entrusted with the management of currency and exchange. It was expected that a Reserve Bank would be established almost simultaneously with the introduction of the new constitution. No Constitution can be considered satisfactory that does not give India complete control over her currency and monetary policy. The advisability of establishing a Reserve Bank is not contested. But if it is to be considerably delayed, the safeguard as now suggested will have to be seriously reconsidered.

Welcome speech.
Sir Cowasji
Jehangir (Jr.)

Sub-Committee No. 2, as you are aware, dealt with the Provincial Constitution and pledged as we were to secure for our Provinces full and real autonomy, many of us could not but oppose a recommendation which sought to give unusually wide powers to the Governor. It was generally agreed that there should be vested in the Governor some suitable emergency powers to enable the administration to be carried on in the event of a breakdown of Government or of the administrative machinery; but we were not prepared to endow the Governor with powers of interference in anticipation of the King's Government being brought to a standstill. We desire the freedom to err or, as Mr. Gandhi put it, the liberty to err and to sin. But, as in all other Constitutions, there must be safeguards to provide for a continuance of Government in times of national crisis.

I come to another important issue which, I am afraid, is likely to loom large on our political horizon with a threatening significance. This issue was raised in the Minorities' Sub-Committee as a direct result of the British commercial community insisting that there should be no distinction whatsoever between their position in India and that of Indian-born subjects. This claim was contested by the Indian Delegates who contended that exceptions would have to be allowed in matters of national importance. After two days of private discussion, a compromise was effected which is embodied in Clause 14 of the Minorities' Sub-Committee's Report, and with which you are all familiar. Broadly, it was accepted that as a principle there is to be no discrimination between the British Mercantile community, firms and companies trading in India and the rights of Indian-born subjects, but the word "generally" was incorporated to signify that certain exceptions would be allowed in matters of national importance which would require *ad-hoc* treatment different from what the main principle of

Welcome speech.
Sir Cowasji
Jehangir (Jr.)

“no discrimination” would warrant. The word “reciprocity” was intended to convey the idea that, in the event of there being discriminatory legislation in England against Indians, India would be justified in retaliating. The word “appropriate” indicates that the conventions mentioned are to be drafted in such a manner that the trading rights of the British Mercantile community shall be regulated consistently with the significance attached to the words “generally” and “reciprocity.” Although this formula allows of discrimination, I am sure no honest Indian desires to deprive Englishmen of the fruits of their enterprise, energy and capital, nor have Indians any intention of placing unnecessary impediments in the way of Englishmen continuing to trade in this country.

The Franchise Sub-Committee has recommended the appointment of a Franchise Commission to investigate the question of suffrage. With one stroke of the legislator’s pen, some members of the Sub-Committee advocated the adoption of adult universal suffrage. The Sub-Committee, by a majority, have suggested the widening of the franchise to a very substantial extent. I do not propose to go into the details of their recommendations but I would most earnestly appeal for caution and careful consideration. The time has not yet arrived even to seriously mention the adoption of adult franchise, and it is most regrettable that so important an issue, which will have lasting and far-reaching effects upon our future, should be connected with the solution of the communal problem. There is sure to be difference of opinion as to the extent to which the franchise should be extended. But taking standards of literacy into consideration, we should not permit more risky experiments to be tried in our country than have been attempted in other parts of the world. The efficiency of a Government does not vary in direct proportion to the size of the electorate. Nor can you expect a Legislature of a A1 quality and calibre to be returned by an electorate of C3 mentality, education and intelligence. We have heard a good deal about taking steps to ensure that stability is imparted into our new Central and Provincial Governments, and that our Legislatures work with a sense of responsibility. Let us not forget that the franchise is the very foundation of all Legislatures.

I shall conclude my remarks with an allusion to one topic which has increasingly occupied our attention and which we shall have to reckon with in no spirit of levity or defeatism.

In these days of widespread economic distress, consequent upon a world-wide trade depression of a magnitude never known before, we find seeds of communistic activities being sown in India. A discontented proletariat and a dissatisfied class of labour are too apt to listen with rapt attention to the false promise of relief from hardships held out by some political agitators who exploit their misery, making it a business and a source of profit for themselves. In the effort to revolutionise the existing economic order, these agitators, some times in alliance with Moscow and steeped in the traditions and doctrines of the Third International, receive overt support from many a misguided politician. Nationalisation of the instruments of production, distribution and exchange, nationalisation of public utility services, abolition of landlordism and capitalism are but some of the oft-repeated objectives on which the Communists have set their heart. No constitution which may give us a stable Self-Government will ever satisfy those who believe in the destruction of the existing order as a condition precedent to its reconstruction. Of late, we have witnessed an increasing tendency amongst labour unions to lean more towards the Muscovite political philosophy. Under the guise of improving conditions of labour, they aim at the disruption of Society and expropriation of proprietors of all kinds. The existing order is by no means perfect and it must be readily recognised that labour should receive its legitimate due in the national wealth, as it is an important factor in its creation. But the aim of the Communists are poles apart from the welfare of the workers. They aim at the establishment of a State wherein the institution of private property will be unknown. Knowing as we do the inherent inequality of talents in human beings, which must ultimately make for inequality of wealth, knowing as we do that private ownership of property has stood the test of time immemorial, we cannot help feeling that the activities of these agitators, if successful, must mean for India a set back from which she will hardly be able to recover. This political disease is spreading; it is infectious and it finds a ready soil for speedy fertilisation in the restless minds of some of our youths. But if we work for the uplift of labour, and if we genuinely sympathise with the misery of the masses, I believe we can make it most difficult for Communism to capture our ancient land.

Welcome speech.
Sir Cowasji
Jehangir (Jr.)

The work before us is immensely vast and extra-ordinarily complicated. The quota which each of us contributes day

Welcome speech.
Sir Cowasji
Jehangir (Jr.)

after day is but an imperceptible contribution to the noble task of rearing a proud and free India ; viewed from close proximity, the effect of our contribution on its growth and progress may not be perceivable ; but if we continue to maintain untarnished the rich heritage of noble traditions handed down to us by our predecessors, at a distance of about a decade hence a grateful posterity may remember their work with gratitude and admiration, which at once shall be our hope and reward.

On the Conclusion of his speech the Chairman called upon Mr. B. N. Gokhale, the Secretary, to read the messages of sympathy which had been received by him.

Mr. Gokhale said :—Mr. Chairman, brother delegates, ladies and gentlemen ;

The Reception Committee of the Conference have received numerous letters and telegrams wishing the Conference a successful session. The first message is from Mahatma Gandhi (applause). He says :

Messages
of Sympathy.

“I thank you for your cordial invitation. I shall be busy attending to the poor people of Borsad at the time of the National Liberal Federation will be meeting. Had it not been so, I would certainly have deemed it a privilege to be present at your meeting and to listen to Mr. Chintamani's inaugural address. All the same I wish you every success and hope that the Federation will come to wise decisions.”

Mr. N. Subba Rao Pantulu :—“My apologies for my non-attendance with my best wishes for the success of the Conference.”

Sir Moropant Joshi :—I wish all success to the next session of the Conference.

Sir Devaprasad Sarvadhikari :—“I wish the Conference all success and shall always maintain my interest and goodwill for the Federation.”

Dewan Bahadur T. Rangachari of Madras :—“I wish the session all success.”

Mr. E. Vinayak Rao, Madras :—“I wish the session all success.”

Dewan Bahadur Ramchandra Rao :—“I very much regret that I am unable to be present at this momentous session of the

Federation to be held at Bombay on Friday next. I have no doubt that the Session will be a great success under the distinguished presidency of my friend Mr. Chintamani. Please convey my good wishes to all friends assembled at Bombay."

Mr. Rai Krishnaji :—"Ill health prevents my attendance. I pray divine grace may give high wisdom for leading country right."

Mr. Parmeshwarnath Sapru :—"Extremely sorry ill-health prevents my attendance. Wishing Conference success pray declare emphatically that only minimum and absolutely essential safeguards in India's interest only will be acceptable. Insult on Indianisation of army and adopt Congress formula on communal settlement."

Sardar S. N. Mutalik :—"Regret inability to attend. Wish Conference every success. Please urge second Chamber Bombay Presidency."

Sir B. H. Nanavatty :—"Regret inability to attend Conference, wish it success."

Mr. Venkatapati Raja :—"Unavoidably detained. Wishing success Conference stoppage foreigners recruitment excepting experts yearly reduction tenth British Army here simultaneous training Indians essential."

Mr. Ramrao :—"Detained here owing serious illness of grand-daughter wish our session every success."

Rao Bahadur Limaye :—"Sorry can't attend. Myself and Sholapur Liberals wish successful session."

Mr. Dalip Mansingh :—"Unavoidably detained wishing every success."

Munshi Iswar Saran :—"Wish your Federation success hope Federation declare substance of freedom alone acceptable to Liberals."

Mr. V. T. Deshpande, Yeotmal :—"Regret inability to attend owing to illness wish every success to the session."

Mr. Prakash Narayan Sapru :—"Regret illness prevented attendance sure party will benefit by your bold courageous lead wish Federation success."

Mr. Shivarao :—"Heartily wishes for success Federation under your able guidance."

Diwan Gokulchand :—Wish Federation success invite next session Benares.”

Mr. Bajnath Kunzru :—“Regret unavoidable absence wish every success Federation under your able guidance.”

Mr. Govindaraghava Aiyar :—“Regret inability to attend wish Federation all success.”

Sir Sivaswamy Iyer :—“Regret inability to attend Liberal Federation session wish every success under able guidance of distinguished publicist and patriot whom you have invited to preside am confident conclusions will be marked by political wisdom and sound nationalism.”

Sir C. P. Ramaswamy Iyer :—“Proceeding Calcutta urgent business much regret inability present meeting wish deliberation all success under your distinguished presidentship.”

Dr. R. P. Paranjpye :—“Under Chintamani’s experienced presidentship Liberal Federation will I hope have successful session and formulate liberal policy for Round Table Conference.”

Mr. A. P. Sen :—“Profoundly regret inability to attend laid up with illness at eleventh hour am confident under able and courageous guidance of Mr. Chintamani, Liberal party will give the country a firm and wise lead at this momentous stage of its political evolution and will strengthen the claims to be our representatives at Round Table Conference for equal partnership in the British Commonwealth in form and in substance wish Federation all success.”

Mr. H. P. Chahewala Ahmedabad :—“I very much regret that owing to unavoidable causes it will not be possible for me to attend the Conference. I wish every success to the Conference.”

Prof. R. Sadaswa Aiyar, Fergusson College, Poona :—

“My indifferent health has made it impossible for me to attend this session of the National Liberal Federation. I have no doubt that its resolutions will make it clear to English statesmen that India is not prepared to accept a type of Federation in which a democratic British India must clasp hands with an autocratic Indian India. On this and other questions like “safeguards” I have the fullest hope this session will give an effective and unequivocal lead to the R.T. C. I wish it all success.”

The Chairman then called upon Sir Chimanlal Setalvad to move the election of the President. Sir Chimanlal Setalvad said :

Election of
President.
Sir Chimanlal
Setalvad.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, LADIES and GENTLEMEN.

I have great pleasure in proposing Mr. C. Y. Chintamani to preside at this thirteenth session of the Liberal Federation. If there is one man more than others who has worked steadfastly for the Liberal cause it is Mr. Chintamani (applause). He was Secretary of the Federation for a continued period of eight years and you will remember that he presided over the Federation session in the year 1920, and I am asking him again to preside over the Federation at this important juncture and I am sure you will carry the proposition with acclamation, (applause).

Mr. J. N. Basu, seconding the proposition, said :

BROTHER DELEGATES, Mr. CHAIRMAN, LADIES and GENTLEMEN: I have great pleasure in seconding this proposal. As Sir Chimanlal Setalvad has pointed out, of all the distinguished workers who have striven steadfastly during the last quarter of a century for the attainment of self-rule for our motherland one of the foremost has been Mr. C. Y. Chintamani. He entered the sphere of his work early in life but with a steady aim and he has gone forward without swerving from the path that he chalked out for himself. He has been a critic, and some times a severe critic, of the present order of things, but along with the spirit of criticism and destruction that animated him there was side by side a stronger spirit, the spirit of constructive statesmanship, looking to the building up of the people day by day in every concern of their lives. The Montagu reforms gave a chance for the working of the system that came into being in consequence of those reforms and Mr. Chintamani was one of those that would not let go the opportunity that so offered itself. We have now arrived at a very critical stage in the history of our country. All parties in India including the Congress party have for sometime felt the need of joint consultation of all parties. You all know that since 1928 there have been occasional conferences of different parties. In 1929 the British Government saw the necessity of such conferences, and the Round Table Conference was called. In 1930 the Congress Party did not see fit to join that Conference. In 1931 the Congress Party is going to join it. There is expectation in every Indian mind. At the present moment, one who has devoted himself so thoroughly and entirely as Mr. Chintamani

Election of
President.
Mr. J. N. Basu.

to the fight for his country has been chosen to preside over our deliberations. I have great pleasure in seconding the resolution placed before you by Sir Chimanlal Setalvad.

The Hon. Munshi Narain Prasad Asthana said :

Election of
President.
The Hon. Munshi
Narayan Prasad
Asthana.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, LADIES and GENTLEMEN: Coming as I do from the United Provinces and the city of Allahabad which Mr. Chintamani has made his home, you will agree with me that it is useless for me to use many words in support of the resolution which has been proposed. Mr. Chintamani has rendered signal service to the cause of liberalism and he is one of the founders of the liberal creed so far as United Provinces is concerned. He has kept the banner of Liberals aloft in that Province. His demands have always been insistent and his convictions have always been persistent. It is such a man who is required at this juncture to give us guidance and lead and I hope under his wise guidance this Federation will march towards success. I have great pleasure in supporting this resolution which has been so ably proposed.

The Hon. Mr. G. A. Natesan said :

Election of
President.
The Hon.
Mr. G. A.
Natesan.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, LADIES and GENTLEMEN: I rise to perform the pleasing but superfluous duty of asking you to support Mr. Chintamani's election to the presidential chair. Those that have the privilege of intimate friendship with him and even those that might differ from him are bound to recognise that he is a man of high character and strong convictions. I have no doubt that in his conduct as President of this Federation he will add to the name which the Liberal Party has won, despite critics, for sound patriotism, sane judgment and farsighted vision of India's appropriate place in the Empire.

Mr. B. S. Kamat said :

Election of
President.
Mr. B. S.
Kamat.

BROTHER DELEGATES, LADIES and GENTLEMEN: I have great pleasure in supporting the proposition that is before you. As a publicist I do not think in the whole of India there is any other man as able and as distinguished as Mr. Chintamani. As a journalist he is so brilliant that he can do credit to journalism in any part of the world. He is as we know a facile writer, a quick political thinker and a ready speaker. Coming to his personal qualities, if I may describe him, he is always unassuming in his ways never self-seeking, never self-advertising, he is one of the truest and staunchest of Liberals whom it is very pleasing and delightful to meet. I do not think at the

present moment there is a man better fitted to preside over the deliberations of this conference and later on to represent the views of the Liberals at the Round Table Conference than he, and I venture to say further that when the Round Table Conference is over and when there is responsibility in the country, there is to my mind no better man to show how to exercise responsibility either at the centre or in the Provinces, that is to say, exercise impartially the authority of a Cabinet Minister than our friend here. Under him I am convinced democracy would be safe even in India, not only for the Hindus or Mussalmans but even for the Britishers whether in the services or in the trade. I have great pleasure in supporting the proposition. (Applause).

Election of
President.
Mr. B. S.
Kamat.

The proposition was then carried with acclamation and Mr. Chintamani took the chair after being garlanded by the Chairman of the Reception Committee. He then delivered the presidential address.

Mr. Chintamani, who on rising received a great ovation said:
FELLOW-LIBERALS,

There is no greater honour which a Liberal may hope to receive from his fellow-Liberals than to be elected President of the National Liberal Federation. I was the fortunate recipient of this signal mark of confidence in 1920, when the third session of the Federation was held at Madras. My gratitude is deep and profound to those provincial Liberal organizations which recommended my election, to the Reception Committee which elected, and to you, brother-delegates, who have voted me to the presidential chair of this, the thirteenth session of the Federation. One may be pardoned to cherish a feeling of grateful satisfaction at being called upon a second time to fill this honourable position, and I thank you for it. Of peculiar gratification is it to preside over a conference at Bombay, the birthplace of both the Indian National Congress and the National Liberal Federation of India and the great city which gave to the Motherland Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Sir Pherozeshah Mehta. But we meet in a situation of such unsurpassed gravity that, not unnaturally, I am overwhelmed by the responsibility you have imposed upon me more than elated by the honour you have conferred. I am not so vain as to think that I am adequate to the position at this critical juncture in the political life of our country. If I were not conscious of your spirit of helpful co-operation I should not undertake the duty at all, and I am sure you will extend it to

Presidential
Address,
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

me ungrudgingly as you did to my distinguished predecessors. In this confident hope, and above all, with humble reliance upon the Giver of All Good, I shall proceed to the discharge of the duty with which you have charged me.

DEPARTED PATRIOTS

At the outset, however, I must, with your permission, pay a tribute, on your behalf and mine, to the distinguished patriots who have been lost to us. In Pandit Motilal Nehru, Moulana Mahomed Ali and the Maharaja of Mahmudabad, India has lost three public-spirited men whose places cannot be easily filled. They stood for India's freedom and served the national cause faithfully and fearlessly. Pandit Motilal Nehru stood pre-eminent among his compatriots for uncommon intellectual capacity, and he and Mr. Mahomed Ali gladly suffered imprisonment more than once in the furtherance of the cause to which they gave their allegiance. The Maharaja of Mahmudabad was a champion of nationalism against communalism.

Our own party is much the poorer for the death of Rao Bahadur K. G. Damle and Sir Shankar Rao Chitnavis, than whom two more genuine Liberals I have not come across. Their death is an irreparable loss to Berar and the Central Provinces and to Liberalism.

Yet another loss the Motherland has sustained was in the premature death of Mr. K. T. Paul, an Indian Christian gentleman of high character and a genuine nationalist, whose political faith was Liberal and who did meritorious work as an educationist. He was one of the few representatives of minority communities who acted throughout as an Indian patriot in the deliberations of the Round Table Conference.

It is my melancholy duty to refer to one more death, news of which was received as I was about to complete this address. Mr. Eardley Norton, the famous advocate who fought many a battle royal in courts of law, was even better known in the earlier years of Congress as a stout-hearted champion of India's political rights. I have never known a man in India who wrote more brilliantly or spoke more pointedly. His speech at the second Madras Congress in 1894 on the abolition of the India Council was never surpassed except by Mr. Lalmohan Ghose's historic speech at Dacca on the Anglo-Indian opposition to the Ilbert Bill, and the two utterances will

remain classics in Indian political literature. On his first appearance on the Congress platform in 1887 at Madras Mr. Norton thus stated his political creed :—

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

'If it be sedition, gentlemen, to rebel against all wrong; if it be sedition to insist that the people should have a fair share in the administration of their own country and affairs; if it be sedition to resist injustice, class tyranny, to raise my voice against oppression, to mutiny against injustice to insist upon a hearing before sentence, to uphold the liberties of the individual, to vindicate our common right to gradual but ever advancing reform—if this be sedition, I am right glad to be called a "seditionist" and doubly, aye, trebly glad, when I look around me today to know and feel that I am ranked as one among such a magnificent array of "seditionists."'

With the families of the distinguished and lamented deceased we of the Liberal Federation greatly sympathize in their bereavement and we offer them our condolence.

THE GOVERNOR OF BOMBAY

Fellow-Liberals, it is impossible for us not to express our sense of great sorrow that a cruel attempt should have been made last week on the life of the acting Governor of this presidency, by a student of Fergusson College, Poona, of all places—an institution with which is associated the honoured name of Gopal Krishna Gokhale, who with his and our Guru Mahadeo Govind Ranade, never believed that end justified means and never did an unrighteous thing for the noblest of purposes. We all wish to offer our respectful sympathy to Sir Ernest Hotson in the sudden danger that overtook him in the most unexpected place, congratulate His Excellency on the splendid presence of mind which rescued him from peril, and devoutly thank God Almighty for mercifully saving his life.

SURVEY OF EVENTS

For the first time after 1918, when our organization came into being in this city under the illustrious auspices of Sir Surendranath Banerjea and Sir Dinshaw Wacha, who is fortunately hale and hearty at the great age of 87—long may he still be spared—there was no annual session of the Federation in Christmas last, owing to the absence of prominent Liberals on duty in another place. This is why we have assembled in conference at this time of the year. When we last met at Madras under the leadership of our distinguished colleague, the Hon. Sir Phiroze Sethna, Lord Irwin's historic announcement of the Round Table Conference was the principal subject

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

of consideration. A few days before, the conversations between Lord Irwin and Mahatma Gandhi ended in failure, and the country stood on the verge of the movement of civil disobedience, which soon after became a tremendous fact. Standing as we did and do for constitutional as distinguished from direct action, we naturally welcomed the Viceroy's announcement, made with the authority of his Majesty's Government in England, and promised our co-operation. We were anxious that it should be explicitly stated that the purpose of the Round Table Conference would be, specifically, to draw a dominion constitution for India, with only such temporary reservations in respect of defence, external affairs and relations with Indian states as might be agreed to by both sides. In this effort we did not succeed, as his Majesty's Government and his Excellency the Viceroy did not think that in the circumstances that existed they could make such a declaration. Congress broke away and embarked on the historic Disobedience Campaign. Liberals and other constitutionalists preferred to make the best use of the rare opportunity offered by the Conference to achieve Dominion Status and Responsible Government for India. As the end of the Conference is not yet, it is too soon to say whether our confidence was justified or misplaced. I have consistently held the opinion that the Conference of the last cold weather would have yielded better results if Congress had allowed itself to be represented at it in adequate strength.

It is not necessary at this stage, nor profitable, that we should discuss the Civil Disobedience movement. On two points, however, I have no doubt whatsoever in my mind. The first is that, even on the assumption that the advocates of direct action were in the right, they should first have tried the conference method and only on its failure should they have resorted to extreme measures. At least, they should have responded to the peace overtures of August last, as by then they had demonstrated their strength and extorted admiration by their capacity for suffering and sacrifice. I am glad, as the whole country is, that the second peace effort did not share the fate of the first, that India has been enjoying comparative calm during the last five months and that Congress will be represented at the resumed discussions of the Round Table Conference. My second point is that the Government method of dealing with the Disobedience movement was altogether bad. We must candidly own that no Government could help answering an open challenge to its very existence and that by the very nature of the case some strong action to counter the

movement was inevitable. The mischief of it is that in such crises both sides cast prudence and discretion to the winds. Those who like ourselves did not agree with him must acknowledge as warmly as his supporters that Mahatma Gandhi at any rate, as becomes a great soul, acted under a sense of duty, however mistaken. But if there be an Indian, both honest and intelligent, who could conscientiously say that many officers of Government—of course, in this term I do not include Lord Irwin the Viceroy—acted more in sorrow than in anger or disinterestedly in righteous obedience to the compulsion of public necessity, I fear I have not met him. In actual fact, such cruel lawlessness was practised at many places, and nowhere more than in this presidency, by the supposititious guardians of law in the name of a civilized Government, that nation-wide indignation was provoked and large numbers were drawn into the agitation in the spirit of sympathy who would never have gone near it, who in the beginning either disapproved of it or at least were in doubt about its wisdom and its opportuneness. No representation of the true facts by constitutionalists who were on the side of law and order made an impression on the Government, and its irresponsibility and unresponsiveness stood revealed in all their nakedness as its lack of sympathy and of human-ness was betrayed at nearly every step. Last year during this struggle, as many a time before and at Cawnpore and in Burma afterwards, the lesson was sharply impressed upon the most moderate minds by Government action, and by the lack of it when it was imperatively required, that of the many urgent needs of India none was more pressing than the transfer of the subjects comprehended in the phrase 'law and order' to the control of the Legislature acting through Ministers accountable to it in the parliamentary sense. Lord Morley addressed the admonition to Lord Minto, 'Your law-and-order' people are responsible for at least as many of the 'fooleries of history as revolutionists are.' It anything like the present bureaucratic control over this supremely important branch of the administration should longer be maintained, the very danger from which they affect the belief that they are saving and will save us, is almost certain to overtake the country and they can hope to be immune from its dire consequences no more than they tell us we can. Lord Chelmsford as Viceroy warned Indians against 'catastrophic changes'. The catastrophe of the Punjab occurred in his time. Noble lords and right hon. gentlemen in England have in recent months been uttering plenty of similar jeremiads. They forget that Bolsheviki Russia is the child of Czarist Russia and

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

Presidential
Address,
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

that Revolutionary India will only be the consequence of alien bureaucratic rule—'too wooden, too iron, too inelastic, too 'ante-diluvian,' in Mr. Montagu's unforgettable language.

Fellow-Liberals, it was from an India seething with discontent never equalled before, that the Indians invited to the Round Table Conference sailed for England in September and October last. Here let me say that 'delegates' though they have been called, the term is a misnomer as they were not elected by any organisation. There was a fair number of Liberals among them, but you and I know that neither the Federation nor its Council was given a chance of at least making a recommendation. Or, would such a leader as Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer, than whom no public man is more deservedly respected for his character or admired for his attainments, have been left out? And would not the so-called delegates have received, not a mandate, but a few general instructions for their guidance, to facilitate concerted action on vital matters? Let me hope that the resolutions which will be passed by the Federation on Sunday will fulfil this need.

Last week were published the names of persons 'nominated' by 'the Prime Minister' as members of the Federal Structure Sub-Committee at its resumed session. Last time the members were appointed by the President of the Conference on the recommendation of Business Committee—which was wholly elected by the Conference—acting in consultation with the three 'delegations'. This time a different procedure has been followed and they have been nominated by the Prime Minister of Britain, of course on the recommendation of the Viceroy or the Governor-General in Council. I at least am not aware of any justification for this change for the worse and deem it my duty to record my protest against the departure from the procedure settled and followed last year by Mr. Ramsay MacDonald himself. It is curious that among the new nominees should have been included those who were 'delegates' in 1930 but were not recommended by the Business Committee and therefore not appointed by the President as well as others who have still to become 'delegates'. We miss in the list the name of our talented General Secretary, Sir C. P. Ramaswamy Aiyer (whom I congratulate on his appointment as officiating Law Member of the Government of India); nor has the place been filled by the nomination of Sir Chimanlal Setalvad or Diwan Bahadur Ramachandra Rao; nor yet, has it been left vacant. Room has been made for more-

Muslim communalists, and therefore, probably none could be spared for a solitary Muslim Nationalist—no, not even for a former member of the Government of India distinguished alike by his ability, moderation and experience of affairs. Neither could a thought be bestowed on the unanswerable claim of independent-minded Burmans for a voice in the deliberations on India's future constitution and the determination of the future of their own country. While Sir Purushottamdas Thakordas will be there, his colleague is to be, not Mr. Birla but another who could not hope to be there if selection were made by election. We all are doubtless gratified by the inclusion of Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya. One of the two new British members is Lord Hailsham, whose strident voice may be expected to make up for the absence of Mr. Winston Churchill and Sir John Simon, but I am sorry that the Liberal section has not been strengthened as it would have been by the nomination of Sir Herbert Samuel.

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

The names of more new members of the Conference are promised at an early date. 'Delegates' they too will be called I have no doubt, but I will not insult the intelligence of the appointing authority by assuming that they are deemed to be the accredited representatives of any organization, with the exception of Mahatma Gandhi as the spokesman of Congress. Indeed, we need not be surprised, and Simla may not wear the mask of injured innocence, if uncharitable critics should greatly dare and say that some of them at any rate are the chosen instruments for the effectuation of unavowed purposes. No one will be happier than your humble servant to find himself wrong on a perusal of the names to come, in which case he will be the readiest to make the *amende honorable*.

Since this was written it has been reported that two Muslim Nationalists are likely to receive invitations to the Conference. We shall hope that this is true and that the amusing bluff of the communal zealots will receive the answer it deserves. It is as well that Government should know that threats of withdrawal can be uttered by others with real reason. Not only should Sir Ali Imam and Dr. Ansari be invited to the Conference, but they should be included both in the Federal Structure and Minorities Sub-Committees.

The Liberal Federation assembled in annual session at Madras at the close of 1929 pressed earnestly that the promised Round Table Conference should be held at the earliest possible date. This was not done. For one reason and another which

Presidential
Address.
Mr. O. Y.
Chintamani.

must have impressed the authorities as being good and sufficient, the Conference was unduly put off and in the long interval between the announcement and the Conference, the political situation in India went on deteriorating more and more. I have already mentioned that the request for a declaration that the object of the Conference was to draw a constitution based on Dominion Status was not acceded to, and that none of our public bodies was consulted in the selection of the so-called delegates. Attempts made during the year, first in India and then in England, both before and during the Conference, to reach a settlement by consent of the communal question were unfortunately not attended with the success they deserved and the best interests of India required, to the regret, I am sure, of all of us, but not equally to the surprise of at least some of us. One new factor must not be overlooked. The original intention was that his Majesty's Government should confer with selected Indians. Later, however, the basis of the Conference was altered, and representatives of the two Opposition parties in Parliament were included among the Members. It cannot be said that this lightened the work of the Indian nationalists who were at the Conference.

In this rapid survey of events I have not thought it necessary to detain you with a reference to the report of the much advertised but unwanted and boycotted Simon Commission. From our point of view it was even worse than many of us were sure it was bound to be. Not even the Government of India could have the hardihood to say that it answered the immediate requirements of the country. Their own elaborate dispatch, indubitably better as it was than the Commission's report as I gladly acknowledge, does not admit, from our point of view, of a more complimentary description than that it was, like the curate's egg, good in parts.

THE ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE

The Round Table Conference was graciously opened by his Majesty the King-Emperor in the Royal Gallery of the House of Lords with a speech distinguished by his Majesty's wellknown and never-failing love of India and sympathy for Indians. The Archbishops of Canterbury and York organized prayers for the success of the Conference. The Prime Minister was *elected* President of the Conference: I would ask you, brother-delegates, to make a note that he was elected by the Conference and did not take the chair, *ex-officio* as

Prime Minister. The Deputy President was likewise elected, and so were the members who constituted the panel of Chairmen. The Chairman and members of the Business Committee—which almost immediately acquired or assumed an all too powerful position—were all elected. Addressing the British Indian 'delegation' the Secretary of State gave the assurance that the Conference itself was left free to determine every arrangement that concerned its business. I emphasize these facts because not everything that was subsequently done accorded fully with the preliminary plans and early assurances.

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

As full reports of all proceedings have been published for general information it is not necessary for me to take you through them. Besides I shall have to ask your attention to certain matters of moment and I must avoid tedious repetition. I cannot however avoid a reference at this stage to the decision of the Business Committee that the first subject of discussion should relate to the issue of federal *versus* unitary constitution. It is fortunate that all that this connoted and implied was not literally insisted upon. But this first decision affected and influenced all subsequent proceedings. There were some of us who thought, among them Sir Chimanlal Setalvad, that the Conference should rather get to grips at once with *the* matter that was uppermost in the Indian mind and for which we went to England braving the wrath of large numbers of our countrymen, viz., Dominion Status with a Responsible Central Government for British India. In my humble opinion there is cause for regret that the advocates of this opinion failed and the Business Committee's decision prevailed.

It is unquestionable that the declarations of the Ruling Princess in support of Federation, which came as an agreeable surprise to many including their friends and admirers and supporters, almost changed the outlook of the Conference ;— for better it appeared then, for better or worse in actual fact we shall have to wait to know. One thing, however, must, I fear, be admitted. The whole of our political effort has been directed to the achievement of self-government for British India. The people of the Indian States have still less of constitutional government than their countrymen of the so-called British India, but they are not under alien rule in the sense or to the extent that we are. What answer was given to this insistent national demand by the representatives of his Majesty's Government and other British parties at the Round Table Conference? I should be sorry and reluctant to say that the

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

answer was in the negative, at least so far as his Majesty's Government are concerned. But I fear I am bound to say that at the best the answer is by no means free from doubt. I have seen it stated lately that responsible opinion in England is now crystallized in the formula—'no responsibility at the centre without federation, and no federation without the States.' Gentlemen, I have a lively and grateful sense of the contribution that the Princes generally and some prominent members of their Order in particular made to the success of the Conference, such as it was, and I can truthfully affirm that there is no man to whom I yield in my ardent desire to see federation an accomplished fact. But I am certain that I speak the mind of you all when I affirm, as I must and do in unhesitating accents, that

Federation or no federation, we must have responsible Government, not less at the centre than in the provinces, and we must have it without any more delay.

Congress and Liberal Federation alike, and the large body of opinion in between the two as well as (in some instances) less advanced than either, have been untiringly and ceaselessly pressing for this, the greatest and most imperative of the nation's needs, and they will not be denied. The Will to Freedom is asserting itself with increasing force as day succeeds day, and it shall prevail. The best friends of India and England, the most sincere advocates of the honourable maintenance of the association of England with India are most anxious, and devoutly pray, that this end may be achieved quickly and peacefully—it can only be peaceful if it is quick—with the helpful and magnanimous co-operation of all that is best in British public life. And as one responsible statesman of England realized and avowed a few months ago, the Round Table Conference is 'our last chance'.

'I can only hope' said the Prime Minister towards the conclusion of his last speech on the last day of the Conference, 'that the memories you are taking away of us are equally 'pleasant, equally happy, and will be held equally precious 'to you as your memories will be to us.' I am certain that no single Indian who was privileged to meet Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, Mr. Wedgwood Benn, Lord Sankey and other British public men at the Conference table and in social life outside will disagree with me when I say that the Prime Minister's 'hope' is a real fact and that we all look back upon

our association with them with pleasure and gratitude for their courtesy, their cordiality, their hospitality and their constant helpfulness. I am not tired of paying my tribute of respect and admiration to Mr. MacDonald himself for the almost incredible amount of time and thought he gave to the Conference and of work he did for its success. If I had not been a witness of who he exerted himself in the service of the Conference, regardless of every consideration of convenience and health, in the midst of the many absorbing and exacting duties of the Prime Minister of Britain, I should not have easily believed it to be possible for any one man to bear such strain as he cheerfully did. And if any success attended the Conference, the credit for it must be given to Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, first and foremost. Of Mr. Wedgwood Benn's sincerity of motive and earnestness of purpose there can be no more doubt than of his accessibility, simplicity, modesty, courtesy and other qualities of character which endeared him to the Indians who had opportunities of seeing him at the Conference or the India Office or the House of Commons or at those social functions of which there were embarrassingly many. I left England in January impressed by the belief that outside the Churchill and Beaverbrook circles there was scarcely one who was a somebody, who retained the belief that India could longer be held in subjection and governed as a dependency. It is with regret that I have learnt that since then opinion has stiffened against India and the atmosphere is much less friendly. I can but hope that events may prove that this is a pessimistic view of the situation.

Presidential
Address:
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

Was the Conference a success? I can only repeat the answer I have elsewhere given, that it was neither a success nor a failure. It was not a success because it stood adjourned before it could record a decision on a solitary question. Disbelieve and discard every statement to the contrary. The Conference in its last plenary session had but one resolution laid before it, and it definitely affirmed only this, that the work on which it had been engaged should be continued without interruption. It acknowledged the value of the reports of sub-committees but recorded no decision on the merits on a single subject of which those reports treated.* This

*The text of the resolution is as follows:—"The Conference sitting in Plenary Session has received and noted the Reports of the nine sub-Committees submitted by the Committee of the whole Conference with comments thereon. These Reports, provisional though they are,

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

is an incontrovertible fact and not an opinion which can be discussed. But the Conference was not a failure either. Its deliberations in sub-committees and committee and plenary sessions were enlightening and useful, it promoted a good understanding between the statesmen of England and the public men of India, above all, it created an atmosphere of good will such as had not existed, I was assured, at any previous time after the never to be forgotten Mr. Montagu was forced out of the India Office, and not often before. Immediate disappointments may be many and serious, but on a long view of things it is my conviction that the Conference has on the whole done good service and even if success may not crown its efforts it will have paved the way to easier and surer success at a later date than if it had not been convoked. It will do us good to remember constantly in our public activities a beautiful definition of 'success' as 'the name given to the 'last of a series of failures.'

IRWIN-GANDHI SETTLEMENT

Whether eventually India will get the 'substance' of 'independence' through the agency of the Round Table Conference time will tell, but already it has done one indisputable good. It has given peace to India. If the last session of the Conference had been nothing but a failure from India's standpoint, would Mahatma Gandhi have thought that there was a *prima facie* case for a reconsideration of the Congress position and 'invited the Viceroy to invite him,' if he will forgive me to quote his own words, for those memorable talks which resulted in the Irwin-Gandhi settlement? If I myself had doubted whether to give credit to the Conference for anything, I should have been cured of my scepticism by this single circumstance. No praise can be too high for the uncommon qualities which both the statesman and the patriot showed in those difficult and delicate negotiations, and India feels as grateful to Lord Irwin as she is proud of her chosen son.

together with the recorded notes attached to them, afford, in the opinion of the Conference, material of the highest value for use in the framing of a Constitution for India, embodying as they do a substantial measure of agreement on the main ground-plan and many helpful indications of the points of detail to be further pursued. And the conference feels that arrangements should be made to pursue without interruption the work upon which it has been engaged, including the provision in the Constitution of adequate safeguards for the Mussalmans, Depressed Classes, Sikhs, and all other important minorities."

LORD IRWIN

Here I might detain you, brother-delegates, for one minute to pay, on your behalf and mine, the tribute of admiration, respect and gratitude which Lord Irwin has so richly earned. Not since 'the golden age of Indian reform' when Ripon the Righteous ruled India with a religious devotion that did not fail and never fails to establish its sovereignty over India's heart has our Motherland been blessed with the rare good fortune of having a representative of the King endowed with the invaluable qualities which Lord Irwin possesses. As the administrative head of the Government of India, a soulless bureaucratic machine, Lord Irwin made mistakes which I fear I must characterize as both many and serious, and it was right that he did not escape criticism for them. But I am sure I voice the feeling of Indians of every variety of opinion when I say that we may well shudder to think of what the state of affairs would very likely have been if a mere matter-of-fact administrator or clever politician had occupied the exalted office which Lord Irwin filled as few others could have done in this testing time. It is our hope and belief that in his native land Lord Irwin will not fail to exert his wholesome influence on his own people in the best interests of the land he has served so well.

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

THE NEW VICEROY

I may, too, accord in the name of the Liberal Party of India a cordial and respectful welcome to our new Viceroy. Lord Willingdon, and Lady Willingdon not less, come to us as old friends whom we are glad to have again in our midst in a position where they can make themselves felt to the greatest advantage at this most interesting and important time. I admire Lord Willingdon's courage in shouldering at his age the immense responsibility of the exacting office of Governor-General of India, and you and I can do no less than offer him our whole hearted co-operation in the task he has set himself of getting relief from most of his administrative duties, not indeed by leaving decisions to be taken by colleagues and subordinates and uncritically acquiescing in them, but by becoming the head of a responsible government, as he was in Canada during four happy years as he told us the other day. Gentlemen, we can wish Lord Willingdon no kinder fortune than that he should write his name in history as the first constitutional Governor-General of India. Nor will the requirements of India herself be met by any reform which falls short of this.

FUTURE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

I trust I have by now disposed of what may be called preliminary issues, and with your leave, shall address myself to an examination, not minute or complete but I hope not too meagre or perfunctory, of the scheme of constitution adumbrated at the Round Table Conference. The proposals relating to the central government are naturally the most important of all, and the whole scheme stands or falls according as these deserve to be commended or condemned. It is not that we can afford to be indifferent to the nature of the proposals regarding provincial governments or the services, but even if they be altogether unexceptionable, which they unfortunately are not as no one knows better than Sir Chimanlal Setalvad and the respected chairman of the Reception Committee, we shall be bound to treat the result as disappointing and unsatisfactory if India's national demand is not conceded. This demand was and is for what Mr. John Redmond called in respect of his own country 'the full rights of national self-government in all internal affairs' in supersession of a system of government which Mr. Asquith described as 'irrational and indefensible'. Year after year from the platform of the Liberal Federation have we been demanding the complete responsibility of the Executive to the Legislature 'in the whole sphere of internal civil administration'. And in resolutions passed unanimously at several sessions we specified after careful consideration of various points of view what should be the nature and extent of reservation of power, as a transitory arrangement for a period limited by statute, to the Governor-General in respect of the defensive forces. Our proposals were adopted almost *in toto* in the resolution moved by Pandit Motilal Nehru in the Legislative Assembly and accepted by that august body—the resolution which embodied what came to be known as the National Demand. Clear in our mind as to what we wanted, and want, we should see whether the proposals of the Federal Structure Sub-Committee of the Round Table Conference—for that is the body which was seized of the subject—give it to us, at least in larger part if not in its entirety.

We shall see. We wanted a responsible central executive—responsible in the technical sense of the term, *i.e.*, removable by the popular house of Legislature, which we demanded should be wholly elected direct by the people. We are offered an executive which will only be removable by a majority of two-

thirds of members of both houses of the Legislature sitting together, and we are offered a popular house of which a large part will consist of nominees of individual rulers of States. As there has been some disagreement as to what precisely is the Sub-Committee's recommendation on this point, I had better quote the very words of the report. 'For the purpose of securing greater stability to the Executive' the report says (para. 35, second report), 'the suggestion was made, and found a large measure of support, that Ministers should not be compelled to resign save in the event of a vote of no-confidence passed by a majority of at least two-thirds of the two chambers sitting together.' The British Indian members of the upper chamber are to be elected by the provincial legislatures and to possess qualifications similar to those now in force for the Council of State. 'And the Sub-Committee have no doubt that the rulers of the Indian States, in selecting their representatives, will ensure that they are persons of similar standing.' You have marked the words 'the rulers . . . in selecting their representatives'. As regards the distribution of seats between the States and British India, 'the States representatives on the Sub-Committee pressed strongly for equality of distribution as between the States and British India'. In the lower chamber, too, the Indian States Delegation 'claim some greater representation than they would obtain on a strict population ratio'. This claim was not conceded by a majority of the Sub-Committee and therefore, 'the minority wish strongly to urge upon their colleagues the desirability of subordinating theory to expediency in the interests of good will'. 'Other members of the sub-Committee' *i.e.*, the members of the British and Indian States Delegations did not approve of a continuance of direct election to the lower chamber, while 'their Highnesses made it clear' (interim report, para 6.) 'that in their opinion the methods by which the States' representatives should be chosen will be a matter for the States themselves'. The position, so far as I had any knowledge of it, was that their Highnesses were not willing to agree to a statutory provision that the States' representatives should be returned by the same method as those of British India even after the expiry of a certain period. They wanted it to be their prerogative for all time to determine how the States' representatives would be selected. So that, I am on solid ground in inviting your assent to this description of the proposals in this behalf of the Federal Structure Sub-Committee, viz :—

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

India is to have a central executive responsible to both houses of the Legislature and not removeable except by a vote of no-confidence passed by a majority of at least two-thirds of both houses ; and a central legislature, in both houses of which the States' representatives will be selected by the Rulers themselves or in such manner as they may please, while it has not yet been agreed that the representatives of British India will be returned by direct election as at present. The States claim a 50 per cent. representation in the upper chamber and some weightage in the lower.

It was known to us in London that the States' Delegation wanted a 40 per cent. representation in the lower chamber and that at least a large majority of the rulers of States who agreed to Federation would only consent to send their own nominees to the Legislature. The proposed strength of the upper chamber is between 100 and 150 and of the lower, 250. A motion of no-confidence cannot succeed unless 267 votes are given in its support. But of 400 members as many as 165 will be the nominated 'representatives' of the States, leaving only 235 members belonging to British India. So that, whether the motion relates to a federal subject or to one exclusively affecting British India, the Executive will be able to dig itself in with the support of the votes of the nominated members from the States. Do not forget that these so-called 'representatives' will have the right to vote even when the subject-matter of a motion is purely British Indian. If you call this the 'responsible government' for which India has been struggling, well, we do not mean the same thing. But I do not mean to suggest that you will express satisfaction with this camouflage in the place of the real thing to which at session after session of the Federation you have pledged yourselves.

FEDERATION

But, brother-delegates, it is contended that such criticism ignores the distinction between federal and unitary constitutions, or the scheme of the Federal Structure Sub-Committee would have met with a friendlier reception. I do not think so. The determining test is, Does this scheme give us responsible government? I do not care whether it is federal or unitary or anything else, but I want to know if with this scheme in our hands we can honestly go before the people

and say that we have achieved that for which they have been aspiring and striving and struggling. My answer is a clear and emphatic No, and therefore I owe it to myself, to my party and, most important of all, to my country to say so without equivocation or mental reservation. If I am asked whether I would lightly throw away the unquestionable advantages of a Federation of States and Provinces because the scheme falls short of theoretical perfection, again my answer is a conscientious No. I unreservedly admit that a 'United States of India' is worth achieving at some sacrifice and I am very far from being among those who do not realize that the best is the enemy of good, at any rate in politics which is a long series of the second best. If I were not of this mentality I could not be a Liberal except on false pretences. To say this, however, is not to say that any federation, be it no better than a confederation, is better than any unitary government, that any price should be paid for it as no price would be too high, that essentials should be surrendered in order that we may get the same solace from the word Federation which the old lady was said to have derived from a certain word which has ceased to be 'blessed' since a disastrous campaign in the great war. I shall indicate my attitude towards Federation as clearly as I am capable of and shall be gratified if you find yourselves able to approve of it in the main. It will be understood that my words bind no one but myself.

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

1. I am a supporter of the federal idea, and am convinced that the only ultimate solution of the Indian problem is a Federation of States and Provinces.
2. I am gratified and grateful that many of our Ruling Princes have supported the idea and expressed themselves willing to come into a Federation.
3. There can be no manner of doubt that the people of the States will be still more warmly in favour of a true and real Federation in which all interests receive just consideration.
4. I realize the position of the Princes and am ready to make large allowances for their susceptibilities exaggerated as they may be. For this reason and in order not to destroy a promising project I do not mean to insist that every provision of it must immediately conform to the soundest constitutional doctrine.

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

5. But I cannot help pressing that concessions to princely sentiment must be kept within reasonable limits and take the form of transitory provisions which will automatically expire after a period specified in the statute itself, and must on no account be permanent features of the constitution.
6. Such transitory provisions must not be opposed to the cardinal requirements of responsible government. I decline to be content with the shadowy lineaments of a *soi distant* Federation and to forego the substance of responsible government for British India, which is the first need of the Indian people.
7. In concrete terms I do not agree to the representatives of the States in the popular chamber of the Federal Legislature being nominees of the Princes; I do not agree that the Federal Executive shall be responsible to both houses of the Legislature; while I shall have no objection to reasonable provision being made for the security of the Executive I do not agree to the proposals of the Federal Structure Sub-Committee in this behalf as they are tantamount to a negation of responsibility and will in reality instal in office a virtually irremovable Executive; and I do not agree to the States members of the Legislature taking part by speech or vote in motions of no-confidence the subject-matter of which is purely British Indian, as British Indians will not be allowed any voice in subjects exclusively the concern of States.
8. In a word, give me the reality of responsible government and I shall be found to be very accommodating in the adjustment of details of ways and means. Deny it, as I hold that the scheme of the Federal Structure Sub-Committee does, and I shall far prefer to wait for true federation in a more propitious time and go forward with my demand for responsible government for British India, which is the core and kernel of the whole of the national movement.

Fellow-Liberals, if in this categorical statement of my attitude towards federation and the actual scheme before the country I have not succeeded in reflecting your mind I am sincerely sorry and shall be open to conviction. But I believe.

from all I have read and heard during the last five and half months since my return from the Conference in London, that in stating my own views I have not gone against opinion generally in the party or the country as a whole.

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

PARAMOUNTCY

Here let me say a word about the Paramountcy of the British Government which has been so exercising the minds of the Rulers of Indian States—and rightly, if I may say so. No nationalist can stand up for the British Government against the Indian States. That goes against his grain. And yet, things being as they are, no nationalist can range himself on the side of the Princes without conditions and qualifications. Why? Because their Highnesses insist upon their right of absolutism. If I may say so with great respect they betray in this attitude an incapacity or unwillingness to profit by the lesson of history and of contemporary events alike and to take a long view of things. If any of them think that they can maintain their position by external aid, if need be against their own people by whose contributions alone they are able to keep up the splendour of their princely existence, they are mistaken. They have innumerable complaints against the agency through which, the extent to which and the manner in which the undefined and according to the Butler Committee, indefinable rights of Paramountcy are exercised by the British Government, but they have no means of redress and are condemned to suffer in silence, without even the right and the opportunity of agitation such as we have and exercise, and their own subjects do—not in their own territory, it is true it is sad, but on the soil of British India. I wonder if it has never occurred to any member of the princely order, that it may be both wiser and more dignified for them to establish constitutional government and act with the support of the people than to present the British Government with a more or less valid reason for control and interference in the domestic concerns of the States. It is evident that there must be some controlling authority or restraining influence over them as over everybody. Foreign control becomes irresistible only when a more legitimate method is not accepted. Constitutional checks from within, representative government leading up to responsible government in a reasonable interval, and full membership of a Federal Government above, are the only means by which, in my view, the States can ever hope to obtain release and relief from the undue interest of the Political Depart-

ment in their affairs. Once free of false notions of prestige, they will have little difficulty in realizing that they are their true friends who respectfully give them this advice.

DEFENCE

The Liberal Federation has frankly recognized throughout the years that for reasons for which Indians are not responsible and which reflect no credit upon British policy, Indians acting through the Legislature and the Executive responsible to it are not now, and will not be for some years to come, in a position to assume control over the Defence of the country as they are in other matters. Therefore the Federation has conceded that Defence and the allied subject of External Affairs should be reserved for administration by the Governor-General acting as the agent of his Majesty's Government in England. A similar view was taken in Pandit Motilal Nehru's resolution in the Legislative Assembly to which reference has been made earlier, as well as by the Nehru Committee. But in taking this position all Indian reformers have at the same time urged that not all the matters comprised in the comprehensive term Defence should be so reserved. A study of the relevant literature on the subject brings into relief the following main propositions :—

1. A mixed committee of experts and representatives of the Legislature should report what would be the minimum amount of expenditure on Defence required during a term of years, say five. And this should be a charge on the revenues of the Government of India available to the Governor-General without a vote of the Legislative Assembly, but without prejudice to its right of discussion.
2. Any excess amount that the Governor-General may require will have to be voted by the Assembly. If the Assembly reject or reduce the demand for grant, the Governor-General should have power to certify that the whole or any part of such excess is required in the interest of India's safety, and to appropriate it from the Government's revenue.
3. Further, in the event of war, the Governor-General should have power to declare an emergency and to appropriate what additional amount may be required

to meet it, without prior reference to the Assembly. But such action should be reported to the Legislature and it may discuss it.

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

4. The fixed non-votable amount should be subject to revision at stated intervals.
5. Indianization of the army should be the responsibility of the Government, and the Legislature should have power to determine within what time all arms of defence shall be wholly staffed by Indians and at what rate the strength of British troops including officers shall be reduced until the whole of the defence forces becomes Indian.
6. As a necessary part of this the provision of adequate facilities for the training of Indians for service in the defence forces should be within the power of the Legislature acting through the Government responsible to it.

You will correct me, gentlemen, if I have mis-stated our requirements under this head.

The subject of Defence was considered by a special sub-Committee of the Conference presided over by the Secretary of State for Dominions Affairs, but the Federal Structure Sub-Committee was also seized of what might be called the constitutional side of the subject. This body reported as follows :—

'The inclusion (in the list of Federal subjects) of certain subjects, *e. g.*, Defence and External Affairs, was not specifically considered, since these subjects, in particular, though not exclusively, raise the question of the relations between the Executive in India and the Crown—a matter not within the sub-Committee's terms of reference.' (Interim report, para 8.)

' . . . during a period of transition—(i) The Governor-General shall be responsible for Defence. . . . It was generally agreed that the presence of a person occupying the position of a Minister would be necessary to express the views of the Governor-General on Defence matters in the legislature, since these will impinge upon strictly federal matters; . . . It is clear, however, that the Governor-General must be at liberty to select as his representatives in the reserved sphere any persons whom he may himself choose as best fitted for the purpose, and that, on appointment they would, if holding Ministerial portfolios, acquire the right like other Ministers of audience in either chamber of the Legislature. . . .' It is further provided

Presidential
Address.
Mr. O. Y.
Chintamani.

that supply required by the Governor-General for reserved subjects should be non-votable, the budget allotment being settled upon a contract basis for a term of years; that he should be empowered 'in the last resort to take such steps as may be necessary to ensure that the funds required for the reserved subjects are forthcoming, and also to secure emergency supply for these subjects in excess of the contract budget (e. g., in connection with a sudden outbreak of hostilities on the Frontier)', and 'that he should be empowered to secure the enactment of such legislative measures as may be essential for the discharge of his responsibility for these subjects'. (Second report, paras. 11, 12, 13 and 14.)

These recommendations are partially in accord with our views, but they leave out some points to which we naturally attach importance, and it is essential that they should be stressed. In particular it is necessary for our spokesmen at the Conference to try to ensure that the Legislature is not reduced to a nullity in all matters affecting Defence. What are the most important of such matters I have already indicated.

Now I take up the report of the Defence Sub-Committee. The document bears traces of hurried deliberation in the closing days of the Conference and is, therefore, superficial to a degree. Left as it is, it does not carry matters very far, as the deliberations of the Sandhurst Committee which lately sat at Simla sufficiently indicate. The Sub-Committee was instructed 'to consider questions of political principle relating to defence, other than strictly constitutional aspects'. 'The discussion in the Sub-Committee centred round the question of Indianization, and'—I am glad to read—'every aspect of the question received thorough attention.' Perhaps the report does less than justice to the deliberations. I further read that 'the Sub-Committee as a whole was very anxious not to create the impression that anyone in any way or to any degree wanted . . . to weaken the strength of the Army'. I hope the reference is not to numerical strength, which, at the least, must be open to examination. I invite particular attention to the following passage of the report :—

'The Sub-Committee also recognized that in dealing with the question of Defence it was not possible to overlook that a factor that must govern all considerations of the subject was the responsibility of the Crown through the Committee of Imperial Defence, which body was ultimately responsible for examining all these problems. It was realized that the responsibility of the Committee of Imperial Defence was not something that was special to India, but was common to the Empire as a whole, (Para. 3.)

I have no ambition to be included among those who rush in where angels fear to tread, but I raised the question in the committee of the Conference and must repeat here, that I am by no means free from doubt if this statement of the position of the Committee of Imperial Defence is not too wide and unqualified. Remember that the Defence Sub-Committee was only empowered 'to consider questions of political principle' and not technical military problems. We know from sad experience that Indians need not look to the Committee of Imperial Defence for an unbiassed and disinterested consideration of their particular point of view, political or financial. Before assenting to the claim made here, I require to know whether the intention is that at all times, and not merely during the transitory stage when Defence will be a reserved subject, the Committee of Imperial Defence should have the powers which it now exercises, and whether it is allowed by any of the dominions a determining voice in 'questions of political principle relating to defence' as it is taken for granted that it must possess in relation to our country. I do not wish to be assertive but I conceive it to be my duty to draw attention to this point if only to get a more convincing statement of the position.

It is notorious that no part of Britain's policy has been more anti-Indian than its military policy, the evil fruit of which is that after the best part of two centuries Indians are incapable of taking charge of the defence of their Motherland. The British Government has not deemed it unworthy of British honour, first to keep down the people and then to take advantage of their helplessness to deny them political justice. And no one has brought into striking relief the untenability of this inconsistent attitude more than our best friend among all the Secretaries of State—I need not mention the name E. S. Montagu, for no one can dispute his title to this description. This being so, what can be more discouraging than that 'the majority of the sub-Committee considered it impossible for practical reasons to lay down any definite rate of Indianization or anything of a precise character that might in any way embarrass those responsible for Defence and fetter the judgment or the discretion of the military authorities'? I regret I have been unable to gather from the volume of Proceedings which of the Indian members assented to a proposition in this comprehensive form, or who dissented from it besides Mr. Jinnah. It is not surprising, in the light of this majority view, that the 'definite resolutions' arrived at by the Sub-Committee are disappointing.

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

Presidential
Address.
Mr. O. Y.
Chintamani

The first of these resolutions stated 'that with the development of the new political structure in India, the Defence of India must to an increasing extent be the concern of the Indian people, and not of British Government alone'. Does this mean, was it intended to mean, that even after the completion of 'the new political structure' the defence of India would still be the concern of the British Government also? It is gravely disappointing that Mr. Jinnah was alone in desiring 'a clear indication of the pace of Indianization'. The proceedings of the Simla Committee of Experts set up in accordance with the recommendation of the Defence Sub-Committee of the Conference have vindicated the wisdom of Mr. Jinnah. Several members of the Commander-in-Chief's Committee have, we were informed, been unable to agree to its conclusions the dissenting members including not only Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer, than whom no other Indian has made a more thorough study of the subject, but Sir Abdur Rahim and General Rajwade.

Is it necessary, gentlemen, that I should say more to persuade you, if you need any persuasion, to agree with me that the result of the deliberations on this all-important subject of the Federal Structure and Defence Sub-Committees is disappointing? The assistance of a powerful microscope is not needed for an observer to detect in their recommendations a very imperfect appreciation of the urgency of this problem of Defence.

SAFEGUARDS

It is not an exaggeration of the truth to say that no part of the provisional conclusions of all the Sub-Committees of the Round Table Conference has received wider attention or closer examination than the so-called safeguards. These are set out in paragraphs 16, 18, 19 and 20 of the second report of the Federal Structure Sub-Committee*. And it was stated by the

* '16. **Governor-General's Special Powers.**—With regard to subjects in the administration of which the Governor-General would normally act on the advice of his Ministers, it was generally agreed that arrangements must be made whereby in the last resort the peace and tranquility of any part of the country must be secured, serious prejudice to the interests of any section of the population must be avoided and members of the Public Services must be secured in any rights guaranteed to them by the constitution. It was further agreed that for these purposes the Governor-General must be empowered to act in responsibility to Parliament and to implement his decisions if occasion so demands by requiring appropriation of revenue to be made, or by legislative enactment.'

Prime Minister that the view of his Majesty's Government is that 'it is of vital interest to all parties in India to accept these provisions, to maintain financial confidence'. It was emphasized in the same statement that 'the transfer of financial responsibility must necessarily be subject to such conditions as will ensure the fulfilment of the obligations incurred under the authority of the Secretary of State and the maintenance unimpaired of the financial stability and credit of India'.

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

Brother-delegates, what are the restrictions on the powers of the future Executive and Legislature to which our assent is invited?

The Governor-General is to have special powers.

(1) to secure in the last resort the peace and tranquillity of any part of the country ;

(2) to prevent serious prejudice to the interests of any section of the population ;

(3) to secure members of the public services in any rights guaranteed to them by the constitution ;

(4) to implement his decisions by requiring appropriations of revenue to be made, or by legislative enactment ;

[For these purposes he will act as at present, as the agent of his Majesty's Government in England whose decisions conveyed by the Secretary of State he will be bound to obey.]

18 **Finance: Special Provisions.**—In the sphere of Finance, the sub-Committee regard it as a fundamental condition of the success of the new constitution that no room should be left for doubts as to the ability of India to maintain her financial stability and credit, both at home and abroad. It would, therefore, be necessary to reserve to the Governor-General in regard to budgetary arrangements and borrowing such essential powers as would enable him to intervene if methods were being pursued which would, in his opinion, seriously prejudice the credit of India in the money markets of the world. The Sub-Committee recommend, with a view to ensuring confidence in the management of Indian credit and currency, that efforts should be made to establish on sure foundations and free from any political influence, as early as may be found possible, a Reserve Bank, which will be entrusted with the management of the currency and exchange. With the same object again, provision should be made requiring the Governor-General's previous sanction to the introduction of a Bill to amend the paper Currency or

Presidential
Address.
Mr. O. Y.
Chintamani.

(5) to intervene in regard to budgetary arrangements and borrowing when he thinks that the responsible Government are pursuing methods prejudicial to India's credit ;

(6) to prevent the introduction of a bill dealing with currency or coinage except with his previous sanction ;

(7) to control monetary policy and currency until a Reserve Bank of sufficient strength and equipped with the 'necessary gold and sterling reserves' has been set up.

I agree to the service of loans, the salaries and pensions of officers appointed by the Secretary of State before the passing of the new Act, and (subject to my observations under the head of Defence) the supply required by the reserved departments being made non-votable. Before proceeding to utter criticisms, it is as well that I make it clear that I do not overlook a passage in a statement published with the authority of the last session of the Liberal Federation, which expressed approval of 'such safeguards and reservations including the 'protection of the interests and rights of minorities as may be 'necessary in the present conditions of India for the period of transition'. I have two observations to make on this. I have not been able to understand the language of the Federal Structure Sub-Committee's report or of the statement of the view of his Majesty's Government to mean that the aforesaid restrictions on the legitimate powers of the new Government are intended to be temporary and to lapse after the expiry of a period of transition. Nor have I seen anywhere an attempt made to limit the transitory period by statute. My second

Coinage Acts on the lines of section 67 of the Government of India Act. They are further agreed that the service of loans, with adequate provision for redemption by Sinking Funds or otherwise, and the salaries and pensions of persons appointed on guarantees given by the Secretary of State, should be secured, along with the supply required for the Reserved Departments, as Consolidated Fund charges.'

'19. . . . In this connection the sub-Committee take note of the proposal that a Statutory Railway Authority should be established, and are of opinion that this should be done, if after expert examination this course seems desirable.'

'20. The Sub-Committee recognize that it may be difficult in existing conditions to set up a reserve Bank of sufficient strength and equipped with the necessary gold and sterling reserves immediately, and that, therefore, until this has been done some special provisions will be found necessary to secure to the Governor-General adequate control over monetary policy and currency.'

observation is this: The generic terms of the passage in the Federation's statement of 1929 must be interpreted in the light of specific resolutions passed at its earlier sessions. I trust that the lawyer members of this distinguished assemblage will endorse the view that this is the accepted rule of interpretation. And you will search in vain among the twelve reports of the Federation for authority for the claim which, I apprehend, is made in certain quarters, that the passage quoted above justifies acceptance of the safeguards recommended by the Federal Structure Sub-Committee. I have no doubt in my own mind that Liberals can accept them in their present form, only by going back upon the authoritatively declared opinions of the Federation, just as I have none that they do not deserve to be supported on the merits. In this point of view I am rejoiced at the resolutions passed by the Council of the Federation in April last under the chairmanship of Sir Phiroze Sethna and I am sure that you, brother-delegates, will not disperse without recording your candid opinion on this very important issue.

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

I think it my duty to bestow a little more attention on these proposed safeguards. Do you think it right and prudent that individual responsibility should be imposed on the Governor-General, or on provincial Governors as a majority of another Sub-Committee of the Conference recommended, for the peace and tranquillity of the areas within their respective jurisdictions? To say that they should be vested with special powers to deal with emergencies is one thing. But to propose to give them powers, legislative and financial, which they will be competent in law to make use of in day-to-day administration if and when they elect to do so, independently and (it may be) in spite of the Government answerable to the legislature, and to defend this on the plea that they must have the requisite power to discharge the responsibilities cast upon them, are very different matters and much more contentious. In my opinion such responsibility and such power are equally out of place. If one lesson has been burnt into my heart more than another by the events of the last ten years and more, it is that the responsibility for law and order must be imposed upon a popular government and must on no account be left in the hands of the bureaucracy—or of their official heads, the Governors and the Governor-General. I would provide for the exercise by them of special powers to deal with emergencies, and for no more.

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

I have no quarrel with the Federal Structure Sub-Committee when they say that it is 'a fundamental condition of the success of the new constitution that no room should be left for doubts as to the ability of India to maintain her financial stability and credit both at home and abroad'. But I part company with the authors of this proposition when they follow it up with the conclusion that it would therefore be 'necessary to reserve to the Governor-General' special powers of intervention in regard to budgetary arrangements and cognate matters. To reserve powers to the Governor-General is to reserve them to his advisers of the permanent services and to the advisers of the Secretary of State drawn from that source and from the City of London. I hereby declare that they have not my confidence, and I confidently invite you to endorse that declaration. Whether in respect of budgetary arrangements or borrowing or the management of currency or the fixation of exchange, can the tongue of man pay a more eloquent or convincing tribute to the sagacity and the disinterestedness of the Government than the present parlous plight of that Government—of every Government in India? They have pursued a career of unchecked extravagance,—it has been a veritable financial rake's progress as our venerable veteran Sir Dinshaw Wacha used to say,—disregarded nearly every warning uttered times without number by able men with a more abiding interest in the land than they possess, lived on deficits and debts, and taxation without end, depleted the resources of the state and injured Indian trade and industry in the pursuit of the will-o'-the-wisp of an eighteen pence rupree, and yet they are the agency—the power behind Viceroys and Secretaries of State—to whom we are asked to look up in the new dispensation as the Good Fairies who will save the country from the ruin that will be wrought by a government of Indians by Indians for Indians. All that I feel I need say by way of comment on this proposition is that there is a limit to human credulity. It is conceivable that an Indian Government may not do much better, at least in the first few years, than the present guardians of the public purse. But unless what a popular author calls 'a wonderful collection of undesirables' be brought together—as some of our provincial Governors have done with striking success in selecting their Ministers—and the labour hard and exercise all their ingenuity, we may fairly doubt if an Indian Government can do worse.

The new Government and Legislature are not to be allowed to control currency and exchange. Why not? I can

quite believe that the proper body to do that will be a Reserve Bank. By all means bring one into being as early as ever you can. But until this is done why should the Governor-General have full power and not the Government? Is this the position now when there is no Reserve Bank? It seems to me a curious method of establishing Self-Government to withhold from a responsible national government powers freely exercised by an irresponsible bureaucracy subordinate to a Government which is six thousand miles away. There is a great fear that if the power is not withheld the 18*d.* rupee will make room for a 16*d.* rupee. Granted. If that be the considered opinion of the Government and the Legislature, why should they not give effect to it? Who are the latest advocates of this change or at least, opponents of the frantic efforts by dint of which the artificial ratio is being sought to be maintained? Not Sir Purushottamdas Thakordas and Mr. Birla, but the *Statist* of London and Sir Montagu Webb. I fear they are of the genus capitalist, but do they belong to the species Bombay capitalist to bait whom is among the latest of statesmanly fashions? Let me hasten to add that I am not a partizan of capitalists whether of Bombay or London. Both have much to answer for, and to neither does the man in the street look up for altruistic concepts of financial policy. I do not want the plutocracy to be my masters or rulers; my ideal is Abraham Lincoln's 'government of the people, for the people, by the people'. But I am free to confess that as between the capitalists of the City of London who exercise so much unseen power through the Secretary of State who is the master of the Governor-General-in-Council and the capitalists of Bombay. I would every time prefer the latter who are my countrymen, whose fortune and fate are indissolubly linked with the Motherland.

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

Gentlemen, in uttering this strong criticism of the financial policy of the present Government I am not oblivious of the collapse of prices as being the immediate cause of the present debacle, and have not the slightest desire to father upon the Government sins not of its making. And this is not at all necessary, for its responsibility is heavy enough for acts wilfully done and policies obstinately persisted in despite of advice and admonition. I will at this point make an acknowledgment of the Prime Minister's recent declaration in Parliament, which has somewhat eased the mind of our Finance Member. I trust the incident will not be cited as an argument in support of the proposed safeguards.

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

In making up your mind on this question? I would ask you, fellow-Liberals, to bear in mind that according to the Government of India the expenditure over which it is proposed that the Legislature should have no control amounts to about 80 per cent. of its net revenue.*

It was pleaded in extenuation of these proposals, first by the Federal Structure Sub-Committee (para. 17, second report) and next in the statement by the Prime Minister of 'the view of his Majesty's Government', that it might be trusted that the Governor-General's special powers would be sparingly used, they were 'powers meant to lie in reserve and in the background'. I have not the slightest doubt that they meant what they said. But unfortunately, good intentions are not enough. Whoever was actuated by better intentions than the late lamented Mr. Montagu? He realized, too, that 'you have to be sure that your constitution is proof against bad individuals as well as of good instruction for good ones'. But his own scheme proved in the sequel not to be 'proof against bad individuals'. Who can be sure of Lord Morley's Tchinoviks? What painful and humiliating experience have we not had of the unsurpassed capacity of the official hierarchy of India to defeat the purposes of Reform by exalting 'reservations and safeguards' and extracting the maximum of service from every colon and comma that could possibly be used or abused for their own purposes? Talk of Mahatma Gandhi as the champion apostle of passive resistance. The caste of permanent officials can teach him a thing or two in that line. His 'disobedience' is at least 'civil'. How many 'transient and embarrassed phantoms' of our provincial Ministers have not had to put up with the uncivil variety of that quality? We shall show ourselves to be 'by lesson untaught' if, in the face of the warning that experience enforces, we substitute an easy-going satisfaction at the avowal of good intentions for insistence upon statutory provision that cannot be cheated. I strongly feel that in this matter the responsibility of our Liberal Party is particularly great in view of such support as we gave—and rightly in the circumstances of that date—to the Present Government of India Act, although not without many qualifications.

There is another passage in Mr. Montagu's *Indian Diary* (from which I have quoted), which may usefully be pondered

* See "Government of India's Dispatch on proposals for Constitutional Reform", 1930, para. 173, page 148.

over by his Majesty's Government. It is this: 'He (Lord Willingdon) warns me against appearing to give something which does not in practice work out as big and as great as it looks on paper. This is the burden of Chirol's most useful article in the *Times* which has been telegraphed out. I am very grateful to him for this'. May we not hope that His Excellency the Viceroy will address to his Majesty's Government advice similar to that which the Governor of Bombay gave to the Secretary of State in 1917? Mr. Ramsay MacDonald himself has so much knowledge of the ways of Government in India that he should scarcely need this reminder.

Presidential
Address:
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani

BRITISH INSISTENCE ON SAFEGUARDS

There has been in England a new and menacing development since the Conference rose in January. A class of British politicians has grown morbidly and suspiciously sensitive on this point of safeguards. And the Council of the National Union of Conservatives has unanimously passed a resolution that the proposed safeguards should be a 'permanent and unalterable' part of the new constitution. In this the Council had the explicit and unqualified support of a member of the Conservative delegation to the Round Table Conference who has become the party's principal spokesman on India. A still more disquieting feature of that meeting was the statement of Sir Samuel Hoare (it is to him I refer), that Mr. Baldwin had authorised him to take the position which he did. I have a very considerable respect for Mr. Baldwin's character-character which is unfortunately all too scarce among the tribe of politicians. Mr. Baldwin has done signal service both to his country and ours by his support of Lord Irwin against the more restless and less unselfish members of their party. His historic speech in the House of Commons in March will live as a deed and not be forgotten as mere words. But he will pardon me to be frank and to say that sometimes, as in his recent correspondence with the Prime Minister, his attitude is perplexing and produces a doubt whether he has a convinced mind or goes on thinking aloud and whether his heart, which I am sure is in the right place, may confidently be relied upon not to allow his head to run away with the mere party politicians among his following.

The latest from Sir Samuel Hoare is that the proposed safeguards must be the 'basic condition' of the Conference. He is mistaken. The basic condition of the Conference was laid down in Lord Irwin's Announcement itself as long ago as

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani

October 31, 1929, with the full authority of his Majesty's Government. Here is the passage :—

'They [his Majesty's Government] will propose to invite representatives of different parties and interests in British India and representatives of the Indian States to meet them, . . . for the purpose of conference and discussion in regard both to the British Indian and the All-India problems.'

There is no reference here to 'safeguards' as the condition precedent of 'conference and discussion'. This was followed by Lord Irwin's own interpretation of the Announcement and his exposition of the nature, the purpose and the scope of the Conference. His lordship said in addressing the Legislative Assembly on January 25, 1930 :

'Those taking part in the proceedings will be completely free to advocate any proposals for the realization of Great Britain's professed policy that they may desire to advance. . . . It is surely no small thing that the claim of India to take a constructive part without restriction and without prejudice in the evolution of the new constitution should have been thus recognized by those on whom the final constitutional obligation must rest.'

Mark the words—'without restriction and without prejudice'. Could anything be clearer? But this was not all. Addressing both houses of the Central Legislature on July 9, 1930, Lord Irwin said :

'After very careful consideration his Majesty's Government have reached the conclusion that it would not be right to prescribe for the Conference any terms more limited than were implicit in my statement of November 1 last and that the Conference should enjoy the full freedom that these words connote It is the belief of his Majesty's Government that by way of conference it should be possible to reach solutions that both countries and all parties and interests in them can honourably accept. . .'

Will it be argued in spite of these declarations that circumstances have altered in as much as the Conference itself accepted the safeguards? This has been repeatedly said by distinguished public men in England. As often as this incorrect

statement has been made, so often has it been contradicted in India. In an earlier part of this address I have reproduced the text of the only resolution that was submitted to and adopted by the Conference. The truth is that, far from the Conference having agreed to anything, it has been the principal criticism of the Conference that it reached and recorded no conclusion or decision on a solitary issue. While this was what happened at the Conference in plenary session, when it sat as a committee of the whole house it merely 'noted' the reports of sub-committees with such observations as individual members offered. Did the Federal Structure Sub-Committee itself take a binding decision or reach a definite conclusion? Let the report tell us.

Presidential
Address.
Mr. O. Y.
Chintamani.

'It must be clearly understood that although agreement has been reached by a majority of the sub-Committee on many important matters,' says the report, 'such agreement is only provisional, and every member followed the example of Lord Reading, who said that the understanding had been from the outset that it would be open to all members, when they came to consider the complete proposals for the Federal constitution, to modify or change any provisional assent they might have hitherto given. Every member of the Sub-Committee reserves to himself the right of modifying his opinion before the final picture is completed. This is the attitude of British and Indian members alike.' (Second report, para. 2.)

Let Sir Samuel Hoare in England and writers in the Anglo-Indian press say what they will, I cannot help expressing my great regret and surprise that so well-meaning and responsible a person as the Secretary of State for India should have risen in his place in the House of Commons and announced that 'there can be no abatement of the safeguards'. Did he when he made this ominous statement, utter the decision, not of the Conference because it decided nothing, but of his Majesty's Government? I trust not, for they are not expected to close their minds until after the Conference concluded its deliberations. My authority for this is Lord Irwin himself. In his address to the central legislature of July 9 of last year, Lord Irwin said, with the authority that attached to his great office: '... any such agreement at which the Conference is able to arrive will form the basis of the proposals which his Majesty's Government will later submit to Parliament . . . his Majesty's Government conceive of [the Conference] not as a mere meeting for discussion and debate but as a joint assembly of representatives of both countries on whose agreement precise proposals to Parliament may be founded.' The 'representatives' of one of the two countries and that one, the most inter-

Presidential
Address.
Mr. O. Y.
Chintamani.

ested and concerned, being but the nominees of the representative of the other and more powerful country, there should be the less difficulty in the honouring of this pledge publicly given by the Viceroy on behalf of his Majesty's Government. The language of the Prime Minister's recent letter to Mr. Baldwin encourages the belief that the position may not be as bad as the Secretary of State's words indicated. Besides, if 'there can be no abatement of the safeguards' there is no meaning in the invitation of Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya to the Conference, and possibly, in the resumption of its deliberations.

I fear I have detained you too long over this question of safeguards, but I shall have to ask your indulgence for a minute longer. A distinguished English friend in a recent letter has put forward the following view :—

'With reference to the question of "safeguards" it may, I think, be generally said that there are three main points of view, namely, that of the Indian Nationalist, the Bureaucrat, and the British supporter of a federated India. The Indian Nationalist quite naturally wishes to reduce safeguards to a minimum, and those that have been suggested have given him plenty of criticism. The point of view of the Bureaucrat is of less importance, because he again quite naturally dislikes seeing the power that he has exercised in the past passing into other hands, but this is a view of less importance and of diminishing force. There remains the view of the British supporter of a Federated India, who, because he is intensely anxious for the success of the scheme, may be over-anxious with regard to the proposals for safeguards which he believes will ensure that success. Now may I suggest to you, with regard to the point of view of this man, that insufficient importance is, I think, sometimes attributed to the fact that he has to placate and convince the great British public, whose main apprehension (on which certain people are playing), is that without safeguards there might be chaos.'

I am free to confess, gentlemen, that I am one of those who do attach considerable importance to the support of British friends of India, as must every Indian who seeks for ordered progress and not for revolution. I recall Mr. Gokhale's exhortation that if friends like Mr. Hume and Sir William Wedderburn disapproved of any proceeding of ours it was our duty to pause and reconsider our position. As I have said earlier today in another connection, I for one will always be ready for accommodation on questions of ways and means, if I am given the substance of what I want, what we all want—Dominion Status and Responsible Government. But it is my duty to cry halt if in the name of safety or security, or for whatever

other reason expressed or unavowed, proposals of 'reservations and safeguards' are pressed which, I am convinced, make such a deduction from the main concession as to reduce its value materially and pave the way for difficulties, disappointments and misunderstandings such as we have been experiencing. The Englishman is vastly more of a political being than we are, and I put it to him that his intense anxiety for the success of the scheme should lead him not to over-emphasize the 'reservations and safeguards' which are certain to jeopardize that very success but to proceed on the footing that we have our fair share of commonsense and of the sense of responsibility, that we love our country too much to wish for chaos, and that a generous trust and not a killing suspicion is the spirit in which Reform should be conceived. It was the great Gladstone's admonition that 'suspicion is the besetting vice of politicians, while trust is the truest wisdom', while one of the ablest and most distinguished of provincial Governors urged at the time of the Montagu Reforms that 'Reform must not be afraid of itself'.

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

TRADING RIGHTS

I have next to ask your attention to the much disputed clause about British trading rights in India. As the published proceedings show, what was urged on behalf of British merchants doing business in India was sought to be converted into something that was agreed to, although it was admitted that the Sub-Committee before which the question was raised had been so pre-occupied with another controversy that every other issue was overlooked. This caused difficulties which could only be composed after much negotiation by the acceptance of the formula that eventually found a place in the report. Its importance demands that I should cite it here :

'At the instance of the British commercial community, the principle was generally agreed to, that there should be no discrimination between the rights of the British mercantile community, firms and companies trading in India and the rights of Indian-born subjects, and that an appropriate convention based on reciprocity should be entered into for the purpose of regulating these rights.'

Certainly, no one on either side can claim perfection for this formula. It is defective on the face of it, as are most compromises. But a comparative study of this and the proposal pressed by Sir Hubert Carr and his colleagues in the representation of British commerce in India will satisfy every fair critic that many thanks are due to Mr. Mody, Sir Phiroze

Presidential
Address,
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani,

Sethna and Sir Cowasji Jehangir, but for whose firm stand the position would have been easily worse.

On the merits my own opinion is, firstly, that we cannot assent to any derogation from the power that should be possessed by the new Government to adopt from time to time what measures they may deem to be necessary to stimulate Indian industrial development, but secondly, that there should be no discrimination against the British except where it is the clear judgment of the Government that a step must be taken in the country's interest which the other side may regard as discrimination. I do not care much for the talk about equality and reciprocity, for the conditions are not equal. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji used to speak of the absurdity of talk of free trade or fair competition between a giant and a pigmy. And only about six weeks ago Prof. Laski wrote that 'freedom of contract only begins where equality of bargaining power begins'.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS.

Consideration of the proposals regarding the future central Government has taken so long that I must hurry on and cannot do more than make brief references to a few points of importance in the reports of some other Sub-Committees of the Conference. The most important of them is the report of the Sub-Committee on Provincial Constitution. And the most important part of it in my view, is, the following :—

*'6. Powers of the Governor.— . . . (2) . . . (d) Special and Emergency powers.—*There shall be vested in the Governor (1) suitable powers in regard to legislation and finance necessary for the discharge of the specified duties imposed upon him by the constitution and (2) suitable emergency powers to carry on the administration in the event of a break-down of government or the constitution. . . .'

I wish to repeat here the objection to 'special' legislative and financial as distinguished from 'suitable emergency' powers it is proposed to confer on the Governor, which eight members took in the Sub-Committee itself. 'The specified duties imposed upon [the Governor] by the constitution 'shall include the protection of minorities and the safeguarding 'of the safety and tranquillity of the provinces'. The meaning of which is, if I understand the language, that the Governor will be able, in a state of so-called provincial autonomy, to do what he may think to be right and necessary, independently of or in opposition to his Government, in the name of 'the safety and tranquillity of the province'. He will be competent

to make orders which will have the force of law;—may be, this may turn out to be an euphemism for ordinances which at present none but the Governor-General may promulgate!—a fine way of giving us a more constitutional government and of extending our liberties. And he will be able to appropriate revenues, and not be accountable to anybody save God Almighty and his own conscience. And all this in day to day administration. To convince you of the objectionable nature of this proposal is, I think, to force an open door.

Presidential
Address
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

The only other point I would select for reference concerns second chambers. The Sub-Committee decided by a majority to burden Bengal, the United Provinces, and Bihar and Orissa with these playthings of the rich concurrently with the introduction of the new constitution, but were more merciful to Bombay and some other provinces 'until opinion in the province definitely favours this course'. I congratulate you, Sir Cowasjee, and other friends of Bombay on this respite given to you, and shall thank you to assist us, your less fortunate compatriots of the three provinces upon whom sentence has already been pronounced, to get a reversal of the verdict. It is my considered opinion, gentlemen, tenaciously held, that while a properly constituted second chamber with limited powers is very desirable in the central government, second chambers in provinces, whose governments are limited to matters of internal administration, are equally unnecessary and undesirable, and we all must resolutely set our faces against this reactionary proposal.

BURMA.

I would next invite your attention to the case of Burma. My position, and I think I may say your position, too, in regard to this is simple and I trust correct. It is the right of the people of Burma, neither of the British nor of Indians, to say, in the exercise of their right of self-determination, whether they shall remain associated with India or prefer a separate existence. It is an historical fact that Burma was invaded with Indian money, annexed to the British Empire, and administratively amalgamated with India, all in spite of India's opposition. A resolution embodying India's opinion and protest was passed by the very first session of the Indian National Congress in this city of Bombay on the motion of no less a man than Sir Pheroze Shah Mehta. The money that was borrowed to carry on that unrighteous war of conquest, undertaken in the

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

interests of British merchants engaged in and covetous of the exploitation of that land of enormous natural resources still undeveloped, became a part of India's public debt, while vast sums raised from the taxpayer in India were spent on its administration for as long as sufficient revenue could not be raised in the province itself. Indians freely migrated thither and established themselves there, though not as temporary sojourners, and to this day Burma is largely dependent upon Indian labour.

In recent years there have been certain developments wholesome as well as unfortunate. Burma has caught the infection of nationalism and love of freedom from India and been seeking for increased opportunities of self-expression. This has taken two forms. One is for constitutional advance in association with India and at the same pace, the other for its creation as a separate dominion. Please note that the Burman advocates of separation, including Mr. Ba Pe, the leader of the Burmese members of the Round Table Conference, do not want separation except with Dominion Status for their country. Which of the two sections has the larger support of their countrymen is still in the region of unascertained facts. A regrettable manifestation of recent years is the growth of anti-Indian feeling. I have no sufficient knowledge of facts to enable me to say what was its genesis. But of the existence of the feeling I do not think there can be any doubt. I am, however, assured that the feeling is not at all general, and that its extent is magnified for their own purposes by a section of the separationists. These latter are strongly supported by the British in Burma. I think I do them no injustice when I say that they feel that whether in administration or exploitation—according to Lord Curzon the allied purposes of Britain in India—circumstances will be more favourable to them if they will have to deal with Burma cut off from India than when the whole strength of Indian national opinion rallies to the support of the gathering forces of Burmese nationalism. The Government of Burma under Sir Harcourt Butler placed on the statute book several anti-Indian laws, at least one of them of such severity that it was said at the time that while India was exercised over the position of her nationals in Kenya, a Kenya was growing much nearer home—in fact in territory under the administrative control of the Government of India itself.

The forces of separation received an unexpected accession of strength with the succession to the position of King Theebaw, of the present Governor. Sir Charles Innes has been

the greatest propagandist for separation. Long before the Government of India conveyed an opinion on the subject to His Majesty's Government, without the latter ever taking a formal decision, this subordinate administrator went on delivering speeches encouraging people to stand up without wavering for separation. If an Indian official had violated the proprieties even to a fractional extent, you and I know what further lease of official life would have been left to him. The four gentlemen sent from Burma to the Conference in London were the nominees of that super-separationist satrap. I cast no reflection on the genuineness of their opinion, but they cannot claim a representative character any more than Sir Fazl-i-Husain speaks for Indian Nationalism. Sir Charles Innes himself is one of the hopelessly strong men of the I.C.S. bureaucracy, whose success in grave situations is impressively demonstrated by his able management of the rebellion of which, after several months we have still to speak in the present tense.

Presidential
Address,
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

The Round Table Conference in committee—not in plenary session—decided with incredible haste to treat separation as a closed issue. But as elsewhere, this was followed by repentance at leisure. A weighty representation from Burma received immediately after that meeting convinced members of the mistake of the first day. And there was the admirable work of Mr. Shiva Rao in Sub-Committee and full committee ably seconded by Mr. H. P. Mody. The result was that 'the settled fact' once more became 'an unsettled issue'. Yet, almost before the ink was dry the Secretary of State told the House of Commons that separation had been decided upon. This statement was so inconsistent with what was said at the Conference that right well did your Council at its last meeting 'express its regret and surprise' at it.

Now it is said that a separate conference on Burma is in contemplation. I endorse the view of the Burmese opponents of separation that this will prejudice the issue and be an unfair proceeding. It is the Indian Round Table Conference which is seized of the subject and it is that body which is entitled to record a decision for the consideration of His Majesty's Government. They may reject the decision if they think that the right thing to do after the assurances given on their behalf by our late Viceroy before the Conference was held, but they have no right to prevent that body from concluding its consideration of the subject or to supersede it by another Conference. I equally endorse the affirmative demand of independent

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

spokesmen of Burman opinion that the Burman delegation to the Conference should be strengthened, not by the addition of more nominees of Sir Charles Innes, but by representatives of both opinions and all major interests. They are entitled, too, to fair representation in the Federal Structure Sub-Committee.

THE FRONTIER PROVINCE

I have just a word to say about the proposal regarding the future government of the Frontier Province. With the demand for reform we all naturally sympathize. It were unnatural if it were otherwise. And we do not recognize the right of a minority anywhere to block the road to reform. All minorities are entitled to demand that all their legitimate interests should be equitably and adequately safeguarded. But I do not admit the propriety of any provincial government maintaining itself by a subsidy from the central revenues. I hold it to be equally essential that the Frontier Province should live on its own resources, in such style as they may render possible, as that a separated Sind or Orissa or Andhra province should do. Holding fast to this view as I do, I have no option but to dissent from the recommendation of the Sub-Committee on the subject, that the central Government should give a subsidy to the new government of the Frontier Province. I have heard it argued that this will only be a continuation of the present position. It will not be. At present the province is included in the centrally administered areas and its affairs can from the subject of discussion in the central Legislature. This is expressly excluded for the future, for the report says:

'The Sub-Committee apprehend that if the subvention be open to debate annually in the central (or federal) legislature, the substance of provincial autonomy in the North-West Frontier province may be impaired. It suggests that the difficulty might be met by an agreed convention that each financial assignment should run undisturbed for a period of years.'

The objection to such an arrangement is obvious. The real difficulty is that administrative autonomy cannot co-exist with financial dependence. My own solution of the problem would be different. I speak for myself. I would re-amalgamate the settled districts with the Punjab, and continue the remainder of the area comprised in the present Frontier Province under the direct control of the central Government. Whether that area and British Baluchistan may not be placed

under one Chief Commissioner, is a question that will then have to be considered. I mention these as suggestions, and shall be free to revise my opinion if good and sufficient reason be shown therefor. But my objection to the proposed subsidy is firm.

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

THE MINORITIES PROBLEM

There is one more subject to which it is inevitable that I should address myself before I can bring this address, the length of which I regret, to a close. It is the problem of the minorities. No question has perplexed Indian patriots more than this during many years, and increasingly so as we have come nearer and nearer to the acquisition of real political power. Upon no question has so much time and thought been bestowed by public men and public bodies eager to remove an obstacle to the attainment of self-government, and, I regret to say, none has baffled them more than this. It is comparatively easy for communal partizans to advocate what they consider to be their claims, and still less difficult under a foreign government for them to be unreasonable and intransigent without the discouraging thought that thereby they may lose more than hope to gain. The reflection upon British policy in India which is implied by this statement has often been resented with a show of righteous indignation by those whose *amour propre* it hurts, and as recently as within the last three weeks, has been stigmatized as 'the ancient slander'. 'Me thinks my lady protesteth too much' is my comment. As Mr. Gokhale once put it, Euclid's proposition that any two sides of a triangle are greater than the third is true not less in politics than in geometry and therefore, no one need be surprised if at times policy is adopted and action taken on the footing that a combination of any two of the three main parties to the Indian national struggle may hope to defeat the third. There are well understood limitations to human nature from which it need not be thought that governments are exempt. Approved writers like Sir John Strachey and Sir Lepel Griffin, whom no one would accuse of radical sympathies, have familiarised us with this, while Lord Elphinstone, Governor of Bombay, had no hesitation in saying (in May, 1850) '*Divide et Impera* was the old Roman motto, and it should be ours.' Mr. Ramsay MacDonald in his *Awakening of India* called attention to the 'suspicion that sinister influences have been and are at work on the part of the

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani

'Government; that Mahomedan leaders have been and are
'inspired by certain British officials, and that these officials
'have pulled and continue to pull wires at Simla and in Lon-
'don and of malice aforethought sow discord between the
'Mahomedan and Hindu communities by showing to the
'Mahomedans special favours'. Lord Oilivier said after having
been Secretary of State: 'No one with a close acquaintance
'with Indian affairs will be prepared to deny that on the
'whole there is a predominant bias in British officialdom in
'favour of the Moslem community, partly on the ground of
'closer sympathy but more largely as a makeweight against
Hindu nationalism.' What would one say of the following
passage in Mr. Graham Wallas' *Human Nature in Politics*?—
'And if half of what is hinted at by some ultra-imperialist
'writers and talkers is true, racial and religious antipathy
'between Hindu and Mahomedans is sometimes welcomed,
'if not encouraged, by those who feel themselves bound at all
'costs to maintain our dominant position.'*

The real difficulty is of those who look at the problem
with non-communal eyes and are anxious to propound a solu-
tion with impartial minds and in a spirit at once national and
rational. They can put forward proposals logically defensible
and substantially just, but are less successful in persuading
communalists to accept either their *bona fides* or their proposals.
Both Congress and Liberal Federation are non-communal
organisations whose dominant aim is Swaraj in which the
whole people will participate and not only particular sections
of them. I conceive that no Liberal is a good Liberal who
has a communal mind. Of necessity every Liberal is of one
or another community but it is his duty to appreciate all points
of view and try to meet them. I am glad and happy to be
able to report to the Federation that every Liberal without

* After the breakdown of the negotiations at Simla between the
two sections of the Muslims, Dr. Ansari, the leader of the Nationalist
section, issued a statement in the course of which he said: "On our
arrival here we found that the Simla atmosphere was very inauspicious
for any compromise. . . . The unfortunate Simla surroundings
and influences, by now too wellknown to the public to require
specific mention, proved too strong for the forces working for unity,
and all efforts to find a formula that would unite the two parties were
set at naught. . . . I have reasons to believe that left to them-
selves the decision of the working committee of the All-India Muslim
Conference might probably have been different, but sinister influences
working behind the scenes have brought the negotiations so well begun
to an abrupt end."

exception acted conscientiously in this spirit in the discussions in London, and some Liberals laboured strenuously to promote a settlement which would err on the side of generosity to the Muslims. It was not their fault that they failed. There was among the Muslims a solidarity produced by the simple device of restricting membership of the Conference to men of one way of thinking. Since then the nationalists among Indian Musalmans have organized themselves, and I am sure I can speak for you all when I pay a tribute of admiration and respect to Sir Ali Imam, Dr. Ansari, Mr. Sherwani and other stalwarts for their bold and patriotic stand. If report speaks true, not one of them is going to be asked to attend the next session of the Conference in London. If this be so it throws a lurid light on the political mentality of those responsible for an omission that admits of no milder description than that it is inexcusable. Who created the communal problem as we have known it during the last quarter of a century? What has kept it alive and accentuated it? I have only to say separate electorates, and leave the rest to inference. Who argue that responsible government cannot be introduced unless the antecedent condition of a settlement of the communal question by consent is fulfilled? And who pack the Conference, on the result of which so much depends, with persons of extreme opinions and rigidly keep out those who have the will to Peace? And all this synchronously and in conjunction with their invitation to Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya to go and achieve a result that will guarantee peaceful political development and dismissal of the very thought of any more Disobedience campaigns! I may leave this tale at this. Let me state here definitely that I do not agree that failure in such circumstances to reach a settlement by consent can be a valid reason for the withholding of the rights of selfgovernment from the people.

You all are familiar with the Muslim demands and the Hindu and Sikh answers to them. You know, too, the extent to

Maulana Shaukat Ali, the leader of the communal section of the Muslims, is reported to have referred in a signed article in the *Roznamai Khilafat* to these 'sinister influences,' which brought about the failure of the negotiations, in the following words: "The Simla heights and the very atmosphere there is not suited for poorer people like us. Everywhere you find intrigues going on. There is no dearth of money. Handsome rewards and bribes are the order of the day, Added to this, there are means for threatening and bullying. It was difficult for the negotiations to succeed in that atmosphere."

Presidential
Address
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

Presidential
Address.
Mr. O. Y.
Chintamani.

which progress was made in London with concessions to the demand. You know of the failure, and you know all the subsequent developments, ending with the decisions of the Congress Working Committee and their acceptance by the Nationalist Muslims. As was to be expected they have not met with a similar reception from the Impossibilists who have received their marching orders. In the situation in which we find ourselves, what is our duty as Liberals and Nationalists? Your Council in April last appealed 'to all communities to accept joint electorates with such legitimate reservations and weightage as will be conducive to peace and harmony amongst the communities concerned.' On the question of electorates the farthest length to which I personally would think it consistent with national interests to go in the direction of compromise is, either to allow separate electorates to return just the numerical proportion to which a minority community may lay a legitimate claim with liberty to contest additional seats through joint electorates, for a period of ten years after which they shall by statutory provision expire automatically; or to allow them to return one-half of the allotted number of representatives in the first election under the new constitution, one-fourth in the second and none thereafter as there should be no communal electorates left. In no province is any special electoral device to be introduced at the instance of a majority community. All important minorities should receive equal treatment, whether they are Hindus or Sikhs or Muslims. The problem is of minority safeguards, not of the protection of majorities. Let this not be overlooked. To the valid objection that a majority community ceases for purposes of elections to be a majority community if it is a minority in the register of voters, my reply is that as recommended by the Franchises Sub-Committee of the Round Table Conference and (I have noticed with pleasure) approved by the Nationalist Muslims, the franchise should, while it is uniform for all communities in any given area, be so devised or extended as 'to give to each community, as nearly as may be, a voting strength proportional to its numbers'. I at any rate can think of nothing more equitable, unless adult franchise is introduced at once—a step to which I for one have no objection.

In his conciliatory statements on the communal tangle, Sir Chimantlal Setalvad, to whose 'magnificent spirit' the Prime Minister bore testimony in the Minorities Sub-Committee has rightly said that the greatest difficulty is presented

by Bengal and the Punjab. I share his anxiety that a solution must be found there. But I am not less anxious that it should not take the utterly indefensible form of the statutory fixation of a majority. On this point I cannot do better than to quote from the report of the Nehru Committee.

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

'Reservation for a majority is indefensible in theory. It is an artificial restriction on the growth both of the majority and the minority and must necessarily retard national progress. . . . A majority reservation or other fixation of seats is incompatible with real representative and responsible government. It obviously interferes with the right of the electors to choose whom they like. . . . it is not only a negation of representative government but it is in direct conflict with the principle on which responsible government rests, . . . It is absurd to insist on reservation of seats for the majority and claim full responsible government at the same time. Responsible government is understood to mean a government in which the executive is responsible to the legislature and the legislature to the electorate. If the members of the executive with the majority behind them have all got in by reservation and not by the free choice of the electorate there is neither representation of the electorate nor any foundation for responsible government. Reservation of seats for a majority community give to that community the statutory right to govern the country independently of the wishes of the electorate and is foreign to all conceptions of popular government. It will confine minorities within a ring-fence and leave them no scope for expansion.'

Among the signatories of this were Pandit Motilal Nehru, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Sir Ali Imam. It there is a reply to their argument, I should like to have it. Consider how the position will be aggravated if that majority guaranteed by statute is returned by a separate communal electorate. You would then be denying to the minority even the scant consolation of taking a small part in the election of the majority. Of all things in the world, you would least expect agreement between the Nehru Committee and the Simon Commission. But though we do not live in the age of miracles, this did happen and the Simon Commission reported definitely against this demand of the Muslims. 'It would be unfair, they wrote, 'that Mahomedans should retain the very considerable weightage they now enjoy in the six provinces, and that there should at the same time be imposed, in face of Hindu and Sikh opposition, a definite moslem majority in the Punjab and in Bengal unalterable by any appeal to the electorate.' 'We cannot go so far.' The Government of India took the identical view. Lastly, I beg you, in your natural and laudable anxiety to arrive at a settlement, never to forget this

Presidential
Address
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

significant warning uttered by the Prime Minister himself at one of the meetings of the Minorities Sub-Committee:

... and then, if you cannot agree amongst yourselves as to a scheme, we shall have to take into consideration all that you have said and all your points, and see how we are going to meet them as abundantly as we possibly can, and, yet consistently with a self governing constitution for India. And, do believe me, my friends, that distinction is not a distinction merely of words; it is a distinction of substance, a very serious distinction of substance. You cannot have it, not only both ways but half-a-dozen ways. . . . (P. 92, Report of the Minorities Sub-Committee.)

One particular claim of Muslims, which I am sorry that Nationalist Muslims have made not less than their more communal co-religionists, is indeed a matter of great constitutional importance infinitely more than communal, and I am surprised at its concession by the Working Committee of the Congress. I refer to the question of residuary powers. 'The future constitution of the country shall be federal,' so runs this part of the Committee's resolution, 'the residuary powers shall vest in the federating units.' But this is qualified by 'unless on further examination it is found to be against the best interests of India'. I am sorry that an organization of such importance should have recorded a definite opinion on such a subject before it concluded its examination of it. And, therefore, I am not surprised to learn that Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, far the most experienced member of Congress and the senior most now living with the one exception of Sir Dinshaw Wacha, has not supported the resolution. In addition to the above qualification, the Congress Committee inserted another clause in an earlier part of the resolution, which states that 'protection of the political and other rights of the minority communities in the various provinces shall be the concern and be within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government'. This may lead to almost daily conflicts between the central and provincial Governments and is certainly a serious deduction from the rights of provincial autonomy. I cannot approve of either decision of the Congress Committee. Even when complete Dominion Status has been attained without reservation or qualification a strong central government will be a *sine qua non* both of India's safety and India's progress, and this is why the Council of the Federation issued a mandate to Liberals who were members of the National Convention to stand firm on this matter. This was done on

the motion of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, and I am confident the whole of the Federation is of the same mind today.

My last word on the subject as it affects Hindus and Muslims is this. We must do everything that is humanly possible to find a way out of the impasse. Not to do so would be to be guilty of unpatriotic conduct. There cannot possibly be two opinions on this. But in all efforts and every effort, we must aim at a real solution and not at makeshifts. To this end I submit for your consideration this advice of Dr. Rabin-dranath Tagore given lately on the seventieth anniversary of his birthday :—

‘If something is sincerely believed to be wrong, to yield on that point for the sake of a compromise does not in my opinion make for a lasting peace. Concession to unjust demand and undue advantage whether personal or communal, is equally a mistaken policy. It only whets one’s appetite and makes one clamour for more and in the end we are left just from where we started or the position becomes even worse. The Lucknow Pact was a mistake. No such shortcut has the chance of achieving a better result today.’

Of all the minorities, gentlemen, the one that has the most irresistible claim on us is the so called depressed classes—depressed because of Hindu social customs. In their case, too, I do not agree to separate electorates, but short of this I should go very far to meet their just wishes. In particular it is our bounden duty to do everything in our power for their educational, economic and social amelioration and, what is more important still, to give them the political opportunity of helping themselves and us alike.

I need hardly say that we have the fullest sympathy with the aspiration of the women of India to be afforded the opportunity of serving our common Motherland by having full citizen rights conferred on them.

* * * * *

Brother-delegates, here I bring to a conclusion such imperfect examination as I have been able to make, during the time at my disposal, of what I considered to be the more important of the subjects which are engaging the thought of political India as the result of the deliberations of the Round Table Conference. I greatly regret the length of this address, apologize to you for taking up so much valuable time, and am grateful for the generous patience you have shown. The

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

Presidential
Address.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

work before us is tremendous and exacting while our numbers are small and rather loosely knit. And not all continue the march until they fall or reach the winning post. But however discouraging the circumstances, against whatever odds we may have to fight, and many and serious as are our failings as well as failures, the duty is sacred and binding, and we have no right to abandon it for whatsoever reason. That would be to violate our Dharma. The Divine injunction is clear and may not be transgressed except at our peril.

मत्कर्मकृन्मत्परमो भद्रकः सगडवर्जितः ।

निर्वैरः सर्वभूतेषु यः स मामेति पाण्डव ॥

'He who does works for Me, who looks on Me as the Supreme, who is devoted to Me, who is free from attachment, who is without hatred for any being, he comes to me, O Pandava.'

In no sphere of life more than in public life, and at no time in our country's history more than in this crisis of her fortune and her fate, is it more necessary for everyone to burn into his heart the eternal truth clothed in the pregnant and beautiful words—

ममेति परमं दुःखं नममेति परं सुखं ।

'Mine' is supreme sorrow, 'not mine' is supreme happiness.

Political fight unfortunately engenders bitterness, but the Divine command is that always we must be 'without hatred for any being'. Our ancient law, the Sanatana Dharma, inculcated the truest internationalism when it enjoined upon all to utter the prayer—

लोक स्तमस्ताः सुखिनो भवन्तु ।

'May all the peoples be happy.' In this spirit let us work in the service of the Mother, and with God's blessing will be born out of present turmoils, the New and Greater India which even now they can see who see with the eye of Faith.

The National Liberal Federation of India reassembled at the Sir Cowasji Jehangir Hall, Bombay, at 11-30 a. m. on Sunday, August 2, Mr. C. Y. Chintamani presiding.

The President at the outset called upon Mr. Natesan, the Secretary, to read some further messages that had been received. The Secretary having done so, the President moved from the chair the first four resolutions on the agenda, viz.

RESOLUTION No. 1.
SYMPATHY & CONDOLENCE.

The National Liberal Federation of India places on record its sense of the loss the country has sustained by the death of Pandit Motilal Nehru, Maulana Mahomad Ali, the Maharaja of Mahmudabad, Mr. K. T. Paul and Mr. Eardley Norton, and the country, and the Liberal Party in particular, have sustained by the death of Sir Shanker Rao Chitnavis, Rao Bahadur K. G. Damle and Principal B. G. Sapre, all of them patriots who rendered meritorious services in the furtherance of India's achievement of self-government; and the Federation offers its sympathy and condolence to the families of the distinguished and lamented deceased in their great sorrow.

Sympathy
and
Condolence.
The President.

RESOLUTION No. 2.
CONDEMNATION OF OUTRAGES.

The National Liberal Federation of India records its strong condemnation of and abhorrence at the dastardly attempt on the life of His Excellency Sir Ernest Hotson, the acting Governor of Bombay, and the assassination of Mr. Garlick, the Sessions Judge of Alipore. The Federation considers such acts highly detrimental to the best interests of the country.

Condemnation
of outrages.
The President.

RESOLUTION No. 3.
LORD IRWIN.

The National Liberal Federation of India records its sense of high and grateful appreciation of the distinguished services rendered to India and England by the Rt. Hon. Lord Irwin as Viceroy and Governor-General and of the services that he is continuing to render for the recognition of India's status and her claims as an equal partner in the British Commonwealth.

Lord Irwin.
The President.

RESOLUTION No. 4.
THE NEW VICEROY.

The National Liberal Federation accords a cordial and respectful welcome to their Excellencies

The new Viceroy.
The President.

The new Viceroy.
The President.

Lord and Lady Willingdon and earnestly hopes that His Excellency's Viceroyalty will be signalized by the establishment of responsible government in India and by the achievement of Dominion Status.

The resolutions were put to the meeting and carried *unanimously*.

Addressing the meeting the President then said :

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, The next resolution is about the Round Table Conference and is to be moved by the Hon. Sir Pheroze Sethna. Before calling upon him to move it I should like to mention that our time is very limited and we have to go through the whole of our agenda in the course of this afternoon. Therefore I should like to announce that as a rule I shall allow movers of resolutions 10 minutes to conclude their speeches and others 5 minutes. Of course as chairman I will allow myself discretion to vary the limit. I now request Sir Pheroze Sethna to move the resolution standing in his name.

RESOLUTION NO. 5.

THE ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE.

The Round Table
Conference.
Sir Pheroze
Sethna.

Sir Pheroze Sethna :

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I beg to move :

(a) The National Liberal Federation of India records its sense of appreciation of the useful preliminary work done by the last session of the Indian Round Table Conference, especially in getting the principles of a Federated India and responsibility at the centre accepted.

(b) The Federation greatly appreciates the services rendered to India and England by the Prime Minister, the Lord High Chancellor and the Secretary of State for India, among other members of His Majesty's Government, by their assiduous labours in connection with the Conference.

(c) This Federation welcomes the Prime Minister's statement on behalf of His Majesty's Government that "responsibility for the Government of India should be placed upon legislatures,

Central and Provincial," and expressions of the willingness of Ruling Princes that the Indian States and British Indian Provinces should form component parts of a Federated India. The Federation trusts that the next session of the Conference will succeed in producing a workable and satisfactory constitution for securing genuine responsible government for India as an equal partner in the British Commonwealth of Nations.

The Round Table
Conference.
Sir Pheroze
Sethna.

(d) While the Federation is gratified that the Indian National Congress will be represented at the next session of the Conference, it most earnestly appeals to His Excellency the Viceroy and His Majesty's Government to remove instead of increasing the inequalities of representation in the Conference by inviting to its next session an adequate number of Nationalist Musalmans, of representatives of Burma opposed to separation from India, and of Indians representing labour and the agricultural classes.

Sir Pheroze Sethna : said : The resolution I have the honour to move is divided into four parts and I propose to take up one heading after the other in the order in which I have read out the same. The first part expresses appreciation of the useful preliminary work done by the last session of the Indian Round Table Conference. May I be permitted to say that the policy of the Liberal Party in this country has throughout been one of supporting Government when the party believes that Government are in the right. On the other hand we are always prepared to oppose Government and oppose as stoutly as we can when we believe that Government are in the wrong, but when we oppose Government we always fight them by constitutional means and will always do so in the future. Not to go back many years in the history of this country, I may remind you that within recent times in spite of severe opposition from the Congress, we Liberals supported the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms which recommended diarchy. Without their support Government could not have made the diarchy system even partially successful as it did. On the other hand, some years later, we had no hesitation in opposing for all we were worth and boycotting the Simon Commission. We will never regret having done so, for, it was our opposition combined with that of the Congress party that eventually made Govern-

The Round Table
Conference.
Sir Pheroze
Sethna.

ment realise that they had erred egregiously, and they thought it prudent to make amends as best possible. The Simon Commission's report is already a back number and it is so, because it proposed only a largely enhanced autonomy in the Provinces, no responsible Government at the centre and an informal association of the Indian States with British India in matters of common concern. It postponed the attainment of complete Dominion Status to the Greek kalends.

Some give credit to Sir John Simon for having suggested the appointment of a Round Table Conference, whereas others urge that the idea originated with Lord Irwin. It is, however, forgotten that a Round Table Conference was at first suggested several years ago by Pandit Motilal Nehru in the Legislative Assembly and the proposal was supported by a similar resolution in the Council of State. Had Government accepted the advice given in the two Houses then, both by members of the Congress and the Liberal parties, things by now would have been quite different and we would not have had to pass through the trying times we experienced during the last eighteen months. When Lord Irwin announced that Government intended to convene a Round Table Conference in London, the Liberals expressed their willingness to attend without any demur. Unfortunately the Congress did not see its way to do likewise. On the contrary, all sorts of threats were held out to us who accepted the invitations. They said that we were going on a fool's errand and no good would come of it. We, however, realised that whatever might have been the case in the past, Government were in dead earnest on this occasion. There were many who prognosticated failure and disillusionment but we went nevertheless feeling that our success or failure would depend more upon ourselves and we were not disappointed. The R. T. C. did prove a platform India had never before possessed. The R. T. C. gave India such a publicity all the world over as it had never received in the past. Above all as a member of the R. T. C. myself I have no hesitation in saying that never before were Indians treated by the Britishers here or even in England, on such a footing of perfect equality as they were at the R. T. C.

Out here, in spite of many professions to the contrary, the Indian, no matter how high in position ability or rank, has always been looked down upon and branded with the stamp of inferiority. Quite the reverse was the case at the R. T. C. and if anything, Governors of Provinces in British India who were

also deputed, not as full delegates, but as advisers to the Secretary of State had to take a place as compared to the delegates themselves which may be the reason, I may remark incidentally, for the same Governors and others, not desiring to attend the next sessions of the Conference, as was reported in the press some weeks ago. If we Indians were treated on a footing of perfect equality let me say that the Indian delegates were able to give a good account of themselves, because of the manner in which they took part in the debates in putting forward their claims and in every other way. I have it on the authority of one very well placed who had the opportunity of attending the meetings both of the Imperial Conference, as also of the Indian Round Table Conference, that whilst there were a few intellectual giants amongst those who attended the Imperial Conference, the rest were perhaps below the average. On the contrary, in the opinion of the same authority whilst there certainly were intellectual giants among the British Indian delegates, it could hardly be said of any one of them that he was below the average. Never before was so much space given in the English papers to Indian matters as during those nine weeks whilst the Conference lasted. It is said that things have altered since we returned, but I have no doubt that the atmosphere will again be changed for the better during the next sessions which will commence a few weeks hence and that this time we shall return with a constitution properly framed and acceptable to the great majority. Whilst on the question of equality, or may I rather say inequality between Europeans and Indians in this country, I must readily admit that there is a growing feeling amongst several Europeans in this country according to which they recognise that India must come into its own and that Europeans here should do all in their power to enable us to have our aims and objects fulfilled. I take this opportunity to refer publicly to the very excellent move started by a few Europeans in the city of Bombay whose numbers I am glad to find are gradually increasing. These gentlemen in a letter which they addressed to Lord Irwin on the eve of his departure observed as follows :—

The Round Table
Conference.
Sir Pheroze
Sethna.

“We attach the greatest importance to the R. T. C. Yet, we cannot disguise our fear that prejudice, lack of courage, and want of confidence may prevent the ideals for which we stand.”

These ideals they expressed in the following words in the first paragraph of their letter to Lord Irwin :—

The Round Table
Conference.
Sir Pheroze
Sethna.

“ We represent a group of Europeans which hopes that the resumed R. T. C. will make possible the speedy creation of a Federal Government which will enable India to take her rightful place as a full member of the British Commonwealth of Free Nations. We believe that the attainment of this goal will be the greatest justification of British rule in India ; it will introduce a new and dynamic factor to World politics ; it will inaugurate a fresh partnership between a great eastern and western people.”

This is what the Indians themselves desire and we cannot but feel grateful to those young Europeans in Bombay and elsewhere who have had the courage to express their views in the words I have just read out. We hope that the same ideas will by degrees prevail with the Die-hards in England and the Die-hards in this country and that they too will come round to the same view of things.

The resolution next thanks the Prime Minister, the Lord High Chancellor, and the Secretary of State for India amongst others, for their assiduous labours in connection with the Conference. We have not words enough to thank them all for all they have done. They have convinced us that they are determined and are in right earnest to do what is right by India and they gave us many proofs of such determination. The Prime Minister on the last day of the Conference observed : “ I have a good deal of experience of these conferences. One week of a Conference produces more good than six months of diplomatic correspondence.” It was with this idea that the R. T. C. was summoned and although no definite conclusions were arrived at the first Conference, yet much spade work was done. In fact, in those nine weeks, more ground has been covered than was possible during three times nine years before now. In addition to the Prime Minister, Lord Sankey and Mr. Wedgwood Benn, we certainly received very great help from other members of Government like Mr. J. H. Thomas, Sir William Jowitt and others. To all of them we are grateful for what they did on the last occasion and we look forward to receiving from them as much and yet greater help in the coming Sessions. Might I here express a word of gratitude to such newspapers in England as espoused our cause, notably the *Times*, the

Manchester Guardian, the *News Chronicle* and the *Daily Herald* and very particularly the *Spectator* which as you know is a weekly.

The Round Table
Conference.
Sir Pheroze
Sethna.

In the third part of the resolution, we express the hope that the next session will succeed in introducing a workable and satisfactory constitution for securing genuine responsible Government as an equal partner in the British Commonwealth of Nations. This is what we have been clamouring for—Liberals and Congressmen—alike for more than a generation past. Government before now have doled out instalments of reforms, always later than the right time at which they might have been given with advantage to themselves. But matters are now going ahead at such a pace that nothing less than complete Dominion Status will satisfy this country and we will no more be satisfied with instalments. We have made this perfectly clear and there is no question that Government themselves do recognise this. It is unfortunate that although every possible effort was made even prior to going to London, also when in London and again since our return from London, the Hindu-Mohamedan question has not yet been satisfactorily settled. This is giving us a terrible setback in the Conference. Although these differences have not been settled, it is very gratifying that every speaker at the Conference, Hindu or Mahomedan, Sikh or Parsi, with one voice asked for Dominion Status. That was a surprise to Great Britain. But the surprise was yet greater and the demand irresistible when they found that not only British India, but the Indian States were at one in this claim. We cannot thank the Princes enough for accepting our invitation to come into the Federation. There are many points to be settled to the satisfaction both of the Princes and of the British Indians as to how best to work conjointly a Federation. But I for one have no doubt that with the policy of give and take, we shall be able to arrive at an understanding that will make the Federation workable and thereby help the cause of this country very greatly. Our esteemed President had much to say on this subject in his opening speech. But, he was cautious enough to admit that his views were his own. Knowing him as we do, we will not be surprised that he will be one of the foremost members at the Conference to help to bring about solutions of any knotty points that may crop up. There will be difficulties but not such as cannot be overcome. Only a few weeks ago H. H. the Maharaja of Patiala expressed himself in terms which might have endangered the success of the Federation, but all that is now happily a forgotten incident.

The Round Table
Conference.
Sir Pheroze
Sethna.

I now come to the last part of the resolution which expresses its gratification that the Indian National Congress will be represented at the Conference and represented by no less a personage than one who is regarded as one of the greatest living men of the age. Mahatma Gandhi has been given *a carte blanche* by the Congress. He may be trusted not only to put forward the Congress demands, but to display that amount of reason which will enable him to decide all points along with the rest of the Conference in a manner as will conduce to the benefit of India and of Indians and to a better understanding between India and Great Britain. (Cheers.)

Rao Bahadur
G. A. Natesan.

The Hon. Rao Bahadur G. A. Natesan in seconding the resolution said: With your permission the few words that I shall speak in support of this proposition I shall start by saying that, left to myself, I would have been glad to have worded this proposition differently. I would undoubtedly and unhesitatingly have said that the first session of the Round Table Conference in London was a success, for, if for nothing else, for the first time in the history of our relations with Great Britain, representatives of the people of British India and of the Princes and politicians of all schools of thought were represented in London and they conferred together with the representatives of His Majesty's Government and made it clear to them that Dominion Status, that is, India's desire to stand on terms of perfect equality with other members of the British Commonwealth, was the desire of the Princes as well as of the people of British India and from all that you have heard I have no doubt you are acquainted that India's case was presented in the best possible manner. I am quite aware and it has been said here and elsewhere that one important section of Indian politicians, that is the Congress, was not represented in London, but I venture to submit that whatever differences there may be between Liberals and Congressmen and others nobody would say that in claiming and insisting on Dominion Status for India the Liberals or other politicians did anything else which Congressmen would not have done in London if they were also parties to the constitution of the R. T. C. My friend the Hon. Sir Pheroze Sethna has taken you through the various parts of the resolution and pointed that the labours of our delegates have been attended with success, that they have had cordial treatment in London, and now, gentlemen, I am sure I am not over-optimistic when I say that the presence of a personality like that of Mahatma Gandhi, with his great name, his great character, would justify the hope that the labours of the second

session of the R. T. C. are bound to be more fruitful than those of the last session. But after all I am perhaps stating a commonplace fact if I say that every nation gets what it deserves. With the presence of Mahatma Gandhi supported by politicians of other schools, by representatives of the Mussalmans and of the Sikhs and of labour which my friend Mr. N. M. Joshi will represent, our case is bound to be presented properly and with the unanimity which is necessary. The success of the Conference will depend on the harmony that will prevail among Hindus, Mussalmans, Sikhs and the representatives of other classes. I do trust, therefore, that all the discordant elements in this country will feel it their imperative duty to make up all their differences and present a common front before England. (applause).

The Round Table
Conference.

Rao Bahadur
G. A. Natesan.

The resolution was put to the meeting and carried unanimously. Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru next moved :

RESOLUTION NO. 6.

THE SCHEME OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

The Scheme of
Federal
Government.

The National Liberal Federation of India, while cordially approving of a scheme of Indian Federation constituted of States and Provinces, is of opinion that—

Pandit Hirday
Nath Kunzru.

1. The Federal Executive should be made responsible to the popular Chamber of the Legislature. [The Federation is in favour of preventing a vexatious use of motions of no-confidence and securing the stability of the Executive by means of reasonable provisions. It recommends in particular that procedure similar to that applicable to motions of no-confidence obtaining at present in legislatures in India and in certain other countries should be adopted in the future constitution. Members of the Federal Assembly belonging to the States excepting Ministers should have no right of speech or vote on motions of no-confidence arising out of matters affecting only British India.]

2. There should be no nomination of British Indian representatives and the States should allow their representatives to be chosen by some form of election which should, after a fixed transitional period be uniform with the system obtaining in

The scheme
of Federal
Government.

Pandit Birlay
Nath Kunzru.

British India although in the beginning all of them may not be elected.

3. The Provinces should return their representatives to the Lower House by direct election.

4. The Federation is of opinion that in the popular Chamber of the Federal Assembly, the distribution of seats should be made strictly on the basis of population.

Mr. Kunzru said : You have already been told, ladies and gentlemen, by previous speakers that the main principles accepted at the last session of the R. T. C. relate to federation and responsibility at the centre. It is true that responsibility is accompanied by certain reservations both in regard to administrative and financial matters. Besides, the form that the federation has so far taken is different from any federation known to history as yet. The Liberal Federation express their views with regard to the reservations which have popularly come to be known as safeguards in another resolution. What we are concerned with here is to determine whether even under the limitations imposed by the safeguards, which we shall consider later the responsibility that has been accorded to us is real and whether the shape that has been given to the federation will enable it to work satisfactorily in future.

I shall begin with a discussion of the question of responsibility at the centre and before I express any opinion of my own I think I had better quote a few words from the report of the Federal Structure Committee to show what was in the minds of those who drafted the report. It is said in the report that the Governor-General's instrument of instructions will direct him to appoint as his Ministers those persons who command the confidence of the Legislature. Now the body that will pass the laws will consist of two houses so far as the whole of India is concerned. We are, therefore justified in assuming that the word Legislature used by the Federal Structure Sub-Committee refers not only to the lower house but also to the upper house. The Committee proposes a special procedure with regard to passing of motions of no-confidence. It says that "for the purpose of securing greater stability to the executive a suggestion was made and found a large measure of support that Minister should not be compelled to resign, save in the event of a vote of no confidence passed

by a majority of at least two-thirds of the two chambers sitting together." Not only then is the Federal Structure Sub-Committee's report in favour of the ministry being responsible to the two houses jointly but it goes further and asks that in certain specified cases a specified majority should be required in order to enable the Legislature to express its opinion regarding the conduct of the executive.

The scheme
of Federal
Government.
Pandit Hirday
Nath Kunzru.

Now, in this resolution we take exception to both these provisions. In the first place we say that the executive should be responsible only to the lower house. Take any constitution you like. I am speaking in broad terms. There may be here and there some exceptions, but speaking in a general way and taking the European constitutions as they are today, it cannot be said that the trend of modern thought is in favour of making the executive responsible not to the lower house but to the lower and upper houses taken together. Safeguards have been introduced in modern constitutions in order to enable them to work smoothly and to overcome obstacles that vested interests or opponents of the constitution might interpose, but I have yet to learn that in any modern constitutions it has been seriously proposed that the ministry should be responsible to the upper house. Now when I say this I do not forget that in practice in certain countries the second chamber has come to wield a power which is in some respects co-ordinate with that of the lower house. To give a concrete instance I would say that in France the Senate has been known to compel the resignation of the ministry. But the power of the Senate is derived not by an express provision in the constitution but because of the manner in which the constitution works practically we do not know exactly how our constitution will work in practice. Experience alone will show what power will be wielded by the upper house. But what we do object to is that the constitution should lay down in express terms that the upper house occupies the same position as the lower house with regard to the appointment or dismissal of the ministry. If I may give another instance I would deal with the case of England. I know that the case of England is peculiar in many ways, that we cannot hope, when we are starting a new constitution, to be able to follow exactly the methods, the practice and the conventions that are in vogue in a country where self-government has been in force for centuries. But it is worth remembering that even in that country it has been found necessary to curtail the powers of the upper house in regard to money bills and to give a dominant

The scheme
of Federal
Government.
Pandit Hirday
Nath Kunzru.

position to the lower house. That being the case I think we shall be on safe ground if following the precedent set, not merely by England but also by other modern constitutions if we say that the responsibility of the ministry will be real only in so far as the executive is responsible to the lower house. If it is made responsible to both the houses the responsibility will be so diluted as to prevent the representatives of the people from exercising that control over the executive which is one of the essentials of responsible government. We object to joint responsibility not because the Indian States will come into the Federation, but because we are opposed to it on principle. It would not be acceptable to us even if we were drafting a constitution purely for British India.

I shall now take up the second question namely that of the special procedure required to pass a vote of no confidence. Now we are not unaware of the fact that if members of the Legislature were allowed unrestricted freedom to propose motions of no confidence, and such could be sprung upon the Legislature at any time, the snatch votes taken after a short notice might not express the real and deliberate opinion of the Legislature. I had myself experience of the improper use that might be made of such a procedure when I was a member of the U. P. Legislative Council and our worthy president was a Minister. Both of us realised at the time the difficulties arising out of the unrestricted freedom of members to propose votes of no confidence. It led to unnecessary dislocation of business and the energy of members which might have been more usefully employed in considering important measures and constructive suggestions was something directed to destructive tactics and used for other than public purposes.

We therefore say in this resolution that we are in favour of provisions for preventing a vexatious use of motions of no confidence. But how is that to be done if the express provisions recommended by the Sub-Committee are not to be accepted. We already have a system in force in the provincial legislatures in India which prevents a surprise being sprung upon Legislatures in connection with motions of no confidence. In the first place a definite notice of motion of no confidence has to be given to the chairman. Then the leave of the house is required before this motion can be discussed. So far as the U. P. Council is concerned at least 40 members must rise in their places in support of the motion before the President can admit it. Then there is the power of the President

to decide whether the motion itself is in order or not. Finally it is for the president to decide when the motion will be discussed provided that the discussion takes place within ten days after notice has been received of the motion.

The scheme
of Federal
Government.
Pandit Hirday
Nath Kunzru.

Some Modern European constitutions also have certain provisions designed for the same purpose. I may refer here to the case of Czecho-Slovakia. I am sorry I have not got its constitution before me. I can therefore only speak from memory, but so far as I remember the constitution lays down that previous notice shall be given of a motion of no confidence, that the motion shall be signed by about a hundred members of the lower house and that before the motion is discussed it shall be referred to a committee which shall report on it within eight days. Now we are prepared to allow that some such safeguard might be introduced in our constitution. We are further prepared that other avenues might be explored, that other means might be sought of giving stability to the executive but we object to the specific methods proposed by the Federal Structure Sub-Committee. We are not in favour of the ministry being responsible to the two houses and we are not in favour of a specific two-thirds majority being required to pass a no confidence motion. Apart from this we are prepared to consider any reasonable safeguards in order to give stability to the executive and to enable it to devote its attention to the consideration of matters that are of real importance to the country as a whole untroubled by artificially manufactured crises.

The last part of the first clause of the resolution asks that members of the Federal Assembly belonging to the States should have no right of speech or vote on motions of no confidence arising out of matters affecting only British India. The objection taken to this proposal is that the executive being unitary it is not fair that when the conduct of a minister is under consideration the entire house should not be allowed to vote on the subject. A vote of censure on one minister might involve the resignation of the entire ministry. Is it fair that only a portion of the house should be allowed to give its decision on a matter which might affect the life of the whole ministry? I will say with regard to this matter that the Sub-Committee's report itself says that the Indian States do not desire to discuss or vote upon questions which concern British India alone, and are of opinion that these questions

The scheme
of Federal
Government.
Pandit Hirday
Nath Kunaru.

should be definitely excluded. Now I know that this does not refer to motions of no confidence but is there any reason why motions of no confidence should be treated on a different footing? I will give you an instance which will enable you to make up your minds on the subject. Let us suppose that some legislation relating to the civil or the criminal laws of India is under consideration. It is possible that the ministry may find itself unable to accept some of the amendments proposed by the representatives of the people. It might regard some of them as being of so radical a nature that it would rather resign than accept them. I should like to know what will happen in such cases. According to the expressed wish of the States themselves their representatives will not vote in such a case because although the decision on such a question might involve the life of the ministry the question itself is not specifically a question of no confidence. Well then if you have to face this difficulty in the consideration of specific measures that might come before the House, what extra complication would there be in facing it in connection with motions of no confidence?

There is another thing that you might consider in this connection. It is true that if the representatives of the States are excluded from participating in the discussion of a question which relates to British India but which involves the life of a ministry it might seem unfair that the Federal executive should not be able to ask the entire Federal Legislature to express its opinion on the subject. I am unable however to accept this view. Since there is a unitary executive it is obvious that all policies whether relating to federal subjects or to purely central subjects will be decided by the same ministry. If then the ministry as a whole is responsible for laying down a particular policy with regard to British India, I see no injustice in its being called upon to resign should the vote of the British Indian section of the legislature go against it on a purely British India issue.

Other considerations could be urged in favour of the view here set forth but I have not the time to go into them. I will only remark in passing that one of the most important considerations that you have to bear in mind is that the representatives of the States might come in by means of nomination and not by election. It is perfectly true that the representatives of the States may not vote en bloc at any rate I hope

that they will not. Nevertheless we cannot ignore the danger of the nominated section acting as a solid block on occasions of crucial importance.

The scheme
of Federal
Government,
Pandit Hirday
Nath Kunzru.

I will now with your leave pass on to the second portion of the resolution. I should like to point out the care with which we have drafted this resolution. I believe I shall be giving away no secret when I say that this particular part of the resolution has the support of all members of the Liberal Federation. Now what does the resolution say? It does not compel the States on threat of any dire consequences to accede to the proposal contained in this resolution. It does not call any outside authority to exercise pressure on them. It simply says that in view of the fact that they have agreed to come into the federation we hope that they will direct their efforts to making the federation real by giving it a form that will satisfy the whole country. The Princes have themselves passed a resolution in their own Chamber regarding the modernisation of their administrations. In view of this federation we invite them to take a further step and ask them to allow their representatives to be elected, to be returned by some form of election which would ultimately conform completely to the principle underlying the federation. We have made ample concessions to the feelings of the States, we take into account diversities of the units that will go to form the federation, we also admit that in the beginning all the representatives of the States may not be wholly elected but the States where there are legislative councils ought not to find it difficult to accept our request that the members of the Federal Legislature who represent the States should be returned by some form of election. As regards those States in which the principle has not been introduced the present state of things may continue for some time but even they must come into line with us within a specified time. Our resolution has been framed in such a way as to take account of the practical difficulties of the situation, the hard realities that we are faced with, into consideration and we hope when we have done this we have done all that can be fairly demanded of us. The princes themselves admitted in the Conference that the Federation would benefit not merely the people of British India but the Princes themselves. May we not therefore ask them that in view of the fact that federation would be to the mutual advantage of the States and of British India to join with us in giving stability to the Federation in so

The scheme
of Federal
Government.
Pandit Hirday
Nath Kunzru.

shaping it as to enable to work smoothly and to command the confidence of the entire country? I think there is no provision which will enable the federal constitution to be regarded with greater approval by the people of British India than the acceptance of the principle of election by the Indian States.

Just one word more, ladies and gentlemen, before I finish. The Prime Minister in closing the last session of the Round Table Conference said to the delegates: "You have to go back to India, we have to go back to our own public opinion. You have spoken here subject to reconsideration, subject to the reaction which your public opinion will show. We, Government and Parliamentary representatives alike, have spoken in the same way and we must also listen to reactions. We must also explain and expound and do our best to bring our people along with us in our pilgrimage of hope to their conclusion."

There is a valuable advice contained in these words which we should take to heart. The decision of the important question of constitutional reforms will not depend merely on the delegates of the R. T. C. When the negotiators have done their best the question will come before a wider public. It behoves us therefore to look at our constitution in a wider perspective than we have done hitherto. We are in the last resort responsible to public opinion outside. We have to bear in mind in framing a constitution the difficulties, the special circumstances and the susceptibilities of the federating units. We believe we have shown our readiness to make compromises on many important points. May we therefore in all friendliness hope that the States will reciprocate this feeling, that they will on their part take our difficulties into account and join with us in giving a form to the constitution which will command the assent of the entire people of India? We have let us recognise it to bear in mind a constitution may be perfect on paper and yet may not work in practice unless it has behind it the sanction of the people who are affected by it. We therefore, appeal to the Princes to exercise their statesmanship. We know the difficulties that they have been faced with since their return from England. We are prepared to make due allowances for them. But let them also envisage the troubles and the difficulties that we have had in defending the constitution formulated by the R. T. C. The Princes have on more

than one occasion during the R. T. C. stood up for the rights of India as a whole not merely as the rulers of certain territories but as the children of the motherland. We ask them with some confidence therefore to join with us in ensuing the future and in enabling us to cast our constitution in a form which is really democratic and which will win the assent of the whole country.

The scheme
of Federal
Government,
Pandit Hirday
Nath Kunzru.

Mr. C. M. Gandhi said: Fellow Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen: The resolution which I have the honour to second has been so very ably and exhaustively dealt with by Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru that it is unnecessary for me to deal with it at any great length. The resolution divides itself into four parts. We now claim that in order that the federal scheme may be satisfactory there should be a fully elective lower house. There should be no nominations, for with an official and a nominated block it is impossible to have a 2/3 majority for removing the executive. It makes the executive practically irremovable. The house should consist of elected representatives of the provinces as well as of the States so far as practicable. Now, it is our experience in the Bombay Legislative Council, and those of you who are familiar with its working will be convinced, that it is impossible to develop responsibility when a large official or nominated block is there to support the ministers. The absence of the official block would also develop a sense of responsibility in the house because those who are in the opposition would then know that if by their opposition they are able to turn out the executive government they will be called upon to resume office and carry out the promises which they make in the house. Therefore, we ask that if the federal government is going to be a success it must be a purely elective body and the lower house should be absolutely independent. We also desire that the federal executive government shall be responsible to that elective body. Now, is it possible to secure anything like a 2/3 majority when the house is partly elected and partly nominated? From Surat I can give you a practical illustration. In the Surat Municipality we have a corporation of 50 with 10 nominated members. The President can be removed by a 2/3 majority. With those 10 nominated members although the house was practically against the president and passed a motion of no confidence twice, the President sat tight in his seat because a 2/3 majority could not be had. That is a position which could hardly be considered favourable to the development of a full responsible government.

Mr. C. M. Gandhi.

The scheme
of Federal
Government.
Mr. C. M. Gandhi

There should be no such statutory limit. After all, the precautions suggested by Pandit Kunzru are quite sufficient to preclude the possibility of a snatch vote. As regards the Indian States it is too much to expect from their present state of development that they will be able to introduce anything like democratic institutions in the near future. Some of them have not even got a Sanitary Committee and it is hopeless to expect them to have elections on any democratic basis. Therefore part 2 of the resolution allows that representatives of Indian States may be nominated for such time as it would be expedient or desirable.

Lastly, we claim that there shall be no indirect election to the federal legislature. No doubt the Simon Commission has stated and to some extent rightly that the constituencies being very large the candidate is not able to get into touch with his electorate. We concede that to a certain extent that our constituencies are too large and at certain times it is not possible to get into touch with them, particularly in the monsoon. But the educative effect of an election carried on throughout the whole district is so very great that even at the expense of some wrong people getting in, it is better to have a direct election.

I need not dilate on the other part of the resolution. I hope it will be carried with acclamation.

Mr. S. M. Bose.

Mr. S. M. Bose (Bengal) said: I cordially support this resolution which has been so ably moved and seconded. Very little indeed has been left to be said on the important matters. I only cordially support the moving appeal made by the mover to the Indian Princes to come forward and join the cause with us so that we shall soon form a strong and united India and take our rightful place in the world. With these few words I support the resolution.

The resolution was put to the vote and carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 7.

RESIDUARY POWERS.

Residuary
Powers.
Mr. G. M. Gupte.

Mr. G. M. Gupte said: PRESIDENT, BROTHER DELEGATES, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The resolution that is in my name reads thus:

That exhaustive lists as far as possible of central and provincial subjects be made and the central government be vested with power to deal with any matter affecting the whole country that may not have been anticipated and put in the central list.

Residuary
Powers.
Mr. G. M. Gupte.

Taking the resolution as it stands the first part suggests that an exhaustive list should be made. It is but essential that the sphere of work of each of the legislatures should be carefully demarcated. It was necessary in order to prevent overlapping that definite proposals should be made in regard to the provincial and central services. I hope the resolution will be carried.

Mr. R. S. Navalkar said: I have great pleasure in seconding the resolution that has been moved by Mr. Gupte. The resolution divides itself into two parts. The first part is limited to the classification of subjects which shall be treated as central and provincial. As complete provincial autonomy is the goal of provincial governments, this list has to be as exhaustive as possible, so that the constitution in the provinces should be permanent and self developing. The interference of the Federal Government has necessarily to be limited to such matters as may be deemed necessary to secure the administration of federal subjects and to discharge its responsibility for the subjects defined in the constitution as of all India concern. The range of provincial subjects will be so defined as to give them the greatest possible measure of self Government. There shall be no reserved subjects in the Provinces but there shall be complete transfer of financial control as well as of law and order to ministers. As regards purely provincial matters no previous sanction of the Federal Government will be made a condition precedent to the passing of any enactments. The second part of the resolution confers residuary powers on the Central Government to deal with any subjects not put in any list of Central or provincial subjects. With these words I commend this resolution for your acceptance.

Mr. R. S.
Navalkar.

The resolution was put to the vote and carried unanimously.

The President: I have to put the next resolution from the chair. It runs as follows:

Government of
States:
The President:

RESOLUTION NO. 8.
GOVERNMENT OF STATES.

The National Liberal Federation, while recognising the maintenance of internal autonomy and sovereignty of States, hopes and trusts that the rulers of States will seriously consider the desirability of gradually making their administrations approximate to the system of administration in British India.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

The President then said: Before we proceed to the next resolution I have been asked to inform you that a telegram has been received that Dr. Annie Besant who wanted to come here to take part in the proceedings has been prevented from doing so by reason of ill-health. I have no doubt that all of you wish her a speedy restoration of complete health and hope that she will once more be able to help us in service of our motherland.

Mr. J. N. Basu of Calcutta will move the next resolution.

Mr. J. N. Basu said: I move the following resolution:

RESOLUTION NO. 9.

DEFENCE.

Defence.
Mr. J. N. Basu.

The National Liberal Federation is of opinion that Defence should be a reserved subject under the Governor-General during a transitional period, its duration should be fixed by statute, and provision should be made on the following lines regarding Defence during such period :—

1. The expenditure should be fixed for five years and revised every five years by a committee of an equal number of experts nominated by the Governor-General and of members elected by the Legislature.
2. The amount so fixed should be at the disposal of the Governor-General without a vote of the Legislative Assembly in this behalf but without prejudice to its right of discussion.
3. Any excess over that amount should be the subject of a demand for grant which will have to be voted by the Assembly.

4. The Governor-General should, in the event of hostilities on the Frontier, have the further power of declaring an emergency and appropriating supply to meet it without prior reference to the Legislature. But he should report his action to it and it should have the right of discussion.
5. A definite scheme for the Indianisation of the Defence Forces including officers and men within a specified time as far as practicable should be immediately propounded and the provision of facilities for the training of Indians for service in all arms of defence so as to complete the process within a specified period should be in charge of a Minister responsible to the Legislature.

Defence.
Mr. J. N. Basu.

I do not think many words of mine are required to commend this resolution to your acceptance. For over half a century we have been striving to attain self-rule to be masters in our own home, we have all along urged that whatever powers may be given to us in the matter of the internal economy of our home we cannot really be masters if someone else, not ourselves, look after the defence of our home. We cannot help having a feeling that we are merely pawns in somebody else's game. This feeling of helplessness was keenly felt during the last Great War. You are all aware that towards the commencement of the war nearly the whole of the British contingent in India and a very good proportion of the Indian troops were taken away to foreign theatres of war leaving India almost depleted of troops and of war material. We were in a helpless condition. It was only because most of the theatres of war were at a distance from India that we continued to live on. Gentlemen, can we agree to such state of things continuing any longer. We have had proclamations, we have had preambles and we have had acts telling us of what rights we ought to have. But whatever rights we may acquire or are given to us will be of no use unless we have the right to defend our own homes, to defend our own country. Gentlemen, ever since the British commenced to have political control over India you will have noticed that gradually they ceased to make use of after nearly a century Indian talent in the matter of the conduct of our defence until faculties which were very much alive at

Defence.
Mr. J. N. Basu.

the start have become paralysed by inaction. We have no longer Hyder Alis and Tipoo Sultans and Ranjit Singhs and many other persons whom I can name. They are not ancient legendary heroes. Well, it is time that we asserted the right that we undoubtedly should have in looking after and controlling the defence of our own country. In considering this question you will have noticed from the report of the Defence Sub-Committee of the Round Table Conference that there is hardly any difference in views between the British delegates and those that went from India to the Conference that there should be Indianisation. But at the same time you will have noticed that the pace of Indianisation has been left indefinite. We want to be fit in modern methods of war, in all arms, infantry, military engineering, aviation and various other matters. There was an assurance given by the Government in England that apart from the outcome of the Round Table Conference steps should immediately be taken to establish institutions for military training of Indians in this country. These are matters which require attention immediately irrespective of the Round Table Conference and this resolution, as you will have noticed, calls attention to the fact that a time limit should be fixed during which Indianisation should be effected. It recognises the fact that at the present moment we have not a sufficient body of officers and of trained commanders to take charge of an army in this country. But we must have an undertaking that the training will be taken in hand immediately and that the training should be such that within a certain number of years we can have a body of officers and commanders ready to take up the work of defence of our country in their hands. Gentlemen, the resolution says that, to start with, the Governor-General will have control over the army and as he will have control over the army, he will fix the sum required for army expenditure which will not be subject to the vote of the Legislature. That will continue for a period of five years. At the end of five years there will be a revision by an independent court, and if at the end of five years we find that we have a sufficient number of trained officers we will have the Indian units officered by Indians and we must ask the British Government to take away a corresponding number of British units from India because as you all know the British units cost nearly five times as much as Indian units and we are a very poor country. A great deal of the money which we require for the spread of education, for

looking after public health and various other matters is swallowed up by the army. It is likely that in a self-governing India our neighbours will be more friendly and will have less distrust of India, so that there may not be occasion hereafter to have the big army that we have at the present day. I will not take up your time any longer. I commend this resolution to your acceptance.

Defence.
Mr. J. N. Basu

Mr. A. D. Shroff, in seconding the resolution, said :

BROTHER DELEGATES, LADIES and GENTLEMEN : I have great pleasure in seconding the resolution so ably moved by my senior Liberal brother, Mr. Basu. The subject of defence is perhaps the most important subject that affects the constitutional position of any country. It supplies what I may call the effective sanction behind any government. Recognising that fact I think even the most rabid nationalist in India has to admit if he is prepared to face facts that the time has not yet come for us to demand full control over our army. I will not take you into the reasons why that demand cannot be placed before the British Parliament today. Suffice it to say that we are not prepared at this moment to demand full control over our army. It is for that reason that the resolution says that for a transitional period the control should be vested in the Governor-General. But the resolution specifically provides that the transitional period is to my mind this that unless you fix the transitional period the anxiety to Indianise the army might slacken and the pace of Indianisation might be such as to remain only a dream. I want to confine myself to clause 2 of the resolution. The military expenditure of India is perhaps the weakest point in the British administration of India. If there was nothing else to condemn the British Government, this fact of maintaining an enormous military expenditure in the country at the sacrifice of the development of the nation building department, I think, would be sufficient to condemn British rule in India. I shall not quote any other figures except the most authoritative figures given by Sir Walter Layton, the financial adviser to the Simon Commission. On this question he says the military expenditure absorbs on an average 62½ per cent of the taxable revenue of the central government of India. Against that look at the military expenditure of the British Government which of course has much wider interests to defend and I find from the latest budget presented by Mr. Snowden that he wanted £. 109,000,000 including army, navy and other forces out of a

Mr. A. D. Shroff.

Defence.
Mr. A. D. Shroff.

total gross tax revenue of £. 680,000,000 which works out to a little over 16 per cent. against the 62½ per cent. of the military expenditure in India. Why the military expenditure should be so high in India is quite out of the question. Remember that military expenditure has to be high for the simple reason that we are under foreign domination, and the primary object of foreign domination cannot be anything else but to perpetuate that domination. That being so the military expenditure is I think self-explanatory but it is to be recognised that this burden of military expenditure has been there for the last century and it has gone on increasing since the last days of the last century and during the last 50 years crores upon crores of the hard-earned money of the Indian taxpayer has gone to meet expenditure on the frontiers of India which are not of strategical interest to this country alone but are of imperial interest. I should like to give you a few further comparative figures if they are needed to convince you of the enormity of the military expenditure of this country. The League of Nations who do propaganda work on the question of disarmament prepared some authoritative figures of the armamental expenditure of the important countries of the world compared to national income. I would read only a few. Great Britain shows a percentage of 3. France 4.6, Italy 4.3, Germany 1.3, U.S.A. 1.1, Australia 0.9, Sweden 2.5, and India, the land of poverty, 4.5. With the sole exception entirely of France whose position in matters of defence is different from that of India, India heads the list in army expenditure to the percentage of national income. I hope there is nobody here who wants further convincing on this question. If therefore the future government of India is to be really self-government, that is to say if it is to be a government to look after the nation building departments such as education, sanitation, industry and general economy of the country, that government will have to find money and resources and such resources cannot be found except by the reduction of the enormous military expenditure. It is for this reason that the resolution provides that expenditure on the army shall be fixed for a period of five years by a committee of experts and members nominated by the Legislature. It is no use simply criticising that the military expenditure is enormous. I should like you for a moment to consider why the expenditure is so large and how economy could be effected. In the first place I think that the army maintained in India is too large for Indian purposes. A peace-loving country like India with crores of population, a country that could be kept under foreign

domination with only 60,000 British soldiers, should not require such a huge army maintained on war footing. There are other reasons why the size of the army should be reduced. Fortunately for us we have certain land frontiers which provide natural defence. We have also the forward policy of the frontier, a policy enunciated in the eighties of the last century and a policy that has proved disastrous to Indian public finances. Our army I think can be considerably reduced. If the Indian army is in future used only for Indian defence purposes and not sent to foreign countries for imperial purposes as hitherto it can stand considerable reduction.

Defence.
Mr. A. D. Shroff.

Over and above all that you hear a lot today about disarmament all over the world. Is not India going to share in that disarmament? I suggest for all these reasons it should be quite possible to reduce the size of the army considerably. One method of reducing the expenditure is to Indianise the army. I will give you a few interesting figures which I am sure will convince you that real, sincere and serious Indianisation of the army cannot but effectively reduce our army expenditure. Last year we had 7,031 British officers in the Indian army with an average pay and allowance of Rs. 8,857 and 60,000 British soldiers at an average of Rs. 984. On the other hand we had 156,000 Indian officers and soldiers whose average cost came to only Rs. 241-8-0. The average cost of the British officer and soldier comes to Rs. 1,525 as compared with the Indian officer and soldier who costs only Rs. 241-8-0. Over and above the pay and allowances of the British army you have to incur various other charges such as the capitation charges, non-effective charges like pensions etc., which work out to Rs. 585 per head. These figures I think are sufficient to indicate the extent to which it is possible to reduce the expenditure, if sincere efforts were made to Indianise the army. I am not suggesting that you can Indianise the army within a year. It must take time but if there is a serious beginning made now within a measurable distance of time it will be possible to have an army which we can call our own.

There is another aspect of the military expenditure in India. I for one think that even with the transfer of commerce and industry to Indian hands we shall not get effective control over the industrial development of the country as long as the control of the army is vested in non-Indian hands. Here

Defence.
Mr. A. D. Shroff.

again I should like to revert to another aspect of the military expenditure. The organisation of the Indian army is something like a self-sufficient state within a state. It is organised on lines where it has its own factories for manufacturing ordnances, bakeries, dairies, flour mills, grass farms etc. These industrial establishments in the army cost every year Rs. 3½ crores and employ something like 20,000 men. The various stores purchases by the army come to Rs. 6½ crores a year. Generally if these establishments and services were to continue in non-Indian hands I for one fail to see how we are going to develop our trade and industry in the country. Further the Indian army spends every year something like Rs. 285 lacs on transportation. Out of this nearly Rs. 89,00,000 is spent over the movement of English troops backwards and forwards. This money goes into the pockets of the British shipping companies, the chairman of one of which had the cheek to tell us the other day that India was not ripe for Dominion Status. That sum of Rs. 90,00,000 which is spent every year for the profit of British companies could be saved to support Indian companies like the Scindia Company. Unless therefore the control of this patronage in the matter of purchase of stores and services is transferred to Indian hands we shall not be said to have got effective Dominion Status.

There is much to be said on other parts of the resolution but I should like to stop here after stressing the point that our demand for the Indianisation of the army is based not on pure sentiment nor is it inspired by racial considerations. The demand for Indianisation is made imperative by the crying needs of the nation building departments which have been starved, by the immense potentialities of commerce and industry in the extensive patronage enjoyed by the army department. Lastly this demand is made imperative for the completion of our position as a self-governing member of the commonwealth of nations known as the British Empire. (applause.)

Mr. Surendranath Varma (U.P.) said : Mr. PRESIDENT LADIES and GENTLEMEN : The resolution which has been so ably moved and seconded hardly needs a lengthy speech to support it. It is a necessary corollary to the resolution and scheme of Federal Government which you adopted a few minutes ago. The Federal Scheme has been described as the substance of independence. If it is our good fortune to achieve that substance it is inevitable that we should be equipped with means

to protect the same, for you are all aware that ever since the days of Alexander the Great our country has been the object of numerous invasions and the least that we can do is to provide for our defence for future contingencies. The resolution itself is simple, clear and definite and it is also cautious. It is not an ambitious resolution. It reserves defence at the outset, then after a transitory period it proposes that we should be put in charge of our defence. It ought to have been possible for a population of over three hundred millions to manage their defence straightaway but on account of causes over which we had no control, and in the history of which we need not go, we are not able to provide for our defence immediately. In these circumstances it is necessary that for a transitory period the matter should be a reserved subject. It is not a matter for pride but it is a necessary caution. Then it provides a minimum expenditure for five years over which the legislature will have no control. This also is necessary for there is just a possibility for a new legislature, in their over anxiety for economy, of hazarding dangerous retrenchments and it is for that reason that a minimum has been prescribed. If a further sum is needed the legislature will have a voice and it will have control. Further on there is a provision for emergency, for times of war when it may not be possible to summon the session of the legislature, as is provided for in the constitution of every other country. Then there is a provision for a definite scheme of Indianisation. Like the reports of other Committees and Sub-Committees of the Round Table Conference in London the report of the Committee in charge of army and Defence is indefinite and vague and it has been very rightly argued in this resolution that a definite scheme and a specified time may be prescribed, if we are being granted Dominion Status or the Substance of Independence. If it is not possible for us to see a distance of time when we can take charge of our defence, then it does not come with good grace for us to demand the Substance of Independence now and immediately. It has been very rightly urged by this resolution that a specified time should be fixed and it is for the experts and those who are qualified to judge to specify that time. It would not take us very long to build up our own machinery of defence and as I have already said it will be really a very awkward position for any country claiming to live as a dominion, claiming to have a position of self-respect along with other nations in the commonwealth and outside the commonwealth. It will really be very awkward and humilia-

Defence.
Mr. Surendranath
Varma.

Defence.
Mr. Surendranath
Varma.

ting if we continue to depend upon foreign agencies even if it be a British agency, to protect us. For these reasons it is my pleasure to place this resolution for your acceptance.

The resolution was put to vote and carried unanimously.

The Hon'ble Sir Phiroze Sethna then moved the following resolution :—

RESOLUTION No. 10.

SAFEGUARDS.

Safeguards.
Sir Phiroze
Sethna.

(a) The National Liberal Federation is of opinion that the "Governor-General's special powers" should be limited to cases where there is a breakdown of the constitution by reason of serious disturbance of the peace likely to involve the country as a whole.

(b) The Federation is of opinion that while the "service of loans and the salaries and pensions of persons appointed on guarantees by the Secretary of State, should be secured along with the supply required for the reserved departments (subject in respect of defence in the foregoing resolution) "as Consolidated fund charges," no power with regard to finance should be vested in the Governor-General except that as regards external loans, provisions similar to those contained in other dominion constitutions may be embodied in the Indian constitution."

(c) The Federation disapproves of the "Safeguards" proposed at the Round Table Conference vesting power in the Governor-General to override the Finance Minister in the matter of Exchange and Currency, borrowing and budgetary arrangements and is of opinion that the necessary safeguards in this behalf for the transitional period may be secured, if necessary, by the creation of a Statutory Financial Council till a Reserve Bank is established.

(d) The National Liberal Federation regrets that the policy pursued by the Government of India with regard to Exchange resulting in frittering away the gold resources of the country is calculated indefinitely to postpone the establishment of a Reserve Bank.

Hon. Sir Phiroze Sethna :—LADIES and GENTLEMEN, if there was one question more than another during the discussions of the Round Table Conference which baffled the ingenuity of the members I have no hesitation in saying that it was this question of safeguards. The reason is self evident. We, by which I mean the Indian members, wanted as few safeguards as possible whereas on the other side attempt was made that the safeguards should be as many as possible in order that there might be a continuity of the existing policy of the Government of India. Now, the first question is whether safeguards are at all necessary or otherwise. In this connection let me read to you a passage from the speech made by the Prime Minister on the last day of the Round Table Conference. He observed:—

Safeguards.
Sir Phiroze
Sethna.

“Safeguarding:—I do not like the word. It is a word which quite naturally arouses great suspicion in you hearts. It is a word the aspects and the meaning and the connotations and the associations of which are rather forbidding. Let us apply common-sense to it”. A little further he added: “And my Indian colleagues, you can twist and you can turn a blind eye to this and a blind eye to that. You can draft with care and you can hide up what really is the substance of your draft, but if you were drafting your own constitution without any outside assistance or consultation you could not draft a constitution without embodying safeguards of that kind in it”!

Well, ladies and gentlemen, it cannot be denied that if there are safeguards in more advanced countries than India we cannot possibly, at any rate during the transitional period in the history of our country, avoid safeguards. It was, therefore that we had to agree to a certain number of safeguards which you find in the records of the Conference. But I have no hesitation in saying that immediately on our return we were faced by our friends and taxed for having given in to a much larger extent than we should have done in the interests of the country. They advanced many reasons, some of which have appealed to us and it is because of what was urged as the result of happenings since we left London in January last and to which I will refer to later, that the National Liberal Federation has framed the resolution as I have moved it.

Safeguards.
Sir Phiroze
Sethna.

You will notice that even in this resolution we have agreed to certain safeguards, as for example, giving absolute power to the Governor-General in the case of a breakdown of the constitution. We also agreed to the safeguard that such guarantees as might have been given in the matter of service by the Secretary of State to officers who have come out from England should be upheld and such other matters. At the Round Table Conference we went further and the Governor-General was given far more safeguards than the country as a whole is prepared to agree to. For example there is the question of giving power to the Governor-General himself in regard to matters of exchange and currency as well as in the matter of borrowing and budgetary arrangements so long and until a Reserve Bank is established. In our defence as delegates let me explain that it was pointed out to us in London that in spite of difficulties a Reserve Bank could certainly be established in India within a very reasonable time and therefore we saw no objection to this safeguard being left in the hands of the Governor-General. We now find that a Reserve Bank cannot possibly be established within a reasonably short time. This is what I alluded to a little while ago. We were not cognisant of the fact when we left England that whilst we were on the voyage, that during that fortnight a considerable amount of gold was transferred from India to England. It is this transfer which in the opinion of experts makes it almost impossible to start a Reserve Bank in this country for a long time to come. Therefore, if conditions had changed so materially within a fortnight and they have been worse since, we have a perfect right to change the opinion that we had formed in England. In that connection I would like to quote a sentence which has already been quoted by my friend Pandit Hirdaya Nath Kunzru. It was in a speech again of the Prime Minister himself. He said addressing the Indian delegates:—

“You have spoken here subject to reconsideration, subject to the reaction which your public opinion will show to your work. We Government and Parliamentary representatives alike have spoken in the same way and we must also listen to reactions.”

This means, ladies and gentlemen, that it is perfectly open to us to correct any mistakes we may have made or any hasty conclusions we may have arrived at. In fact this is the policy propounded right throughout. Any arrangement we made was temporary and if we are now satisfied that some safeguards will not suit India for the reasons I have endeavoured to explain

then nobody can blame us if we go back and demand that the question be re-opened. We shall certainly ask that such matters be re-opened and so far as we members of the Federation are concerned we shall take a mandate from you in terms of the resolution you will pass today.

Safeguards-
Sir Phiroze
Sethna.

Prof. V. K. Jog said : Mr. PRESIDENT, LADIES and GENTLEMEN, I have great pleasure in seconding the resolution which has been commended to you for your acceptance so ably and eloquently by Sir Phiroze Sethna. I do not wish to cover the ground which he had already covered so well. I shall therefore say only one word in support of this resolution. Ladies and gentlemen, we have been criticised in one section of the press that our demand is for complete autonomy without any safeguards. It is said that having accepted the principle of safeguards our attempt now was to go back upon that principle and to criticise the safeguards proposed in the Sankey Scheme in a destructive spirit. The resolution that we passed some time ago on defence and the resolution that now before us together constitute a complete answer to that criticism. We do not propose to go back upon the principle of safeguards. Ladies and gentlemen, I am sure, you will all agree with me that it is one thing to accept the principle of safeguards and it is another thing to say ditto to whatever has been proposed in the Sankey Scheme. The Liberals never committed themselves to that policy and as our President pointed out to us the other day we have always retained to ourselves complete freedom to criticise the proposals made in the Sankey Scheme so as to improve upon them. In the two resolutions that I have just referred to we have made constructive recommendations about these safeguards, in regard to defence and in regard to emergencies that may arise and might result in the breakdown of the constitution. We have also made constructive recommendations in regard to the financial proposals and so on. We have made constructive proposals and these two resolutions constitute a complete onset to our critics. I hope we shall have silenced these critics by our resolutions. I am sure the resolution will be carried with acclamation.

Prof. V. K. Jog.

Mr. B. S. Dabke in supporting the resolution said : Sir Phiroze Sethna was the member of the Round Table Conference and he has knowledge of what actually passed during the discussion in the Committee of the Round Table Conference on "safe-guards." He has dealt with this resolution generally and particularly the clauses A, B and C. I shall reserve my remarks to the clause D of this resolution.

Mr. B. S. Dabke.

Safeguards.
Mr. B. S. Dabke.

The Federal Structure Sub-Committee has laid down as a fundamental condition of the success of the new constitution that "No room should be left for doubts as to the ability of India to maintain her financial stability and credit, both at Home and abroad. It would, therefore, be necessary to reserve to the Governor-General in regard to the budgetary arrangements, and borrowing such essential powers as would enable him to intervene if methods were being pursued which would, in his opinion, seriously prejudice the credit of India in the money markets of the world."

The Sub-Committee has further recommended that "with a view to ensuring confidence in the management of Indian Credit and Currency, efforts should be made to establish on sure foundations, and free from any political influence, as early as may be found possible, a Reserve Bank, which will be entrusted with the management of the Currency and Exchange."

From the observations of the Federal Structure Sub-Committee, it is obvious that the powers of the Governor-General to intervene into the sphere of Finance, Currency and Exchange, will not be transferred to the elected Finance Member of the Central Government, as long as the Reserve Bank is not established. But for starting a Reserve Bank a huge amount of gold will be required.

The Indian Members of the Sub-Committee of the Round Table Conference were led away by the assurances of the Federal Structure Sub-Committee and especially those of Lord Reading that this safe-guard about Currency and Exchange and the power of the Governor-General to intervene will automatically vanish the moment the Reserve Bank is established. The Indian Members of the R. T. C. were ignorant about the possibility of the establishment of a Reserve Bank in the near future, in view of the present depleted gold Reserve of the paper currency and the reduced capacity of India to absorb gold from the world markets as she used to do in the past. India generally draws gold from the rest of the world markets in settlement of her favourable balance of trade. If we look to the figures of gold imports into India for the last 10 or 12 years, we find that India's absorption of gold is gradually dwindling down. India imported gold in the 5 years from 1921-22 to 1924-25, on an average Rs 36.45 crores of gold per year during these five years.

In 1925/26,	she imported gold worth	Rs. 35.23	Crores,
In 1926/27,	" " " " " "	Rs. 19.50	" " "
In 1927/28,	" " " " " "	Rs. 18.13	" " "
In 1928/29,	" " " " " "	Rs. 21.22	" " "
In 1929/30,	" " " " " "	Rs. 14.23	" " "
In 1930/31,	" " " " " "	Rs. 13.35	" " "

Safeguard.
Mr. B. S. Dabke

But in 1930/31, gold worth Rs. 2.8 crores and odd has been paid into the currency Reserve and therefore, the nett absorption of gold by the Indian public is not Rs. 13.35 crores but only about Rs. 10½ crores.

Now for starting a Reserve Bank "Hilton-Young" Currency Commission has laid down that a gold backing of 40% of the notes in circulation plus gold worth Rs. 50 crores for silver coins in circulation will be required. We have hardly 1/3 of that gold which is necessary for starting a Reserve Bank according to the scheme of the Hilton Young Commission. On the other hand whatever little gold reserves that we have, are now being frittered away by the currency authority in India.

On 31st March 1929 gold bullion in India, in the paper currency reserve was worth about Rs. 32.22 crores. Besides, there were gold securities held in England of paper currency Reserve, worth Rs. 10.69 crores. Thus the value of the gold in the paper currency Reserve was worth about Rs. 43 crores. But since the return to India of the Indian Members of the R. T. C. and since the publication of Federal Structure Committee's report, India has lost on an average Rs. 26 crores worth of gold, averaging Rs. one crore per week by the end of July 1931. Mr. President, you will, therefore, see that there is no possibility of starting a Reserve Bank as soon as possible.

Besides, there is an unprecedented fall in the prices of all the primary commodities in the world and India being an agricultural country, is very largely affected by this fall in price, and the prices of her exportable commodities, which are valued most in all the Western Countries, have fallen in most cases below the cost of production. There is thus the least possibility of trade recovery in such a way as to enable India, to draw huge amounts of gold from the rest of the world in settlement of her favourable balance of trade. Thus there is absolutely no possibility for India to accumulate large quantities of gold to enable her to start a Reserve Bank at least during the next 10 years or so.

Safeguards.
Mr. B. S. Dabke.

I do not at all intend to attribute motives to the English Members of the Federal Structure Sub-Committee of the R. T. C. when they laid down that as long as the Reserve Bank is not established, the portfolio of Finance Currency and Exchange should not be transferred to the elected Member, but when one considers that the Federal Structure Sub-Committee was quite aware of the fact about the inability of India to start a Reserve Bank immediately in view of the lack of sufficient gold reserve for same and in spite of this knowledge when the Federal Structure Committee imposes the condition about starting of the Reserve Bank, one is forced to the irresistible conclusion that the condition to start a Reserve Bank is deliberately laid down to delay the transfer of the power over Finance, currency and exchange to an elected popular Minister of the Central Government, and thus to introduce Diarchy in the Central Government. This means no power over purse, and no responsibility at the centre and as a consequence, the present method of starving the nation-building departments is to continue indefinitely.

With these observations, Sir, I commend this resolution for your acceptance and I hope that you will carry it with acclamation. The resolution was carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION No. 11.

TRADING RIGHTS.

Trading Rights.
Mr. B. S. Kamat.

Mr. B. S. Kamat said : Mr. PRESIDENT, LADIES and GENTLEMEN, the next resolution is about the trading rights of the British commercial community and the respective rights of Indians. I shall read to you the resolution as it stands on paper:—

“The National Liberal Federation is unable to accept the proposal embodied in clause 14 of the Minorities Committee's report unless it is made clear that the future Government of India will have complete freedom to take measures for promotion of basic trades and industries.

We are all aware, gentlemen, the Britisher came to India for trade. We should not, therefore, be surprised if he should cherish his trading rights and be unwilling to part with them at a time when Great Britain is lessening her grip on India under the new constitution. In order therefore that there should be a clear understanding between the British commercial community and India on this question our delegates tried to arrive at a formula at the Round Table Conference in Janu-

ary last. They made two or three attempts at an agreed formula but unfortunately the final formula evolved is not satisfactory. If you carefully read the formula you can see the ambiguity ; It shall try to make clear to you how far we disagree on that formula. The second formula which came up before the Conference was as follows : It was agreed that the rights of the future by means of a commercial convention or otherwise the rights of British commercial community should be guaranteed that is, enjoy equal rights with Indian born subjects. Now, you will notice here that what the British commercial community wanted was equality of trading rights with Indian-born subjects. Now, our representatives at the Conference made it clear that Indian public opinion demanded that the future Government of India should be in a position to protect Indian industries and also to promote basic industries. Our representatives, chiefly from Bombay viz. our friends Sir Pheroz Sethna, Mr. H. P. Mody and others stressed this point. It was also urged that this right of discrimination should be given to India for the main reason that Indian industries are lagging behind and everything must be done to promote such industries. You will recognise I am sure that it is but the fundamental right of the nationals of any country to do all that might be necessary to protect the industries of that country despite certain vested interests. Such a formula in spite of the protests of our friends was not agreed to and they decided to have an improved formula towards the week-end and at that stage the Conference adjourned. On the insistence of the British commercial community the principle was generally agreed that there should be no discrimination between the rights of the British commercial communities, firms and companies trading in India and the rights of Indian-born subjects. This is in my opinion an unfortunate decision. We disagree with this resolution because Indian public opinion demands that there should be reserved to Indian the right of discriminating, where necessary.

Trading Rights.
Mr. B. S. Kamat.

It must be remembered that Lord Reading and Lord Peel have made it clear at the Round Table Conference that any agreed decisions at that stage were to be considered as provisional. We have therefore a right to express public opinion on this important question in order that our representatives at the next session may re-open the point and revise these decisions and arrive at a formula in the light of public opinion in India. Public opinion it has been evident, is perfectly clear on this point. Let it be made clear, however

Trading Rights.
Mr. B. S. Kamat.

that we do not want to disturb vested interests. The British people who have sunk their capital in India shall be as safe under the new regime as they are now. Similarly, let me also make it clear that so far as ordinary trade and commerce is concerned, British firms and companies will be perfectly safe and shall be entitled to do their ordinary vocation namely of exporting commodities. The question of discrimination only comes in extreme cases, in restricting new applications for business, e. g. for mining rights or similar rights. In other words what we really like to reserve is the power that there should be no undue competition by virtue of superior organisation or resources of Britain so as to secure to her a permanent exploitation of India in commercial matters through British companies acquiring trading rights in India. Now it might be argued that because Great Britain is releasing her hold on India, it would not look graceful to claim this right. But as I said before every Government in the world reserves this right to itself. Take Japan for instance. The Japanese Government have the right to impose certain restrictions against foreign companies wanting to do, say, banking in Japan. The bulk of the money collected by the Indian insurance companies, to take another case, is drained away to other countries. For these reasons, I contend it is but right that we should have the power, we should reserve to ourselves the fundamental right of making discrimination, where necessary in the interests of those nationals who wish to start Indian enterprise. Further again it is argued that the British people would be willing to concede reciprocity in our favour. But that sort of concession will not be a sufficient attraction. We are hardly likely to gain much by reciprocal trading rights. On these grounds I trust this resolution will be found acceptable to you. I beg to move the same for your acceptance.

Mr. G. B. Trivedi (Bombay) addressing the meeting in Gujarat said : I have great pleasure in seconding this resolution. The question has aroused great interest both in England and India. At the Round Table Conference Lord Reading cleverly pushed it in and our representatives who were unprepared and in a hurry gave it their approval with a mild reservation. On their return they were received with much opposition on account of their mild stand. The Indian Merchants' Chamber exposed the hollowness of the British traders' claim. The question has now gained a momentum and even the Europeans have realised that it is impossible to maintain their unfair demand. Mahatma Gandhi has thrown his weight on the side

of the Indian opposition and his example of wolf and lamb has had a telling effect. British traders by the help and patronage of Indian Government have gained certain preferential rights which cannot be maintained under a Swaraj Government. In all countries the rights of nationals in certain essential trades and industries have been recognised for being reserved as against foreigners. It is so in Canada, in Australia and in the United States and in almost all the European countries as so well stated in a most reasoned speech of Sir Chunilal Mehta at the last quarterly meeting of the Indian Merchants' Chamber. In today's *Narvajivan* is published the case of the Indian coal. The coal of an Indian owned coal mine was classed second class whereas the same coal was classed first class when a European purchased the coal mine. The reservation of the coastal navigation is a test case and the Scindia Navigation Company would be strangled to death if it has to fight against a company like the British India Steam Navigation Company. This is not a political question but an economic question and India asserts her right of being a mistress of her own household.

Trading Rights.
Mr. G. B. Trivedi.

I hope our representatives at the next session of the Round Table Conference will stand by Mahatma Gandhi in his demand for this national right.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION No. 12.

THE INDIAN DEBT QUESTION.

Mr. A. D. Shroff next moved:

The National Liberal Federation, whilst unreservedly denouncing all suggestions for repudiation of India's public debt by any future Government of the country, is of opinion that, in view of the various financial obligations imposed hitherto on India, an impartial and independent tribunal be appointed to investigate and decide the nature and extent of adjustment between Great Britain and India on the eve of the transference of power from the British Parliament to responsible Indian Government.

The Indian
Debt Question.
Mr. A. D. Shroff.

Speaking on the resolution Mr. Shroff said :

FELLOW DELEGATES, LADIES and GENTLEMEN: In explaining the object of this resolution I should like to point out at the

The Indian Debt
Question.

Mr. A. D. Shroff.

outset that the heading of the resolution is not very appropriate. It is not really the Indian debt question. As I will show later, it has very little to do with the present public debt of India. I will take the resolution in parts. A lot has been said about repudiation of India's public debt. I am prepared to admit that when the question was mooted by the Congress a few years ago a definite suggestion was conveyed to the world that repudiation of India's public debt was intended but subsequently that position has been considerably modified and in the latest expounding of the case it has been made perfectly clear that nobody in India stands for repudiation. A body like the Indian National Liberal Federation must definitely pronounce that no sane person in India is for repudiation of India's public debt because such a suggestion is still being exploited by the enemies of India to thwart and obstruct India's progress towards political liberty. This resolution will serve the purpose of telling the world in terms absolutely unequivocal that India does not contemplate and sane persons in India will never tolerate any such repudiation. Ladies and gentlemen, let me tell you one or two reasons why it is the duty of every sane Indian to denounce such a suggestion. If there is one factor more than another which has been brought into the world by the last war it is the greater internationalisation of the different parts of the world. What I mean is the interdependence of the different parts of the world upon one another has been expanding and today there is no single part of the world which is not influenced in its daily life by international influences. India therefore cannot afford to be an isolated unit in the world. India must establish friendly contract with other parts of the world and that being so there should not be the slightest suspicion in any part of the world that India will ever encourage the violation of her plighted word though that word may have been given in the name of India by an irresponsible and bureaucratic government of the past. Gentlemen, the investment markets particularly in London have for some time past been affected by this bogey of repudiation. Our sworn enemies like Churchills and Beaverbrooks have not been honest enough to appraise this question at its true value but have exploited it to its best advantage and have scared British widows and trustees into selling off their investments in India stocks raising the bogey that as soon as India is responsible for her own government she will repudiate the debts. That being so the first part of this resolution must stand.

Coming to the second part it appears there is not yet complete unanimity on the question amongst Liberals. I am afraid the lack of unanimity on this question is very considerably due to the fact that this question has assumed very great importance only in recent months. Uptil now it used to be considered one of the things of the dreamland. The movement of events in recent months has shown that the question has become now a practical live issue, a question which will require to be tackled in the coming months with great care and delicacy, a question to which we cannot any longer shut our eyes. I would refer for one moment to the equity of the question. Is it fair, right or just for India to make a claim like the one we are making in this resolution, to ask for an inquiry into the various obligations imposed hitherto on India? If there are people still living who are not convinced of the equity of this question, if there are people who still believe that such a case can only be made by rabid extremists, may I for one second invite their attention to what that prince of moderates among Indians, the late Mr. G. K. Gokhale said before the Welby Commission? The late Mr. Gokhale whose moderation nobody here or outside can doubt prepared a bill and presented it to the Welby Commission pointing out in very clear terms that certain expenditure which was incurred out of the revenues of India was foreign to the interests of India and therefore should be borne by the British Exchequer. If you will study the different items of the bill you will come across several items pertaining to expenditure on foreign wars. These are some of the items which we will have to include into the inquiry we are asking for. Besides this here are items of a different category. I particularly refer to an item like buying out the proprietors and directors of the East India Company, a body of traders who came to India for the purpose of trade and perhaps in a moment of absent-mindedness they became the rulers of this country. Because it was found that the East India Company should cease to be the rulers of this country and that the responsibility should be transferred to the British nation that company had been bought out and, look at the equity of it, India had to pay the price. That is a case which requires to be very closely investigated. I can mention a host of other items but I think it is sufficient to point out that if we set about seriously to collect materials we can make out to my mind an overwhelming case to be placed before an independent and impartial tribunal to decide to what extent we are entitled to have refund of the moneys which were unjustly

The Indian
Debt Question.
Mr. A. D. Shroff.

The Indian Debt
Question.
Mr. A. D. Shroff.

spent out of our revenues. The authorities in this connection fortunately for us are in the majority of cases the past finance members of India, English statesmen like John Bright and others, and therefore, we need not be in the least diffident about the overwhelming strength of the case we propose to make out. If only the British nation would recognise the equity of the question and submit this question to be decided by an impartial tribunal, with an open and unbiassed mind we agree to abide by its decision.

There is one point I should like to make clear. As I told you, the resolution is not properly headed. One common criticism of our claim for an inquiry into these past transactions is that while our public debt consists of about Rs. 1,200 crores, nearly Rs. 800 crores relate to productive debt, that is to say, you have got railways, irrigation works etc. which give you a return of nearly 5 per cent. on the money you have spent and therefore, why should you complain about it? It appears to be forgotten by the layman that most of the transactions to which I referred were financed mainly out of additional taxes levied upon the taxpayer of India. I should particularly refer to the increase in the military expenditure after 1880 due mainly to our entanglements on the frontier. Every incident on the frontier was made the excuse for the enlargement of our army and the consequent increase in the military expenditure which continued to increase in the following years. All this expenditure was met out of increased taxes.

To come now to recent events. I am not one of those who would make our war gift to British as an item in the bill to be presented to Great Britain. But still I want to point out that crores and crores of Indian money have been spent during the war in financing operations of the allied army in Mesopotamia and Near Eastern battles, and crores of this Indian money has gone out of additional taxes. Therefore, it is not correct to say that what we are asking Great Britain to inquire into, is the present Indian public debt.

There is another matter. A very thick mist of prejudice has been created against the consideration of this question on the publication of what is called the Congress Committee's report on this question. I do admit that opinions may differ and some extravagant claims are made in this report but that is no reason why the whole question should be condemned because of a few extravagant items included in the bill. There

is another criticism also made, that the case that India can make out on this question would be one-sided. Our Anglo-Indian friends from whom I wish God would spare us tell us: "You forget all the time that we have been paying for the naval protection you have had all these years." I admit about that naval protection but they seem to forget the other side of the picture that of all the frontiers of the Empire the north western frontier has been safeguarded absolutely at the expense of India, so we can offer a very valuable set-off against the naval protection given to us.

The Indian Debt
Question.
Mr. A. D. Shroff.

I hope I have made out a case for asking for an inquiry into the debt question. I am putting before you a simple matter-of-fact resolution on a question on which there could be perfect unanimity among Indians if only they would study the question a little further.

Mr. M. D. Alteker who seconded the resolution said: I have much pleasure in seconding the proposition moved by my friend Mr. Shroff. He has given several figures in connection with the subject. Therefore I need not worry you with them again. I will confine myself only to a few principles that underlie the question.

Mr. M. D. Alteker.

India is a poor country and she has many burdens to bear and she has been finding it very hard to bear them. Again the Reforms that have been granted from time to time to India by the British Government have the curious characteristic of adding to the expenditure every time. This is what happened when Montague introduced his reforms. He was a great friend of India and I count myself among those who have very high regard for him. At the same time it must be added that his reforms have cost India tremendously. Take the simple case of our own Presidency. Before Montague reforms came, it was in the first instance looked after by a Governor and two executive members and later on after the Morley-Minto-Reforms a third executive member, an Indian was added. Till 1921 these four men could very well look after the administration of the Presidency. Now there are four executive members and three ministers which to me appears to be a waste.

All this shows how imperative it is for India to look into every item of her expenditure and to reduce it if possible. The public debt of India is calculated at a very great figure and we must find out whether all that debt was incurred for India and in the interests of India. The resolution clearly

The Indian Debt
Question.
Mr. M.D. Altekér.

states that we repudiate the idea of repudiation. We want to take the responsibility of all debts for which we must take responsibility. At the same time we want to know exactly what is our position and for that purpose we are asking for an impartial inquiry. Now in order to make myself clear, I will give an instance of how expenditure may be incurred which has nothing to do either with the needs or the interests of the country. There is a young boy who has got a guardian and that guardian decides that the boy should go to England for his education. He also persuades himself to decide that he must accompany the boy to England in order to look after him. After the boy becomes a major some of his friends might think that the guardian need not have incurred the expenditure of his own visit to England. That view may be right or wrong but the guardian had taken that decision in a *bona fide* manner with a view to the interests of the boy and even supposing that the expenditure was unnecessary, I would say that it was incurred in the interests of the boy and that we cannot blame the guardian for it. But suppose the guardian while the boy goes to England for his education himself goes to Africa for lion hunting and puts down that expenditure to the account of the boy then I would say that the boy must not pay the expenses incurred for this lion hunting of his guardian.

That is how I look at this question of Indian debts. I want to know exactly how much of these debts were incurred for the expansion of the British Empire over the borders of India and how much of it was incurred for the purpose specifically in the interest of India. And if there are debts that were incurred for the expansion of the British Empire with which India had nothing to do then I should say to England please share that expense with us. I will quote the case of Burma. We never wanted to include Burma in India. Burma was conquered by the British for their own purposes and even now we will not mind the separation of Burma provided the interests of Indian residents there that have been created in recent times were properly satisfied. In this manner what we today want to know exactly is the position of our debts, how and why they were incurred and to strike a balance of accounts. That is not repudiation at all. As anybody can see this is only asking for correct accounts and balance adjustments of that kind between Great Britain and India. Those adjustments are a necessary thing when we are taking new responsibilities in the field of political reform and that way I support this resolution.

The resolution was put to the vote and carried unanimously.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir said: FELLOW DELEGATES, LADIES and GENTLEMEN, I move the following resolution:

RESOLUTION No. 13.

PROVINCIAL CONSTITUTION.

The National Liberal Federation of India, while generally approving of the recommendations of the Conference Sub-Committee on Provincial Constitution, is strongly opposed to the following majority recommendations. viz:

1. that the Governor should be endowed with special powers ; legislative and financial, for the maintenance of peace and tranquility, except that he may have emergency power to deal with a serious disturbance of peace and.
2. that second chambers should be established in some and may be established in other provinces.
3. It is the Federation's deliberate conviction that these two recommendations, if carried into effect, will materially detract from the autonomy of provinces and should be reconsidered.

When I had the privilege of addressing you the day before yesterday I referred to the conclusions arrived at the Round Table Conference by the Provincial Constitution Sub-Committee. There was one issue which was really a bone of contention. That issue is referred to in Para 1 of this resolution. There were some members of the committee who suggested that Governors should be endowed with special powers to maintain peace and safety in their provinces. Kindly note the word maintain. Now, ladies and gentlemen, some of you at least are familiar with the present Government of India Act. There is a section 52 (3) which has caused more trouble to the working of that Act than any other section. That Act gives power to Governors to override the decisions of ministers, not the executive members. They are on a different footing altogether; and when that Act was being considered in

Provincial Consti-
tution.
Sir Cowasji
Jehangir.

Provincial Con-
stitution.
Sir Cowasji
Jehangir.

joint committee we who took an interest in it were convinced that it was intended by the framers that the Governors so far as transferred departments were concerned should be constitutional Governors. But the interpretation placed on that section by Governors during the last ten years was very different and they believed that they had powers of interfering with their ministers whenever they had cause to differ and they did interfere. With that bitter experience before us it was not likely that we were going to be let in for another dangerous section in the new Act. It was contended that Governors should continue to have some power of interference. We were told, perhaps rightly, that ministers might make mistakes which might cause damage, material, social and otherwise to the provinces and that if the Governors were given powers of warning ministers we had nothing to object to, that after warning if Governors were given powers to interfere with the ministers' actions we would save a considerable amount of loss. Well, we have tried that experiment and we strongly insist that the Governors of provinces would have no powers of interference and that they should be constitutional Governors not only in theory but in practice. But we are prepared to admit that there might be a safeguard such as is included in other constitutions in the world a safeguard whereby some authority in Provinces it may happen to be the Governor should have power to interfere when a breakdown has actually occurred. In short the Governor should be there to pick up the bits when the Government has gone to pieces. But he should have no power to prevent that government from going to pieces. That is in short the first part of the resolution and those who have had any experience of the working of Provincial Governments will realise the importance of this resolution.

In a number of cases in which we did not agree with the British delegation we found ourselves in a majority. Most unfortunately on this point of great importance we found ourselves in a minority. I am not going to trouble you by giving you reasons as to why we were in a minority, when the constitution of the Committee shows that Indians were in a large majority. Let bygones be bygones. Gentlemen, I have alluded in my speech the day before yesterday to one of the causes which found us in a minority on this important question.

The second part of the resolution refers to second Chambers. There were many of our Indian friends from other provinces who strongly advocated second chambers for the pro-

vinces. The Sub-Committee as a whole were inclined to the conclusion that second chambers were not necessary. But some of our friends from other provinces were most insistent in their demand that we should not oppose them in their having second chambers in their own provinces. Well, gentlemen, you can realise that it is difficult to oppose the earnest request of the representative of a province when he asks that a provision should be made for his province alone and the majority of the Committee came to the conclusion that for those provinces whose representatives demanded second chambers that demand should be conceded. But for those provinces that had not put forward such a demand there was no necessity. But it left it open for all provinces to get second chambers if they so desired in the future. There were some members of the committee who were of the opinion that second chambers in Provincial Government was a retrograde step and would lead to a considerable amount of unnecessary friction and would also lead to the retrogression of social reform. The Liberal Federation must therefore definitely state that whatever may be the opinion of some in some provinces, no provinces should have second chambers. Those are the two points embodied in the resolution which I have the honour to place before you.

Provincial Con-
stitution.
Sir Cowasji
Jehangir.

Rao Bahadur R. R. Kale said: MR. PRESIDENT, BROTHER DELEGATES, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN; The resolution placed before you is rather obscurely worded. After passing the resolutions regarding the Federal Government, Army and so on in the earlier part of the day we are now nearer home, namely, to the Provincial Government, with which we are immediately concerned. There is an important part which the Provincial Sub-Committee of the Round Table Conference has laid down in its report and we are here called upon to express our opinion with regard to all those recommendations which are of a reactionary character. One recommendation is that the Governor of the Province should be endowed with special powers, both legislative and financial for the maintenance of peace and tranquility. That is one part and the second part is that there should be a second chamber. With regard to the former you will see that the first part of the resolution says that this Conference is opposed to the recommendation of the majority of the Sub-Committee. We want to express the opinion that while we would leave the Governor exceptional powers to meet an emergency we are opposed to giving him power for the ordinary administration wherein he may be called upon to

Rao Bahadur
R. R. Kale.

Provincial Con-
stitution:
Rao Bahadur
B. R. Kale.

maintain peace and tranquility. In other words you have been told by the proposer of this resolution who had the inside sight in the working of the Government of the day that the Governor under the present Government of India Act is endowed with powers whereby he can override the decisions of the ministers. Besides now we have diarchy. The department of law and order is a reserved department. That department is concerned with the maintenance of peace and tranquility in the country. Now under the future government this diarchy is to go away. We are to have provincial autonomy and the department of law and order will be a department under the control of a minister who will be responsible to the electorate who have sent him to the Council. If that is so, what is meant by still leaving the power of maintaining peace and tranquility with the Governor of a Province. I mean it is like giving a thing with one hand and taking it away with the other hand. Therefore we say that this decision or rather the opinion expressed by a majority of the committee; and I am glad to say that the President of our Federation, Sir Cowasji Jehangir and Sir Chimanlal Setalvad, who were members of this Committee, emphatically expressed an opinion that this is wrong. If you are going to give real Provincial autonomy then you must not endow the Governor with these exceptional powers. The Governor may be given certain reserve powers but they must be restricted to cases of emergency only and should not apply to the ordinary maintenance of law and tranquility. So the first part of the resolution says, by all means keep the reserve powers but not for the ordinary maintenance of law and order and for the day to day administration. Otherwise it would mean that the Governor could pass legislation without the consent of the Council. He may pass an order just as the ordinance of the Governor-General. I mean to say it is rather an extraordinary power which should not be vested in the Governor. Therefore, we members of the Conference must strengthen the hands of those representatives who are going to the Round Table Conference by expressing the point of view that in the future constitution whether it be Dominion Status or a Federal Constitution we should have a Provincial Governor who will be a constitutional Governor, who as Lord Willingdon said will be relieved of the trouble of looking after the onerous task of maintaining peace and tranquility in ordinary times. We say that just in other countries the Governor possesses only emergency powers and no other powers it is necessary to keep the powers of the Governor within proper limits. Similarly we

have no objection to giving special powers for emergencies but there should be no other power vested in him to override the ministers.

Provincial
Constitution.
Rao Bahadur
R. R. Kale.

Coming to the second part of the resolution, we are told that just as there are two houses in England there should be in some of the Provinces two Councils, one the lower chamber and the other the Upper chamber. Now, it is said in the report that the institution of a second chamber was claimed by certain representatives of the Round Table Conference and therefore it was given to them. Those Provinces to which these upper houses are given are the United Provinces, Bengal, Behar and Orrisa and the reason given is that because there were certain landlords who attended the Conference and who put forward a demand that they must have a second chamber there it was recommended. Now, the constitution of a second chamber is really undemocratic and out of place. At least so long as our lower chamber is to be constituted not of representatives of the communities only but also by representatives of institutions. The lower house is really not going to be a democratic body in the sense that the House of Commons is and so long as that is so it is no use having a second chamber. I therefore think that since there is no second chamber for one Province there should be no second chamber in other Provinces. In the Central Assembly there are going to be two chambers but so far as the Provinces are concerned there should be only one.

So in these two respects the opinion of the Conference has to be obtained by means of this resolution and I hope you will give support to this resolution so as to strengthen the hands of our representatives at the next session of the Round Table Conference.

Mr. B. N. Gokhale said: Mr. PRESIDENT, LADIES and GENTLEMEN, our Federation has already recorded that the last session of the Round Table Conference accomplished considerable useful preliminary work. The proposals, which have emanated from Sub-Committee No. 2 of the Conference and which form the subject matter of the resolution constitute to my mind a very satisfactory feature, with certain exceptions of that work. Before we consider those exceptions, let us see in what directions we have recorded a progress over the present position under the report. In the first place, according to the Sub-Committee's report all the provincial portfolios are to be transferred to the control of ministers responsible to the Provincial

Mr. B. N.
Gokhale.

Provincial
Constitution.
Mr. B. N.
Gokhale.

Legislature and this transfer is to include the important department of Law and Order. Secondly, the official block is to be dispensed with and the legislature is to be wholly elective, except that a strictly limited proportion of non-officials might be nominated to represent certain interests who might not get in at the polls. Thirdly, the Sub-Committee has very properly refused to vest in the Governor the discretion to appoint officials as ministers as contemplated by the reactionary proposals of the Simon Commission.

Gentlemen, unfortunately the bane of every constitutional reform in this country has been that our rulers have refused to approve of straightforward and honest political advance. Apparently on the surface they are quite prepared to be liberal. But there is always this thing at the back that certain limitations and restrictions are tried to be put in which practically nullify the advance. The Sub-Committee's report on Provincial Constitutions is no exception to this. The proposal to vest in the Governor certain special powers which are capable of being exercised even in normal times and the recommendation to create second chambers in certain Provinces are likely, as the resolution says, to detract much from the reality of the responsibility conferred on the provinces. This resolution purports to record a protest against these two safeguards in the main.

The first safeguard refers to the special powers of the Governor. Now gentlemen, our Federation is not opposed to vesting in the Governor special emergency powers which might be used by him in the event of an admitted and actual breakdown of the constitution. But the report of the Sub-Committee does not stop at this. It seeks to entrust the Governor with special powers for discharging certain duties that would be specially imposed upon him under the constitution, those duties being first of all the protection of the minorities and secondly, safeguarding the safety and tranquility of the province. Gentlemen, let me remind you that this list need not be, and is not meant to be, exhaustive, so that if these special powers, financial as well as legislative, are to be allowed to be retained in the future constitution, I am sure the real advance that is contemplated by the transference of power in the department of Law and Order is likely to be totally nullified. Virtually what is meant to be done under this clause is that the present powers enjoyed by the Governor under Sub-section 3 of Section 52 of the Government of India Act are to be retained. The Federation cannot, consistently with its avowed principles, support such a position.

As regards the question of second chambers, I notice that the Subjects Committee has put in all speakers from Bombay on this resolution. That is probably in response to our revered President's appeal that Bombay should come to the rescue of their brethren in the Provinces of Bengal, United Provinces, Behar and Orrisa. In regard to these Provinces, the Sub-Committee wants the creation of a bi-cameral legislature. Now the report of the Sub-Committee does not show that a valid case was made out for the institution of second chambers and yet it is surprising that the majority of the members of the Sub-Committee should have supported such a retrograde recommendation. The Sub-Committee also does not show what the basis of representation should be as regards the proposed second chambers and I am afraid that as regards this there will be an insistence upon providing high property qualifications, and if in the upper chamber the propertied class alone is to find a way, then it will mean eternal class conflict, giving ample opportunity to the Governor to exercise his special powers. Apart from these defects, there are other shortcomings also such as the proposal to allow the Governor, on a special occasion, to preside over the meetings of the provincial cabinet. For my part I cannot look at the proposal without suspicion. I hope that our delegates at the next sessions of the Round Table Conference will throw overboard these recommendations of the Committee and be able to devise a scheme of complete autonomy for the Provinces which will satisfy the fundamental needs of the population. With these words, I commend this proposition to your acceptance.

Provincial
Constitution.
Mr. B. N.
Gokhale.

The resolution was put to vote and carried.

RESOLUTION No. 14.

I. C. S. GOVERNORS.

Mr. S. P. Andrews-Dube said: LADIES and GENTLEMEN, I ask your attention just for a few minutes as I place before you the shortest resolution on the agenda. The resolution says:—

I. C. S.
Governors.
Mr. S. P.
Andrews-Dube.

"The National Liberal Federation is strongly of opinion that no member of the permanent Indian Civil Service be hereafter appointed as Governor of any Province."

While this is the shortest resolution it is not for that reason any the less important. On the other hand I am inclined to think that it is the most important resolution which has been

I. O. S.
Governors.
Mr. S. P.
Andrews-Dube.

placed for your acceptance. Without meaning any disrespect to the speakers on the previous resolution or without minimising in any way the importance of the resolutions moved and passed already, I would say that in comparison to the resolution which I have the honour to place before you the previous resolution can be compared to the limbs of the human body while this resolution can be compared to the head. You may have all the limbs in a sound condition but if your head is not sound the whole body becomes useless. Suppose we get all that we have been demanding in the resolutions passed up to now and we are placed under a Governor who belongs to the Bureaucracy what would be the effect? Those of us who come from the Provinces which are governed by the I. C. S. Governors know very well what it means. I shall not go into the history of the case as this question of I. C. S. Governors is a very old one. I shall just ask you to give me one moment as I tell you the a recent history of the question. The Simon Commission in its report dealing with Provincial Governments recommended that the permanent officials could be members of the Provincial Cabinets while the Provinces are enjoying full autonomy. If this is so it does not take much imagination to think that the same permanent officials could be made Governors of the Provinces. We know that the Sub-Committee of the R. T. C. dealing with this question has turned down that proposal but another thing has cropped up on the question of safeguards and the protection of certain minority interests. If the question is insisted upon as we think it ought to be at the second session of the R. T. C. and the Governors are not made constitutional in the sense in which they are constitutional Governors in other parts of the Empire the trouble would be that these I.C.S. Governors with all the bias and prejudice which they have gathered during the 20 or 25 years of their service would not be conducive to the best interests of the people. We should insist that hereafter the Governors of the Provinces should be recruited directly from the public life of England or preferably of our own country.

There is one more reason I can advance—I can advance any number of arguments but I will just give one only. I would ask those of you who come from Bombay, Bengal and Madras and who are governed by Governors recruited from the public life of England that we, the people of other provinces are not the less intelligent or progressive. If we had Governors recruited in the same way as other provinces we would have made the same progress as they have done. With these words I commend the resolution for your cordial acceptance.

Dr. P. N. Daruvala (Bombay) said: Mr. CHAIRMAN, LADIES and GENTLEMEN: I have very great pleasure in seconding this short but pithy resolution proposed by my friend Mr. Andrews-Dube. This resolution appears to me to be the pivot upon which the resolutions that we have already passed will turn. The change that we have demanded in the resolution is most urgently needed in the present stage of our development and unless and until we get Governors who have been brought up in the atmosphere of liberty and freedom of a free country we cannot hope to see the machinery of Government carried on with that large-hearted statesmanship which is so necessary at this juncture. Civilian Governors have been provided for the minor provinces which were expressly created in the Government of India Act, 1921. We have to ask ourselves therefore why this differentiating element was introduced in that Government of India Act. Why should the major Provinces of Bombay, Bengal and Madras have been expressly excluded from the other provinces, in the most important matter of Governorship. That is an anomaly in the constitution which requires to be done away with and we as members of the Federation should make a protest against it and see that this anomalous differentiation is weeded out of the Indian

L. C. S.
Governors.
Dr. P. N.
Daruvala.

RESOLUTION No. 15.

BURMA.

The National Liberal Federation of India is of opinion that the Secretary of State for India's declaration in Parliament upon the separation of Burma from India was premature as the proceedings of the Round Table Conference show that the issue was left open for further consideration. The Federation urges that the question should be decided on the merits after the fullest opportunity has been given to that section of opinion in Burma which is opposed to such separation, to state its case.

(Pur from the Chair and carried unanimously.)

should not be less complete than over any other departments.

I. C. S.
Governors.
Mr. S. P.
Andrews-Dube.

placed for your acceptance. Without meaning any disrespect to the speakers on the previous resolution or without minimising in any way the importance of the resolutions moved and passed already, I would say that in comparison to the resolution which I have the honour to place before you the previous resolution can be compared to the limbs of the human body while this resolution can be compared to the head. You may have all the limbs in a sound condition but if your head is not sound the whole body becomes useless. Suppose we get all that we have been demanding in the resolutions passed up to now and we are placed under a Governor who belongs to the Bureaucracy what would be the effect? Those of us who come from the Provinces which are governed by the I. C. S. Governors know very well what it means. I shall not go into the history of the case as this question of I. C. S. Governors is a very old one. I shall just ask you to give me one moment as I tell you the recent history of the question. The Simon Commission in its report dealing with Provincial Governments recommended that the permanent officials could be members of the Provincial Cabinets while the Provinces are enjoying full autonomy. If this is so it does not take much imagination to think that the

in the same way as other provinces we would have made the same progress as they have done. With these words I commend the resolution for your cordial acceptance.

Dr. P. N. Daruvala (Bombay) said: Mr. CHAIRMAN, LADIES and GENTLEMEN : I have very great pleasure in seconding this short but pithy resolution proposed by my friend Mr. Andrews-Dube. This resolution appears to me to be the pivot upon which the resolutions that we have already passed will turn. The change that we have demanded in the resolution is most urgently needed in the present stage of our development and unless and until we get Governors who have been brought up in the atmosphere of liberty and freedom of a free country we cannot hope to see the machinery of Government carried on with that large-hearted statesmanship which is so necessary at this juncture. Civilian Governors have been provided for the minor provinces which were expressly created in the Government of India Act, 1921. We have to ask ourselves therefore why this differentiating element was introduced in that Government of India Act. Why should the major Provinces of Bombay, Bengal and Madras have been expressly excluded from the other provinces, in the most important matter of Governorship. That is an anomaly in the constitution which requires to be done away with and we as members of the Federation should make a protest against it and see that this pernicious differentiation is weeded out of the Indian Statute. I have great pleasure in seconding the resolution.

I. C. S.
Governors.
Dr. P. N.
Daruvala.

The resolution was put to the meeting and carried.

Mr. G. M. Gupte next moved resolution No. 16 which was as follows :—

RESOLUTION No. 16.

THE SERVICES.

The National Liberal Federation is of opinion that judicial services throughout should be recruited entirely from the members of the Bar in India and that members of the Civil Service should not be eligible for the same ; that provincial governments should have the same freedom in respect of the recruitment of their medical services as in respect of other services under their control, and that their control over the police in their respective provinces, both legislative and administrative, should not be less complete than over any other departments.

The Services.
Mr. G. M. Gupte.

The Services.
Mr. G. M. Gupta.

Speaking on the resolution Mr. Gupte said :

The resolution which I have placed before you dealing with the judicial service refers to recruitment only. It does not deal with the question as to who should appoint the judges and how they should be appointed. You are aware that so far as the power of appointment is concerned it vests in the Crown or the head of the executive. Our recommendation here is confined merely to the recruitment of the personnel of the judiciary. At present, you are aware, both the magistracy and the judges of the higher judiciary are recruited from among men who are not necessarily practising at the bar. The free atmosphere of the bar is conducive to greater independence and better training in dealing with a variety of questions. In England you know that the higher judicial posts are filled from among the leading practitioners at the bar and no men who do not enjoy the confidence of the legal profession are appointed on the bench. Here in India we get our judicial appointments filled from among officials who have had no practice at the bar. Experience of recent years has shown what we have to suffer on account of the lower Magistrates being those who are not members of the bar. I would impress upon you the necessity of the confining recruitment to the members of the bar.

As regards the Indian Civil Service probably you are aware that by their training and bureaucratic atmosphere there is naturally a greater inclination to give credence to official and police versions in certain cases. I would also draw your attention to certain powers which are abused by the Magistrates such as the powers under section 144 of the C. P. C. I am sure that had the magistracy and the judiciary been recruited entirely from the bar probably such abuses would not have occurred.

As regards the High Court several members of the bar will bear me out when I say that the Civil Service has contributed to the High Court many eminent judges. Under ordinary circumstances they have been a great hindrance to litigation in the High Court. During the first few months when the I.C.S. Judge is inexperienced it is a great tax on the litigants. Therefore we are of opinion that the judiciary should be recruited from the members of the bar.

As regards the second part of the resolution if the provinces have to get complete autonomy the freedom in respect of the recruitment to other services is a necessary corollary.

Rao Bahadur R. G. Mundle seconding the resolution said:

I have great pleasure in seconding the resolution. The recommendation made in the resolution is intended to make the judiciary in India as independent as it is say in England. As regards the second part of the resolution it is well known that civil servants are not as well grounded as lawyers practising at the bar and therefore they do not cut a very good figure on the bench.

The Services.
Rao Bahadur
R. G. Mundle.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

The next resolution (No. 17) was put from the chair and carried. It ran as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 17.

FRANCHISE.

The National Liberal Federation approves of the extension of the franchise for men and women alike and strongly supports the recommendations of the Franchise Sub-Committee of the Conference.

Franchise.
The President.

The resolution was put from the chair and carried unanimously.

Sir Chimanlal Setalvad then moved:

RESOLUTION NO. 18.

THE MINORITIES PROBLEM.

While the National Liberal Federation regrets that until now no solution of the problem of minorities acceptable to all could be reached and while it is deeply concerned that every possible attempt should be made by all the parties to arrive at an agreement generous to minorities and fair to all, this Federation is of opinion that in any arrangement, the following points should be borne in mind as being essential to its durability and acceptability and as conforming to the requirements of responsible Government :—

The Minorities
Problem.
Sir Chimanlal
Setalvad.

1. Separate electorates should be done away with or in the alternative, they should not be maintained beyond a fixed term of years.
2. There should be no statutory fixation of a majority.

The Minorities
Problem.
Sir Chimanlal
Setalvad.

3. The position of all important minorities should be equitably considered in the determination of weightage.
4. There should be no statutory recognition of communal representation in the All-India or the Provincial Executive or the services, but by a convention, a fair and adequate representation should be secured to the various communities consistently with considerations of efficiency and the possession of the necessary qualifications.
5. All necessary, reasonable and practicable guarantees should be given to all communities with regard to their religion, culture, language and special laws.

Speaking on the resolution Sir Chimanlal said:

The resolution that I have been asked to submit for your consideration deals with a subject which is of vital importance at the present moment. It is indeed a matter for sorrow and some humiliation that we have still to deal with this subject in this Conference sorrow and humiliation at the fact that unfortunately we have not been able to settle amongst ourselves this purely domestic question. As you are aware, when the R. T. C. met in London various earnest efforts were made to solve this communal tangle and we had almost succeeded but owing to the attitude of some diehards on both sides the solution which was in sight was frustrated. Under these circumstances the problem is still before us and it is our duty to solve it in some manner. If you are unable to settle amongst yourselves the questions between the various communities you will be supplying the greatest handle to the reactionaries to withhold the full measure of self-Government, that we are claiming. Very naturally they will say: If the important communities, the Hindus and the Mussalmans, are not able to settle your differences, are not able to agree about the powers and rights of each community how can you be trusted with the full responsible self-Government that you are asking for. Then again you must remember that if in spite of that obstacle the Round Table Conference achieves the self-Government that you want and the new constitution that you desire what will that constitution be worth? Will it be worth 24 hours' purchase if the communal question has not been settled. How is that constitution to work smoothly? How is it to

bring the freedom that you want, if you have in your own country warring elements of the character that you have? Therefore, we hope that both communities will put their heads together and solve this problem so that before the deliberations begin in London we may be able to present a united front and tell the British people that we have solved our own domestic difficulties and here we are with a united voice demanding responsible Government that you can no longer withhold from us under the circumstances. In solving this problem there are various matters to be considered and I beseech all my friends both Hindus and Mussalmans to bear this in mind that whatever abstract principles may appeal to us, after all as practical men we have to find a solution for this problem and find a solution which may be acceptable to all and in order to do that it may be necessary to compromise to a certain extent even theoretical principles which may appeal to you as good and perfect principles, not because we think any the less of those principles, not because we do not want to act up to those principles but because to secure an agreed solution we have to concede certain things. In the London negotiations as I said we had come to very near a settlement of the communal difficulty. As regards the claims put forward by the Muslim community about the protection of their religion their culture, their education and their religious rights and things of that character I do not think any person will disagree that they have to be conceded not only to the Mussalman but to all other communities inhabiting this land and in London we had agreed ultimately to certain formulas securing this liberty of religion, culture etc. With regard to the North-Western Frontier Province and Sind a solution has already been practically found and these are not matters with which we are very much troubled at the moment. The only outstanding question is the question of the electorates, the question whether the Mussalmans are to retain the present system of separate electorates or are they to come into the joint electorates in all parts of the country? Now it is perfectly axiomatic I submit that if, we are going to have full responsible Government of the character we are claiming, if there is to be the responsibility of the cabinet to the legislature both at the centre and in the provinces, and that full responsibility of the cabinet is to be a joint responsibility of all the Ministers of the Cabinet, then it is very clear that you cannot have that joint responsibility of the Cabinet if one part of the Cabinet is looking for their election to one part of the electorate while another section is looking to another part of the electorate for election. Therefore,

The Minorities
Problem.
Sir Chimanlal
Setalvad.

The Minorities
Problem.
Sir Chimanlal
Serajvad.

there cannot be any doubt that joint electorates is the only right system to be adopted. A little thought will make it clear to my Mussalman friends who are at present insisting upon separate electorates that separate electorates are really not in their own interests. Take as an illustration the case of the Bombay Presidency. In the Bombay Presidency, if Sind is separated, the Mussalmans will be reduced to about 8 per cent. so that even granting them the weightage they want and which we are quite prepared to concede, supposing we make it 15 per cent, then the result would be that taking 100 as the strength of the legislature, about 15 will have to be Mussalmans and 85 from the majority community. Remember also that under the new constitution the official and nominated blocks will no longer be there on whom the Mussalmans very often rely. Then what would be the position? These Muslim electorates will have no voice whatever in the election of the 85. How does that community expect the 85 to be beholden to them in any manner to protect their interests? If on the contrary the 85 members of the majority community had to seek the suffrages of the Mahomedan voters, then they will have to care for the Mussalman community also and look to their interests. Therefore to my mind if dispassionate thought is given to this matter the Mussalman community should come to the conclusion that under the new constitution it is in their own interests that they should come within the joint electorates so that they would be able to exert their influence on the whole body of the legislature to secure what they want.

While this is no doubt the position if you have clear thinking in these matters, if you have dispassionate thinking in these matters, unfortunately matters have gone to such a pass that clear and dispassionate thinking do not hold the field. But whatever that may be it is no use telling our Muslim brethren that they are wrong, that their apprehensions are misplaced and that this is the right thing for them to do. You have to grapple with the fact that in spite of all counsel of perfection, in spite of your counsel being in their own interest they do not approve of it, that they are not prepared just at this moment to come into the joint electorate. If they have apprehensions—although entirely mistaken—you cannot get rid of the fact that there are those apprehensions in the minds of the minority communities and I for one think that it behoves the majority community to go to the farthest limit to make concessions and sacrifices to remove the apprehensions, however, unwarranted they may be. For if you win them over

by a generous gesture now a time will come speedily when the minority communities will realise their mistake and in a few years they will come round to the view that their present view was not correct, that their real interest lies in coming into joint electorates and they would certainly welcome them. Therefore, though no doubt joint electorates are the right thing and though as I have said it is in the interests of the Mussalmans to come into the joint electorates, no useful purpose will be served by forcing them down their throats.

The Minorities
Problem.
Sir Chimanlal
Setalvad.

The next best thing is to tell them that we advise you to come into the joint electorates but if you are not prepared to do so although we consider you misguided, you may have your separate electorates but it will not be wise for you to keep them for all time not only for your future but for the future of the country. We may give them a certain fixed term of years during which they might continue separate electorates and at the end of which joint electorates may come into operation. We must give them that time so that within that fixed period of time more sympathy and confidence will be created between the two communities and at the end of that period I am sure the Mussalmans themselves will see their mistake and will be quite ready to accept joint electorates. It is indeed a matter of hope that among the Mussalmans themselves we have now a well-formed Nationalist Muslim Party which is taking the right view of the matter and which is willing to come into joint electorates and are advising their brethren to be of the same opinion. You cannot shut your eyes to the fact that although the Nationalist Muslim Party rightly claims to represent the intelligentsia of the community and some of the best Muslim brains are in it, there is a large majority of Muslims uneducated though they may be who are not prepared to listen to their Nationalist brethren. The proposal that we are making here is that if we cannot persuade them to come into joint electorates let us have a fixed term of years after which separate electorates are to go. We thereby also give time to the Nationalist Muslim Party to convert the rest of their community to the right view. I submit that the resolution that we have drafted and placed before you is a resolution which ought to commend itself to you.

As I have already said there is really no dispute about all the other things regarding religious liberty and the rest of it. In London we had very nearly agreed on a formula and the only issue was about the electorates.

The Minorities
Problem.
Mr. N. B.
Karnekar.

Mr. N. B. Karnekar seconding the resolution said:

The resolution which has just been proposed by Sir Chimanlal Setalvad requires very little to be said in support to commend it to your acceptance. However, I am standing before you to support the resolution. This communal question has been before us in India for the last 25 or 30 years. The question of communal representation has no parallel in the history of the world. The failure to settle this communal question for the last 25 or 30 years has left many important subjects undecided. Some 16 years back, the Lucknow Pact of which you have heard so much was formed and it was then decided that separate electorates should be given to the Mahomedans. From that time it has been the opinion of all sane men that separate electorates have been responsible for all the communal troubles. Even after this experience it is held in many quarters that separate electorates have benefitted the Mahomedan community. Taking the example of separate electorates for Mahomedans, the non-Brahmins of Madras also began to grumble and some provision was made for the non-Brahmin of Madras by way of reservation of seats. Even in Bombay the question of reservation of seats was considered and a resolution was passed at the first Session of the Liberal Federation that joint electorates with reservation of seats should be given to the Mahrattas and other backward communities. Such joint electorates with reserved seats were tried in Madras and there they have been found successful. In the Bombay Presidency during the last few years this method has been tried and found successful. So there is no necessity for separate electorates. A section of the Mahomedan community also holds that separate electorates are not necessary and as has been pointed out by my learned friend Sir Chimanlal in future it will be very difficult to maintain separate electorates, because supposing there is a Muslim member in the Bombay Council and there is a question to be discussed which pertains to Hindus alone, this Muslim member will naturally think "what have I to do with it?". The same will be the case with a Hindu member. Under these circumstances the differences between the two communities will increase. This applies to non-Brahmins also. Supposing there is a question which pertains to Mahomedans only. These non-Brahmins will think they have nothing to do with the question. In this way it has been found that the different communities will be indifferent to the interests of each other. That has been the experience of so many years. Therefore, the question of sepa-

rate electorates ought to be finally solved and that is why the Federation has placed this resolution before you in the first part of which, we suggest that separate electorates should be done away with. Bearing this principle in mind, if the Mahomedans even now after the bitter experience, of so many years think that they want separate electorates, they may have them for ten years more, but after this period they must be done away with. I have already pointed out that this method of joint electorates with reserved seats has been tried with success in Madras and in Maharashtra in Bombay. If the Mahomedans come compromise, this method may be tried in their case also.

The Minorities
Problem.
Mr. N. B.
Karnekar.

Another question is that public services should be given to the different communities consistently with considerations of efficiency. The question also ought to be considered very carefully. There are certain men who think that in service the question of communities should not be considered at all. My humble opinion is that, this question ought to be taken into account. Some provision ought to be made for the minorities. I do not mean to say that this question should be solved without reference to efficiency. What I say is, supposing a vacancy is to be filled and there are two candidates, one from the backward classes and another from the advanced classes. If both have passed the same examination, then the backward class candidate should be preferred. I do not mean to say that at the cost of efficiency this preference should be given to the backward class men. That is what is set forth in the second part of the resolution.

The third part of the resolution says the position of all important minorities should be considered in the determination of weightage. What is meant by this is, supposing some provision is made for the minorities by way of reservation of seats; if this is not sufficient, some more provision should be made. All these sub-clauses of the resolution are meant to provide for the minorities. In this way the Federation has taken into account all the questions affecting the minorities. With these remarks I second the resolution.

The President : Rao Bahadur R. R. Kale has given notice of an amendment. If he wishes to move the amendment he may do so. According to past precedents as it is now very late I will allow only five minutes to each speaker and the mover of the amendment will have no right of reply. But the mover of the original proposition will have that right.

The Minorities
Problem.
Rao Bahadur
R. R. Kale.

Rao Bahadur R. R. Kale said: The amendment of which I have given notice is in respect of the first clause of the resolution which reads as follows: Separate electorates should be done away with or in the alternative, they should not be maintained beyond a fixed term of years. I agree with the first portion which deals with the doing away with the separate electorates but my amendment deals with the words "or in the alternative they should not be maintained beyond a fixed term of years and I want to put in the words:" *"and that they should be replaced by joint electorates with reservation of seats for the minorities"*. I think the mover and seconder of the original proposition have lightened my task. You must have seen that the arguments that were advanced by them in support of the proposition would support my amendment and not their proposition. I am not therefore, taking up your time in dealing with the necessity or desirability of joint electorates. Nor do I propose to say anything about the way in which a mutual agreement should be arrived at. You may say that every possible attempt should be made by all parties to arrive at an agreement generous to the minorities. It is to give effect to this generousness that I have added the clause for the reservation of seats for the minorities. Separate electorates are unknown in any constitution of the world. If we want to secure an arrangement with such parties by way of a compromise we have to make some surrender. In the past we surrendered at the time of the Lucknow Pact in the shape of giving the Mahomedans separate electorates. A trail to that surrender has been given for the last 20 years and the surrender or the concession has not proved successful in any way but on the contrary it has resulted in embittering the feelings and widening the differences between the two communities. Then why give it a further trial. In the original proposition there is no clear fixed period for the continuance of the separate electorates. You will remember that the Mahomedans have already taken a stand for separate electorates on the ground of vested rights that they have been in existence for the last 20 years. They have been advancing that argument over and over again and where is the guarantee that if separate electorates are maintained for another term of years they will not use the same argument with greater emphasis at the end of that period? The mover of the proposition has not shown how the introduction of joint electorates will be possible a few years hence if it is not possible now. Are the Mahomedans likely to see the folly of the disadvantage of separate electorates at the end of a period of a few years more than now. Fortuna-

tely there is a certain section of the Mahomedan community which has begun to see eye to eye with us. It cannot be stated that the section is in a very small minority. Is it not right for us therefore as a Liberal party who have always stood for a principle and not for numbers to support and help them to convert their co-religionists and at the same time continue to adhere to our principle? Are we not justified in helping those Mahomedans of the liberal type of Dr. Ansari rather than the other section of Mahomedans?

The Minorities
Problem.
Rao Bahadur
R. R. Kale.

So far as I can speak for my own district I can say that the illiterate rural population certainly does not hanker after separate electorates. I can give you an incident which happened in my personal experience. Several Mahomedans came to me and said at the time of the last but one election "we want to elect you." I said unfortunately there is a division. I am a non-Mahomedan and your constituency is a Mahomedan constituency. If you take a plebescite in each district I am sure you will find a very large support for joint electorates among the rural Mahomedan population. This cry for separate electorates is raised by people who are interested in perpetuating the present system, as they get an easy entrance. I quite appreciate and agree with what my friend Sir Chimanlal has said that we have to adopt a measure to get round the Mahomedans. But the only difference is in the method of bringing them round to an agreement. Whether the method proposed in the resolution or that proposed in the amendment is the right one is what we have to learn from past experience and in the light of events that have been happening during the last few years. I do differ from my friend as I have my own bitter experience in the matter. You see these separate electorates have been condemned in the Montford report. The authors say they are reluctantly obliged to accept it. No part of the world has accepted this the very negation of democratic principle. But there is the Lucknow Pact and we have therefore to accept them. But they had uttered a warning that they never wanted to extend that principle to other bodies or beyond a fixed period. The only question is whether there is a chance of getting joint electorates by continuing separate electorates at present. Or whether by supporting such of them as do want joint electorates and in that way persuading the others to join them. That is the only point that is before you and I do feel once you get into this vicious circle what absurd lengths it may lead us to. The Sikhs, the depressed classes, the Christians etc., will begin to make similar compart-

The Minorities
Problem.
Rao Bahadur
R. R. Kale.

ments. It is for us to give a direction, the right direction founded upon sound principles to the people and I, therefore, think we ought not to give a direction which will be considered by the Nationalist Muslims and by other parties to be a misdirection and not a proper direction. With these words I commend the amendment for your acceptance.

Mr. S. Hussein said:

Mr. S. Hussein

LADIES and GENTLEMEN ; I regret to find that out of the 30 resolutions placed before this Federation not a single Mahomedan of Bombay has taken part in the discussion of any of them. That shows that the National Liberal Federation is only nominal so far as the Mahomedans are concerned. Of course on the whole the Mahomedans of the country have been talking of separate electorates but we must not forget that we Mahomedans and the Hindus have been living together for the last thousand years. Since the communal electorates have come into existence we have mistrusted each other. If communal electorates are maintained I do not know what we are going to do at the end of five years. Therefore, I am in favour of joint electorates with reservation of seats for Mahomedans.

Mr. V. N. Chandavarkar said:

Mr. V. N.
Chandavarkar.

Mr. PRESIDENT, FELLOW DELEGATES, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN; I rise to support the amendment moved by my friend, Rao Bahadur Kale, and in doing so, I shall admit that I have no claim to speak as a practical politician. The question before the Federation is one of vital principle, and I would like to draw the attention of Sir Chimanlal Setalvad and his friends to the representation made by the Bombay Presidency Association in 1908 to the Government of India, on the eve of the introduction of Morley-Minto-Reforms. In that representation which was signed, among others, by the late Sir Phirozeshah Mehta and Sir Chimanlal Setalvad, a submission was made to the Government that it would be most dangerous to introduce the principle of communal electorates in the Indian Constitution, and a demand was made that electorates should be formed on territorial basis only. That was the considered view of the Liberal Party in 1908 when, you will admit, the country was not so politically advanced as it is at present. I admit that much water has disappeared from the Back Bay in Bombay since 1903, and in considering the question now before the Federation, we cannot forget the

Lucknow Pact of 1916. Well, at the same time, I want you to remember that the Lucknow Pact itself was a transitional arrangement, and it was then understood that separate electorates would, when a further advance was made, be replaced by joint electorates with reservation of seats for the minorities. It is true that in the original proposition moved by Sir Chimanlal, it is urged that separate electorates should be done away with but, if such a proposal is not acceptable to the minorities, an alternative is provided under which separate electorates would continue only for a fixed number of years after which, I presume, joint electorates would automatically come in. In placing the amendment before the Federation, our object is to avoid the Liberal Party from being committed, even in the shape of an alternative proposal to the principle of separate electorates and to make it clear beyond doubt that we want to have joint electorates in the new constitution which will be framed as a result of the deliberations of the Round Table Conference. I know Sir Chimanlal will say that the supporters of the amendment are mere idealists, and are ignoring the difficulties in the way of getting the minorities to accept joint electorates immediately. We all welcomed wholeheartedly the calling of the Round Table Conference. But we never thought that the Round Table Conference would become such an obsession with some of our leaders as to make them tell us "If you say this, you will frighten the Indian Princes; if you say that, you will frighten the Mahomedans" and the wonder of it is that these very gentlemen who are advising caution and prudence on the question of representation of the Subjects of Indian States and of the minorities, are not afraid of displeasing the British Authorities on the question of Financial and commercial safeguards. Such an attitude on the part of some of our leaders is likely to be misunderstood and to create an impression in the country that all that we want in the name of constitutional reforms is to transfer the powers now vested in British Government and Parliament to the capitalist and commercial classes in India. The Liberal party, you will agree, stands for a form of government which will be truly responsible to the people and which will not leave any scope for exploitation of one class of people by another. Sir Chimanlal, in moving the resolution, very properly observed that without joint electorates we cannot have a really responsible government for the country. May I ask him whether he and his friends are not going to England to bring back responsible Government for the country? How can he reconcile himself to any provision in the resolution

The Minorities
Problem.
Mr. V. N.
Chandavakar.

The Minorities
Problem.
Mr. V. N.
Chandavarkar.

which might strengthen the hands of those who are out and out communalists? The position taken by Sir Chimanlal and his friends might perhaps have been tenable if the whole of the Mahomedan community was in favour of continuing the separate electorates. Can you face the country with the proposition moved by Sir Chimanlal when a strong and influential section of the Mahomedans, under the leadership of Dr. Ansari, has come out openly and made a demand for the immediate introduction of the principle of joint electorates with reservation of seats in the new constitution? I submit we shall be untrue to our principles, if, inspite of the gesture made by Dr. Ansari and his friends, we commit ourselves to any course of action which is sure to strengthen the hands of those who, ignoring the great advance made by the country in political matters since the adoption of the Lucknow Pact, demand the continuation of the vicious principle of separate electorates.

Pandit Hardatta Sharma (Punjab) further supported the resolution.

Mr. Jos. Alex
Dias.

Mr. Jos. Alex Dias, in further supporting the amendment said : I belong to one of the most minor minorities amongst the major minorities and even my community viz., the Catholic Christian community in this very hall and on this very platform declared openly at a public meeting under the presidentship of the late Mr. Joseph Baptista that they were opposed to the system of separate electorates and favoured joint electorates with reservation of seats for minorities. The system of separate electorates was unheard of in the history of politics all over the civilised world. Even the Zulus in Africa and the Maoris in New Zealand regretted the introduction of this political anomaly which tended only to perpetuate communal discords and animosities. In the amendment moved by Rao Bahadur Kale, the last clause of the original proposition still remains incorporated, which ensures sufficient guarantees to all communities for safe-guarding their religion, their culture their language and their special laws and the securing of a fair and adequate representation to various communities consistently with considerations of efficiency and the possession of the necessary qualifications. What we should therefore, aspire to on the eve of the Reforms is the education of all classes and masses for education will be our firm bedrock upon which the superstructure of Home Rule

for India is to be based. Separate electorates must now die a natural death in progressive India and be replaced by joint electorates in our new constitution which could ensure adequate protection to all parties and interests, including the Europeans domiciled in India whose vested interests commercial or otherwise will receive due consideration. As one coming from the Catholic Christian Community which numbered only 3 millions out of the 300 millions in India—a very microscopic minority indeed—I have no hesitation in strongly opposing separate electorates and no minority need be afraid of its religion or culture under a Self-governing Constitution based on joint electorates. Fellow Delegates, let us proclaim from this Liberal platform that India's political aspirations are sincere and the best form of political sincerity and integrity would be to make a lasting impression on all countries that India has already reached the stage of Political Reforms where separate electorate has no chapter in the history of regenerated India which will thus command the respect and admiration of all civilised Nations of the world. (applause)

The Minorities
Problem.
Mr. Jos. Alex
Dias.

Mr. Phadnis said:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN : Sir Chimanlal Setalvad has been arguing a dead and lost cause and on behalf of the younger section of the Liberals I want to say that the very principle that he has laid down, the strongest argument that he has used is that it is a compromise. I ask him with whom is he compromising? Does he want to compromise with communalists like Maulana Shaukat Ali and Dr. Moonje? On the very face of it that section of the resolution is anti-national in character.

Mr. Phadnis.

My second argument is this; ours is a non-communal party. Why should we countenance such communalism? I say drop out the resolution altogether. After all the Hindus and the Mahomedans are the majority communities in this country. They may settle this question either now or later.

My third argument is that this is the best time to do away with communal electorates. If you have reservation of seats with separate electorates for five or ten years that right will be abused for propaganda purposes.

Lastly I would analyse the resolution and say that it is a very illogical portion to take up. The first part of the resolution says separate electorates should be done away with

The Minorities
Problem.
Mr. Phadnis.

and the next part says that they should be retained with reservation of seats. This is a compromise with reactionaries outside the country and people like Maulana Shaukat Ali.

Mr. M. D.
Altekar.

Mr. M. D. Altekar said: It is extremely painful for me to have to differ from my revered leader, Sir Chimanlal Setalvad on this question of the minorities problem. And yet I have to differ from him and he will appreciate that his followers have the courage to differ from him. We have to look to certain questions of principles in this connection and though I am extremely anxious that the hands of our leaders who will be at the Round Table Conference should not be tied down to any details of compromise in various subjects still it is quite necessary that this Liberal Federation should lay down the principle and in order that such a principle should be laid down I must say that separate electorates must be abolished and no compromise should be entered into that would retain them. It has been argued that the Muslims or the minority communities would be satisfied if separate electorates were retained for a fixed number of years and then were to disappear automatically according to the letter of the statute. I personally do not believe in that for this reason. Twelve years ago when this Federation met for the first time I along with a few others had protested against these very separate electorates and had argued according to my humble light that separate electorates were bound to develop a communal mentality as opposed to a national mentality and that they would constitute a permanent danger to the growth of nationalism in this country and I believed then and I believe now and that without nationalism this country had no future. I see it is said that these separate electorates would last for ten years only and nationalism would so much progress in the country during that period that the Muslims and the minorities themselves would come forward and in their patriotic fervour would say "take away these electorates. We want joint electorates". After twelve years this is not a question for guess. We know exactly what has happened. These separate electorates have developed a communal mentality and in fact communalism has run riot in the country during the last twelve years. I put it to the account of the separate electorates and I want that they should not be repeated. India is in need of the continuous development of nationalism and no impediment in its path should be tolerated by patriotic people. I am prepared to accept any other compromise than separate electorates and I am prepared to say this that as a so-called high class Brahmin I will per-

suade my community not to stand for any election in the country for a period of ten years if that would satisfy the backward classes. I will even do that rather than separate electorates. These separate electorates have created a vested interest and this interest will always try to retain them. Therefore the argument that after a fixed number of years there would be an automatic disappearance of these electorates is fallacious and no sane man can subscribe to it. Therefore I request our leaders to bear this principle in mind when they go to the Round Table Conference and insist that separate electorates should be abolished and that they should be replaced by joint electorates with reserved seats. With these remarks I support the amendment.

The Minorities
Problem.
Mr. M. D.
Altekar.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir said: I am really not sorry that this discussion has taken place today and that there has been a difference of opinion expressed openly at this Conference. It appears to me that in this hall consisting of delegates and visitors there is not one person present today who is in favour of separate electorates on principle. I have listened to the speeches and what amused me most was that three quarters of the speech of my friend Sir Chimanlal contained arguments against separate electorates. Now we were told that the Presidency Association was against separate electorates in 1908. Times have changed and circumstances have changed since then. It is not a question of whether the Liberal Federation is in favour of joint or separate electorates. Of course we are every one of us in favour of joint electorates and that is stated in the resolution moved by Sir Chimanlal Setalvad, but the point before you is of much greater importance. I had occasion to speak about it the day before yesterday. The point is, do you want political liberty or do you not, and if you want political liberty do you think you can get it with a large section of the minority community discontented and dissatisfied? If you think that political liberty can be obtained against the wishes of a large majority of a major minority then I have nothing further to say; or if you are honestly of opinion that rather than concede one little inch from the principle of joint electorates you would rather say to the British Government that you do not want political liberty at present under these conditions and that you want it to be postponed, then your position is consistent. But if in your heart of hearts you are affairs to prepared for a few years to allow the present state of continue in order to get that political liberty, is there anything wrong in saying that at this stage and creating

Sir Cowasji
Jehangir.

The Minorities
Problem.
Sir Cowasji
Jehangir.

an atmosphere for it? Where do you trip? All we have to say is that if a major portion of the Mahomedans still continue to insist upon having separate electorates for a term of years, we will allow that to go on in order to get their support and their sympathy for political liberty however strongly we may be against the principle of separate electorates. Is the sacrifice a very great one? If the majority of the Mahomedans wanted joint electorates this resolution would not have been here, there would have been no discussion and there would have been three cheers for political liberty. But our experience has been bitter. Let us candidly admit that communal differences have arisen at every step in our efforts to get political liberty and if there was any achievement at the R. T. C. it was not due to communal unity; it was due, let me tell you candidly and openly once and for all, mainly to the magnanimous attitude of the Labour Government who refused to take advantage of our differences. If there had been any other government in power except that of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald and Mr. Wedgwood Benn and if our differences had come to light as they did, we should have come back empty handed and we should not have been able to blame anybody else but ourselves. Do you want your representatives to go to London without any communal unity? What can you expect them to bring back but reservations and safeguards multiplied tenfold because the minority communities will join the British Government in insisting upon these safeguards? Is that what you want us to do? We want to go united, Hindus and Mohomedans, to resist safeguards that will be insisted on by the Conservatives and the Liberals. We do not want to go to England to fight against safeguards backed up by the minority communities. Therefore all that you have to say is, let there be a clear understanding, that if nothing avails, if all efforts fail you will continue these separate electorates for a term of years with a clear understanding that automatically they will go at the end of that period. (applause).

Mr. G. K. Gadgil said:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN : My voice is against me but
Mr. G. K. Gadgil. I feel that this is a most momentous question that you are discussing. What is it that you are called upon to make up our minds about? The Liberal Federation is talking this question with a view to present a united front when the R. T. C. meets in London. What is the united front that you are going to show in London if the minority representatives are

not able to be satisfied at every step and demand safeguards? That is the question on which you have to make up your minds one way or the other. What are you going to do? Here is a solution suggested in the resolution. You must take into consideration the fundamental things with which we are concerned. If we stick to our point we shall not go an inch further. It is only the Musalmans that have separate electorates and it is the Musalmans the separatists, the communalists who say that if we stick to our point they will not give in. There is another party called the Nationalist Muslim Party. They suggest a solution which if it is acceptable to the Congress will be acceptable to us also. But there is the other group called the Shafi group who were content at one time to scrap the separate electorates after ten years but even at that time when almost a final solution was being reached at the Nawab of Bhopal's palace they again went back on what they had said. This is the position in the country and what is the solution, you are offering? Would not the Shafi group be perfectly justified in saying? You Liberals what are you offering us? If separate electorates are to be done away with what are you offering us in their place? Nothing? That will lead us nowhere.

The Minorities
Problem.
Mr. G.K. Gadgil.

The president then called upon Sir Chimanlal Setalvad to reply on the debate. Sir Chimanlal said:

BROTHER DELEGATES, LADIES and GENTLEMEN: I beg of you in a matter of this importance not to be carried away by sentiment and feelings but to consider hard realities soberly and squarely. There is no question that we are all agreed that joint electorates is the right thing to adopt. Nobody disputes that. The resolution itself asserts it. The whole question is under existing circumstances what shall we do to secure unity in this country so that we may present a united front. Just consider what Mr. Kale's amendment comes to. It comes to this. However much the Mussalmans or a large section of them may be against coming into joint electorates, at this very minute you must force joint electorates, upon them, whether they agree or not. They may be perfectly misguided but the fact remains that they are asking for separate electorates. Mr. Kale's amendment means that even if that is so we should have joint electorates and we should force them down the throats of the Mussalmans. Is that an attitude which is likely to conduce to harmony and peace in this country? Is it no use referring to what happened in 1907 and 1908? Can you compare the condi-

Sir Chimanlal.

The Minorities
Problem.
Sir Chimanlal.

tions of 1908 to conditions of to-day? Had you in 1908 the happenings of Benares and Cawnpore? Had you at that time the communal feeling of these days? Is it wise for you in these days to antagonise the Mohamedans in these circumstances or is it wise to offer them a via media whereby we might unitedly demand full responsible government which we want. In course of time after we have worked the new constitution I am sure it will be more easy when things have calmed down to make them see what the right thing is. If on the other hand you try to force this down their throats what is going to happen? The existing distrust and want of confidence between the two communities will be immensely increased and endanger the prospects of our securing responsible government. Do not delude yourselves for a minute but make up your minds now. If there is to be no unity at the R. T. C. you may be sure you will not achieve half as much as you desire to achieve and I go further and say that even if you achieved self-government in India, what is the value of that self-government? How long can that self-government last? How soon will it break down if all the communities are not united in working harmoniously. Eschew sentiment and theoretical considerations and face hard facts and do something which will bring the Mahomedans along with you at this time to present a united front at the R. T. C.

As regards the resolution you will see that we lay down is that joint electorates are the right thing. The fact remains that a considerable section of the Mussalmans are not prepared to enter into joint electorates. Therefore we give them the alternative for a fixed period. What we mean by that is that at the expiration of that term joint electorates will automatically come into operation.

If you Mr. President will allow me to make a slight addition to the resolution I will add to clause 1 that separate electorates should disappear automatically at the end of the fixed term.

Rao Bahadur R. R. Kale interrupting raised a point of order and protested against any amendment of the resolution at that stage.

The president upheld the objection pointing out that the amendment was unnecessary as what was proposed to be added was clearly implied.

Continuing Sir Chimanlal said : Please do not be carried away by sentiments. Please give importance to the real facts of the case. You must have some such alternative to secure unity between the Mahomedans and the Hindus. I wish you therefore, brother delegates, to think well before you vote.

The Minorities
Problem.
Sir Chimanlal.

Putting the amendment to the meeting the President said: The question before the house is the amendment moved by Rao Bahadur Kale which says delete the words in clause 1 commencing from "or in the alternative etc.," and substitute the words "there should be reservation of seats for minorities." In order to clearly understand the effect of the amendment I will read the clause as amended. "Separate electorates should be done away with and there should be joint electorates with reservation of seats for minorities". Only those who are delegates and the members of the reception Committee, who are *ipso facto* delegates will have the right to vote. Visitors may remain in their seats but will kindly take no part in the voting. I have looked up the rules of the federation and I find that no provision is made with regard to the method of voting. Obviously it could not have been expected that a situation would arise for such rules. In the absence of any rule regarding voting on provincial basis I direct that the voting shall be by individual delegates. I would suggest that Mr. Dixit and Mr. Gokhale should count the votes.

After the votes were counted the President declared the amendment carried. The resolution as amended was then put to the meeting and was carried *nem con.*

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

RESOLUTION No. 19.

THE "DEPRESSED" CLASSES.

The National Liberal Federation has the strongest sympathy with the most legitimate and laudable aspirations of the classes called "depressed" to ameliorate their condition in all the spheres of national life and heartily commends all suitable measures for achieving this end.

The "Depressed"
Classes.
The President.

Council and
Officebearers.
The President.

RESOLUTION No. 20.
COUNCIL & OFFICEBEARERS.

(a) This Federation elects Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Jr.) K. C. I. E., M. L. A., and Mr. D. G. Dalvi to be the Hon. General Secretaries of the National Liberal Federation of India until the next session.

(b) The Federation elects the following Council to function until the election of another Council by its next session.

Speaking on the last resolution the President said:

Before putting this resolution to the vote I have to mention that we are obliged to the Honorary General Secretaries who are retiring, Sir. C. P. Ramaswami Iyer and the Hon. Rao Bahadur G. A. Natesan. I am sure I am speaking on behalf all of you when I say that we are grateful to them for valuable services they had rendered to the Liberal Federation as General Secretaries for the last 18 months. We regret they are going out of office but we are confident that they will render the same service in the organisation as members as if they were secretaries. At the same time I am sure we are all agreed that we could not have made a happier choice as their successors than Sir Cowasji Jehangir and Mr. Dalvi. We are all indebted to Sir Cowasji Jehangir who is an extremely able man and to Mr. Dalvi for having consented to take up the duties of general secretaries in this city which has always provided us with a home for our activities and here I hope the work of the Liberal Party will flourish and we shall begin to have a better record in the succeeding year. With these words I put the resolution.

The resolution was carried.

The President proceeding said: I have to announce that a meeting of the council will be held immediately after the session of the Federation is over this evening. Let not members feel uneasy as the meeting will not last more than ten minutes.

Mr. J. N. Basu next moved the following resolution and carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION No. 21.
MEETING PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION.

Resolved that the fourteenth annual session of the National Liberal Federation be held at Calcutta on such dates as may be fixed by the Council in consultation with the Reception Committee.

Meeting place of
the next session.
Mr. J. N. Basu.

Mr. Basu said : We shall be very glad to have the next session of the Federation in our midst in Calcutta. I only hope that session will be held in a much more pleasant political atmosphere than that in which we have been holding the present session here. To you from Bombay I say that it may not be possible for us to be as lavish in our hospitality as you have been but I may assure you that we shall not be lacking in the heartiness of our reception. I trust you will come to Calcutta in large numbers at the next session.

Meeting place of
the next session.
Mr. J. N. Basu.

Mr. S. N. Bose seconding the resolution said: I beg to second this resolution and I hope all of you without fail will accept our invitation. In Calcutta we have not got such a splendid hall but we shall do our best to make amends for our lack of wealth. With these words I commend the resolution for your acceptance.

Mr. S. N. Bose.

The resolution was carried.

Mr. V. N. Chandavarkar then moving a vote of thanks to the chair said : It gives me great pleasure to ask you to place on record our appreciation of the great work done by Mr. Chintamani as President of the Federation. If anyone is entitled to be called a national asset in India today, I submit, he is one of the few people who can claim that title. Born in Madras he has worked all his life in the United Provinces and some years in the C. P. and for some months in this city. He is truly a national asset. He can claim to be an all-India man. I doubt whether there is any Indian who has got his capacity for political work, who has got his memory or who has got his knowledge. The greatest compliment that could be given to Mr. Chintamani was paid by one of the papers in Bombay when it said that in a spirit of friendly criticism that the address which he delivered to this Federation the day before yesterday would have suited the Congress platform. We Liberals say that Mr. Chintamani if anything is the staunchest liberal. He is one of those few people who are loyal to principles and not loyal to parties or loyal to anybody. That is why he has been a true liberal all these years. Everyone knows that it is not a paying proposition if he wants to get on in public life to join the liberal party. Therefore it requires a great deal of courage to join the liberal party and to be closely associated with the party and Mr. Chintamani has never faltered throughout his long career in public life as a liberal. As he has worked as a liberal

Mr. V. N.
Chandavarkar.

Meeting place of
the next session.
Mr. V. N.
Chandavarkar.

and as a leader he has given the correct lead to his followers. This party stands for principles and not expediency. In giving a correct lead to his friends he forgot that he was a nominee of Government at the Round Table Conference and only remembered that he was the President of the federation whose duty it was to give a correct lead to this federation forgetting all that had happened in the past in London and what might happen in future in London and that the correct attitude that he could take. And I am sure all of you are grateful to Mr. Chintamani that he ignored all the influences of his lifelong friends and all other considerations and stuck to his line of action and tried to give a correct lead to his party of liberals which has been handed down to us from the date of Sir Pherozesha Mehta and Mr. Dadabhoj Nowroji. It is a great pity I submit that Mr. Chintamani is not appointed on the Federal Structure Committee. If you look at the list of the Committee you will find only one influential liberal on that Committee and that is the Rt. Hon. Shrinivas Shastri. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru having resigned the membership of the party for reasons best known to himself and it will be a great loss to the country and not only to the Liberal Party if a man like Mr. Chintamani and the President of the federation is not on the Committee. If I had any influence in the Liberal Party and in its management I would submit to this Council that if the liberal party wants to do any service to the country they should send Mr. Chintamani to London if not as a member of the Federal Structure Committee at least to be present there in the committee to hold a watching brief. His very presence ought to be a great asset to all our members who are there. Although he was not a member of the Federal Structure Committee and was a member of certain other committees I know it from reliable quarters that Mr. Chintamani was a great asset to everybody and a great help to many of his friends who sometimes giving say to political expediency wanted to make concessions which were contrary to principles. I want him to be there and I hope this suggestion will be given practical shape and that Mr. Chintamani will it convenient to go to London during the next session of the R.T.C. on behalf of the Reception Committee and the delegates who have come here from all parts of the country I pay our humble tribute of appreciation of the distinguished services rendered to the federation by Mr. Chintamani as President.

Mr. N. M. Joshi seconding the proposition said: I consider it a great privilege to be asked to second this resolution. Mr. Chintamani is one of our most brilliant, clear thinking, far-sighted, broad-minded patriotic public man. To us the Liberals he has rendered distinguished services. He is as Mr. Chandavarkar has said one of the truest exponents of Indian Liberalism. He is a staunch follower of principles. To the Liberal Party he has rendered great service by his great organising capacity. Whatever may be the strength of the Indian National Liberal Federation it is mainly due to the untiring work, to the great ability, to the attractive personality of Mr. Chintamani. His position in Indian public life is outstanding. To all people in this country he is known by his great knowledge, by his earnestness and by his capacity for work. We liberals love Mr. Chintamani, we admire him and we are proud of him. LADIES and GENTLEMEN, without detaining you for a moment longer may I usurp the function of the chairman and request you to pass this vote of thanks with acclamation.

Meeting Place of
the Next Session.
Mr. N. M. Joshi.

The vote was carried with acclamation and the President then rose to deliver his concluding speech.

PRESIDENT'S CONCLUDING SPEECH.

Mr. Chintamani who, on rising to reply, received a great ovation. He said:

SIR COWASJI JEHANGIR, BROTHER DELEGATES, LADIES and GENTLEMEN.—I cannot hope to express in anything like adequate language my deep sense of humble gratitude for all the kind and generous things that have been said of me just now by Mr. Chandavarkar and Mr. Joshi, and the day before yesterday by Sir Chimanlal Setalvad, Mr. Basu, Mr. Natesan, Munshi Narain Prasad and Mr. Kamat. I hope I am not so foolish and vain as to think that I deserve a fraction of what it has pleased them to say with their natural brotherly feeling for a friend and colleague. I shall reckon it a piece of singular good fortune if I should continue to deserve your confidence to even a fraction of the extent to which you have given it to me during the session of the Federation out of the abundance of your generosity, I am deeply obliged to every friend, to every delegate, to every member of the Reception Committee for the encouraging and cordial assistance and co-operation for which I pleaded the day before yesterday and without which it would not

President's
Concluding
Speech.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

President's
Concluding
Speech.
Mr. Chintamani.

have been possible for me to assist in bringing to a successful conclusion the deliberations of this session of the Federation. I am sure that every one will agree with me that important as was the business transacted at several previous sessions of the Federation during the last thirteen years, at no one of them was the business of so momentous and delicate a nature as that we had to consider at this session in view of the circumstance that we have met in between the last and the coming sessions of the Round Table Conference, and I am deeply indebted to those who have assisted in the deliberations of the Subjects Committee which extended for nearly nine hours and to those who have taken part in the proceedings of this afternoon for having brought to bear upon their duties the qualities of knowledge and ability, of moderation and fairness, of sense of responsibility and regard for principles, qualities which must distinguish every adherent of the creed of Liberalism.

LIBERALISM.

Whether they did or did not distinguish the members of our Liberal Party, LADIES and GENTLEMEN, I have never apologised, do not mean now to apologise and I hope and trust I shall never have to do so, for being a member of the Indian Liberal Party. Old-fashioned I may be, and I shall not be sorry if I am really so because not everything that is new is good, but I confess without regret that in the whole of the English political terminology I know of no single word which is more appropriate to the description of the creed and the position of a political party than the word 'liberal'. By its very definition it must exclude every narrow consideration of sectionalism. Liberalism stands for all and for every one with strict impartiality and in a practical way, erring on the side of generosity to those who are weak either in numbers or in strength. Liberalism at the same time stands for practical sagacity because it never sacrifices the supreme regard which every public man is bound to have for the interests of the country as overriding every other consideration. To that extent whenever fair-minded critics may find that the Liberal Party as a whole or its members individually fall short of this ideal of Liberalism, the fault is not of the creed of Liberalism but it is due to the imperfections of man, imperfections which the critics of the Liberals are no more immune from than are the Liberals themselves.

AN OMISSION EXPLAINED.

Referring to the present session of the Federation I should like to draw attention to an omission which might have been noticed by several. All the resolutions which were placed before the Federation and which have been passed by it, apart from formal resolutions, related almost directly to the subjects which were considered and will be considered by the Round Table Conference and the agenda did not include other subjects. The time at our disposal being limited and the subjects which had to be considered in connection with the Round Table Conference being as many and as important as they are, it would have been impossible for adequate consideration to be given to other subjects if the programme had been extended. It is due to this single circumstance and not due to lack of interest in other subjects or indifference to the larger point of social welfare that we have had with great reluctance to omit certain of the subjects to which we do attach great importance. And I hope his omission will be correctly understood instead of being unfairly misinterpreted.

President's
Concluding
Speech.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

R. T. C. AND LIBERALS' DUTY.

LADIES and GENTLEMEN, if you do not mind my detain-
ing you for a few minutes longer I should like to make a
reference briefly to one or two matters connected with the
Round Table Conference and my attitude thereto. Please do
not think that the statement that has been made outside this
hall is in any manner and to any extent correct that I had
attacked everything that had been done at the Round Table
Conference. I should have thought that any fair-minded and
truthful critic would have hesitated to have the extreme bold-
ness of making the statement if only he had cared to show
me the courtesy of reading what I said. Let me state here
clearly that I am second to no one including my distinguished
friend Sir Phiroze Sethna in my appreciation of the valuable
work that was done at the last session of the Round Table
Conference and I would remind you that in my own address
I stated that even if the results of the coming session should
prove to be disappointing, still I would hold that the political
prospect of the country was all the better for the Conference
having been held than if it had not been held. I did not
think it necessary, and I do not regret that I did not, to cata-
logue all the proposals of every Sub-Committee of the Confer-
ence of which in common with the rest of our countrymen I

President's
Concluding
Speech.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

really approved. If such a thing had been done I would have had to detain you day before yesterday not for two hours but for several times two hours. I thought that what was necessary was to point out where in our judgment the provisional conclusions of the Sub-Committees of the Conference fell short of our just expectations or the requirements of the country or took a line or shape different from what they should have been, and then to stress those points in order that at the next session attention might be concentrated upon them. It is no more necessary for a critic to make a prefatory statement of all that he approves and appreciates than for the editor or the publisher of a newspaper to print on the front page a standing advertisement in big type avowing that he is loyal to the Government by law established in British India and therefore need not be prosecuted. (Laughter). I did and do appreciate the good work that has been done by the Conference. I must say that in one respect, that is in respect of the method of approach, my opinion is not on all fours with the opinion of every other member of our party. I recognize as much as those of a very cautious temperament that the situation is delicate and that the greatest tact and moderation must be observed in the presentation of our case and the utterance of our criticisms. I do not disagree with them there but I part company with those of them who think that even at the preliminary stage of the expression of our opinion, in the presentation of our case, we must allow ourselves, to be overwhelmed by a sense of the difficulties of the situation and therefore, not on any ground that is dishonourable to any person but out of consideration of the highest patriotism, hesitate to be outspoken in the statement of what we consider to be the defects of the scheme. The ultimate decision would be taken by his Majesty's Government when they will go before the British Parliament with a new Government of India bill. Even the decisions of the Round Table Conference will have no higher status than of recommendations to the British Government and Parliament. We in this Liberal Federation are engaged in deliberations of a still more preliminary character. We are here to state, certainly in the language of restraint, of dignity and of moderation, but at the same time in the language of clearness, whether in our opinion the provisional schemes that are now before the country fall short of even the minimum which in our opinion the country requires and to express the hope and confidence that these opinions of ours will be considered for what they may be worth by all the members of

the Conference and its Sub-Committees when they reassemble in London. Not to make a clear statement of our case at this preliminary stage will in my opinion be almost equivalent to allowing judgment to go by default. I do not pretend that I must necessarily be right in holding this view. I recognise that some of those who do not hold this view are far more qualified and experienced than I am. But I shall be guilty of intellectual dishonesty and of misleading this Federation if I did not candidly state what I felt to be the right thing.

President's
Concluding
Speech.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

FAITH AND COURAGE.

I have one more word to say in this connection. It is to bring to your notice a statement made some years ago by a distinguished British statesman, Sir Austen Chamberlain, a former Secretary of State for India, and one who is not a Labourite or a Radical but a Unionist or Tory. Sir Austen said: "Now and then there comes a moment when courage is safer than prudence, when some great act of faith touching the heart and stirring the emotions of men can achieve miracles that no act of statesmanship can achieve." I think it will be our own fault if at this stage we are to hesitate to state unequivocally what we shall want the Round Table Conference to do. This does not necessarily mean that if the conclusions of the Conference and the legislation based thereon fall short of our expectations we necessarily commit ourselves to a particular course of action thereafter. It does not mean anything except this, that in our opinion these are the changes in the scheme that the interests of the country demand. I consider it the more imperative that advanced constitutionalists such as we are should deem it a national duty of the highest importance at this particular juncture to be plain-spoken in our opinions and in our demands in view of the most unscrupulous and vindictive campaign of misrepresentation of all Indian aspirations which is being carried in England. Only on my way to Bombay a few days ago I read with amazement a speech made by one of our former Governors whose fame lies buried in the Back Bay of Bombay in which he indulged in mendacious statements and false representations of things in this country and appealed to the passions and prejudices of the British man in the street against the cause of Indian reform. British statesmen and politicians are apt to think that all sense of responsibility is the monopoly of members of their own race. But we know there are men like Mr. Churchill and Lord Lloyd, who, after having held offices in successive

President's
Concluding
Speech.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

Cabinets, or the governorship of this presidency and the high commissionership in Egypt, and after long years of membership of the British Parliament can give points to the most irresponsible Indian extremists in making extreme and mendacious statements. Another British nobleman who is what he is because of Indian money, Lord Inchcape, has referred with unblushing effrontery to the greatest soul that modern India has produced in language that our own seditious fanatics would be ashamed of using. This noble Lord, this exemplar of good measures, did not think it beneath his dignity to refer to Mahatma Gandhi as a "*wretched, seditious fanatic*". And he proceeded to say in the same ignoble utterance that such a thing as Dominion Status for India was inconceivable either now or at any time in the future. I am glad to think that the average Englishman is not of the type of Lord Inchcape or Lord Lloyd and that true constitutionalist need not be deterred by the reckless utterances of such foolish men. The only obligation that is imposed upon us and the warning that we should take is that we should never hesitate to speak our minds stating the truth the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

THANKS TO RECEPTION COMMITTEE.

Now, LADIES and GENTLEMEN, it is my pleasant and grateful duty to convey to the chairman and members of the Reception Committee and the volunteers under their captain, on my own behalf personally and on behalf of all other delegates present here, our most sincere and grateful thanks for the patriotic efforts by dint of which they have made this session such a great success at this critical juncture. I mentioned the day before yesterday that it was the unique privilege of the city of Bombay to be the birthplace of the Indian National Congress as well as of the National Liberal Federation. It has also been its unique privilege always to come to the rescue of the National organizations, both Congress and Liberal Federation, to give them temporary home when other places were available. You will remember the years 1904 and 1915 when Bombay City and 1907 when Surat came forward to hold the Congress when it was found inconvenient to hold it elsewhere. I am not aware of any other province with such a proud record. We held a session of the Liberal Federation in this City and in this Hall at the end of December 1927 and yet Bombay City has volunteered to hold the present session here recognising as it did that it would be an act of disservice to the Liberal Party to allow it to remain in abey-

ance at this juncture. For this act of patriotism and for the subsequent effort without which the session would not have been such a great success, our thanks are due to our highly respected chairman of the Reception Committee to whose family we are indebted for this most beautiful hall, just as a few minutes ago I stated that our thanks are due to Sir Cowasji for having consented to shoulder the responsibility of General Secretary. I cannot omit to mention our distinguished leader who reminds us of our greatest leader, Sir Phirozshah Mehta, I mean Sir Chimanlal Setalvad. The other names which have been given to me as workers to whom in a special measure our thanks are due are my friend Mr. Dalvi, one of our new General Secretaries to whom we wish a speedy restoration to his normal health, Mr. Chandavarkar and Mr. Gokhale, two friends whose names bring to our minds the honoured names of Sir Narayan Chandavarkar and Mr. Narain Vishnu Gokhale, and Mr. A. D. Shroff. Messrs. Ambekar and Jog and Rao Bahadur Kale have done propaganda work in Maharashtra. My friend Mr. Vasant Rao Raout has acted as honorary treasurer. I thank the volunteers and their captain Mr. Dixit. Here is another name which recalls to memory another distinguished departed leader, Mr. Hari Sitaram Dixit. A cousin of the present captain was himself captain of the volunteers when the Congress was held here in 1904. Then there is Professor Deodhar of the School of Indian Music whose young students entertained us with charming music the day before yesterday and are going to entertain us again this evening. Last but not least there is one name which it gives me peculiar pleasure to commend to you and which Sir Cowasji has instructed me specially to mention. He is the man who 'though small and slight has done the most important and useful work.' This is Sir Cowasji's language. You find that small and slight man there, Mr. V. R. Bhende. That young man has managed to retain the uninterrupted and continuous confidence of, and become and remained the favourite of three such men as Sir Dinshaw Wacha, Sir Chimanlal Setalvad and Sir Cowasji Jehangir. I am sure such a young man must have exceptional qualities in him.

Mr. President's
Concluding
Speech.
Mr. C. Y.
Chintamani.

Let us hope that Mr. Bhende may live long of realise the promise of his younger days. There are also the Parsi volunteers under Mr. Shroff and Mr. Powri. Our thanks are due to all of them and we thank them gratefully.

President's
Concluding
Speech.
Mr. C. Y.
Chinnamani.

LADIES and GENTLEMEN, it only remains for me to once more express my sense of deep and profound gratitude to all of you for the extreme kindness you have shown to me and to express the humble hope that it may not be my misfortune to do anything seriously wrong which may lead you to withdraw that confidence. I hope and trust that at the next session of the Round Table Conference and in the work that will follow in connection with the coming reforms the National Liberal Federation of India as representing a great principle and a great tradition will justify itself amply in the eye of the country and will be acknowledged even by its critics to be a party and an organization worth having, worth admiring and worth respecting. With these words I thank you all again for your kindness to me.

The thirteenth annual session of the National Liberal Federation of India is dissolved.

Appendix A.

Members of the Reception Committee.

1. Ramchandra Ganpath Mallya, Esqr., Vasant Vihar, 14th Road, Khar, Bombay No. 21.
2. Madhavlal Makanji Bhat, Esqr., J. P. Alice Buildings, Fort, Bombay.
3. Devji Nanji Esqr., C/o Madhavlal & Co., Ltd., Alice Buildings, Hornby Road, Fort, Bombay.
4. Ramchandra K. Tatnis, Esqr., Editor The " Vividha Vritta " 364, Thakurdwar, Bombay.
5. K. J. Dubash, Esqr., M.A. LL.B., (Solicitor) 79, Meadows Street, Fort.
6. Jehangir P. Mehta, Esqr., C/o the Central Bank of India Ltd., Esplanade Road, Fort, Bombay.
7. Sir Cowasji Jehangir, (Jr.) K.C.I.E., M. L. A., Readymony Mansion, Churchgate Street, Bombay.
8. Dr. D. A. D'Monte, "Summit View", Bandra Hill, Bandra.
9. Nowrojee Rustomji Wadia, Esqr., No. 120, Woodhouse Road, Middle Colaba, Bombay.
10. V. N. Chandavarkar, Esqr., Bar-at-Law, 41, Pedder Road, Bombay.
11. Chunilal Maneklal Gandhi, Esqr., Advocate, Nanpura Road, Surat.
12. Sir Hormusjee C. Dinshaw, Kt., M.V.O., O.B.E., 121, Meadows Street, Fort, Bombay.
13. Gopaldas Viharidas Desai, Esqr., Nadiad (Gujrat).
14. Rustom Sorabji Davar, Esqr., Ruby Mantion, Nepean Sea Road, Bombay.
15. Jayakrishna M. Gopaldas Desai, Esqr., Nadiad (Gujrat).
16. D. N. Sirur, Esqr., C/o Messrs. N. Sirur & Co., Bank Street, Fort, Bombay.
17. G. B. Trivedi, Esqr., Merchant, Navsari Chambers, Fort, Bombay.
18. Joseph Alex Dias, Esqr., B.A., B.Sc., LL.B., J.P., Solicitor, Bell Lane, Fort, Bombay.
19. Cavasji D. Mahaluxmivala, Esqr., Halcyon Lodge, Vatchagandhi Road, New Gamdevi, Bombay.
20. C. A. Rebello, Esqr., Readymony Mansion, Churchgate Street, Fort, Bombay.
21. Madhav Damodar Altekar, Esqr., M.A., Tilak Mandir Road, Vile Parle.
22. Shripad Mahadeo Varde, Esqr., Girgaon Back Road, Bombay.
23. Dr. P. N. Daroowalla, Bar-at-Law, Gowalia Tank Building, 46C, Gowalia Tank Road, Bombay.
24. Vishvanath P. Vaidya, Esqr., Bar-at-Law, Forbes Street, Bombay.
25. J. R. Gharpure, Esqr., Angre's Wadi, Girgaon, Bombay.
26. J. R. B. Jeejeebhoy, Esqr., Alice Building, Hornby Road, Bombay.
27. Khan Bahadur Hormasji P. Chahewala, B.A., LL.B., Advocate, Kharpur Road, Ahmedabad.
28. L. X. Rego, Esqr., Mazagaon, Bombay.
29. Amirudin Shalebhoy Tyebjee, Esqr., Little Gibbs Road, Malabar Hill, Bombay.
30. R. S. Navalkar, Esqr., Advocate, Bhai Jeevanji Lane, Thakurdwar, Bombay.
31. Colonel Sir Byramji Hormasji Nanavatty, Kt., C.I.E., Ahmedabad.
32. The Hon. Sir Phiroze Sethna, Kt., Canada Building, Hornby Road, Bombay.

33. P. J. Marzban, Esqr., M.A. C/o Jame Jamshed Office, Fort, Bombay.
34. Gustadji D. Billimoria, Commisariat Bldg., Hornby Road, Fort, Bombay.
35. Shapurji Sorabji, Esqr., J. P., Messrs. Sorabji Shapurjee & Co., Ltd., Asian Building, Nicol Road, Ballard Estate, Bombay.
36. Khan Bahadur Ardeshir R. Bilimoria, Excelsior Theatre, Fort, Bombay.
37. J. D. Mahaluxmivala, Esqr., C/o The "Times of India", Fort, Bombay.
38. Sorab Pherozeshah Mehta, Esqr., 1, Govt. Gate Road, Parel.
39. M. S. Patker, Esqr., 16, Harvey Road, Gamdevi, Bombay 7.
40. Meyer Nissim, Esqr., M.A. 10, Outram Road, Fort, Bombay.
41. B. D. Lam, Esqr., Solicitor, 113, Esplanade Road, Fort.
42. Raghunath Pandurang Karandikar, Esqr., Advocate, Satara.
43. S. W. B. Nowrange, Esqr., Wasudeo Bhuwan, Laburnum Road, Bombay.
44. Kaikhosru N. Chandabhoy, Esqr., Morarbhai Building, Apollo Street, Fort, Bombay.
45. Jamshed N. R. Mehta, Esqr., Bonus Road, Karachi.
46. Sir Shapoorjee B. Billimoria, 113, Esplanade Road, Fort, Bombay.
47. Manu Subedar, Esqr., Kodak House, Hornby Road, Fort, Bombay.
48. Ramchandra Madhavram Bhat, Esqr., 483-96, Sandhurst Road, Bombay.
49. Dr. Merwanji Erachji Pavri, Colaba Castle, Middle Colaba.
50. Vithaldas Kanji, Esqr., 9, Wallace Street, Fort, Bombay.
51. Dr. Kavasji Edalji Dadachanji, 92, Ardeshir Dady Street, Khetwadi, Bombay.
52. Kazi Kabiruddin, Esqr., Bar-at-Law Malabar Hill, Bombay 6.
53. Chunilal B. Mehta, Esqr., 51, Marwari Bazar, Bombay.
54. Dattatraya Babaji Kambli, Esqr., Rajaram Bhuwan, East Tilak Bridge, Dadar, Bombay 14.
55. Shridhar Ganesh Chitale, Esqr., Advocate, High Court, Fanaswadi, Bombay 2.
56. Narhar Raghunath Phatak, Esqr., C/o Nawakal Office, Kandewadi.
57. Bhalchandra Narayan Gokhale, Esqr., M.A., LL.B., Advocate, High Court, Above Ambewadi Post Office, 157-59, Girgaon Bombay.
58. Dr. Joseph Alben D'Souza, M.L.C., 507, Girgaon Road, Bombay 2.
59. Raghavandra Sadashiv Purandare, Esqr., 1317, Kasba Peth, Poona.
60. G. V. Ranade, Esqr., Contractor, Vishnupura, Rawiwar Peth, Poona City.
61. H. V. Chinmulgund, Esqr., 383, Sadashiv Peth, Poona, 2.
62. Mrs. Tarabai Patwardhan, 383, Narayan Peth, Poona City.
63. Mrs. Kamalabai Gandhi, 569, Sadashiv Peth, Poona City.
64. G. K. Gadgil, Esqr., Bar-at-law, 580, Sadashiv Peth, Poona.
65. Ganesh Raoji Gandhi, Esqr., 569, Sadashiv Peth, Poona.
66. Prof. Vishwanath Keshav Jog, M.A., 213, Shukrawar Peth, Poona 2.
67. Shridhar Ganesh Vaze, Esqr., Servants of India Society, Poona.
68. Hari Ganpatrao Gharpurey, I. C. S. (Rtd.) 334, Shanwar Peth, Poona City.
69. Gopal Krishna Devadhar, Esqr., M.A., C.I.E., Servants of India Society, Poona City.
70. Kashinath Shriram Jatar, Esqr., C.I.E., 388, Narayan Peth, Poona.
71. Shapur N. Guzder, Esqr., 5, New Queen's Road, Bombay 4.

72. B. S. Dabke, Esqr. 144A, Girgaon Back Road, Bombay 4.
73. Vinayak Mahadeo Limaye, Esqr., B.Sc., 319, Shanwar Peth, Poona.
74. Lt., Colonel, Dinshaw D. Khambatta, 3, Jubitor Road, Poona.
75. Bomanjee Pestonjee, Esqr., B. A., LL. B., 602, Sachapir Street, Poona Camp.
76. J. M. Braganza, Esqr., 324, Main Street, Poona.
77. M. R. Joshi, Esqr., 299, Narayan Peth, Poona.
78. Prof. Shankar Gopal Sathe, 585, Shanwar Peth, Poona.
79. Khan Bahadur Dr. E. S. Bharucha, 6, B. J. Road, Poona.
80. P. S. Bakhale, Esqr., B.A., LL.B., Advocate, Godavari Niwas, Damar Lane, Grant Road, Bombay 7.
81. R. G. Pradhan, Esqr., B. A. LL. B., Advocate, Sydenham College of Commerce, Bombay.
82. Vicajee Ardeshir Taraporvala, Esqr., 7-10, Elphinstone Circle, Fort, Bombay.
83. Rao Bahadur, V. L. Thube, 1247, Shukrawar Peth, Poona City.
84. A. B. Sethna, Esqr., B.A., LL.B., Convent Street, Poona.
85. Khan Bahadur M. N. Mehta, East Street, Poona.
86. M. P. Frenchman, Esqr., 5, Main Street, Poona.
87. Cawasjee Jamsetjee, Esqr., 2, Elphinstone Road, Poona 1.
88. S. K. Godbole, Esqr., B.A., LL.B., 859, Sadashiv Peth, Poona.
89. Laxman Raghunath Karaley, Esqr., 843, Shukrawar Peth, Poona.
90. Mancherji Edalji Joshi, Esqr., L.C.E., J.P., 724, Parsi Colony, Dadar, Bombay.
91. Cursetji Jamsetji Cursetji, Esqr., White House, Apollo Bunder, Bombay.
92. J. D. Ghaswalla, Esqr., West Street, Camp Poona.
93. Lt. Col. K. C. Sanjana, 9, Parvati Villas, Poona 1.
94. Mahomed Ali Dost Mahomed, Peer Mahomed, Esqr., Bund Garden Road, Poona 1.
95. Dinshah Dorabji Kapadia, Esqr., 6, Staunton Road, Poona 1.
96. Mohomed Alaudin, Esqr., 35, Wellesley Road, Poona.
97. Dr. G. K. Ranadive, M.B.B.S., 243, Rasta Peth, Poona.
98. Framroz A. Vakil Esqr. 113, Esplanade Road, Fort, Bombay.
99. B. Chakranarayan Esqr., East Street, Poona.
100. Diwan Bahadur K. R. Godbole, M.C.E., 859, Sadashiv Peth, Poona.
101. Rao Saheb K. T. Gupte, B.A., LL.B., Shukrawar Peth, Poona.
102. Jugmohun Kaliandas, Esqr., Krishna Kunj, Ridge Road, Malabar Hill, Bombay 6.
103. Dwarkadas Kaliandas, Esqr., Krishna Kunj, Ridge Road, Malabar Hill, Bombay 6.
104. Pandurang V. Laud, Esqr., Saraswat Colony, Poona 2.
105. Sir Chimanlal H. Setalvad, 113, Esplanade, Road, Fort, Bombay.
106. The Hon'ble Mr. H. M. Mehta, Apollo Street, Fort, Bombay.
107. A. D. Shroff, Esqr., Savoy Chambers, Dalal Street, Fort, Bombay.
108. Sir Byramjee Jeejeebhoy, Alice Buildings, Hornby Road, Fort, Bombay.
109. Husseinally M. Rahimtullah, Esqr., M.L.C., Agakhan Building, Dalal Street, Fort, Bombay.
110. D. G. Dalvi, Esqr., 217, Charni Road, Girgaum, Bombay.
111. Vasantrao S. Raut, Esqr., J.P., French Bridge, Bombay 7.
112. Mulchand A. Shah, Esqr., Advocate, Madhav Baugh Road, Ahmedabad.

113. Kanji Dwarkadas, Esqr., Ridge Road, Malabar Hill, Bombay.
114. J. K. N. Kabraji, Esqr., Meteorology Quarters, Poona 5.
115. Rao Bahadur K. V. Shinde, 17, Budhavar Peth, Poona City.
116. D. R. Guru, Esqr., 81, Raste Peth, Poona City.
117. Narhar Nilkanth Hingne, Esqr., Pleader, Gujar Lane, Ahmednagar.
118. G. A. Advant, Esqr. Near Maidan Road, Ahmednagar.
119. Shridhar Govind Bhavs, Esqr., Radha Bhuvan, Matunga.
120. S. N. Pochkhanwalla, Esqr., C/o The Central Bank of India, Ltd., Fort, Bombay.
121. N. J. Kohiyar, Esqr., (Solicitor) 113, Esplanade Road, Fort, Bombay.
122. Dr. T. M. Kajiji, LL.D., "Dilkhoosh," Grant Road, Bombay.
123. Mangesh Anandrao Dabholkar, Esqr., Anand Mahal, Chowpatty, Bombay.
124. Gajanan K. Deshpande, Esqr., Advocate, 928, Sadashiv Peth, Poona 2.
125. Balkrishna Sitaram Kamat, Esqr., M.L.C., Geneshkhind Road, Poona 5.
126. P. R. Chikodi, Esqr., M. L. C., Belgaum.
127. Raoji V. J. Sunkerseth, Esqr., Sunkerseth House, Girgaum, Bombay.
128. Hormasji M. Chowna, Esqr., J.P., Morarbhaj Building, Apollo Street, Bombay.
129. Gustadji Burjorji Reporter, Esqr., Hormuzd Building, Sussex Road, Byculla.
130. Rao Bahadur Laxman Vishwanath Pophale, Malegaon, Nasik.
131. Knan Bahadur Muhmad Ismail Curtay, C/o Messrs. Captain & Vaidya, Solicitors, Fort, Bombay.
132. Ramchandra Govind Kashikar, Esqr., Pleader, Malegaon, Nasik.
133. Joseph Gomes, Bar-at-law Esqr., 24th Club Road, Byculla, Bombay.
134. Dr. D. M. Masina, 63, Pedder Road, Bombay.
135. Dawoodbhai S. Tyebji, Esqr., M.L.C., Bank Street, Bombay.
136. The Hon. Sirdar Sri Jagannath Maharaj Pandit, Bhau Maharaj House, Poona City.
137. Khan Bahadur D. N. Cooper, M.L.C., Satara.
138. Manek Ardeshir Karanjawalla, Esqr., 16, Walkeshwar Road, Malabar Hill, Bombay.
139. Capt. Sohrab R. Bamji, York Building, Fort, Bombay.
140. V. A. M. Pereira, Esqr., Herbal Pharmacy, 318, Marine Lines, Bombay.
141. Dr. F. M. Sethna, Wasiamal Building, Grant Road, Bombay.
142. Rao Bahadur Govind M. Thenge, Goverdhandas Building No. 2, Parekh Street, Sandhurst Road, Bombay.
143. G. S. Marathe, M. A. Esqr., Poona, No. 4.
144. Prof. V. G. Kale, M.A., Durgha Nivas, Poona 4.
145. Prof. S. Y. Ponshe, M.A., LL.B., Gokhale's Bungalow, Ambrai Camp, Poona, 4.
146. Moreshwar C. Javle, Esqr., 684, Dadar Road, Bombay.
147. Alwyn Ezra, Esqr., F.R.G.S., J.P., Esplanade Road, Fort, Bombay.
148. Ramchandra Dharmaji Shinde, Esqr., Govt. Pleader & Prosecutor, Nasik City.
149. Kaikhansru Cursetji Lalkaka, Esqr., "Cirrus Avenue," Byculla, Bombay No. 8.
150. Dhirajlal K. Thakore, Esqr., Bar-at-Law, Tulsi Villa, Harvey Road, Gamdevi.

151. Shiavax C. Cambatta, Esqr., Cooks Buildings, 324, Hornby Road, Fort, Bombay.
152. V. C. Setalvad, Esqr., Nepean Sea Road, Malabar Hill, Bombay.
153. Nowroji Dossabhoy Billimoria, Esqr., Commisariat Building, Hornby Road, Bombay.
154. H. R. Patel, Esqr., C/o R. Manekji & Co., Lal-Baug, Parel, Bombay.
155. C. J. Billimoria, Esqr., 69, Cawasji Patel Street, Fort, Bombay.
156. Abdali M. Kajiji, Esqr., Bar-at-law "Dilshoosh," Grant Road.
157. Abdul Rahim Dimtimker, Esqr., Nemanee Building, Bellasis Road, Bombay 8.
158. T. Buell, Esqr., J.P., Principal, American Mission High School, Byculla.
159. Rao Bahádur Hanmantram Ramnath, 609, Raviwar Peth, Poona 2.
160. Phirozshah N. Mehta, Esqr., Cooks Bldg., 324, Hornby Road, Fort.
161. S. A. Manurkar, Esqr., 1245, Budhwar Peth, Poona 2.
162. Rev. J. F. Edwards, United Theological College of W. India, 7, Sholapur Road, Poona.
163. N. L. Halbe, Esqr., 343, Shukrawar Peth, Poona 2.
164. Nasarwanji N. Boyce, Esqr., Dubash Building, Fort, Bombay.
165. Firoz N. Cooper, Esqr., 5, New Queen's Road, Bombay 4.
166. Mr. M. R. Baxter, Tata Sons & Co., Ltd., Bombay House, Fort.
167. Mr. Frank Oliveira, "The Haven", Mount Road, Mazagaon, Bombay.
168. The Rev. Henry Lees Adamson, 1, Stanley Road, Poona.
169. Mr. M. N. Paranjpe, 217, Budhwar Peth, Poona City.
170. „ Laxman N. Heblkar, Amrai Camp, Poona 4.
171. „ S. S. Gaikwad, 188, Raste Peth, Poona City.
172. „ Abdul Latif Curtay, 139-45, Ali Umer Street, Umerkhadi, Bombay No. 9.
173. Khan Bahadur Shaikh Ali Baakza, New Queen's Road, Bombay.
174. Mr. Gopal B. Chitale, Dandekar Building, Charni Road, Bombay.
175. Rao Bahadur R. R. Kale, M.L.C., Palace Street, Satara City.
176. Mr. A. E. Dalal, 59, Queen's Road, Bombay 2.
177. Dr. Vasudeo K. Kirloskar, Sholapur City.
178. Mr. K. D. Nerurkar, Sholapur.
179. „ Damodar G. Gadgil, Hatch Road, Sholapur.
180. „ Pandurang T. Phadke, Pleader, Sholapur.
181. „ Dattatraya G. Sathe, Sholapur.
182. „ Nilkanth C. Limaye, (Advocate) Public Prosecutor, Sholapur.
183. „ Jal S. Jassawalla, Vishnu Villa, Sholapur.
184. „ Govind R. Deshpande, Pleader, Sholapur.
185. „ Balaram V. Senjit, Solicitor, 41A, Bruce Street, Fort, Bombay.
186. „ D. D. Shroff, C/o S. B. Billimoria & Co., 113, Esplanade Road.
187. „ D. D. Romer, Solicitor, 14K, Hamam Street, Fort, Bombay.
188. „ D. J. Toddywalla, Chief Agent, The Motor Union Insurance Co., Ltd., Jehangir Wadia Building, Fort, Bombay.
189. „ Kaikobad C. Dinshaw, 121, Medows Street, Fort, Bombay.
190. Dr. R. N. Ranina, Parsi Colony, Dadar, Bombay.
191. Dr. J. J. Cursetji, 130, Banu Mansion, Cumballa Hill, Bombay.
192. Mr. Jehangir R. Dubash, 10, Carnac Bridge Road, Bombay 3.
193. Mr. N. G. Pawar, 18, Carmichael Road, Cumballa Hill, Bombay.
194. „ J. D. Khambatta, Solicitor, Central Bank Building, Fort.
195. „ S. D. Saklatwalla, 18, Carmichael Road, Cumballa Hill.
196. „ Haroon T. Noorani, 171, Kambekar Street, Bombay 3.

197. Mr. Jehangir H. Sorabji, 33-35, New Queen's Road, Bombay.
 198. „ Dinshaw D. P. Dinshaw, 16, Sleater Road, Bombay, 7.
 199. „ Sarvotam G. Kantak, Kantak's Bunglow, Vile Parle.
 200. „ Jehangir B. Boman-Behram, Sea Side, Colaba.
 201. „ Vinayak B. Rege, 171, Civil Lines, Cantonment, Belgaum.
 202. Rao Bahadur Sirdar M. V. Kibe, Saraswati Niketan, Camp Indore.
 203. Mr. Pestanji M. Kanga, 25, Nepean Sea Road, Malabar Hill, Bombay.
 204. „ N. H. C. Koyaji, Hughes Road, Bombay 6.
 205. „ N. M. Raiji, C/o S. B. Billimoria & Co., Fort, Bombay.
 206. „ D. R. Toddywalla, Rustom Baug, Victoria Road, Mazagaon.
 207. Khan Saheb A. M. M. Mansuri, Pankorenaka, Ahmedabad.
 208. Mr. M. S. Sirdar, Bar-at-Law, Phaltangath, Sholapur.
 209. „ J. R. Limaye, Manager, Narsingirji Mill, Sholapur.
 210. „ D. M. Wadia, Agent, „ „ „
 211. Rao Bahadur K. V. Brahma, C.I.E., High Court Pleader, Amraoti Camp, Berar.
 212. Rao Bahadur W. R. Bhat, Medical Practitioner, Amraoti.
 213. Rao Bahadur D. G. Padhye, M.A., Nasik.
 214. Mr. W. B. Pradhan, Charni Road, Girgaum, Pombay.
 215. „ Rahimtoola M. Chinoy, Meher Building, Chowpatty.
 216. „ N. M. Joshi, M.L.A., Servants of India Society, Sandhurst Road, Bombay.
 217. „ M. K. Apte, Advocate, Dhulia.
 218. „ Muhammadally Allabux, 110, Cowasji Patel Street, Fort, Bombay.
 219. Mrs. Anandibai Dhavle, C/o Principal Gharpure, Angre's Wadi, Girgaum Back Road, Bombay.
 220. Mr. Syed Munavar, M.L.C., 494, Parel Road, Opp. J. J. Hospital, Bombay 8.
 221. „ Laxman R. Gokhale, M.L.C., 419, Narayan Peth, Poona 2.
 222. „ Anant V. Patwardhan, Arya Bhushan Press Office, Poona 2.
 223. „ Mr. Purshotamrai G. Solanki, M.L.C., 419, Narayan Peth, Poona 2.
 224. Rao Bahadur Krishnaji G. Joshi, 383, Narayan Peth, Poona City.
 225. Mr. Bomanji A. Parikh, Excise Contractor, Dharwar.
 226. „ K. S. Redkar, Sangli.
 227. „ M. B. Marathe, Advocate, Belgaum.
 228. Diwan Bahadur A. B. Lathe, Belgaum.
 229. Mr. A. S. Deshpande, 92, Thalak Wadi, Belgaum.
 230. „ B. R. Kulkarni, „ „ „
 231. „ J. E. Frenchman, 620, Sachapir Street, Poona.
 232. „ P. E. Kalyaniwalla, 2, Parwati Villa, Camp, Poona.
 233. Rai Bahadur Dr. V. V. Mulay, Sholapur.
 234. Diwan Bahadur Thakoreram Kapilram, C.I.E., Athwa Lines, Surat.
 235. Mr. R. D. Kanga, Tramway Bungalow, Ormiston Road, Fort.
 236. „ G. M. Gupte, Bar-at-Law, Turner Road, Bandra.
 237. Dr. M. N. Bulsara, No. 5, 1st Carpenter Street, Mazagaon.
 238. Mr. Shankar S. Persha, 104, Main Street, Camp, Poona.
 239. „ G. D. Ghule, Dapoli Ghule Wadi, Post Kirkee.
 240. „ A. P. Chaughule, Belgaum.
 241. „ S. Meherbaksh, M.L.C., 6-8, Cadell Road, Mahim.
 242. „ Jivaji K. Parulkar, J.P., 24, New Queen's Road, Bombay.

APPENDIX B.

List of Delegates.

BOMBAY.

1. P. G. Naik, Social Worker, 6, Morland Road, Byculla, Bombay.
2. Mr. R. G. Nayak, Merchant, "Dawn", Khar Road, Bombay 21.
3. Mr. Vamanrao D. Joshi, Merchant, 10, Mohan Building, Girgaon, Bombay.
4. Mr. Jayaram Krishna Joshi, Service & Insurance Agency, Girgaon, Bombay.
5. Mr. N. C. Bhesania, Advocate, Javeri Bldg., Charni Road, Bombay.
6. Mr. G. A. Godambe, M.A. LL.B., Solicitor, "Green Villa", Harvey Road, Gamdevi, Bombay.
7. Mr. M. S. Dixit, Hari Nivas, Ville Parle.
8. V. R. Bhende, Esqr., Alice Building, Hornby Road, Bombay.
9. Mr. P. N. Shende, Advocate, 226, Charni Road, Bombay.
10. Mr. Krishnajeo D. Dewal, B.A., Sadashiv Nivas, Ville Parle.
11. Mr. S. Kamalakar, B.A., LL.B., Advocate, Thakurdwar, Bombay.
12. Mr. B. P. Phatak, B.A., LL.B., Advocate, Badam Wadi, Bombay 4.
13. Mr. N. M. Kale, B.A., LL.B., S.T.C.D., Lower Parel, Bombay 13.
14. Mr. P. G. Patil, LL.B., Advocate, Sandhurst Bridge, Bombay 7.
15. Mr. N. J. Mankanse, Chief Store-Keeper, Tramway Bunglow, Ormiston Road, Fort Bombay.
16. Mr. S. V. Phadnis, B.A., S.T.C., Bhaskar Bhau's Wadi, Gamdevi, Bombay.
17. Mr. Nadir T. M. Garda, B.A., LL.B., G.D.A., Vasantpuram, Juhu.
18. Mr. M. D. Karaka, 127, Cumballa Hill, Bombay.
19. Mr. Shivram Shripad Washikar, "Dnyan Prakash" Office, Bombay.
20. Mr. B. Y. Khisty, S.T.C., J.P., Headmaster, Wilson High School, Girgaon, Bombay.
21. Mr. D. E. Misquita, Park Road, Ville Parle.
22. Mr. Sitaram Govind Raje, Ville Parle.
23. Mr. Y. S. Ravut, Merchant, French Bridge, Chaupaty, Bombay.
24. Mr. Sakharam Waman Joshi, B.A., LL.B., Merchant, 14, Hammam Street, Bombay.
25. Mr. G. N. Sahasrabudhe, B.A., Working Men's Institute, Parel.
26. Mr. G. L. Chandavarkar, B. A., 41, Pedder Road, Bombay.
27. Mr. Y. V. Bhandarkar, B.A., LL.B., Advocate, Khota's Wadi, Bombay.
28. Mr. K. G. Chitalia, Member, Servants of India Society, Bombay 4.
29. Mr. S. H. Modak, B.A., (hons.) Working Secretary, Deccan Merchant's Association, Bombay.
30. Mr. G. M. Ghate, Reporter, Ville Parle.
31. Mr. H. L. Desai, Bombay.

POONA.

32. M. D. Gokhale, M. A., LL.B., Pleader, 687, Budhwar, Poona.
33. Dr. V. C. Gokhale, L.M. & S., 922, Sadashiv Peth, Poona 2.
34. Prof. S. R. Kanitkar, M. A., 319, Shanwar Peth, Poona 2.
35. Mr. Cowasji J. Shroff, B. A., Main Street, Poona.
36. Mr. L. J. Kamat, B. A., Raste Peth, Poona 2.
37. Mr. P. D. Dikshit, House Agent, Poona No. 1.
38. Prof. T. F. Yeolekar, M. A., Poona 4.
39. Prof. S. B. Bondale, M. A., Poona 4.

40. Prof. G. V. Tulpule, M. A., Sadashiv Peth, Poona No. 2.
41. Prof. R. H. Kelkar, M.A., Kanya Shala, Shanwar Peth, Poona. 2.
42. Prof. R. N. Joshi, M.A., Superintendent N. E. School Boarding House, Shanwar Peth, Poona. 2.
43. Prof. V. B. Naik, M.A., Sadashiv Peth, Poona 2.
44. Dr. K. K. Joshi, M.A., Ph. D., Poona 4.
45. Prof. K. G. Pandit, M.A., Poona 4.
46. Prof. N. G. Suru, M.A., Sadashiv Peth, Poona 2.
47. Dr. P. L. Vaidya, M.A., Ph.D., 342, Sadashiv Peth, Poona.
48. Prof. K. R. Kanitkar, M.A., B.sc., Poona No. 4.
49. Mr. K. T. Dikshit, B.A., B.sc., G. D. A., 903, Sadashiv Peth, Poona.
50. Mr. Shrinivas Narayan Karnatki, Govt. Pensioner, Raste Peth, Poona.
51. Mr. K. M. Chiplunkar, B. A. LL. B., Pleader, Sadashiv Peth, Poona.
52. Capt. S. G. Ranade, I.M.S., Govt. Pensioner, Poona.
53. Rao Bahadur B. N. Sathye, L.C. E., Pensioner, Deccan Gymkhana, Poona.
54. Mr. P. K. Gode, M.A., Poona 4.
55. Prof. G. B. Kolhatkar, M.A., Poona 4.
56. Prof. M. K. Joshi, M.A., Poona 4.
57. Miss Chandrabai Ponskhe, B.A., LL.B., Pleader, Amrai Camp, Poona.
58. Prof. D. G. Karve, M.A., Fergusson College, Poona.
59. Mr. V. K. Chitale, B.A., LL.B., Chitle Wadi, Poona 4.
60. Mr. V. H. Barve, Member of Servants of India Society, Poona No.4.
61. Mr. B. S. Brahme, B.A., LL.B., Pleader, Budhwar Peth, Poona No.2.
62. Mr. Baburao Ganpat Jagtap, B.A., B.T., 1248, Shukrawar, Poona.
63. Mr. M. G. Honap, B.A., LL.B., Pleader, Budhwar Peth, Poona.
64. Mr. V. G. Gokhale, B. Com., Merchant, Amrai Camp, Poona 4.
65. Mr. N. G. Bhadbade, B.A., LL.B., Pleader, Budhwar Peth, Poona.
66. Prof. B. D. Sttigiri, M.A., Tilak Road, Poona No. 2.
67. Rao Bahadur Chimanlal Kisandas, 586, Rawiwar, Peth, Poona.
68. Mr. G. L. Dhekne, B.A., LL.B., Gov. Pensioner, 316, Somwar Peth, Poona.
69. Mr. N. D. Dange, B.A., LL.B., Advocate, Budhwar, Peth, Poona No. 2.
70. Mrs. Saralabai Naik, M.A., Seva Sadan, Sadashiv Peth, Poona.
71. Mr. V. G. Bhandarkar, Poona No. 4.
72. Mr. P. L. Modak, Building Contractor, Poona 4.
73. Mr. M. B. Palkhiwalla, B.A., 852, Dastur Meher Road, Camp Poona.
74. Mr. Dattatraya Vithal Bapat, M.A., Superintendent, M. E. S. High School, Baramati, Dist. Poona.
75. Mr. Dattatray Vasudeo Ambekar, Member, Servants of India Society, Poona.
76. Mr. S. N. Tadpatrikar, M.A., Bhandarkar Research Institute, Poona.
77. Mr. K. M. Bal, Arya Bhushan Press Office, Budhwar Peth, Poona 2.
78. Dr. S. L. Chinchankar, M.B.B.S., 131, Main Street, Camp Poona.
79. Mr. A. C. Bhat, 634, Budhwar Peth Poona 2.
80. Mr. G. C. Bhat, M.A., LL.B., Pleader, 634, Budhwar Peth, Poona City.
81. P. D. Tamhankar, 9, Narayan Peth, Poona 2.
82. Dr. B. B. Wable, M.B.B.S., 551, Sadashiv Peth, Poona.
83. Capt. V. A. Belsare, Budhwar Peth, Poona.
84. Prof. V. G. Mydeo, M.A., Poona No. 4.
85. Mr. A. G. Padhye, B.A., LL.B., Pleader, 528, Sadashiv Peth, Poona.
86. Mr. N. V. Mainkar, Dentist, 249, Budhwar, Poona.

87. Mr. K. R. Gadgil, Journalist, Poona 4.
88. Mr. W. G. Puranik, Kasba Path, Poona City.
89. Mr. K. G. Limaye, M.A., LL.B., 940, Bhamburda, Poona, 4.
90. Mr. S. G. Gokhale, M.A., Member, Servants of India Society, Poona.
91. Mr. K. G. Sharangpani, B.A., LL.B., Servants of India Society, Poona.
92. Mr. L. G. Mahajani, Merchant, 342, Sadashiv Path, Poona.
93. Mr. V. K. Khasnis, B.A., M.E. Society's High School, Sadashiv Peth, Poona.
94. Prof. R. K. Khandekar, M.N., 321, Shanwar Peth, Poona.
95. Mr. Narhar Ganesh Joshi, M.A., Vaidya's Wada, Chitale Raod, Poona.
96. Prof. R. S. Aiyar, M.A., Tilak Road, Poona.
97. Mr. A. P. Bapat, Merchant, Budhwar Peth, Poona.
98. Mr. G. G. Thakar, B.A., LL.B., Pleader, 484, Budhwar Peth, Poona.
99. Mr. M. Y. Datar, "Dnyan Prakash" Office, Budhwar Peth, Poona.
100. Mr. R. K. Bhide, B.A., Sadashiv Peth, Poona 2.
101. Mr. B. S. Rudra, Journalist, 923, Sadashiv Peth, Poona.
102. Mr. A. G. Ganu, Journalist, "Dnyan Prakash" Office, Poona 4.
103. Mr. Gangadhar V. Gupte, B.A., LL.B., Pleader, 364, Sadashiv Peth, Poona.
104. Mr. A. L. Deshpande, Pleader, 180, Kasba Peth, Poona.
105. Mr. B. A. Deshpande, Poona.
106. Mr. D. V. Velankar, Amrai Camp, Poona 4.
107. Mr. Y. R. Date, B.A., LL.B., Deccan Gymkhana, Poona 4.
108. Prof. N. G. Damle, M.A., Poona 4.
109. Mr. Sulochanabai Hudlikar, B.A., Poona No. 4.
110. Prof. S. B. Hudlikar, M.A., Poona No. 4.
111. Mr. K. S. Gupte, B.A., LL.B., Pleader, 691, Budhwar Peth, Poona.
112. Mr. S. P. Karekar, L.E.E., 247, Raste Peth, Poona.
113. Mr. S. V. Bhide, B.A., Journalist, Sadashiv Peth, Poona.
114. Mr. S. K. Shindkar, Landlord, 317A, Narayan Peth, Poona, 2.
115. Principal G. S. Mahajani, M.A., Fergusson College, Poona.

SATARA.

116. Mr. R. N. Rajadnya Landlord, Islampur (Dist. Satara.)
117. Mr. N. G. Joshi, B.A., LL.B., Pleader, Satara.
118. Mr. V. N. Phansalkar, Pleader, Karad, Satara.
119. Mr. Vaghat N. Deshpande B.A., LL.B., Advocate, Sadashiv Peth, Satara.
120. Mr. A. M. Kuber, B.A., LL.B., Pleader, Dahiwadi, (Dist. Satara.)
121. Mr. Ganpatdas Hirachand Devi, Merchant, Satara.
122. Mr. Bhaudada Kudale, Landlord, Satara.

SOUTHERN MAHARASHTRA COUNTRY.

123. Mr. V. N. Desai, L.M.&S., Sangli.
124. Prof. G. R. Abhyankar, B.A., LL.B., Pleader, Sangli.
125. Mr. S. V. Joglekar, B.A., Kelkar Bag, Belgaum.
126. Mr. V. A. Abhyankar, B.A., LL.B., Pleader Belgaum.
127. Mr. Vaman Achyut Desai, B.A., Belgaum.
128. Mr. G. B. Gajendragadkar, B.A., Thalakwadi, Belgaum.
129. Mr. A. N. Nadgauda, B.A., Thalakwadi, Belgaum.
130. Mr. M. N. Salgarkar, B.A., LL.B., Pleader, Sholapur City.
131. Mr. V. C. Limaye, B.A., LL.B., Pleader, Sholapur.

132. Mr. M. V. Lele, B.A., LL.B., Pleader, Sholapur City.
 133. Vithoba Sivappa Vadepalli, Merchant, Sakharpet, Sholapur City.
 134. Mr. N. B. Karnekar, B.A., LL.B., Pleader, Sholapur.
 135. „ P. G. Boke, Merchant, Dnyan Prakash Office, Sholapur City.
 136. „ N. P. Patankar, B.A., LL.B., Advocate, Nasik City.
 137. Mr. Vishwanath Jayaram Gupte, Pleader, Malegaon, Dist. Nasik.
 138. Mr. R. S. Modak, Missionary, Ahmednagar.
 139. Mr. W. Q. Suraet, Ahmednagar.
 140. Mr. S. R. Rajahansa, B.A., LL. B., Pleader, Ahmednagar.
 141. Mr. H. G. Parkhe, B.A., LL.B., Pleader, Ahmednagar.
 142. Mr. Sindhubar Hivargaonkar, Ahmednagar.
 143. Mr. V. C. Valimbe, B.A., LL.B., Pleader, Ahmednagar.
 144. Mr. Ganesh T. Dhaneshwar, B.A., LL.B., Pleader, Ahmednagar.
 145. Mr. R. G. Dhaneshwar, Ahmednagar.
 146. Mr. B. M. Deshmukh, B.A., Ahmednagar.
 147. Mr. Gopal T. Dhaneshwar, B.A., LL.B., Pleader, Ahmednagar.
 148. Mr. P. R. Kabare, Merchant, Ahmednagar.
 149. Mr. R. R. Rajahansa, B.A., Pleader, Ahmednagar.
 150. Mr. G. R. Gaikawai, B.A., LL.B., Pleader, Ahmednagar.
 151. Mr. P. G. Mehendargi, B.A., LL.B., Pleader, Ahmednagar.
 152. Mr. M. N. Durve B.A., LL.B., Bhivandi, Thana.

UNITED PROVINCES AND THE PUNJAB.

153. Mr. C. Y. Chintamani, M.L.C., Journalist, 17, Hamilton Road, Allahabad.
 154. A. P. Andrews-Dube, M.A., Servants of India Society, Allahabad.
 155. Pandit H. N. Kunzru, B.A., B.Sc., 1, Katra Road, Allahabad.
 156. The Hon. Munshi Narayan Prasad Asthana, M.A., LL.B., Advocate, High Court, Allahabad.
 157. Mr. Surendra Nath Varma, M.A., LL.B., Advocate, High Court, Allahabad (U. P.)
 158. Mr. Krishna Ram Metha, B.A., LL.B., Journalist, Leader Press, Allahabad.
 159. Mr. Vishvanath Prasad, B.A., LL.B., Journalist, 4, Leader Building, Allahabad.
 160. Pandit Hardatta Sharma, B.A., LL.B., 17, Maclagan Road, Lahore.

BENGAL AND BEHAR.

161. Mr. S. M. Bose, M.A., M.L.C., Barrister-at-law, Calcutta.
 162. Mr. Jatindranath Basu, M.A., M.L.C., Solicitor, Bolaram Ghose Street, Calcutta.

MADRAS.

163. The Hon. Mr. G. A. Natesan, Editor, Indian Review, Madras.

CENTRAL PROVINCES AND BERAR.

264. Mr. Shankar N. Bhalchandra, B.A., LL.B., Pleader, Yeotmal.
 165. Rao Bahadur R. G. Mundle, B.A., LL.B., High Court Pleader, Yeotmal.
 166. Rao Bahadur V. M. Kelkar, M. A., Craddock Town, Nagpur.
 167. Mr. M. D. Shahane, B. A., Servants of India Society, Nagpur.
 168. Mr. A. R. Bambawale, B. A., B.L., Craddock Town, Nagpur.