

**FORTY-THIRD
INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS**

CALCUTTA

1928

FOREWORD

The Secretaries of the Reception Committee of the Calcutta Session of the National Congress kindly undertook to see this report through the press. The labour and responsibility involved in this work has thus fallen on them, and on behalf of my co-Secretary and myself I have to express our indebtedness to them.

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU,
General Secretary,
A. I. C. C.

ALLAHABAD,
June 25th, 1929.

INTRODUCTION 38657
TO THE
CALCUTTA CONGRESS REPORT.

GENERAL.

When the question of deciding upon the venue of the next Congress came before the A. I. C. C. meeting at Gauhati, there was a feeling amongst many members that in view of the impending enquiry into the Constitution of India, the Congress for the years 1927 and 1928 should be held in a big Provincial City like Madras, Calcutta or Bombay and the first choice fell upon Madras. When the same matter came up for decision in 1927 at Madras, Punjab although anxious to have the Congress in Lahore, stood aside in favour of Bengal. The Session, therefore, took place in Calcutta. It was rather a queer coincidence that the Simon Commission arrived in Calcutta only three hours after the arrival of the President-elect Pandit Motilal Nehru. No one could fail noticing the differential behaviour of the people of the country. It gave them a unique opportunity to give a royal welcome to the President of the Congress. This was as enthusiastic as their boycott of the Simon Commission was deliberate.

The Congress Session of 1928, was unique from other points of view. The All Parties Conference had met at Lucknow in August and had decided to meet at Calcutta during Congress Week. The Reception Committee had to look for the arrangements for the holding of the Sessions of the All Parties Conference which commenced on the 22nd of December. They had to arrange for the board and accommodation of the delegates to the Convention, many of whom were not even members of or delegates to the Congress. This practically meant a prolonged Congress Session of a fortnight, starting from 20th of December, when the guests began to arrive till the 3rd of January when they departed. The workers and the volunteers had a strenuous time and the Committee are very grateful for the ungrudging services rendered by these men in order to make the sojourn of the visitors as comfortable as possible.

This was the first occasion in the history of the Congress when a deliberate attempt was made to give to the President a military wel-

come. Over two thousand volunteers took part in the procession, mostly on foot; there were 50 cavalry men, about 200 cyclist volunteers. They marched from the Howrah Station to the Congress Grounds a distance of over four miles and managed to keep the enormous crowd under control.

This was the Session, again, when the labourers numbering over 50,000 men from neighbouring mill areas marched in an orderly fashion and saluted the national flag hoisted in the Congress grounds and occupied the Pandal for nearly two hours, passed their resolutions deciding for Independence for India and then walked out. It was a unique scene and indicated more clearly than any arguments would show what the real heart of India pined for.

FINANCIAL.

When the Reception Committee first met, doubts were expressed as to the feasibility of realising suitable sums for meeting the expenses, the estimates for which reached a high figure. A strong Committee was formed for raising subscription and enlisting members of the Reception Committee. The response was slow in the beginning. The total number enlisted on the 10th of December were only 935 but by the 20th the number had risen to 1389 and on the 25th the number had reached the maximum number of seats available for members of the Reception Committee and then the list was closed. The sale of visitors' tickets and ladies' tickets were much beyond our estimate.

The eagerness shown for the purchase of tickets was a complete proof that the people realised the momentous nature of the session.

ARRANGEMENTS.

In order to facilitate the work of the Reception Committee, two Executive Committees were formed, one to deal with arrangements regarding holding of the Congress session and the other with the Exhibition. The Congress Committee then appointed sub-committees to raise subscriptions, organise volunteer corps, attend to the publicity of Congress news, respond to the numerous enquiries made regarding the Congress, look after the boarding and kitchen arrangements of the delegates. Each sub-committee worked with a Secretary. The Exhi-

bition Committee also appointed sub-committees for the Khaddar, Education, Public Health, Agriculture, General, Industrial and Amusement Sections, each section being in charge of an organiser. The Reception Committee also appointed a Chairman, a General Secretary, an Exhibition Secretary and a Finance Committee to look after the accounts, indicate the ways and means and be responsible for necessary financial accounts.

The Reception Committee, after much enquiry fixed upon Park Circus as the most suitable area for the holding of the Sessions. The Calcutta Improvement Trust and the owners of all land in the neighbourhood gave us the use of property free of cost for the purpose of building the main and accessory pandals, the erection of the Exhibition stalls and offices and the construction of delegates' quarters, kitchen and the volunteer quarters. Nearly 2,500 volunteers and 2,500 delegates were accommodated during the Congress session in this area. The main pandal was 300 ft. by 300 ft. It was unique in design made of *hogla* and bamboos and served its purpose well. It was meant to hold 25,000 people but during the visit of the labourers to the Pandal on 31st December nearly 35,000 on modest computation were accommodated inside the Pandal. The entrance into the Pandal was from the east of the Park and that to the Exhibition was from the west. At the centre of the Congress oval was erected a flag staff 60 ft. high from which floated the huge Swaraj flag, hoisted on the 28th December by Pandit Matilal Nehru. Separate gates of entrance into the Pandal were provided for the members of the A. I. C. C., ladies, the distinguished visitors, the delegates, the members of the Reception Committee and the ordinary visitors.

Besides the main Pandal, three other pandals were erected, one for the Subjects Committee, one for the All Parties Convention, and one for holding all other Conferences.

The whole area of 100 bighas, on which the different structures for holding the Congress, Conferences, Exhibition, kitchen and quarters for the delegates and volunteers were erected was called Deshbandhunar after the great leader, the late Chittaranjan Das. The Railway Companies, the Post and Telegraph Departments opened branch offices for the comfort and convenience of the delegates and visitors to the Congress and Exhibition.

The lighting of the Congress and Exhibition grounds and the delegates and volunteers' quarters was done from gas and electricity supplied respectively by the Oriental Gas Company and the Calcutta Electric Supply Co. Besides this, electricity was generated on the grounds from tractor engines supplied free of cost by the Runo Engineering Works and Messrs. Martin & Co. The water supply for the delegates was found to be deficient and a tube well was constructed which gave ample supply of water. The conservancy arrangements were very satisfactory; 400 connected privies and urinals were provided in different parts of the Nagar for the use of the thousands of people who daily visited the area. The sanitary arrangements were effectively supervised by the medical volunteers and their officers and first aid in cases of accidents and injuries were given by them. The traffic both vehicular and pedestrian were controlled very admirably by the volunteers aided by the cavalry. Two hundred volunteers were detailed to form fire brigade and they were in charges of trained officers. The Calcutta Corporation helped the Congress Authorities in many ways and gave full use of their roads, men and equipment.

The 43rd Session of the Congress was a unique event and its success was due to the help rendered by the Corporations and Associations mentioned above, to the ungrudging services of the workers and the volunteers and last and not the least due to the fine response of men of the province and the keen enthusiasm of the delegates and visitors who thronged the Assemblies and Meetings.

Forty-third Indian National Congress

FIRST DAY—SATURDAY, 29TH DECEMBER, 1928.

The Forty-Third Indian National Congress which commenced its sittings on Saturday, the 29th December, 1928, was an epoch-making event and proved in every respect an unqualified success, for never before in the history of this great organisation, had there been attempted anything on such a huge and magnificent scale and never before had the people of India responded with such great enthusiasm or attended any previous session of the Congress in such large numbers. In connection with the Congress was held a most remarkable Exhibition of Indian manufactured wares of many kinds which were hardly distinguishable from the same class of goods manufactured in Europe. The exceedingly praise-worthy exertions of the Reception Committee which had successfully converted the many acres of waste land belonging to the Calcutta Improvement Trust at Park Circus, into a well ordered city, which had been aptly styled "Deshbandhunagar," gave all the amenities of city life, including excellent roads and unsurpassable lighting and splendid sanitary arrangements, and all this was well calculated to impress the thousands of delegates and many thousands of visitors, giving them a foretaste of the ample provisions made for their welfare and for their creature comforts.

The enormous Pandal constructed to provide seating accommodation for about 25,000 persons was filled to overflowing quite an hour before the proceedings commenced, after which even the wide spaces left between the blocks provided for delegates from different parts of India and the enormous crowd of visitors, were occupied right up to the rostrum and from then onwards there could not have been less than 35,000 persons inside the monster enclosure. With very few exceptions only the delegates from the various provinces and visitors who had paid for their seats were admitted, everyone else being barred out by the serried ranks of Bengal National Volunteers, whose soldierly bearing and strict enforcements of the orders issued to them, were greatly admired and to their exertions was due the perfect order which prevailed throughout this huge assembly. Although it was not possible for those sitting at a distance from the dais and rostrum to discern even

the features of the president or the distinguished persons sitting on the dais,—and this was particularly the case from the galleries running round and fringing the Pandal, the installation of some three dozen or more loud-speakers placed at convenient points rendered it quite easy for everyone, no matter at what distance from the speaker, to hear with perfect distinctness every syllable uttered from the rostrum, while even the interruptions from the most remote parts of the huge structure reached all parts of the House.

Long before the appointed time streams of visitors, distinguished Congressmen and leaders began to pour in and by 11-30 A.M. the rush was so great at the gates that it became difficult to manage the crowd. At one or two places visitors simply rushed in and all available space was occupied before 1 P.M. The huge pandal was taxed to its utmost capacity.

Almost full contingent of delegates attended the Congress this year, the number of lady delegates being unusually large. The following figures will give an approximate idea of the number of delegates that attended this session of the Congress :—

Karnatak	100
Punjab	500
United Provinces	400
Delhi	100
Berar	50
Bombay and Maharastra	250
Ajmere	400
Assam	150
Utkal	300
Bengal	1,000
Tamil Nadu	450
Burma	150
Gujerat	60
Sindh	66
Kerala	95
Andhra	450
C. P. Maharastra	200
Behar	500

Besides these the number of visitors exceeded twenty thousand. There was a tremendous rush before the Congress ticket office at noon and one gentleman fainted in the crowd and was removed to Calcutta in ambulance.

A very effective feature was the magnificent and imposing procession which was formed at the tent of the President-elect, who was then led into the Pandal preceded by the Band of the Bengal National Volunteers, a corps of mounted volunteers and a contingent of foot, following it came the members of the Reception and Working Committees. The order of the procession was as follows:—Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar, Mr. Jamnalal Bazaz, Mr. Sardul Singh, Dr. Ansari, Mr. S. Srinivas Iyengar, Moulana Mohamed Ali, Moulana Abul Kalam Azad, Mr. C. Vijaya Raghavachariar, Dr. Annie Beasant, Chairman Reception Committee, President-elect, General Secretary Reception Committee, Treasurer Reception Committee and Secretary Exhibition Committee in pairs; then came 10 Provincial leaders in pairs, namely, Mr. Khonda Venkatappaya, Mr. Prakasam, Mr. T. R. Phookan, Mr. N. C. Bardoli, Mr. Rajendra Prosad, Mr. N. C. Chunder, Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta, Moulana Akram Khan, Mr. Satyendra Chandra Mitra, Mr. Lalit Mohan Das, Mr. Aney and Mr. Abhayankar, Dr. Kitchlew, Mr. Satyamurti, Mr. Shankerlal, Mr. Indra, Mr. Abdul Quadir Bawazi, Mr. Deshpande Kowdalh, Mr. V. R. Naik, Mr. C. N. Vaid, Dr. Satyapal, Lala Duni Chand, Mr. Jairam Das, Sardar Mangal Singh, Mr. Jamnadas Mehta, Mr. Gobindanand, Mr. Gobind B. Panth, Mr. Gopabandhu Choudhury, Mr. Nil Kanta Das, Mr. J. Chaudhuri, Mr. Satyananda Bose and Mr. Himatsingka.

The entry of the President was hailed with loud shouts of "Bande-mataram," the processionists having taken their seats on the dais, three Indian girls, the leaders of an immense choir entered the rostrum led by Sj. Dipak Choudhury, who acted as Bandmaster, and gave a very effective rendering on the National Anthem, "Bande Mataram" which was taken up by the whole choir of 200 boys and girls with very pleasing effect, the whole Assembly standing throughout the rendering. This was followed by another soul-inspiring song by Rabindra Nath "Bharater Mahamanaber Sagaratireh." This together with the song which followed "Joya Juga Alokomayi" by Srimati Sarala Devi was

exceedingly well appreciated by the audience. Among the distinguished visitors present were Mrs. Motilal Nehru, Mr. and Mrs. R. S. Pundit, Miss Krishna Nehru, Mr. and Mrs. Brijlal Nehru, Mr. and Mrs. Zutshi, and Misses Zutshi, Mrs. Bakshi, Mr. and Mrs. Burns, Miss Binnaral, Mrs. White, Mrs. Kaul, Kumar Narendra Nath Mitra, Raja Sir Basudeva Rayiah of Kollengode, Mr. B. C. Sen, Mr. N. R. Mehta, Mr. Robert Fraser, the American Consul General, Mr. Birla

Mr. J. M. Sen Gupta, President of the Reception Committee, received quite an ovation when he mounted the rostrum. Addressing those present he said :—

BROTHER AND SISTER DELEGATES, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

This is the ninth time that the Indian National Congress is holding its session in Calcutta and the first time since that memorable Special Session of September, 1920, when it accepted the programme of Non-co-operation placed before the country by that great and good man M. K. Gandhi. On behalf of the Reception Committee and the people of Bengal I have the honour to extend to you a most hearty welcome to this city. Our shortcomings are many, but I beg of you to remember our difficulties. The Congress is not what it used to be before 1920. In magnitude and in importance it is not to be compared to the older Congresses. To-day the Congress embraces not only the intelligentsia but includes within its orbit the masses as well as the classes. It is no more a bourgeois organisation. Its message has reached the remotest corners of the country. To-day the illiterate but intelligent Indian of the village who has never set his eyes on a city is anxious to know what the Congress is doing, what it expects him to do, and is ever ready to carry out its behests. Where formerly the Reception Committee had to look after a few hundreds, now they have to minister to the needs of many thousands. In point of fact, the members of a present Reception Committee find themselves faced with problems akin to those of a city. Not only have they to play the host to the delegates of the Congress, but they have to make arrangements for the hundreds of thousands who find their way into the enclosure during the week. It is therefore more

than likely that our arrangements would suffer from many deficiencies, and for a proper discharge of our duties we shall have to depend on your indulgence to overlook our shortcomings rather than on our ability to remove them. I must mention here that whatever success the Reception Committee may have achieved is due in a great measure to the zeal and enthusiasm and untiring efforts of those patriotic victims of a law-less law—the political prisoners—who have recently come out from their prison cells. Some of the political prisoners lost their lives while still in prison. I shall not express any sorrow for them. They are above sorrow. We offer their sacrificial soul as a burnt offering to the altar of the Almighty.

HAKIM AJMAL KHAN AND LALA LAJPAT RAI.

Friends, during the last twelve months India has become poorer by the death of several of her most eminent sons, three ex-Presidents of the National Congress being among the number. Hardly had we dispersed from the annual session of the Indian National Congress held at Madras last year than the hand of death took away from us the great Hindu-Moslem leader, Hakim Ajmal Khan. An eminent physician, an ardent patriot and a far-sighted statesman of great judgment he was a unifying force in the country. He was one of the few men in India who kept a cool head and gave a correct lead during the troublous days of Hindu-Moslem disturbances in 1926. Though he was in failing health he never lost his thorough grasp of the Indian situation and his healing hand was ever ready to serve the country in every difficulty. We had to mourn again for another ex-President of the Congress, Lord Sinha of Raipur. Great in law, he also combined in him the virtues of a keen statesman and a very able administrator. The cause of Indian freedom sustained incalculable loss by the untimely death of Pundit Gopabandhu Das, Mr. Maganlal Gandhi, Mr. Anandi Persad Sinha and Andhraratna Gopal Krishna Iyer. But another blow was yet to come.

Friends, as we were in the midst of the preparations of this momentous session and both Lala Lajpat Rai and we were looking forward to his presence and active participation in this Congress and the National Convention he also was snatched away from us.

His was a life of persecutions, prosecutions and deportation at the hands of the Government from which he felt it was his duty to deliver his country. He was a Congress man through and through and his life gives the lie direct to the charge that Congress men have no concern with the masses of the people, that Congress men do not take an interest in the depressed classes, that Congress men are recruited only from the Brahmin and upper classes and that they mean by Swaraj the rule of a high caste oligarchy. Lajpat Rai's whole career was one long train of labours and sacrifices for the depressed classes. His activities in connection with the Arya Samaj and the Servants of People Society will go down to posterity as monuments of his greatness. But friends, although he was so great, so honoured by his country men; although in any free country he would have easily attained the highest position in the councils of the realm, we have to confess it and hang down our heads in shame, that he, even he could not escape the deliberate insult and assault of a paid servant of the Government. Indians are convinced that even if the assault was not the only cause of his death it did hasten it. Perhaps Providence in his inscrutable way wanted to remind us, through this humiliation of our leader, of the humiliating position of the whole nation and of our utter helplessness and thus to inspire us to sink all our differences and put forth our best efforts for the purpose of destroying once for all a state of things which makes it possible for a foreign government and their agents to insult, imprison, assault, to deport without trial, the greatest, the noblest and the most illustrious of our men.

OUR GOAL AND THE NEHRU REPORT.

How can we do that? How can we put an end to that state of affairs? There is only one way—mobilisation of all the scattered forces of the nation, their concentration at one point. For united action a common platform, a single rallying point is necessary. We have got such a rallying point in what is known as the Nehru Report which has just been considered in the National Convention and has come out with certain modifications for the consideration of the Congress.

I look upon this document not as a begging bowl for Dominion Status but as a weapon in our fight for full independence. A supreme

embodiment of the labours of some of our most prominent leaders, it is an instrument of unity. Its chief merit, in my humble opinion, lies in the fact that, so far it is possible to judge, it provides a centre of unity for the various political forces that are agitating our country to-day. The strength of a draft constitution is to be measured primarily, I think, by the amount of support it is able to marshal behind itself. Judged from this point of view there is no proposal before the country which can challenge comparison with the Nehru Report.

A very serious question has been raised whether the adoption of the constitution advanced by the Nehru Committee interferes with our endeavour after the attainment of full independence. I do not think in politics the question whether any two views are logically consistent with one another, really matters. The crucial question is whether the two interfere with each other, or, to put it differently, whether our efforts to achieve one of them hamper our efforts to achieve the other. All facts considered Dominion Status far from excluding independence as an ideal may be used as a means in furtherance of the latter, while the deliberate repudiation of the basis on which the Nehru Report has been grounded may scatter the various elements which it has brought together. I say, take your stand on this unity which has been produced by the Nehru Report and do not, in view of the present political situation, take the risk of destroying it, in the hope that after a lapse of time the ideal of independence would produce a similar and perhaps a more powerful unity. Take the report, the whole of it, as a pragmatist and not as a philosopher or a logician or a student of political theories in the abstract. Are you prepared to say that a constitution based on independence will produce the same unity to-day among the political forces operating in India as this document has done? If not, spare it.

RESISTANCE OR CO-OPERATION.

The next question is, how shall the vantage ground, the unity afforded by the Nehru Committee's Report, be utilised in furtherance of our cause? How are we to get the maximum result out of the solidarity evolved out of this agreement about our immediate objective? What will be the propelling motive of this tremendous force? Shall it be used to force the hands of the Government or be united in co-operation with them as we are being invited?

In his speech at St. Andrew's Dinner, on Nov. 30th, Sir Stanley Jackson held out Dominion Status as a reward for co-operation. "The policy of progressive realisation of responsible Government in British India," he said, "has been determined by Parliament. The application must be gradual. The pace of its adoption must depend upon that demonstration of good will and desire for that co-operation which is a necessary preliminary for that partnership which Dominion Status implies." The Viceroy also spoke in the same strain to the Calcutta European Association. While the Viceroy and the Governor of Bengal speak of realisation of Dominion Status as being the determined goal of India, see what Sir Michael O'Dwyer, ex-satrap of the Punjab, says on this point. In an article in the October issue of "India" he thus unburdens himself: "The Reforms Act of 1919 said nothing about Dominion Status, it contemplated British India, even if she attained self-government, remaining *an integral part of the British Empire*. Later on for want of a better analogy, that of Dominion Status was talked of in a slipshod way."

Whatever else he is, Sir Michael is a plain-spoken man who knows no hypocrisy, and, in the interpretation of the diplomatic phraseology of Whitehall, is a truer guide than the subtle ex-whip of the Conservative party. According to Sir Michael, Their Excellencies talked of Dominion Status in a slipshod manner. The Declaration of 1917 as well as the British Parliament never meant "Dominion Status," when they used the term "Responsible Government" as the accepted goal of India. I would not attempt to assess the constitutional value of Sir Michael's interpretation. For, whatever its legal worth, it is an exact representation of the inner mind of British policy in India. In plain language, Britain does not mean what she says.

CO-OPERATION IN EXCELSIS.

Friends, if England was sincere, if co-operation was really meant to be rewarded with Dominion Status, India has already earned it. There can be no question of its gradual realisation. The policy of co-operation has been overdone. No honest man can even conceive of a greater degree of co-operation than what India has accorded to Britain. India co-operated with Britain in establishing British Empire in India.

It was the Indian Sepoy and the Indian taxpayer that turned John Company from a trader into a ruler. They it was who extended British possessions in Asia and planted the Union Jack in Africa. Then again when in 1857, breach of faith with Indian princes and bungling with the army shook British Power in India to its very foundations, it was Indian co-operation that saved them from sailing away bag and baggage towards the Cape of Good Hope. British historians have written volumes on the Mutiny of Indian soldiers but the mutiny of British soldiers has been allowed to be forgotten. Could British power in India be maintained even for a day but for the loyalty and co-operation of the Indian Army when British soldiers mutinied to enforce their demand for higher pay? The Sepoy Mutiny was a mutiny of a small section of the Indian Army and was confined to a limited area. The greater part of the army not only remained loyal but carried loyalty to a degree unparalleled in the history of the world. They not only fought shoulder to shoulder with British soldiers but when provisions fell short proposed to live and actually lived, on boiled rice water giving the solid food to their white comrades. Could good will and co-operation go further? Is the like of it to be found in the history of the Dominions in spite of the "community of blood" mentioned by Sir Michael O'Dwyer? What the Indian soldiers did in 1857 has been done by the whole Indian nation ever since. Indians as a nation have allowed themselves to be starved so that Britishers might not feel the pinch of hunger. India has paid England's debt unjustly piled up on her head; she has paid vast sums as tribute, has purchased British stores much in excess of her real requirements to find employment for British labour and British capital; she has patiently suffered her fiscal and currency policy to be manipulated to develop British industries at the expense of her own. And all this while famines have been carrying away millions every year and leaving hungry and emaciated many millions more. During the great European War when not only the British Empire but the independent existence of Britain herself was hanging in the balance, India rose as one man and hastened to her rescue. Neither men nor money were grudged. The Indian National Congress resolved to stand by the Empire "at all hazards and at all costs." The Extremists vied with the Moderates in raising recruits and war contributions. Leaders of the national movement headed by Lokamanya Tilak and Mahatma Gandhi

showed a zeal that might be an example to the Army Head-quarters. The Imperial Legislative Council voted a free gift of 150 crores followed by a second gift of 45 crores. In addition to this, India spent about 300 crores on behalf of the War Office, the Dominion and the Allied Governments. Over and above this she supplied a huge quantity of food stuff and other war materials but did not insist on payment in specie—the reserve in the Currency Department to cover the notes issued to finance these purchases being ultimately nothing but the I. O. U's of the Allied Governments. The Army, the Marine and the Railway materials of India were placed at the absolute disposal of Britain.

There was an opportunity before India to develop her industries. But instead of availing herself of that opportunity she imposed upon herself a law, whereby in order to ensure the success of the War loans, restrictions were placed on the floatation of new Joint Stock Companies. Could there be a greater self-denying ordinance? In the beginning of the war if Indian soldiers had not raised with their body a wall of living tissues, Joffre could not have found the time necessary to organise the resources of France and in that case the map of Europe would have been different from what it is now. India with her children's blood and money secured for Britain extensive territories in Mesopotamia and East Africa.

Friends, we have co-operated with Britain; we have shown her good will. In doing that we have destroyed our industries, our mercantile marine, debased our currency and piled on our shoulders a heavy interest charge. We have shed our blood, and starved our children. We have conquered for her vast territories. We have sent our men and women to develop Britain's overseas plantations to be kicked out as soon their development was complete. By submitting to inhuman emigration and coolie recruiting laws we have co-operated, co-operated shamefully. If in these Britain sees good will fit for appreciation other nations see in them incredible stupidity and utter lack of self-respect. I ask my co-operating countrymen, what do they mean by co-operation—what are its limits and have not they been already over-stepped?

BRITAIN NEVER CO-OPERATES

British people do not understand co-operation. They understand force only. Not only India but other countries also have not got justice from Britain by co-operation. It is only when justice is backed by force that Britain recognises it as such. America had justice on her side when she demanded the abolition of the tea-duty. Did Britain pay any heed when petition after petition was sent to Parliament by co-operating America? No. Realising the futility of co-operation, which meant never-ending acquiescence in taxation without representation, America asserted herself and by methods better appreciated by Britain got more than her original demand, and the United States were lost to the British Empire. Turkey co-operated with Britain as a trusted ally. Did that save her from losing Egypt or Cyprus? Could she disentangle herself from the meshes of the Capitulations until the military strength of Kamal Pasha, aided by force of circumstances, brought about their abrogation?

Britain's relations with the dominions tell the same tale. In South Africa, the Boers were unjustly deprived of their freedom when they were weak. It was defeat in war that compelled England under Gladstone to recognise them again as a free nation. It is often said that Britain under the leadership of Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman after the second Boer War in 1898 showed unprecedented magnanimity to a fallen foe by granting self-government to South Africa. But is that the fact? The Boers were already an independent nation—they did not require any self-government. It was the disfranchised Uitlanders, that is, the Britishers in the Transvaal, who were in need of it and sought Britain's intervention to back up their claim. The last Boer War was fought on that issue and though the Boers were compelled to enfranchise the Uitlanders, the British could not inflict on them a defeat sufficiently crushing to be able to impose on them the disabilities of a subject nation. At least there was the fear of recrudescence of another upheaval. How did Canada get self-government? Canada was on the verge of rebellion. And though Lord Durham succeeded in restoring order temporarily there was apprehension of another outbreak and amalgamation with the United States.

British policy in China has no more justification than what may be claimed by smugglers and pirates. For it was by supporting, first a smuggler and then a pirate, that Britain got a footing in China. And it is not sense of justice and fair play, but the power of the Nanking Government that has compelled Britain to slacken her grip in China. How did Afganistan wrest her freedom from the incubus of a British Resident? Was it a gift from Britain? It was the broad sword that in 1919 turned Amir Amanulla into His Majesty King Amanulla of independent Afganistan. Britain had established a virtual protectorate in Mohammarah, in spite of, or shall I say, because of, the co-operation of the Persian Court. It was the long and powerful arm of Reza Khan Pehlvi that restored Persian supremacy in Mohammarah. During the Great War Arabia co-operated with Britain against Turkey on the distinct understanding that she would be recognised as a free country. But was that promise fulfilled? What has Britain to answer to the indictment made by Lawrence who was instrumental in bringing about the revolt of the Arabs against their Turkish masters?

The history of Ireland proves to the hilt the futility of co-operation in obtaining justice from Britain. Ireland was exploited; Ireland was oppressed. Groaning under the Church and the Government imposed by Britain, victimised by tithe acts and iniquitous land-laws, the Irish people cried for justice—cried themselves hoarse for more than half a century. What was the result? Daniel O'Connell's movement for the repeal of the Act of Union was answered by coercive measures. Parnell pinned his faith on constitutional agitation and constitutional remedies. An idealist prime minister was persuaded of the justice of his case. But the more matter-of-fact Parliament refused to do justice merely because it was justice. The Home Rule Bills of Gladstone failed to enlist their support. The Home Rule League went on agitating for quarter of a century and was answered with a policy of alternate coercion and conciliation according to the varying strength of the movement, until the Sinn Feinners appeared on the scene and compelled Britain to recognise Ireland as a Free State. Throughout history, not a single instance can be cited when Britain has dealt fairly with weaker nations. John Bright declared in tones of melancholy conviction that the House of Commons had done many things which were just but never anything merely because it was just. Britain would deviate into an act of justice

only when her own interests lie in that direction. If a choice has to be made between justice and her own national interest, Britain would be just only under compulsion and not otherwise. Co-operation and good will on the part of the weaker nations have not only not succeeded in evoking a like sentiment in Britain but have produced opposite results. Like all bullies she has regarded them as signs of weakness—to be seized upon and exploited with impunity to further her own selfish ends. After what I have said and shown from history, what substance is there in the Viceroy's threat that refusal to co-operate would alienate the sympathy of Britain? Evidently His Excellency is under a double delusion that Britain would do justice through conviction without compulsion and that India has not yet got out of the trance that her salvation lies in cultivating the good opinion of the British people.

BRITAIN'S RESPONSE TO INDIA'S CO-OPERATION

I have pointed out before that India has been showing good will to England and co-operating with her patiently from the beginning of the British rule. What is the net result? Instead of progressing we have receded farther and farther. Our faith has been rewarded by suspicion and our good will by contempt. Our co-operation has been smelted for forging our own fetters and erecting our own gallows.

India has ever stood by Britain in fighting her enemies. She has believed in her professions, in her *bona fides*, so much so, that with the older generation of Indian leaders anything bad, petty or unjust was "Un-British." Our language was made the vehicle of thoughts and sentiments which will be denounced as unworthy of man everywhere on the face of the earth. Dadabhai Naoraji christened his book on British misrule as "Un-British Rule in India." When a European killed an Indian and escaped scot-free; when a peaceful meeting was fired upon or dispersed with the help of regulation lathies; when innocent citizens were deprived of their liberty without trial, the press and the platform called for redress in the name of "British justice." This faith in Britain's good will—how was it reciprocated? It was reciprocated by a policy of distrust and suspicion. The peculiar regimental formation of the Indian Army, the exclusion of Indian soldiers from the artillery, the air-force and from garrison duty, what do all these

things indicate? The co-operating tribe of Umar Hyat Khan's notwithstanding, Britain distrusts us and so cannot have a regiment of Indian soldiers without a corresponding percentage of Europeans as a balancing factor. It is this distrust that has made her follow a policy of disarming the whole nation. In order to make her grip tighter she has further weakened the people by dividing them artificially into martial and non-martial classes. By this policy, except a limited area, the entire country has been rendered unfit for the growth of a virile population. And be it noted that this policy of recruitment from among Indians and their neighbours has systematically shifted from the more progressive to the less and less progressive. Thus the Sepoys of the old Bengal and Madras army came to be replaced by the Sikhs and the Rajputs, the latter again by the Pathans, and for the last thirty years, the Gurkhas of Nepal have become the chief source, and I suppose, if the British people are able to plant their broad heel deep enough into the soil of Mesopotamia, the Pathan garrison in the Fort William of Bengal will be in time replaced by the Iraqis.

BRITAIN IN HER ROLE OF TRUSTEE.

As self-interest, pure and simple, has been throughout the keynote of Britain's military policy, so it has been of her industrial policy. The paternal British Bureaucracy trumpet themselves as the friends of the masses and pretend to defend them against their educated countrymen, against their own ignorant selves. But look how they have discharged their duties as the trustees of the Indian people, the dumb millions as they are called.

India was a prosperous country before the British captured the reins of her government. Her trade and industry and agriculture were in a flourishing condition—she had a big mercantile marine—she had an excellent system of primary as well as higher education—a wonderful system of irrigation and an unobstructed drainage system. The people were healthy and free from the ravages of malaria, kala-azar and other preventible diseases. All this changed soon after John Company became master of India and began their dual function of commerce and governance—trading like rulers and ruling like traders. It seemed as if the magic lamp of a malignant

Aladin played its trick on a garden city, turning in a trice its garden into desert. Let us see how this was done. How has this metamorphosis come about? The prosperity of a country depends on the prosperity of its industries. And the industries of India were broad-based and secure behind impregnable fortifications. The country had a vast fund of accumulated capital which flowed through a well devised system of indigenous banking, nurtured her diverse industries and financed the movements of their products. There was an unlimited fount of skill and enterprise of a very high degree—the result of accumulated experience of ages. The possession of an efficient mercantile marine gave the children of the soil a strong, strategic position in regard to markets, internal as well as international. To all these were added the invaluable advantage of having an abundant supply of raw materials near at hand. Under these circumstances it was not easy to destroy the industries of India. Indeed, it could never be done by honest competition. Britain realised that, and bringing to her aid the political power acquired by John Company applied herself assiduously to destroy the Indian industries and build out of their ashes, her own industrial greatness. The stages by which it was done look like a carefully laid out plan, killing foe after foe, espousing the immediate interests of the one when striking the other and then turning to the second when the first had been floored. The first blow was dealt at the mercantile marine. To-day, it sounds strange to the ear of the man-in-the-street that pre-British India was a great naval power. But as a matter of fact there was a considerable fleet along the country's extensive coast line when the East India Company became master of India. They were destroyed by restrictions on their use and movements. Indians were forbidden to take part in foreign and afterwards in inter-provincial trade. On the one hand Indian goods had to be re-exported to other continental countries. On the other hand, vessels employing Indian sailors were forbidden entry into British ports. Thus by mere strokes of the pen a flourishing industry employing a large body of labour was ruined and the valuable ocean transport trade passed away from the hands of the Indians. When the destruction of India's mercantile marine and the expulsion of her children from foreign commerce were complete and their place was securely occupied by British merchants and British carriers, the industries of India lost their first

line of defence. India still manufactured but the trade came to be concentrated in the hands of the East India Company who made of London a great centre of entrepot trade in Indian goods. The result was that by regulating the rate of her profit and other charges she could raise something like a tariff wall against Indian goods in all other countries. The guillotine was ready for the next victim. An aggressive policy against the industries of India followed, and excise duty in India and increased custom duty and even total prohibition in England reinforced by free import of British goods into India, differential railway rates and currency manipulations crushed them out of existence. Protection has been resorted to by national governments to enable indigenous industries to capture home markets. But nowhere has political power been abused to devise such a Machiavellian instrument of handicapping a country's industry. This was the way that our industries were killed and millions of labourers were thrown out of employesnt by a parental government. This was how the chartered brigands and libertines who called themselves the East India Company discharged their duties as trustees of the dumb millions.

Has there been a change in the spirit since the British crown made itself directly responsible for the government of this country? Has the leopard changed its spots? Now as ever all their policies, all their actions are directed towards one aim, *viz.*, exploitation of India for the benefit of England. India is burdened with an ever swelling military expenditure so that the Army bill of England may be reduced. She is compelled to maintain a costly white personnel in all branches of her public services though an equally efficient indigenous agency is available at a much lower cost, in order to provide employment for Britain's educated labour. The public works of India are used as dumping ground for British manufactures, the policy underlying the purchase of stores being neither to encourage Indian industries nor to buy in the lowest market. The tariff, currency and loan policies of the country are directed towards the same end—stimulation of British industries and suppression of those of her own. I shall content myself here with setting out in some detail one instance of Britain's programme of systematic exploitation, or, shall I say, burglary.

While anxiety for the preservation of Britain's Empire was the one pre-occupation of India during the war, when India ran to her

rescue and stood by her at all costs and at all hazards, Britain was engaged in the honourable business of devising ways and means as to how best to pick her pocket. She was following a currency policy which for unabashed selfishness and treachery has no parallel in history. And to achieve this end she had an instrument ready in the system of currency known as the Gold Exchange Standard. Through its instrumentality the vast war profits of India were intercepted and made to accumulate in England. India's gold accumulated in London came to be looked at with wistful eyes by British financiers. The more they saw the more they were reluctant to part with it. At last they hit upon a plan of swindling India by manipulation of the Exchange. To put on a hypocritical gloss on this diabolical scheme, a committee of so-called experts under the chairmanship of Sir Babineton Smith was appointed. Against the protest of the only Indian member, against the protest of the entire Indian nation, they raised the value of the rupee to 2 shillings. An orgy of sale of gold exchange followed. Gold which was purchased at the rate of 15 rupees to the pound was sold at rates as low as $7\frac{1}{2}$ rupees to the pound. The extent of this loss to the Government as well as the country at large has been computed at about 500 crores of rupees. As soon as this was done the Government of India decamped from the field of Exchange, and the Finance Member, Sir Malcolm Hailey, who in any other country would have been impeached and perhaps hanged, was promoted to the Governorship of a province. A correspondence between the Government of India and the Secretary of State divulged by Sir Purshottamdas Thakurdas in his Note of Dissent to the report of the Currency Commission presided over by the Right Hon'ble Hilton Young throws a lurid light on the underhand game the Government played in raising the Exchange. It was an exhortation to screw up the value of the rupee to as high a level as was possible without breaking the back of the camel. The motive becomes evident when we read with this the Annual Report of the Senior British Trade Commissioner in India. He deplored the condition of British trade in India, how it suffered from Japanese competition and competition with Indian mills and suggested a rise in the value of the rupee to 2 shillings as a powerful aid in facing this competition. In the language of the Viceroy, "truly then could India say that her wounds were those with which

she was wounded in the house of her friends"—her "real friends" and not those "false friends" who would guide her towards "the morass of independence."

"BLESSINGS" OF BRITISH RULE.

Anglo-Indians, in season and out of season, sing hymns in honour of their rule re-counting its blessings. They point to the extensive railways, the magnificent ports and harbours, and the populous cities that have sprung up under the charm of British rule. They point to the increasing volume of trade that yearly passes through the ports, the favourable balance of trade, the mammoth exchange banks, the schools, colleges, and hospitals. They point to all these, congratulate themselves and exclaim, "Look here, Indians. Look at these wonderful achievements. All these we have done for you." But is that the whole story? True, the achievements are wonderful. But what is that to us? Have they benefited us or have they done us more harm than good? Britain may congratulate herself on these wondrous works for they are their principal beneficiaries. To us they have done more harm than good. Most of our miseries, our poverty, our degradation, the impairment as well as the enslavement of our body and mind are attributable to them. The main purpose for which they were brought into being was to serve British interests—and any benefit that has accrued to us is only incidental and has been far out-weighed by their injurious effects—by the fact that they were devised to serve antagonistic interests and have served that end with merciless accuracy. Look at that much vaunted thing, the railways, the iron chains that bind India. What is their genesis? They have their root in the minute of Lord Dalhousie who urged the introduction of railways in India as a valuable military adjunct. The main railway lines have been constructed with an eye more to military requirements than to those of trade and industry. The result is that India has been saddled with a considerable mileage of unremunerative lines. In their zeal to shorten the route, to shorten the time for mobilization of troops, they have ignored the natural drainage of the country, and have turned vast expanses of fertile regions into water-clogged, anopheles-breeding swamps—malaria scouting the country as the vanguard of the army.

The system of encouraging railway construction by guaranteeing to British companies the payment of a fixed interest out of public revenues on the invested capital has involved the country in a loss of about 350 crores. The Indian railways up to the end of the last century imposed a heavy burden on the tax-payer. Afterwards by a faulty system of account-keeping they were paraded as productive enterprise, contributing substantially towards the public exchequer. But their productive character has been authoritatively challenged for want of adequate provision for depreciation out of current income. They are really an incubus on the Indian tax-payer. Their expansion has often responded to the requirements of British capital seeking investing outlet and British engineering industries seeking market and employment. This is one of the most important functions for which the Indian railways exist. While performing this function they are made to serve also as a cloak to hide the huge "unproductive debt" of India, by a system of financing railways out of current revenues and transferring an equivalent portion of the unproductive debt into the account of the railway debt. When India groans under the burden of the so-called "Home" charges her British masters bid her be thankful, pointing their finger to such cooked accounts, for the benefits that she has got in return for British capital. But what are the truths? Are not a very considerable portion of the so-called 'productive' debts mere pilings up of transferred "unproductive" debts—debts incurred in England for war and other wasteful purposes? The Indian railways have in charge a total capital of over 650 crores, the capital expenditure in the five post-war years alone amounting to 150 crores. If the Government really cared for the people, they could turn these huge capital expenditures for the growth in India of wagon-building, locomotive building, bridge-building and other engineering industries. The iron and steel industries of the country could be strengthened to such an extent as to capture not only the home market but foreign markets as well, resulting in a tremendously beneficial effect on the economic condition of the people. In fact, when the post-war programme of 150 crores of capital expenditure for railway expansion was set on foot, the Government promised to spend as much of that amount as was possible to spend in India. A committee was appointed to devise ways and means for the purpose. But the traditional policy of stores purchase

was not materially affected; Britain got the lion's share of the orders. The interest of the consumer was used as a plea to reject the higher tenders of Indian manufactures. But those interests were thrown to the four winds by our so-called trustees refusing to purchase at the lowest market when British manufacturers were under-quoted by continental and American manufacturers. What have the advocates of co-operation to say to this? Did 150 years of co-operation move the parental Government with the least compunction, when they thus fleeced the dumb millions? What answer have the trustees to make to the charge of swindling their minor wards? I say if the Government cared a brass farthing for responding to the good will of the Indian people—for their welfare and well-being,—they would not have gone in for a reckless programme of railway construction. There was another alternative means of transport that would have benefited India more—I mean the construction of navigation canals and development of inland water transport as a substitute for railways to a large extent. See what Sir Arthur Cotton, of great irrigation fame, has to say on this point. This is what he stated, as early as 1872, before a Parliamentary Committee. "My great point is that what India wants is water carriage; that the railways have completely failed; they cannot carry at the price required; they cannot carry the quantities and they cost the country three millions a year, and increasing, to support them. That steam boat canals would not have cost one-eighth that of the Railways; they would carry any quantities at nominal prices and at any speed; and would require no support from the treasury and would be combined with irrigation." To give an earnest of his suggestion being practical and practicable, he offered, at a public meeting in Manchester, in January, 1878, under the auspices of John Bright, to construct all the necessary navigation canals in India at a cost all told of thirty million pounds, that is, a little above thirty crores in our money according to the exchange of the day. Sir Arthur's project, if accepted, would have given India all the transport facilities that the railways give with only one-eighth of the capital expenditure incurred on railways. Moreover, as it could be combined with irrigation the agriculture of the country would have prospered beyond the dreams of avarice. Why did not the Government who pose as the friend of the ryot, accept those proposals? Because it would have touched the

pockets of the British shareholders of the Railway Companies who could not withstand the competition of the water transport. Because it would have restricted the field of investing surplus British capital. Because it would have restricted the market for Britain's steel and engineering industries. What is that to the benign government if ministering to these British interests means starvation in the homes of 90 per cent. of the population of India, directly and indirectly dependent on agriculture. What does co-operation mean under such a state of affairs? The Indian lamb must walk into the jaws of the British lion to appease his hunger without ruffling his temper. Ungrateful wretch! Why should he not do so. For has not the lion come here all the way to protect him?

His Excellency the Viceroy has in his speech in the Associated Chambers of Commerce triumphantly pointed to the increased volume of India's foreign trade as an indication of her increased prosperity. True that after about two decades the volume of the country's imports and exports has reached their pre-war figure. But is that a sign of prosperity or of decadence? The bloated volume of foreign trade of India—especially the enormous size of its balance of trade—is a sign of economic anaemia in as much as it does not constitute a real exportable surplus. The exports from India are excessive not because her people do not need them to satisfy their wants but because they have to forego a considerable amount of certain absolute necessities of life to pay not only for the visible imports in merchandise but many a large item of invisible imports such as the freight bill and the "home" charges, insurance premia, banking commission, "home" remittances of official as well as non-official Europeans. They constitute a drain on the annual income of India to the extent of something like ten rupees per head of the population. It is a commonplace of economics that the growth of indigenous industries brings about a fall in both exports and imports and this state continues until they saturate the home market and grow to such proportions as to have a real exportable surplus. The war-born industries of India and the stimulation that the Non-co-operation movement gave the cottage industries had something to do with the post-war fall in the volume of our foreign trade. Does not the return of foreign trade to its pre-war level signify a set-back to

those industries? And is not the post-war policy of systematic deflation of currency followed by the Government responsible for that?

We hear so much of Britain's educational work in India, of the advancement of the people towards literacy. But is it a thing to boast of? Can it be claimed with truth that India under British rule has progressed, in literacy, in the education of the masses—the special care of a paternal government? Take the example of Bengal. The British bureaucracy claim the credit due for the existence of 40,000 primary schools in the province though they are mostly the result of private enterprise and only a fraction of their cost is met from provincial revenue. This is claimed to be an achievement of 150 years of British rule. We are invited to co-operate in accelerating this process in order to fit ourselves for self-government when the process is complete.

According to Max-Muller there were 80,000 schools in Bengal when the East India Company became the arbiter of the province's destiny. That also being the number of villages in the province it means that there was a school in every village. Now two villages have between them one school—a rare specimen of progress! One hundred and fifty years of co-operation has reduced our primary schools from 80 to 40 thousand—has shut the door of education to half the villages of the province. If a tree is to be known by its fruits—the character of British rule and the results of Co-operation with the British bureaucracy have to be tested here. That India has gone backward in mass education under British rule can be judged from the fact that among the Indian provinces Burma which was the last to be drawn into the enchanted circle has got the highest percentage of literacy. Though the Census report confesses the backward movement of that province since its annexation by Lord Dufferin, the policy of co-operation has not been tried long enough and so the progressive realisation of illiteracy has not gone forward to the extent reached by the older provinces.

When universal literacy is made the condition of India's getting self-government and when it is realised that the country has gone backwards towards illiteracy under the British Government where is the fool who would advocate co-operation with that very Government as the way to self-government?

FREEDOM OR SECURITY.

My object in emphasising British exploitation and British misrule in India is to point out the absurdity of co-operation with Britain and not to seek justice or redress from her and neither do I base on them India's right to freedom. Even for a moment I cannot accept the position that had she given us a good government and satisfied the material needs of the people she could derive on that account a title to continue her rule. Freedom is a nation's birthright; we want freedom for its own sake, not because British rule is injurious to our trade and industries but because it emasculates our people and makes us pariahs in our own land. The people to-day are pulsating with a new life, they feel an inner urge, a burning desire for freedom and would be satisfied with no amount of material prosperity if they are purchased at the cost of self-rule. Sir Stanley Jackson has denounced freedom purchased at the cost of security, but I say there is no greater calamity that can befall a nation than security purchased at the expense of freedom. And here I cannot resist the temptation of recalling the glorious exhortation of Cicero addressed to Roman citizens: "The name of peace is dear, and the work of peace is truly beneficial; but there is a vast difference between peace and slavery. Peace is the tranquil enjoyment of freedom; slavery is the last and worst of evils, and must be resisted by war, resisted even by death." We want life, we want realisation of our national self and for this peace and order purchased at the cost of freedom is the last thing that we could desire. British courts may give us justice, British police may give us security. What is this security and justice worth when not based on the free will of the nation, when they are imposed by a third party, when we have to swallow them like bitter pills whether or not we consider them real justice and real security. The Hindu flies at his Mohammedan neighbour's throat and the Mohammedan flies at the throat of the Hindu, the police intervenes, British justice binds them down both under the security sections of the Penal Code and they sit in their houses chafing and raging with a grievous sense of wrong, seeking the next best opportunity to wreak vengeance on each other. We do not want this security. It would be far better if the country plunges again into war, if disorder takes the place of this soul-killing

Pax Britannica; the life that would emerge out of chaos would bring a new order, a new creation and a new Zion would be built on the ashes of our burnt houses and broken bones. Tired of killing and breaking each other's head there will be a genuine desire for peace. The seeds of justice lying dormant in man would fructify. There would be a real searching of hearts preparing the way for a union based on an understanding of each other's point of view. The system evolved may not be in accordance with the best traditions of European jurisprudence but nevertheless it would be real justice giving real security inasmuch as it would be based on our assent and will.

FREEDOM AT ANY COST.

Britain may give us railways, she may give us schools and hospitals, she may build cities of palaces, magnificent harbours and docks, develop the mineral and the forest wealth of the country, a powerful fleet of dreadnoughts, an invincible army, a wonderful air-force, posts and telegraphs, a fertilising system of irrigation; she may give us all the text-book blessings of British rule, scope for the development of our trade and industry—she may do all these and more. But will that satisfy India? Materially we may be richer, apparently we may look more civilised but in reality we shall go down and down by losing our power of initiative. These magnificent appearances would hide the dwarfed soul of the nation, its decay and approaching death. What are these wonders worth if we only enjoy their benefits and have no hand in their planning or making? Enjoyment is not the end of life. It is not in reaping but in sowing that life finds its true realisation, not to sleep a comfortable sleep under the shadow of greatness but to be great ourselves, even at the cost of restless discomfort. For this we have to go out to meet the whirlwind—stake all our borrowed glammers and throw ourselves into the vortex of strife.

A nation is the best manager of its own affairs. It may not manage its affairs as efficiently as some manage theirs. But even in the worst case of misrule it has got a potentiality which far surpasses the value of all apparent peace and order and even material prosperity that others can give. In the one case, it is mechanical and in the other it is big with life and all its possibilities.

British exploitation and British misrule are not the *raison d'être* of our demand for freedom; they are the obstacles in our way. We cannot remove them by co-operation. The more we carry co-operation—this old man of the sea—on our shoulders the more will he drive us on. Exhaustion will not bring mercy. It will simply make his grip the more complete. We shall therefore have to follow the war-path, create the spirit of resistance, as Deshbandhu Das put it—call it Non-co-operation, Satyagraha, Passive Resistance, Obstruction, Civil Disobedience or armed revolution, as you please. There is no other way. Britain will not yield an inch of ground unless she is compelled to do so. Nothing is more ridiculous than to look for Swaraj towards Whitehall and expect that one fine morning a ship load of that commodity will be landed on Bombay wharf along with other consignments of British goods. India's freedom must be wrought within her own borders by her own children. The first condition, therefore, is self-assertion of the nation as a whole, united action with a unity of purpose. We have got to mobilise our own forces, close our ranks, stand on our own legs. For this, a radical transformation of national life is indispensable. And to begin with, there should be a thorough self-examination. We should first ask ourselves, why great national movements in India led by great men have failed, while success has crowned similar movements in Turkey, Persia and China. India has now as its leader the greatest man living on earth in the present generation. Why is it that the Non-co-operation movement led by Mahatma Gandhi failed? Why is it that Aurobindo has become a recluse, Chittaranjan died of a broken heart and Gandhi retired to his Ashram at Sabarmati, while Kamal Pasha, Reza Khan and Chiang Kaishek sit in state in the councils of free nations? The answer is to be sought in our national defects.

OBSTACLES IN THE WAY.

Slavish worship of the past, communal dissensions, the caste, the purdah, polygamy, early marriage and such other cankers of the body politic are responsible for our failure. We live a life divided into compartments; our patriotism is communal; our unity amounts to mere juxtaposition. Steeped in the prejudices of a mediæval age, with half the nation losing their vitality behind the purdah and in its turn devital-

ising the other half; disintegrated by warring castes and creeds which condemn a population more than that of the United Kingdom or Japan as untouchables whose shadow even it is pollution to tread—can we ever expect that we shall be able to bear upon Britain the necessary pressure? In order to assert ourselves in the modern world, we must be modernised. You cannot oppose howitzers, dreadnoughts and aeroplanes with the primitive bow and arrow. What is true of the instrument is also true of the agent. The man power of India has to be fully developed and equipped with up-to-date ideals. The women must be free. You cannot with impunity paralyse half the nation and by its dead weight handicap the other half. Is it not national harikari to impair the vitality of the race by screening half its number behind the purdah, and accelerate the process by the horrible custom of immature parenthood? The thousand and one air-tight compartments of the social fabric should be knocked down without mercy. The caste must go. What purpose does it serve in the present day economy of India? The original economic purpose behind it no longer exists. It is not based on division of labour. It serves no useful purpose and exists only to emphasise meaningless, nay, harmful social distinctions—a fruitful source of hatred, jealousy and conflict—an enervating factor in national life, narrowing down the marriage circle and often resulting in the evils of near-blood marriage. Lastly, what can we expect from a people with a polygamous habit? A people so pleasure-seeking, so devoid of self-control, cannot show that self-abnegation which is so very necessary in a soldier of liberty. Unfortunately, the conservative instinct in us is so deep-rooted, that the work of a previous generation is lost to the next. The life work of a Ram Mohan Roy, a Vidyasagar or a Vivekanand brings about some progress. But like a spring we go back to the former position. Joshua leading her people to the promised land finds them at the spot from which Moses started. There should, therefore, be a social revolution which must go hand in hand with political revolution. We do not believe in the progressive realisation of freedom. In social matters also gradualism should have no place.

ANALOGY OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

I know that some may consider it diplomatic not to emphasise at this moment our national defects and weaknesses. Those who hesitate and fear self-examination and self-introspection suffer from an inferiority complex. They are still under illusion as regards the good intentions of the Government. They think that this exposure of our national defects would handicap us in bargaining with Britain. They are still eager to prove their fitness for self-government before the bar of England—the very thing for which we object to appear before the Simon Commission. Admission of weaknesses, in their view, would ruin India's case before her judges. And so the cancerous sores must be bandaged with white linen to get a passport to freedom. I have no such illusion as regards the intentions of the British nation. I believe our salvation lies along the path of our own efforts, and therefore, have no hesitation in calling a spade a spade.

I know that I shall be told that free European nations also have their class distinctions and other social evils; that America has her Negro problem; that Japan once had her untouchables; that in South Africa the Boers and the Britishers flew at each other's throat, and not very long ago, the latter invoked outside intervention to protect their interests; that Canada was divided into two hostile camps—the Protestant Britisher and the Catholic French. If social evils did not stand in the way of the independence of the independent countries all over the world; if communal dissensions did not prove an obstacle but rather disappeared when Canada and South Africa got self-government; why should we bother ourselves so much about social evils and communal barriers in the case of India? But apart from the fact that class distinction is not so hidebound and disintegrating as caste distinction, is there not a radical difference between our case and the case of those countries? Canada and South Africa are bound with bonds of kinship with Britain. Besides, the stakes Britain had in those countries were not so vast as those in India. The pressure required to make Britain yield and to give self-government to these countries was nothing in comparison with what would be required in our case. As Britain's imperial greatness hinges on the retention of her Indian dominion, she would mobilise all her forces before she would yield

an inch of ground at our demand. Then again retention and enjoyment of freedom is quite a different thing from its acquisition by single-handed efforts. The nations already independent can afford to tolerate in their midst disintegrating elements which would be fatal in our case. We have to deal with a determined enemy equipped with all the strength that modern civilisation connotes and so shall have to raise ourselves to a higher plane of organisation and efficiency in order to get the upper hand in the struggle that is inevitable.

PAST COMPLEX.

Do we really want freedom? If we do, let us make up our minds that we cannot attain it if we regard it as a mere by-product of the ordinary activities of our life, a thing to be picked up while moving along the path of daily routine. If necessary, we shall have to throw away our so-called culture, to break away with our past, however dear and respected it may be. I must emphasise, even at the risk of hurting fondly cherished sentiments and susceptibilities, that we suffer from an undesirable past complex; that apotheosis of past culture has become an obsession with us which is really detrimental to our national progress, to our fight for freedom. We look back on our distant past, wonder at its splendour and antiquity, thank God for giving us such a noble heritage, and suffer ourselves be deceived that every thing must be right in our present culture which is the lineal descendant of such a glorious past. Our forefathers composed the Vedic hymns. The Upanishads solved the mysteries of the Unknown. The world owes a debt of gratitude to India for the invention of the decimal notation. Our astronomers discovered the roundness of the earth, its diurnal rotation round its own axis, and annual revolution round the sun, and the force of gravitation that binds the whole solar system, long before Galileo or Newton was born. The Kalpasutras forestalled Euclid and Taxila and Nalanda anticipated Oxford and Cambridge by many centuries. Our people clothed themselves with the finest muslins, built lofty minars, lived in magnificent palaces, when the forefathers of the people of modern Europe lived in caves and hollows of trees, and tattooed their bodies to cover their nakedness. Surely a race of men with such splendid records could have no drawbacks. The worst of vices,

the worst of wrongs, must be tolerated, if sanction could be found for them in the practices of our forefathers, in a culture so great, so noble.

But we forget that no nation however great has ever exhausted the possibilities of progress: no culture can claim immunity from reformation. We forget too that we have another culture and another past which also have entered into our making. It is the de-humanising Raghunandan-brand culture of the ignoble past of Laxman Sen and Joy Chandra, Umichand and Mirjafar. The past is past, and has a value in so far as it teaches us the underlying causes of the ups and downs of national life. It is the creative vision of the future and the stern reality of the present that should be our earnest concern.

SOCIAL REVOLUTION

The entire social fabric requires a thorough over-hauling, and has to be revolutionised; no amount of tinkering or superimposition of piece-meal reforms would serve our purpose. A frontal attack should be led on the forces of reaction. If it is found that Hindu culture means purdah, and Mohammedan culture means the harem, both must go. If Hindu culture means caste system and marriage before puberty, and Mohammedan culture means polygamy, none of them should have a place in our social polity. Mere mutual toleration for Hindu and Mohammedan culture is not enough. It is at best a negative virtue; something positive must be done, and the shackles alike of the Shariats and the Shastras should be unceremoniously cast off if they are found to stand in the way of formation of a united nation.

If we cast our eyes abroad what do we see? Turkey, Persia, Afghanistan and China—nations which until yesterday were groaning under the suffocating restrictions imposed upon them by white nations—made a supreme effort to rectify their national defects when they found that they stood in the way of attainment of their freedom. Sun Yat Sen not only waged war against opium, but carried a crusade against a long-standing national custom. To the Chinese, the pigtail was almost as dear as the head of which it formed an adjunct. But when it was thought that this custom of wearing pigtail was an obstacle to progress, China cut off her pigtail in a day. Kamal Pasha threw away the Fez, broke open the doors of the Turkish harem, and separated the church from the state, when he found that these institu-

tions handicapped the nation in their fight against white domination. Nothing was too sacred for him, not even the holy Khilafat, when it stood in the way of independence. Even the other day we saw King Amanulla declaring a crusade against purdah and polygamy, when he realised after his European visit, that these customs, whatever their sanction, are an obstacle to the fulfilment of his dream of a great and powerful Afghanistan. Why did China, Afghanistan and Turkey break away from the past, trample under foot the customs and institutions which have the sanction of ancient traditions? Because to them freedom is a matter of life and death; not an artificial make-belief or a matter of economic gain or loss; but an irresistible inner urge, the desire for a new birth and a new life. No sacrifice was too great; culture, tradition, theological formalities, however fondly cherished, and however deep-rooted, were plucked out without the least compunction. They did not pin their faith on their past but on their future. They did not worship the culture of the past because they are out to build the greater culture of the future.

Unfortunately we in India while applauding the achievements of these nations, the revolutionary suddenness with which they shook off the trammels of long-standing prejudices, possess the mentality of a foot-ball crowd, who cheer the players for all they are worth, but would not themselves play, for fear of injuring their limbs. More unfortunate it is, that national leaders not unfrequently either temporise with the forces of reactionary conservatism, or, sit on the fence without committing themselves to any view for fear of public criticism. Mere admiration is of no avail. It simply shows that we are not in earnest about freedom. It is one among the many cravings of our heart and is not very much missed when the others are satisfied. No nation has acquired freedom while in this state of mind.

Be earnest. Let freedom be the thought of your day and the dream of your night. Let the sons and daughters of India gather under her national standard, and, with "Equality and Fraternity" as their battle-cry, march onward, unceasingly, tirelessly, towards the freer life of a free India; undaunted by calamity, unmoved by the wrath and repression of the powers that be. Do not despair. Marshal all your forces, and no power on earth can resist you in your triumphant march to the promised land of the Great India of the future; an India

welded and federated into a powerful nation; great in art, great in science; widening the bounds of knowledge and contributing her share to the progress and civilisation of the world; mistress of the Indian Seas, leader of an Asiatic Zollverein, upholder of the right of the coloured races throughout the world.

BANDE MATARAM.

Another tremendous ovation was accorded to Pundit Motilal Nehru as he ascended the rostrum. His Presidential Speech was as follows :—
FRIENDS,

I am deeply grateful to you for the honour you have done me in electing me to preside for a second time over this great national assembly. That honour, signal as it is, carries with it a burden which is none too light, and the bravest amongst us may well hesitate to shoulder it. You are well aware how I have hesitated. But the exceeding kindness with which you have repeated your confidence in me has left me no choice but to bow to your will and to endeavour to shoulder, as best as I can, the heavy burden of guiding a great nation in its struggle for freedom. That very kindness also emboldens me to expect from you every indulgence and co-operation in the high task with which you have entrusted me.

Nine years ago I had the honour to preside over the National Congress. Martial Law with all its grim consequences and implications had just come and gone, and we were preparing for a great tussle with our alien rulers. That trial of strength came soon after and although we did not emerge victorious, the honours of war were with us and the promise of future victory was ours. The great giant, that is India, woke up for a while and the very awakening shook the foundations of British rule. There was a reaction and a relapse; but again we see unmistakable signs of another and a greater awakening, and who will stop India in her forward stride when she is fully awake? Non-cooperation followed Dyerism and O'Dwyerism. Something perilously like these is again in the air, and again we are on the threshold of another great struggle for freedom.

In this struggle we shall unhappily miss many familiar faces, many trusty counsellors and gallant warriors who are no more. We

shall miss Hakim Ajmal Khan and Lala Lajpat Rai whose death in the course of the year has deprived India in the moment of trial of two of her most trusted and valiant sons. Another ex-president who has passed away was Lord Sinha. Among other national workers who have gone I should like to mention specially Maganlal Gandhi, Gopabandhu Das and Andhraratna Gopal Krishnàyya. On behalf of this Congress I offer its respectful condolence to the families of our departed colleagues.

I now proceed to place my views and suggestions before you on the immediate work before us. To prevent disappointment I must at the outset prepare you for a plain matter of fact statement from a plain matter of fact man of the world as it is, and not of the world as it should be. Let me warn you that you will be disappointed if you expect from me anything in the nature of high idealism presented in an attractive setting of word and phrase. Not that I deprecate idealism in the broader sense or am less convinced than anybody else of the supreme necessity of keeping the highest ideal in view, provided you try to live up to it. But pure idealism completely divorced from realities has no place in politics and is but a happy dream which must sooner or later end in a rude awakening. However high pitched the ideal may be, and the higher the better, the actual work to be done in the pursuit of that ideal must be guided solely by practical considerations. I am sure that we are all agreed upon that ideal though we give it different names. I am equally sure that we are also agreed upon the only way to achieve it. But the tragedy of it all is that we have so magnified our differences on what to my mind are non-essentials that we are unable to see the wood for the trees. These differences lie at the root of our failures, and are responsible for conflicting schools of thought which have rendered common action impossible. In my humble judgment the whole trouble is traceable to varying tendencies in the different schools to over-rate some and under-rate other aspects of the situation. For instance there is one school of thought which exaggerates our weak points to such an extent as to feel utterly helpless in achieving anything except through the grace and good will of the very people who are oppressing and exploiting us. As against this there is the opposite school which takes little note either of our weak points or of the strength of the opposing forces and is ready to dash

out full steam ahead on uncharted seas. It will be my humble endeavour to face the stern realities of the situation without blinking and then to suggest what seems to me to be the most suitable line of action for your acceptance.

It is, I take it, the duty of every man to help as far as it lies in his power to make his country fit to live in. But the actual process to be employed in bringing about the necessary change from what is to what should be, depends upon circumstances which cannot be the same in all countries and at all times. The essentials considered in the abstract are always the same, but concrete cases present peculiarities of their own to which no general rule or particular example is wholly applicable.

No two peoples in the world have started from exactly the same point or followed exactly the same course. Indeed the same people have had to change their course from time to time to suit the altered conditions of ever changing situations. We can always profit by the failure of others but seldom, if ever, by their success. The reason is obvious. It is easy to avoid mistakes made by others if we find ourselves in the same or similar predicament in which those mistakes were committed, but it is impossible to bring into existence the potent factors which made for success in some other country if those factors are entirely lacking in our own. The practical problem before us is to find out how under the conditions in which we live and with the materials at our disposal we can deliver the goods at the lowest cost of production. False analogies from other countries can only help to confuse the real issue.

To form a true idea of the work before us we have to answer three questions :

- (1) **Where do we stand?**
- (2) **What is our destination?** and
- (3) **How can we reach our destination?**

I shall endeavour to answer these questions to the best of my ability more from the practical than the dialectical point of view.

We have first to make sure of where we stand so as not to lose our bearings after we start. The point has a two-fold aspect—one in relation to the Government and the other in relation to ourselves. As to the former we all know that whatever political or civil rights we

possess they are in the nature of a conditional gift enjoyable during the pleasure of our rulers. They can deprive us, and indeed have from time to time actually deprived thousands of us, of those rights at any moment with or without reason at their sweet will by using the vast reserve of arbitrary power which they retain in their own hands. I will not encumber this address by repeating an oft told tale. It is well-known how the present Government has re-inforced and consolidated itself in the political and economic spheres by legislative, executive, and administrative action. It will serve no useful purpose to take you through the long list of repressive and oppressive measures which have been taken in India from the beginning of British rule down to the present day, or to remind you of how, after we were thoroughly crippled, the door to recovery was completely barred against us. We have been persistently denied all "opportunity for self-realisation, self-development, and self-fulfilment" for which Deshbandhu Chittaranjan Das fought so valiantly in the closing years of his life. We have been scrupulously shut out of all effective part in the internal and external affairs of our own country.

The solemn promises of responsible government have found fulfilment in that colossal fraud, the Statutory Commission, which is now careering along our streets leaving bleeding heads and broken bones behind. Nothing has so clearly brought out the cold callousness of the officials on the one hand, and the utter helplessness of the people to protect themselves on the other, as the progress of this Commission from town to town. To my mind the circumstances attending it are symptomatic of a grave organic infection and not merely of the well-known functional incapacity of the Government. It shows the presence of the toxin of Dyerism in their internal economy. The happenings at Lahore and Lucknow are only mild eruptions on the surface indicating the deep rooted disease within. We are indebted to the stupidity of the special correspondent of an English newspaper of Calcutta for a glimpse into the real mentality of the members of the Commission which may be taken as a faithful reflection of the mentality of the Government. He says :

"The Cawnpore scenes have apparently put the finishing touch on a psychic impression which the riotous scenes in Delhi had begun. Some of the Commissioners are making no secret of their indignation that such things should be permitted. I feel that if some of the Commissioners had to write

their report this week Lord Salisbury's famous prescription in another matter, 'twenty years of resolute government,' would recommend itself much more to their minds than any advance whatever."

So that the only way to achieve responsible Government for India is to fawn upon the great Commissioners and flatter them with a false declaration of confidence. And the surest way to invite "twenty years of resolute government" is to show your true feelings about the commission. All I need say is that India will refuse to take responsible government as a reward for servility and will welcome "resolute government"; but whether it will last for twenty years the future alone can decide. This prophet of evil has even dared to envisage the future. He proceeds to say:

"I seemed to sense a vision of realities stark and grim, and catch from the future the tramp of marching men."

These remarks were called forth by the grand boycott demonstration which greeted the Commissioners on their arrival at Cawnpore. It is remarkable that while this correspondent was sending his inspired vision, the Police Superintendent of Cawnpore was writing to the organisers thanking them for the excellence of their arrangements and the absence of any untoward incident. That letter has, I believe, been published in the press. But the editor excelled the correspondent, as was befitting his superior position, by indulging in a particularly venomous attack, in the course of which he threatened resistance of the Indian demand for freedom to the "last ounce of ammunition." I am sure that if this editor and his correspondent had an ounce of discretion between them both, they would not have so easily given away official secrets. But we must thank them for their timely warning and assure them that we are ready. There can be nothing better than 'resolute government' at this juncture to bring matters to a head.

Our English friends affect to be shocked at these demonstrations. I should have ignored the foolish talk in which they have indulged but a responsible statement has recently been publicly made in this City on the subject by the Viceroy, and I feel that I cannot allow it to go unchallenged. However much one may regret untoward incidents, the right to hold peaceful demonstrations to give expression to strong public feeling has never been doubted. The demonstrations held after the return of the Commission to India have been characterised as "un-

mannerly and offensive." My answer is that such demonstrations must in their very nature be 'offensive' to those against whom they are made, and it is hardly reasonable to expect drawing room manners from a hostile crowd. The Viceroy has uttered two platitudes and a threat. The first platitude is: "However much those who organise such demonstrations may themselves deprecate violence, they are, when it comes to the point, often quite incapable of controlling the forces they have excited." The second is: "Those who deliberately embarked on a course so crude, so senseless and so dangerous, whatever the object they may mistakenly desire to serve, incur a very heavy responsibility."

The threat is that "it is the plain duty of Government to take whatever steps it deems necessary to prevent the recurrence of these discreditable incidents."

I agree with His Excellency on the first platitude and would also agree with him on the second if he could substitute the word "natural" for the words "crude and senseless." But both platitudes have no relation whatever to actual facts. As regards the threat it was anticipated by the English newspaper a week before; it indicates an early materialisation of 'resolute government.' I have already dealt with the latter and have nothing further to add. In regard to the former, I have to point out that it has been established to our entire satisfaction by public statements of responsible Indian leaders, which no amount of departmental enquiry can controvert, that all the violence at these demonstrations was started by the Police, and attempts made by the people at one or two places to retaliate were speedily put down by their leaders. But if a stray missile struck a motor car, one of the occupants of which happened to be a lady, or some men in the large crowds came too near the great Commissioners and waved their black flags in close proximity to their highly respectable noses, is it a matter about which any undue fuss need be made? I am sure that under similar circumstances worse things would have happened in England. I should like to put a few questions to those who have affected righteous indignation at the happenings at Lahore, Lucknow and Cawnpore. Those questions are:

(1) Would it be possible in any European country more specially in England for a commission of enquiry, which the people looked

upon as a national insult, to travel in the comfort and safety enjoyed by Sir John Simon and his colleagues in India?

(2) Would not all the silken flags and gold embroidered decoration such as were displayed in Butler Park have been torn to shreds and all the beautiful multi-coloured electric lamps, shining on them, smashed to pieces, if any attempt were made in England to entertain publicly, men connected with a mission as highly unpopular among Englishmen as Sir John Simon and his colleagues are among Indians?

(3) How would any Englishman like his house to be broken into, his guests treated to a sound thrashing and then arrested and imprisoned for a night for making a peaceful demonstration from his own terrace?

(4) How would an Englishman like to be imprisoned in his own house, for however short a time, for holding opinions against the Government of the day?

(5) How long would a government last in England which allowed the things mentioned in questions (3) and (4) to happen?

We know that the house of the great nationalist nobleman of Oudh, the Maharaja of Mahmudabad, was surrounded with a cordon of police while his reactionary compeers were entertaining the Commission in a neighbouring park. The Maharaja, as is well-known, bravely stands for the boycott of the Commission and has refused to take part in any function given in its honour. Where is the liberty of the ordinary citizen when the premier baron of Oudh, a retired Home Member of the U. P. Government, decorated by it with the highest honours in its gift, can be imprisoned in his own house, simply because he holds an opinion disliked by the Government? Is this anything very different from the "resolute government" foreshadowed by the Viceroy and the English newspaper. It has actually come upon us since.

The recent murder of a police official at Lahore has provided an excuse to those whose minds are already made up, to forge new weapons to destroy the forces of nationalism. It need hardly be said that the crime is to be regretted. Congressmen, whether belonging to the school of independence or that of dominion status, stand, and have always stood, for a policy of strict non-violence and have given

practical proof of the sincerity of their convictions on numerous occasions, including the recent incidents at Lahore, Lucknow, Cawnpore and Patna. It is at present impossible to say whether the Lahore murder had a political significance. But assuming that it had, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the real responsibility for such incidents lies on the shoulders of the Government. History teaches us that incidents like these are symptomatic of a condition which can only be dealt with effectively by a wise and radical change of policy, and not by resort to coercive methods which defeat their own purpose and are resisted by the people with all the strength of which they are capable. But the bureaucracy has little use for lessons of history. The orgy of repression has already begun in the Punjab and is likely to extend at no distant date to the other provinces.

Forgive me for taking so much of your time over the Commission. It might well have been completely ignored, were it not for the direct bearing it has on the work before us. It is a portent of evil, but not without the good which comes out of all evil. It has shown us the fine courage of our men, specially the students, their serene coolness under the gravest provocation, their splendid stand against brutal *lathi* assaults with their own empty hands crossed on their chests, their gallant rescues of their comrades and leaders in utter disregard of the injuries inflicted on them. Let those who take this for cowardice try their "resolute government" and they will soon be disillusioned. They will have the satisfaction of shooting brave inoffensive men with their backs to the wall and chests bared to receive the bullet.

Let us now turn to the economic sphere. To have an adequate idea of the continuous exploitation to which we have been subjected, and of the enormous extent of the economic hold acquired by England over us by legislation and otherwise, it would be necessary to review the whole period of the British occupation of India. I shall however content myself by reminding you of a few historical facts the accuracy of which cannot be questioned. Besides maintaining the costliest civil and military services in the world at our expense, the solicitude of our trustees, as they delight to call themselves, has been mainly directed to the creation of markets in India for England's manufactures. This laudable object has been achieved by a number of direct and indirect methods too numerous to be dealt with satisfactorily in the course of

this address. It is a long story beginning from the days of the well-known barbarities committed on the Dacca artisans and continued through periods of more refined spoliation till we come to the present day powerful banking, commercial, and industrial combines which are now successfully choking off indigenous enterprise.

But by far the most important economic hold which the Government has acquired over the country by legislation and otherwise is through its manipulation of the currency. It will be tedious to go into the history of this highly technical question, but the fact is now admitted that the present depression in Indian commerce and industry, and the low buying power of the cultivator are due to the action of the Government in forcing up the rupee from 1s. 4d. to 1s. 6d. It has resulted in pinching the over-taxed cultivator of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in the price of the raw materials produced by him, and giving a bonus of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to the importer of foreign manufactures into India. If the Government had the interests of India at all in view, it would have reduced the land tax by $12\frac{1}{2}$ % and imposed an import duty of $12\frac{1}{2}$ % on all goods which can be manufactured in this country, including textile goods.

It was left to Sir George Godfrey of the Bengal Chamber of Commerce to discover for the first time the other day that all the authentic records of India's prosperous trade and commerce before the advent of the British were pure legends. In the course of an utterance at the last meeting of the Associated Chambers of Commerce attacking everything Indian, he justified the British exploitation of India using fiction for fact. He said: "If Lancashire is accused of devastating India, Lancashire has equally devastated the English countryside." What a comparison! I presume Sir George Godfrey is in possession of some history of England unknown to the rest of the world which records the fact that the weavers of the English countryside were subjected to the pains and penalties that were inflicted, as proved by European witnesses, on Indian weavers by the East India Company, that the English countryside was compelled to buy Lancashire cloth in the place of homespun; and the further fact that a Cotton Excise Duty was imposed on Lancashire textile while foreign goods were imported free of duty.

His reference to Indian shipping betrays the same fondness for fiction as his reference to textile does—for facts I must refer you and him to the excellent literature that Mr. Haji has published on his harmless and timely bill. Indian shipping was as deliberately sacrificed for the English interest as was India's greatest cottage industry. Now that a belated bill is before the legislature seeking somewhat to stop the continuance of the grave wrong done to Indian shippers by the English monopoly, the monopolists accuse us of attempting racial discrimination and pass a resolution demanding that the legislature shall not have the power to pass that bill.

Not content with distorting history this English merchant prince almost hit below the belt when he suggested that the framers of the draft constitution now before the country had sought to disfranchise Britishers. It was his duty before he brought so grave a charge against responsible men to make sure of his facts. He should have known that as soon as the Committee discovered that there was a possibility of a doubt they removed it in their supplementary report which was before the country days before Sir George Godfrey delivered his oration.

It will be clear from what I have said above that the process of forging new chains to keep us in perpetual bondage has gone on simultaneously with a long protracted, ruthless exploitation of our material resources. While, however, the Government has to answer for a great deal, it must be frankly confessed that we cannot honestly acquit ourselves of all blame for our present plight. The strength or weakness of a nation depends upon the strength or weakness of the tie which keeps its component parts together. In our case this tie has not for centuries been very strong and with the march of the new order of things has lost much of what binding force it ever had. There is no overlooking the fact that we are divided into a number of large and small communities, more or less disorganised and demoralised. The Government is undoubtedly responsible for the prevailing ignorance and poverty among the masses and in a very large measure for the growing hostility among the classes. But it certainly is not to blame for the evils of our own social system, which has relegated millions of our people as good as ourselves, to the category of untouchables and depressed classes, and has put our women under restrictions which

deprive them not only of many natural rights, but also of the opportunity to render national service. Nor is the Government solely accountable for all the communal differences which have contributed a dark chapter to the recent history of our own times.

The Committee of the All Parties Conference has dealt fully in its report with the communal problem in India. It has offered a solution which I trust this Congress will accept. The problem before us however is a wider and more fundamental one than a mere adjustment of communal differences. It is: what place, if any, religion, as practised and understood to-day, should occupy in our public life?

Whatever the higher conception of religion may be, it has in our day-to-day life come to signify bigotry and fanaticism, intolerance and narrow-mindedness, selfishness and the negation of many of the qualities which go to build a healthy society. Its chief inspiration is hatred of him who does not profess it, and in its holy name more crimes have been committed than for any professedly mundane object. Can any sane person consider the trivial and ridiculous causes of conflict between Hindu and Moslem, or between sect and sect, and not wonder how any one with a grain of sense should be affected by them?

The aim of all education and progress is to develop the collective instinct in man; to teach him to co-operate with his neighbour; and to make him feel that his individual good depends on the good of society as a whole. Only thus can the selfish and individualistic instincts be suppressed and the energy of mankind be diverted from mutual competition to co-operation for the common good. Religion as practised to-day is, however, the greatest separatist force. It puts artificial barriers between man and man and prevents the development of healthy and co-operative national life. Not content with its reactionary influences on social matters, it has invaded the domain of politics and economics, and affects every aspect of our life. Its association with politics has been to the good of neither. Religion has been degraded and politics has sunk into the mire. Complete divorce of one from the other is the only remedy.

But this is not all. A strange fatality has been pursuing our political activities from a very early stage. We have never been entirely free from serious differences among those who have taken up

the patriotic duty of liberating their country in right earnest and have not winced at any sacrifice in discharging it to the best of their ability. These differences have inevitably set back the hands of the clock and opened the door to disruptive forces. There have been serious splits among the leaders which have spread with lightning rapidity to the rank and file on almost every occasion when a forward move has been taken or even contemplated. We would do well to profit by the lesson of the past lest the inexorable fate which has been pursuing us for the last 20 years or more overtake us again. It is close upon our heels already in the garb of socialism and will devour both complete independence and dominion status if you let it approach nearer.

The brief outline I have given above will show that we stand at present in the thickest part of the wood. We suffer from two sets of serious disabilities—those imposed upon us by foreign rule and those of our own making. It is difficult to stand against the foreigner without offering him a united front. It is not easy to offer a united front while the foreigner is in our midst domineering over us

The two sets of disabilities together form a vicious circle around us and we stand in the centre, heavily handicapped by one in trying to get rid of the other. We have to break through the vicious circle before we can hope to be out of the wood.

This is my answer to the question—where do we stand?

The second question is : what is our destination?

My answer straight and simple is FREEDOM in substance, and not merely in form, by whatever name you call it. The Madras Congress has declared the goal as complete independence. The All Parties Committee has recommended dominion status. I have explained my position more than once but with your permission I shall re-state it here as clearly as I can. To put it in a nutshell it comes to this : I am for complete independence—as complete as it can be—but I am not against full Dominion Status—as full as any dominion possesses it to-day—provided I get it before it loses all attraction. I am for severance of British connection as it subsists with us to-day but am not against it as it exists with the Dominions.

Let me explain. National freedom unrestricted and unqualified is the natural craving of the human soul. I do not believe that there is a single Indian, be he or she a member of a party or group, or one

completely detached from all parties and groups, who does not love freedom or will not have it. Differences arise only when the question is raised whether it is possible to have and to keep freedom; and it is then that we find opinion sharply divided. There are those who have the faith in them and in their countrymen to answer the question by an emphatic "yes"—and I may at once say that I am one of them. But there are also those who will shake their heads, some from conviction and others in doubt. Complete independence is the goal of the former, dominion status that of the latter. I will not undertake a fruitless enquiry into the relation or want of relation between independence and dominion status. It does not matter to me whether theoretically they belong to the same or different stocks, or whether one is or is not the negation of the other. What matters to me is that dominion status involves a very considerable measure of freedom bordering on complete independence and is any day preferable to complete dependence. I am therefore not against an exchange of our abject dependence with whatever measure of freedom there is in full dominion status if such exchange is offered. But I cannot make dominion status my goal as it has to come from another party over whom I have no control. The only way I can acquire such control is by working in right earnest for complete independence. I say 'in right earnest' because I know mere bluff will not take me far; it is only when complete independence is in sight that the party in power will be inclined to negotiate for something less. Empty bluff will not carry us to that stage. Solid work and ungrudging sacrifice alone will do it. When that work is done, and sacrifice made, the party having the whip hand will dictate. Whether it is to be dominion status or complete independence will depend upon whether the conditions then prevailing are similar to those of Ireland or to those of the United States of America at the time when each came into what she now has. Meanwhile, there is nothing before us but a protracted life-and-death struggle on the one side, and continued repression relieved by an occasional dose of undiluted oppression on the other. It follows therefore that whatever the ultimate goal, we must be prepared to traverse the same thorny path to reach it. If we are not so prepared, independence will ever be an idle dream and dominion status an ever receding will-o'-the-wisp.

I must here notice another part of the Viceroy's speech from which I have already quoted. He draws a dark picture of the damage that India is "likely to suffer at the hands of its false friends who would guide it towards the morass of independence." The description of 'independence' as a 'morass' is rather original. It would be more correct to say that we have to cross a morass before we arrive at independence. But the morass surrounds us on all sides and we can arrive nowhere except by crossing it. That being so our friends who support the movement say: why not make for independence pure and unadulterated which depends upon your own effort, however long and arduous, instead of floundering in the direction of dominion status which depends upon the good will of Britain. They argue that it will be sheer waste of time, energy, and sacrifice first to struggle in the morass for dominion status and when you find your way barred then to bungle back to the starting point and plunge again into the same morass to struggle for independence. From Lord Irwin's point of view this argument is unanswerable. From my point of view dominion status is passed on the way to independence, and if it is refused you have simply to press on to your destination which must always be independence. Lord Irwin's argument based on loyalty to the Crown can easily be overstressed. Loyalty is a fine thing but the strain it can bear is not unlimited.

But it is obvious that independence does not mean walking out of the world. If you continue to live in it you must come across others who also live in the same world. It is neither necessary nor possible for the existence of an independent state in the present day world conditions to cut off all political, economic, and social relations with other states. Indeed the more independent you are the more necessary it will be to establish relations all round. When, therefore, we talk of the severance of the British connection we do not mean a cessation of all relations, but such appropriate change in existing relations as is necessary to transform a dependency into a free state. The extent of the change will depend upon the extent of freedom we achieve. If it is dominion status, the change, as it is now well understood, will be from a dependency to 'an autonomous nation, free and equal member of the British Commonwealth of nations.' If, however, it is complete independence, India will stand out of the British Commonwealth of

nations and the nature of her relations with Great Britain will be determined by treaty and mutual understanding. In either case, some connection with other nations including the British must subsist if we mean to take an active part in shaping our own future and that of the world.

Mahatma Gandhi presiding at the Belgaum Congress said :

“ In my opinion, if the British Government mean what they say and honestly help us to equality, it would be a greater triumph than a complete severance of the British connection. I would therefore strive for Swaraj within the Empire but would not hesitate to sever all connection if severance became a necessity through Britain's own fault. I would thus throw the burden of separation on the British people.”

This was four years ago. Much water has since flown under the bridges. We have striven and striven hard for Swaraj within the Empire but the British people have not so far shown any inclination to help us honestly to equality. All the indications have been to the contrary. Indeed responsible British statesmen have repeatedly declared that full dominion status is yet a far cry. I therefore fully sympathise with those who have exhausted their patience and have now raised the cry of complete separation. But let us fully grasp the meaning of Mahatma Gandhi. I am sure he never meant that the moment we felt sure that Britain was not going to give us dominion status we were to declare for independence irrespective of our own readiness to enforce it. He was, to my mind, referring to the time when we acquired what I have described as the whip hand. The time admittedly has not arrived.

In the same address Mahatmaji said :—

“ The better mind of the world desires to-day not absolutely independent states warring one against another but a Federation of friendly inter-dependent states. The consummation of that event may be far off. I want to make no grand claim for our country. But I see nothing grand or impossible about our expressing our readiness for universal inter-dependence rather than independence. It should rest with Britain to say that she will have no real alliance with India.”

And then comes the pregnant passage which I earnestly commend to your very serious consideration. It runs thus :—

“ I desire the ability to be totally independent without asserting the independence. Any scheme that I would frame while Britain declares her

goal about India to be complete equality within the Empire would be that of an alliance and not of independence without alliance "

So far as Britain's formal declaration of her goal about India is concerned, it is complete equality within the Empire. The scheme prepared by the All Parties Committee and adopted by the Conferences is therefore in full accord with Mahatmaji's views.

The truth is that we cannot get anything from England except by proving our strength. The way to acquire that strength is to organise ourselves and our resources. Such organisation is as necessary for those who desire dominion status as it is for those who work for complete independence. That being so the obvious course is to work together up to the point the weakest of us is ready to go. If he is not disillusioned by the time we reach that point, let us leave him there and forge ahead.

I must here ease the minds of those who fear that the moment dominion status is granted to us, we shall use it to throw off British connection altogether. In the speech from which I have already quoted Lord Irwin said :

" Those in Great Britain who sympathise most warmly with the ideal of India attaining at the earliest possible moment the status of any of the other great Dominions of the Crown, will find the ground cut from their feet if British opinion ever becomes convinced, as some apparently are now endeavouring to convince it, that so-called Dominion Status was only valued by India as a stepping stone to a complete severance of her connection with the British Commonwealth."

There is no foundation for this apprehension and there is no reason whatever why we should seek complete severance of British connection if we are put on terms of perfect equality with the Dominions. If we are not put on such terms it will not be dominion status; we will not take a colourable imitation. It must therefore be clearly understood that dominion status has to be offered and accepted with all its implications, its rights and obligations, which both parties will be in honour bound to respect and uphold. But as Mahatmaji has put it, we " would not hesitate to sever all connection, if severance became necessary through Britain's own fault." It is conceivable that we may be driven to separation by the treatment accorded to us by Britain herself, and in that case we shall have precisely the same remedy as the dominions now have.

It will, I hope, now be clear why I say that I am for complete independence and at the same time not against dominion status, if the latter comes without avoidable delay. It is impossible to say which of the parties will have the whip hand at the psychological moment. Great Britain has the whip hand to-day, and the psychological moment for her to offer, and for India to accept, full dominion status, has arrived. If Great Britain will not avail herself of the opportunity India will have the whip hand to-morrow, and then will come the psychological moment for her to wrest complete independence from Great Britain. No offer of dominion status will then be acceptable.

Objection is taken to the preparation of any scheme of government on dominion lines by us on the ground that it is for Britain, and not India, to make the offer. It is pointed out that those who enjoy dominion status did not fight for it but achieved it in the course of their struggle for complete independence, the offer having come from Great Britain. I am quite clear in my own mind that substantially the same process will have to be repeated in India if we are ever to have dominion status, and as I have already pointed out, we cannot reasonably accept it unless complete independence is in sight. But I cannot understand why it is not open to us to offer terms to Great Britain, as much as it is open to her to offer terms to us. If the offer is honourable to those who make it as well as to those who accept it, it does not matter to me who is the proposer and who the acceptor. I do not believe that we have among the soldiers of independence a more fearless and selfless patriot and a greater fighter for the freedom of India than Deshbandhu Chittaranjan Das was. Let me recall to your minds the great speech he delivered at Faridpore in which he said that all he needed was a full and fair opportunity for self-realisation, self-development and self-fulfilment. He did not hesitate to make an offer of full co-operation to the bureaucracy if it would only afford that opportunity, show a real change of heart, and guarantee "Swaraj in the fullest sense to come automatically in the near future." That offer was no sign of weakness. It was made in the full consciousness of strength. "If" he declared "our offer of settlement should not meet with any response we must go on with our national work on the lines which we have pursued for the last two years so that it may become impossible for the Government to carry on the administration of the country except

by the exercise of its exceptional powers.....and when the time comes we shall not hesitate to advise our countrymen not to pay taxes which are sought to be raised by the exercise of their exceptional powers."

Those were the words of a statesman, a political philosopher and a determined fighter for liberty a man who believed in the doctrine of self-reliance which he preached. It was not beneath his dignity to offer a settlement while he was preparing for a great fight. As a matter of fact, Britain has already made an offer of a kind in the most solemn manner she could, by embodying it in the preamble of the Government of India Act. It is true that this offer is utterly inadequate and wholly unacceptable. The proper course is to make a counter offer. This is what the All Parties Committee has done.

A good deal has been said about developing sanctions. On this point I am content to quote Mahatma Gandhi. Commenting on the All Parties Committee's Report he said in *Young India* :

"There is still much diplomatic work to be done. But more than the diplomatic work is that of forging the sanction. Pandit Jawharlal Nehru truly observed that whether it was Dominion Status or Independence, a proper sanction would be necessary if the national demand was to be enforced. Bardoli has shown the way, if the sanction has to be non-violent. The Congress creed has non-violence as its integral part. There is no denying the fact that non-violence had receded in the back ground before Bardoli. But even as the Nehru report has made an unanimous demand possible, Bardoli has brought back the vanishing faith in non-violence. If, then, we are sure of the sanction, we need not worry whether Swaraj is otherwise spelt Dominion Status or Independence. Dominion Status can easily become more than Independence, if we have sanction to back it. Independence can easily become a farce if it lacks sanction. What is in a name if we have the reality? A rose smells just as sweet whether you know it by that name or any other. Let us therefore make up our minds as to whether it is to be non-violence or violence and let the rank and file work for the sanction in real earnest even as the diplomats must work at constitution making."

I have now given my answer to the second question I formulated. It is :

Our destination is Freedom, the form and extent of which will depend upon the time when, and the circumstances under which, it comes.

Meanwhile there is nothing for us but to do the work necessary for all forms and all degrees of freedom. That work is one and the same and I now proceed to consider it.

It must be remembered that the same Congress which declared complete independence as our goal, by another resolution invited all parties to confer with its Working Committee to devise a constitution for India based on common agreement. It was then as obvious as it is now that no party outside the Congress was prepared to set its goal as high as complete independence from the point of view of its own conception of practical politics. The Congress must therefore be taken to have embarked upon the enquiry with full knowledge of this fact. What then was the object of directing the Working Committee to call an All Parties Conference or Convention if complete independence was not merely the goal but the next immediate step? It certainly was not for the mere fun of it. The importance of the Convention and the political value of its agreed conclusions are quite obvious and must have been so to the Congress when it passed the resolution. But the Congress could not, at the time, have any clear conception as to what the next step would be after the All Parties Convention came to decisions. That would depend upon the extent of agreement reached and the nature of the decisions arrived at which could not then be known.

The Working Committee has faithfully carried out the instructions of the Madras Congress and called the All Parties Conferences. The remarkable success of these national gatherings, in their endeavour to find the highest common basis for a constitution for India, is well-known. Never before, in the history of our public movements, so many organisations—political, labour, religious, communal, and commercial—as took part in those gatherings have come together on one and the same platform. There can be no doubt that the credit of this great achievement—perhaps the greatest since the day of Non-cooperation—belongs to the Congress which conceived the idea, and more specially to Dr. Ansari, the President of the Congress who never spared himself in carrying it out. The resolutions of the National Convention will come up before you in the course of this session. You will have all the materials before you and it will be your solemn duty to discharge the obligation inherited from the Madras Congress to determine the next step. You have succeeded to the great asset left by the Congress—the goal of complete independence. You cannot shirk its liability. The future will depend largely on the manner in which you discharge that liability.

The recommendations of the main and the supplementary Reports of the Committee appointed by the All Parties Conference are all based on the principle of the highest common agreement. That principle I earnestly commend to this Congress for its acceptance. The Congress is in itself an All Parties Conference and it is its duty to deal with every question coming before it from the point of view of the greatest good of all the parties and the people of India. So far the Congress has been discharging this duty on its own initiative, taking upon itself the responsibility of determining what is good for the people and regulating its policy accordingly. This is the first time in the history of the Congress that it invited the people of India through the various organisations representing them, to determine for themselves what is good for them. In doing so the Congress has acted on the principle of self-determination. Those invited have accepted the invitation of the Congress as they never did before—no, not even in the palmy days of Non-co-operation—when, with all the millions behind it, the Congress was not supported by many well-known organisations. There is not one organisation—political, social, religious, communal, commercial, industrial or labour—of any note or standing to-day which did not take part in the All Parties Conferences and the National Convention or which, having so taken part, has not given up much that it valued for the sake of unity. It is an achievement of which any country in the world might well be proud. That achievement will now be presented to you. Will you accept it or spurn it? If you have any faith in your claim for self-determination, you have no right to spurn it even if you disagree. The only question is, whether there is such a consensus of agreement on the scheme that it can be treated as self-determined. I say there is. The only dissentients are a few communalists. As regards them, I must say frankly that I do not understand them and am unable to reconcile their claim for special communal advantages with their desire for complete independence. Some of these would reserve to a handful the right to arrest the whole course of the country's legislation. Others are prepared to go back even on joint electorates if a few additional seats are not given to them in the legislatures. Their dissent with a scheme of dominion status can hardly be taken seriously.

I have commented adversely on the speech of the Viceroy deliver-

ed in this city recently, but I think I owe it to His Excellency to express my appreciation of another part of the same speech which is germane to the point I am discussing. He said :

“ There is no use pretending that the different classes, the different communities, the different races in India will not have different standards, but in such disagreement there is nothing unhealthy or unnatural. If interests clash it does not mean that one set of interests is to be swept away or that one community need smother its individuality to suit the whole. Each has its own good qualities, it's own ideals to pursue, it's own rights to maintain but each should be capable of self-realisation in it's own sphere and at the same time taking it's own place in the whole scheme of National life.”

I heartily endorse this sentiment but am not quite sure that His Excellency and I are not at cross purposes. I claim that the Report of the All Parties Committee allows ample scope to every community to pursue its own ideals and affords it ample opportunity for “ self-realisation in its own sphere ” and at the same time gives to each “ its own place in the whole scheme of national life.” I have however a shrewd suspicion that Lord Irwin does not mean the same thing. But let me proceed.

Apart from the principle of self-determination the only other criterion by which you can judge the All Parties scheme is real and lasting good of the country. Spurn it, by all means, if you honestly think that it is not for the real and lasting good of the country and only offers a temporary advantage, at the sacrifice of the ultimate goal. But do not spurn it, merely, because it conflicts with theories and dogmas which have no relation to the living facts of the situation.

Neither the authors of the recommendations, nor the Conferences which have adopted them, have put them forward as a counsel of perfection. Speaking for myself and my colleagues on the Committee, I can say that there is not one of us who, left to himself, would have produced the identical report which, acting together we have considered it our duty to make. There are points on which our recommendations run counter to the settled convictions of every one of us, as for instance reservation of seats for minorities. We were, however,

compelled to recommend such reservation by the exigencies of the situation.

The one question, therefore, that this Congress has to answer is whether these recommendations and resolutions, taken as a whole, are so utterly outrageous, so thoroughly inconsistent, with the real and lasting good of the country, that it is its duty to reject them, in spite of the consensus of opinion in the country behind them. If they are not, this Congress has no option but to accept them.

It will be observed that the recommendations are divisible under two main heads—general and communal. Both are so inter-related that you cannot accept the one and reject the other. We cannot overlook the Lucknow resolution, whereby all parties agreed that "every one of them will stand by it (the Report) as a whole and will refuse to accept any single part of it without giving full force and effect to all other parts." There are communal and politico-communal organizations which favour dominion status and have, not only joined the communal agreements as parties, but given up what they considered substantial rights for the sake of an agreed constitution. Many hundreds of public meetings have been held throughout the country, attended by people of all shades of opinion, which have approved of the recommendations as a whole. It is impossible to say how many accepted the communal solution because of the draft constitution for dominion status, and how many accepted the latter because of the former. We have to keep our faith with all. The course suggested is therefore not open to the Congress. It has either to accept both, the communal solution and the dominion status, recommended by the Conferences, without prejudice to its goal of complete independence, or to scrap the whole scheme.

The position, as I view it, is this. Here is a constitution agreed upon by the various parties, invited by the Congress to frame it. These parties know that the goal of the Congress is complete independence. They do not ask the Congress to change its goal, but present to it the result of their labours such as it is, and say that they are prepared to go thus far and no further at present. They offer their co-operation and demand that of the Congress, to enable both to reach the point up to which they are prepared to go. After that point is reached they reserve

liberty to themselves and to the Congress to consider the next step. Is the Congress going to refuse them this co-operation and this liberty? Is the Congress after bringing them together going to send them back to the wilderness in isolated groups, each to shift for itself, and leave the Congress to wrangle over the respective merits of complete independence and dominion status to the end of time? If the Congress will do that, it will abdicate its proper function to guide the nation on its forward march. The occasion calls for skilful generalship, and not academic discussions which take us nowhere. The nation is knocking at your door. You must open it wide—wide enough for every one to enter, or lose your rightful place of high command. My advice to you is to accept the offer. If you do so the way to your destination is clear.

Begin at the point at which the All Parties conference have now arrived and push forward with them as far as they would go, then pause and take stock of your equipment, and finally throw the strength of your whole being into one great effort to reach the goal.

That is my answer to the question: how can we reach our destination?

The first, and the most obvious step is to set our own house in order. For this purpose, rally all the parties under the banner of the Congress and prepare to march shoulder to shoulder with them to the farthest end of the common road. That will be the first part of the arduous journey. I suggest the following programme for it:—

- (1) Popularising the communal solution, agreed to at the All Parties Conferences, in the country, by intensive propaganda in the press and on the platform and organising village to village lectures.
- (2) Organising similar propaganda in regard to the resolutions of the Delhi Unity Conference and the Madras Congress, with such improvements as this Congress might make on communal matters, other than those dealt with by the Conferences.
- (3) Work among the untouchables and depressed classes.
- (4) Organisation of labour, agricultural and industrial.
- (5) Other village organisation.
- (6) Popularising khaddar and boycott of foreign cloth.

- (7) Campaign against social customs which retard social intercourse and national growth, more especially crusade against the Purdah and the other disabilities of women.
- (8) Intensive campaign against the drink and opium curse.
- (9) Publicity.

It will be observed that this is a predominantly social programme. I claim no originality for any of its items and have merely selected them out of a long list which, with the exception of the first item, has been before the Congress and the country for years past. I may, however, be pardoned when I say that we have so far not done much worth speaking in carrying out the constructive work. Commonplace as this programme may appear, it is the only true foundation on which the hopes of the high priests of complete independence, as well as those of the votaries of dominion status, can be safely built. To the former I say, that the measure of their capacity, for the tremendous sacrifice that the first real step towards their goal will demand is the measure of their success in carrying out this seemingly unpretentious programme. To the latter I say, that the only chance there is of dominion status being ever offered to them lies in the complete fulfilment of this very programme.

Large sums of money and organised work throughout the country are necessary if we are to set about the business in right earnest. It is not merely the business of any particular organisation or individual, but of all organisations and all individuals in the country who have the least desire to attain any measure of freedom. Among those who took part in the Convention there were, the representatives of all interests in the country—there were the wealthy, the well-to-do, and the poor. Let the wealthy give of their abundance, the well-to-do of their savings, and the poor of their pittance. Let the Indian Princes, great and small, come forward with munificent donations, and give practical proof of the great solicitude they profess for the general well being of their country. In the social part of the programme all can join including Government servants. But will the Government let them? This is the acid test of the honesty of the pious intentions and wishes expressed by British statesmen in England and India. Let the Government, if it honestly means what it professes, publicly declare

that the Indian Princes, the Indian commercial and industrial magnates, the great Zamindars, and Government servants, have full liberty to help the social work in every way possible. Let there be no secret instructions to the contrary in sealed covers or in cipher, circulated at the same time. Let the English Banks undertake that they will not turn away Indian commercial and industrial concerns from their door if they subscribe to this fund. Let these three things be done, and I shall see that enough money is forthcoming within a very short time for the full fruition of this programme.

But we Congressmen need not depend upon the pious wishes and intentions of the British bureaucracy and those who are interested in maintaining it in power. The real work has to be done by Congressmen with the help of the progressive parties in the country.

I shall now examine the various items of the programme in relation to Congressmen.

Items 1 and 2 need no explanation. It will be observed that I have confined these items to the communal part of the recommendations as to which there is, and should be, no difference of opinion among us. The vital importance of the work is obvious.

As to untouchability, a great deal has been said but very little work has been done. It should, in my opinion, be the duty of every Congressman to help actively in this work to the best of his ability. Untouchability must be abolished altogether, so far as Congressmen are concerned, and no person who refuses to associate with untouchables as his equals should be permitted to belong to any Congress organisation. The All-India Spinners Association is doing good work in both directions but it needs further support and its work should be supplemented by lectures on sanitation and formation of village and circle committees to promote co-operation among the villages.

No. 6 is the special province of the women of India and I call upon them to offer their services to the Congress.

The campaign against social customs which retard social intercourse and national growth is essential for the success of any programme but we have so far paid the least attention to it. The purdah and the other disabilities of women are a curse which we should wipe out without delay. If woman is the better half of man, let us men assist them

to do the better part of the work of national uplift. To get rid of Purdah and to re-organise domestic life, no money is wanted. Every individual can and should do his bit.

It is impossible to enter into further details in the course of this address and I would suggest that the All-India Congress Committee be empowered to divide itself into a number of sub-committees, each to be presided over by a member of the Working Committee, and to be in charge of one or more of the above items. The actual work will be done by similar sub-committees of the Provincial Committees who will look for instructions to the sub-committee of the All-India Congress Committee in charge. All other details will be left to the Working Committee.

This is the general programme for all parties to carry out. It is as necessary from their point of view as that of the Congress, and I have reason to believe that they will give their full support. If we all do this work honestly and intensively the goal should be within sight. But if we are unable to work out this programme to the full measure expected, whether we retain the support of the other parties or not, for Congressmen non-violent non-cooperation is an obligation they dare not shirk unless there is a better aggressive programme before the Congress. Sirdar Vallabhai Patel and Bardoli have shown us that absolutely peaceful direct action is possible and can be made successful. He has shown what patient work among villagers can do. In your name, I tender my congratulations to the Sirdar and his brave comrades—men as well as women.

We may not forget our countrymen overseas. Though the great work done by Mr. V. S. Sastri has eased the situation to a certain extent in South Africa the position requires considerable watching. The problem in Kenya is growing more and more serious and threatens the very existence of the Indian settlers there who, by the way, went there long before any European and enjoyed the happiest relations with the Africans. In Fiji and British Guiana too the pressure of British exploitation is telling upon our countrymen who have gone there, as much as upon the natives of the soil. But without forgetting them, the best aid we can render them is, in the words of Sir Pheroza Mehta, to gain our freedom here.

I have only dealt with what I consider to be the real crux of the present situation and in doing so I have tried to discharge what I conceive to be my duty to the country at this juncture. My views may not be acceptable to all, specially to the younger men. I quite appreciate their impatience. We need both patience and impatience. Patience with those who differ from us, impatience with ourselves. I have no quarrel with the ideals of the younger men nor with the practical work they have laid out for themselves. I hold with them that all exploitation must cease and all imperialism must go. But the way to do it is a long and dreary one. They know it and have themselves pointed it out. The work before the young and the old is one and the same. Only the mentality is different. Let the younger men by all means preserve their own mentality, but let them not, for the sake of the very motherland they seek to serve, divide the country into more factions and parties than there are already. To the older men I repeat the same advice. Let them both remember the words of wisdom uttered by Mahatma Gandhi and Deshbandhu Chittaranjan Das I have quoted above. The masses want bread. They have no time to make experiments and no use for theories and dogmas imported from abroad.

I have done. You have been patient with me. My humble services for what they are worth are at your disposal. Let us sink our differences. Let us march forward shoulder to shoulder and victory is ours.

BANDE MATARAM.

Forty-third Indian National Congress

SECOND DAY :—30TH DECEMBER, 1928.

There was, an increase in the enthusiasm on the second day, when the President was led into the Pandal and conducted to his seat on the dais, the impressive procession of the previous day having been repeated. The singing of "Bande Mataram" and the choice musical programme, which was greatly appreciated, commenced the proceedings.

Pundit Jawaharlal Nehru, who was cheered on mounting the rostrum, made a short speech in Hindi and read messages of sympathy and congratulations from :—

(1), Mrs. Naidu from New York :—(2), London Branch of the Indian National Congress ; (3), American Branch of the Indian National Congress ; (4), Mr. Saklatwala ; (5), London Branch of the League against Imperialism, British Section ; (6), Madam Sun-yat Sen ; (7), Mr. Hola Charaqui, Medina (Arabia) ; (8), Workers' Welfare League ; (9), South African Federation of Trade Unions, Johannesburg ; (10), The League for the Defence of the Negro Race ; (11), German Committee of the World Federation of Youths for Peace ; (12), Mr. Sulaiman Mirza of the Persian Socialist Party, Teheran ; (13), War Resisters' International Enfield, England ; (14), Secretary, National Amalgamated Furnishing Trades' Association, England ; (15), M. Romain Rolland ; (16), Henri Barbusse, President of the League of the Rights of Man ; (17), Chairman of the Shillong Labour Party ; (18), Communist Party of New Zealand ; (19), Educational Workers' International, Paris.

MESSAGES FROM ABROAD

Cablegrams to the President

From Sarojini Naidu, New York, U. S. A.

Under your wise and valiant leadership, may the Nation initiate and triumphantly help every programme of splendid sustained and united endeavour to deliver India from the manifold forces of intricate

and intimate bondage that beset her and so transfigure the haunting dream of National liberty into a noble and imperishable reality.

From Hola Charaqui, Medina, Arabia.

I regret my inability to attend your Congress. I am with you in your just demands. Sincere wishes for success of Congress and for realization of your national aspirations.

From S. J. Saklatwala, Sandown, England

Wish success in efforts *bona fide* freedom also trust with full support on enlightened Moslem opinion you will support Islam's struggle in Afghanistan, Persia, Turkey, Iraq for mass uplifting against old world superstitions in false name of religious orthodoxy.

*From Sailendra Nath Ghose and Ramlal Bajpai,
New York, U. S. A.*

In name American Branch, Congress, we greet you India unite act.

From C. B. Vakil, Secretary, London Branch I. N. C., London

London Branch National Congress with Associated Branches, Manchester, Edinburgh, convey salutations and reaffirms Congress creed complete independence.

*From James Maxton, President, Edo Fimmen, Vice-President
Muenzenberg and Chattopadhyaya, Secretaries,
League against Imperialism, Berlin*

Executive Committee League against Imperialism in name one hundred affiliated associated organizations send cordial fraternal greetings forty-third Congress. Hopes battle absolute independence will be continued to victory by India's organised masses and that demand Dominion Status will be branded as compromise with Imperialism with betrayal Indian people. Draws attention growing war danger with India as base and urges intensive propaganda against imperialist war. Calls upon you protest expulsion Johnstone, our fraternal delegate to your Congress, thus prevented delivering our message personally. Hopes India will send powerful delegation anti-imperialism World

Congress and strengthen united front oppressed nations world imperialism. Long live independent India.

*From J. Maxton, Chairman and R. Bridgeman, Secretary,
British Section, League against Imperialism, London*

British Section League against Imperialism conveys warmest greetings Indian National Congress. League clearly sees that problem of real liberty conquered peoples lies along road of complete national independence and trusts that Congress will adhere to declaration of independence made last year at Madras.

*From Goune Sinha, President, All Ceylon Trade Union Congress
and Chairman, Ceylon Labour Party, Colombo*

On behalf workers Ceylon convey you fraternal greetings and wish Congress every success in fight India's freedom. Thanks invitation.

*From Eaglesham, Secretary, Communist Party,
New Zealand, Blackball N. Z.*

Communist Party, New Zealand sends fraternal greetings to National Congress.

From the Indian National Association, Capetown, South Africa

Wishing Congress successful session. Hope New Agent-General will consult all Indian opinion before concluding negotiations Union Government regarding existing rights and future legislation affecting Indians.

LETTERS

From Sun Soong Chung Ling (Madame Sun Yat Sen)

To the Indian Nationalist Congress.

I am unable to attend your Congress in person, because the foreign power who holds you in subjection has refused—as it refused last year—to issue to me the requisite *visa*. This petty act, however, will not prevent me from sending a message to assure you that the cause of

Indian Independence continues to command the interest and sympathy of all true followers of Sun Yat Sen who died wishing success of the Indian Nation in their struggle for freedom, and who looked upon that struggle as part of the larger movement of Asia towards the social readjustments rendered necessary by the material developments of the West.

A free and independent India is a vital interest of the New Order in Asia, whose definite emergence has been heralded by the Chinese Revolution and whose growth and progress are governed by forces which no counter-revolution in China or any betrayal and treachery fostered by imperialism can arrest.

But if Indian independence is to be realised in our times, Swaraj must secure the wide and active support of the broad masses of the workers and peasants of India. As in China, these two elements of your population are the greatest pillars of India's strength. And if there is any outstanding lesson in the Chinese revolution for Indian nationalism, it is the imperative need to mobilise the workers and peasants of India in the national struggle with British Imperialism.

SUN SOONG CHUNG LING,

Berlin

(*Madame Sun Yat Sen*)

From Romain Rolland

(Translated from original letter in French)

Mr. President of the Indian National Congress,

I address my respectful and affectionate salutation to India assembled to-day in her Indian National Congress. The world sees her children assemble with the high hopes which brought into being the States General of 1789, which opened out a new era to man. May to-day begin the era which will bear in history the name of the Independence of India—*India Liberata*!

This sacred land from which have gone forth the greatest streams of ideas and of civilisations, which have fertilised the ancient continent, has shown for a century a miraculous power of renewing itself. An

uninterrupted succession of geniuses, of whom may I mention in these times of Renaissance, the great figure of the Precursor, Ram Mohan Roy—in association with that of the heroic apostle of truth and love whom the world venerates, M. K. Gandhi, have forged again the unity of the spirit of India. A band of intrepid workers and of great citizens among whom I mention one whom India mourns to-day—Lajpat Rai—have made it possible for the nation to catch up the Western giant in his onward march.

The time has come when the enchained Prometheus struggles to free himself on the Himalayas. May Prometheus having freed himself remain, whatsoever may happen, faithful to himself, to his past, to those ideas for which he has suffered, to justice, to the universal soul which he has within him—the *Atman Brahman*—to the high mission of humanity which is his true reason for existence.

We in the West know too much of the abuses, the errors and the crimes of a monstrous nationalism not to hope that India will escape the murderous route followed by the peoples of Europe and America; that she will raise herself above it and attain the superior status for the future of humanity when she will realise in her people the harmony of all faiths, the co-operation of all forces, and the union of all ideas for the good of all humanity.

Villeneuve

ROMAIN ROLLAND

December 1928

From Henri Barbusse

(Translated from the original letter in French)

Paris, November, 1928.

Comrades, friends and brothers,

As it is physically impossible for me to go to you at this moment owing to other engagements and previous obligations, I wish to offer you my homage and the fraternal and ardent homage of all those proletariat and intellectual West who fight by my side and are wholeheartedly in sympathy with the men who raise the banner of India's independence.

I wish you fruitful work in the present session of your Congress, which is the organisation symbolizing in the most authoritative and in the most formidable manner this magnificent watchword—the Independence of India, the forerunner of the glorious social development and the high future destiny of your great race.

The greeting that I send to the representatives of this race, which is raising itself against a foreign imperialism, is the greeting of the International of the Anti-militarists, of the League against Imperialism, of the Committees for the Defence of the Victims of the White Terror, and of all the other organisations which I represent. It is also my personal greeting, the salutation of a revolutionary.

We wish you to realise the ardent sympathy which all the proletarian and intellectual revolutionaries of old Europe feel for the emancipation of India, a prey as she is to exploitation, to slavery, to inexpressible oppression, and the tremendous importance which this problem has acquired in their eyes. We wish you to realise how much the indignation evoked in the Indian continent by the Simon Commission, despised by all true Indians, has had its repercussions amongst us; and with what fraternal emotion the masses and the younger generation follow the efforts of the League for National Independence founded under the direction of our friend Jawaharlal Nehru and all the true revolutionary movements having for their object the liberation of your vast and splendid country from a degrading servitude, and to give to the innumerable Indian masses towed by British Imperialism the right to live, liberty, and the conquest of power.

Your great cause is the cause of all the exploited people of the world who to-day are preparing to demonstrate to all their desire to get rid of the exploitation of the great powers. That is the reason why all these masses proclaim their profound solidarity with you and look forward to prove this solidarity to you in an effective manner.

I hail the independence of India, I hail the liberation of the oppressed!

HENRI BARBUSSE

From League for the Defence of the Negro Race

(Translated from the original letter in French).

Paris, 10th November, 1928

The League against Imperialism and for National liberty has invited us to the coming annual sessions of your National Congress.

We greatly regret the physical impossibility of sending a special delegation. But we wish to note our entire agreement with the National Congress. We associate ourselves with all the activities for your national liberty and with your protests against the situation created by the English Government by the Simon Commission which is calculated to weaken the strength of certain of your fighting elements. We greatly desire a unified India in face of the urgent problem, a truce to political and religious strife which is supported by English Imperialism. During the course of your debates which are about to take place, think of us. Remember in French dark Africa, despite the refinements of the oppression exercised by French Imperialism, the people are awakening to the bitter fight for National liberty and international equality. We are prevented from communicating with other people and that is why you may ignore the drama which is being unfolded here for world opinion. Our English, Belgian and Italian comrades in Africa are hardly in a better state. Remember that under France the workers and peasants are suffering atrociously under the joint action of racial prejudice and merciless imperialism; remember that in the United States of America the Negroes are hard hit by ostracism. You know better than we do what is going on in South Africa. We have the duty and the right to point out the actual state of affairs to the National Congress.

Mr. General Secretary, dear comrade, please receive yourself and all those who attend the annual session our fraternal salutation. May your deliberations be followed by results for the good of India.

Long live India bent upon achieving her national freedom! Long live all oppressed peoples!

From Chedly ben Mustafa of the Destour (National) Party in Tunis, Africa, Dated Tunis, 30th November, 1928.

Dear Comrade,

In the name of the people of Tunis still under the yoke of French imperialism, the Executive Committee of the National Party of Tunis directs me to convey to you their fraternal saluation on the occasion of the Indian National Congress Sessions on December 26th, 27th and 28th next.

Our party knows about the political boycott you have organised against the Simon Commission and the economic boycott by which you are resisting England.

Cognisant as our Party is of your efforts to achieve political and social emancipation, we realise also that your fight is only an episode in the great world movement for the liberation of oppressed peoples and the large numbers of human beings who are exploited.

At the moment when you affirm your wish to have no compromise of any kind with British Imperialism, our party sends you its sympathy, its encouragement and the assurance of its solidarity with you.

In adding the testimony of my militant faith in the work of truth and justice in which we are co-operating with all our living strength, I would assure you, my dear Comrade, that the people of Tunis have the most ardent wish for the triumph of India's cause.

We do not despair here to see in the near future, India, free and independent, taking along with her the other peoples, her brothers, who hunger for their political and social emancipation.

With our fraternal sentiments,

CHEDLY BEN MUSTAFA

Member of the Committee of the Destour Party and of the Executive Committee of the International League against Colonial Oppression and Imperialism.

From Dr. Otto Reinemann on behalf of the German Preparatory Committee for a World Federation of Youth for Peace.—

Frankfurt/M Germany. November 26th, 1928.

It was the young people who after the great war first crossed the frontiers of the nations till that moment hostile, convinced that they would find the human being in the enemy of yesterday. A strong desire for *peace* inspired them. In the first decade after the war members of the Youth movements of the different nations gathered ever more frequently to give expression to this desire for peace. But they were forced to realise that the real enemies of peace, that is imperialism and exploitation, both national and social, have not lost power since 1918, but on the contrary have gained it more and more. They were forced to realise that real peace can only be founded on *freedom* and *justice*.

The idea of a *World Federation of Youth for Peace* has gripped the leaders of the Youth movements of many countries since several years; a great Congress at Eerde (Holland), in August, 1928, prepared the way. The representatives of German Youth groups of all political and philosophical stand-points have placed the realisation of the nature of true peace in the foreground of all discussions and resolutions. They feel especially driven to this as Germans, as members of a nation placed between the mentality of the East and the West; their country is nationally bound to-day; the masses of its workers are struggling hard to-day for social justice, for the abolition of the present economic system of brutal exploitation.

The undersigned German preparatory Committee for a World Federation of Youth for Peace, in which the representatives of those German Youth groups who agree with the idea of a World Federation of Youth are gathered together sends its *fraternal greetings* to the All-India Congress at Calcutta whose holy task is the attainment of India's freedom. These German Youth groups *sympathise* heartily with this *fight for India's national independence*. They believe that India's fight is an important part of the great fight of the oppressed peoples and the masses of the international revolutionary proletariat against the all too strong front of imperialism and capitalism. The fight of

national freedom and for just economic order free of exploitation are one and the same thing; our front must be unanimous and strong.

*From Solciman Mirza on behalf of the Persian Socialist Party,
Teheran, 18th November, 1928*

We have just come to know from a kind letter from the League against Imperialism that you have had the goodness to invite us to send delegates to the next sessions of the National Congress for the Independence of India.

Unfortunately it is not possible for us, owing to certain difficulties to which we cannot give expression for the moment, to accept your kind invitation and to be present in Calcutta and give you our hearty co-operation. We take the liberty however to send to the National Congress, through your good self, our most ardent prayers and our sincerest good wishes.

We are certain that the Congress movement will be helped by many international factors and that all the oppressed peoples will do their utmost so that your just emancipation may soon be crowned by real victory.

It goes without saying that Persia, owing to many historic and other bonds, is one of the countries which particularly shares your sufferings and will acclaim whole-heartedly the independence of India. Our Socialist Party is specially interested in this.

Please accept, therefore, dear friends, our excuses for our inability to be present there and at the same time our best wishes.

*From H. Runham Brown, Honorary Secretary, War Resisters'
International, Enfield, (England)*

The War Resisters' International is unable to be represented at the Indian National Congress which is to take place in Calcutta on December 26th—28th, but on its behalf I have much pleasure in enclosing herewith a message of greeting which I trust you will present to the Congress.

“ War Resisters' International sends warmest greetings to Indian National Congress of December, 1928, and assures representatives of

people of India of its full sympathy with their just demand for National Independence.

We are with you uncompromisingly opposed to both political and economic imperialism which are only made possible by domination of force. We rejoice that under inspiration of Mahatma Gandhi Indian peoples have been applying way of non-violence to overcome violence and we hope India may be able to give an example to whole world in securing freedom without degrading itself to level of its oppressors by copying their methods."

From M. E. Burns, London District Secretary, League against Imperialism, London, December 12, 1928

On behalf of organised workers in the London District who are joining up in the struggle against Imperialism, the London District Committee of the League against Imperialism sends fraternal greetings to the Indian National Congress.

The Committee declares its absolute repudiation of the Simon Commission, and in its work in London is making every effort to expose the real purpose of the Commission. It hopes that the present session of the Congress will be the means of securing a new advance in the struggle for Indian independence.

From M. H. Andrews, Secretary, South African Trades Union Congress, Johannesburg, December 3, 1928

My National Executive Council has been informed that your Congress meets on December 26th, 27th and 28th.

I am instructed to say that if it were possible my Congress would have been pleased to send a fraternal delegation, but nevertheless assures your Congress of the sympathy of the South African Trades Union Congress with the Indian workers in their struggle for economic and political freedom. It recognises the heroic struggles which the Indian workers have conducted against their unspeakable exploitation and hopes and believes that the deliberations of your Congress will

assist and inspire the Indian people to further efforts in the direction of their emancipation from Imperialism and capitalist exploitation.

From B. Weinbren, Chairman, South African Federation of Non-European Trade Unions, Johannesburg, December 28, 1928

On behalf of the S. A. F., N.-E. T. U. I desire to extend our fraternal greetings to your Committee and to wish you a most successful conference. My Committee regrets our inability to be with you during the Congress, but sincerely hopes that your Congress will give the lead to the working class of India in their terrific struggle against the Imperialist oppression and the capitalist yoke which is suffocating our Indian comrades. Although many thousands miles away from you, the members of the Federation and its affiliated unions will be eagerly awaiting the result of your deliberations. One and all we wish you every success and hope that the next Congress which will be very soon, will be in a liberated working class India.

From the Secretary, Arab Secretariate of the Anti-Imperialist League, the Secretary, Workers' Class of Palestine and the Secretary, Arab Workers' Group, Jerusalem, December 6, 1929

The undersigned organisations beg you to convey their greeting to the Indian National Congress meeting on December 26th, at Calcutta.

Oppressed like you by British Imperialism which rules our country most arbitrarily without regard to the needs of its population, creating divisions between races and religions and exploiting the sweat of the toiling masses—we have the highest appreciation and profess most sincere sympathies for the liberation movement of the Indian Nation. We are sure that no power in the world can withstand the strife for freedom of India, if it only succeeds to mobilize the millions of workers, hundreds of millions of poor peasants to fight British imperialism.

We hope that your Congress will be a step in this uncompromising anti-imperialist struggle. We also trust that your Congress will lay

the foundation for the mighty alliance between the Indian masses and the revolutionary section of the European proletariat on the one hand, and with the other oppressed nations in all parts of the world, on the other.

*From Harry Pollit, Honorary General Secretary, National
Minority movement, London, 10th December, 1928*

We received recently, through the League Against Imperialism, an invitation to send a fraternal delegate to your Congress. We at once appointed our Chairman, Tom Mann, who is known to all here and in South Africa, Australia and China as an opponent of British imperialism, to attend your Congress and convey to you the greetings of these workers here in the British trade unions whom we represent.

Unfortunately the British government flatly refused to allow our chairman to travel to India at all. Any "labour" gentleman who is willing to do the work of the Imperialist rulers can get a passport to India—can even travel at the expense of the British government to inquire the fate and future of the great Indian people. But those who have a different message for the Indian people—a message urging that it is time they should take their fate and future into their own hands—are not allowed to visit this part of the Empire.

We therefore can only send you our friendly greetings by this letter, with the message that we wish to give all in India who seek for an ending of India's present subjection and the exploitation of the Indian workers and peasants.

Our message is: Do not believe that the workers of Britain are rightly represented by the bureaucrats and Parliamentarians who have recently visited India. These gentlemen call themselves "Labour" but they have betrayed and misled the workers of this country, just as in the past they called themselves friends of India, but now at the time of testing are to be found at the side of Simon, at the beck and call of the murderers of Lala Lajpat Rai.

And the workers in this country are finding, slowly but surely, the truth about these men as Labour leaders, just as you are finding out

the truth about them as friends of India. The workers of Britain, who have never desired the subjection of any people, are more and more supporting the League against Imperialism, more and more supporting our Movement which aims at the freedom of all who are oppressed and exploited, and will be ready to give you aid and fight on your behalf when our common enemies, the ruling classes of Britain, try to suppress your movement towards independence by new Amritsars.

For we believe that the Simon Commission—including the two "Labour leaders," Mr. Hartshorn and Major Attlee—are preparing the way for new repression in India; their function is to give an appearance, for those who can be misled into weakness, of consultation and compromise. But behind this apparent willingness to listen to Indian opinion is the confident hope, in the minds of the callous exploiters who rule us and you, that the Indian people will be so divided—as hitherto the British working class have been—that British Imperialism may be enabled to build up greater fortunes than ever out of the blood, the misery and the starvation of India.

When the people of India, through your efforts, oppose this increased exploitation and move towards freedom men such as Mr. Baldwin, who appointed the Simon Commission, or Mr. Lloyd George, who carries the responsibility for Amritsar, or Mr. Macdonald, who imposed the Bengal Ordinances, will try to use the guns again to hold you back.

But guns will not hold back a united people, as here we hope that in the years to come guns will not break a united working class. In all the struggles of the future—struggles not of your choosing, but imposed upon you by the ruthless oppression of imperialism—rest assured that there is a growing body of workers in Britain who hold out to you the hand of friendship and fraternal aid, and look forward with you to the days when all peoples shall be linked together only by the bonds of consideration for the welfare of others, and a common determination to share fairly among all the wealth that the labour of all produces.

With fraternal greetings.

From A. Eaglesham, General Secretary, Communist Party of New Zealand, Blackball, 7th December, 1928

On behalf of the Communist Party of New Zealand I hereby convey fraternal greetings to the Annual Session of the Indian National Congress.

The Communist Party of New Zealand sends a message of solidarity to the workers and peasants of India in their bitter struggle against the oppression of British Imperialism. We pledge our fullest and most active support to the exploited masses of India in their fight for complete National Independence and for their social emancipation.

Your's for International Solidarity against Imperialism!

From J. E. Potter Wilson, Secretary, the Workers' Welfare League of India, London, December 5, 1928.

The Workers' Welfare League of India has pleasure in forwarding greetings and best wishes for a successful and useful Congress. It trusts that the Congress in its deliberations will give due and full consideration to the need of energetic efforts being made to raise the standard of the workers of India.

The League urges that to lift up the masses both materially and educationally and to range them in full co-operation as a solid backing to Congress effort will add considerable power and stimulus to the aims for which the Indian National Congress exists.

Again wishing your Congress every success.

From Alex Gossip, General Secretary, National Amalgamated Furnishing Trades' Association, London, 16th November, 1928

I am directed by my Executive Committee to send you their very best wishes and fraternal greetings on occasion of your coming congress and sincerely trust Conference will be fruitful of good results to down-trodden and oppressed workers in India.

We strongly approve of your determined opposition to Sir John Simon Commission as we have taken very active part in opposition to

same and we think it a gross insult to whole of our fellow workers in India.

Again wishing you the very best of success.

From the Educational Workers' International, Paris
(Translated from the original message in French)

Brothers of India.

In the name of the 8,10,000 teachers of all countries, of all races and of every degree, who form part of our Trade Union International, we send you a warm and fraternal greeting.

To our greeting we join our best wishes for all success in your activities.

We promise you that our support in your struggle for the emancipation of the Indian people shall never fail you.

The conditions under which you are holding your Sessions this year are not unknown to us; throughout the world the adversaries of Imperialism followed with great admiration the movement of indignant protest that roused your country against the Simon Commission, and against the measures of repression that were recently imposed on your people. We also know that there is not one Trade Union in your country that has not declared to carry through a social and political boycott of the Commission, and our great international teachers' Trade Union assures them its solidarity in their long and difficult struggles.

We know very well that at your Sessions you will discuss efficacious measures to be taken in order to assure the liberty of the press, of meeting and of association, in view of fighting for independence. In these conditions we are happy to be able to give you unreserved support. Already some weeks ago, our International, inside of which, independently of shades of political opinion, teachers affiliated to the two big Trade Union Internationals, or affiliated to neither, are grouped on the principle of the class struggle basis for the liberation of the working class, the struggle against world fascism and the struggle against war and imperialism, sent an appeal to struggle to the Conference of the All India Federation of Teachers' Associations:—

Born from the working class, it continued, teachers of the children of the people, it is their duty to let European, American or Japanese Imperialism and its native bourgeois accomplices know that they mean to stand by the people in their struggle to re-conquer the right to the fruit of their labour, to national freedom and to the establishment of a regime of fraternal co-operation between the metropolitan working class and the colonial population, as well as the right to freedom from Imperialism.

Our ten years of activity in colonial and semi-colonial countries are the token of our determination to struggle with the oppressed peoples of all countries. It is through independent circumstances of work that so far our activities in Asia have only been developed in Indo-China, inspite of the frightful repression of the teachers' movement by French Imperialism at our fourth Conference (Vienna, August, 1926), a fraternal delegate from Indo-China teachers reported on the oppression of teachers, schools and culture in his country; he officially declared that our "Unitary International is the first to take an interest in us, the first to admit us in its ranks, and according to us, it is particularly this that distinguishes this Unitary International from all others, and which has received all our sympathy, all our hopes, and all our confidence, no matter whether we be progressives, socialists, communists or no party at all."

Although so far, the relations between our Secretariat and Indian colleagues have been insufficient, we have closely followed the struggle of the Indian people for the schools; our monthly bulletin as well as our press bulletin have described the miserable conditions under which Indians live. They related how in Bengal, 131,000 children died in 1926 less than a year after birth; that on account of British rule, 92·8% men and 98·2% women are illiterate; how in Bengal, 4 shillings and 5 pence is spent per Indian pupil on education, whereas £7 14s. 11½d. is spent per European child: and how 5½d. per head, per annum is spent on education, whereas 4 shillings and 7 d. is spent for the army, police, etc.

Our action has always been organised to protest against child oppression and the exploitation of teachers who are only paid Rs. 8 a month. At our last World Conference (Leipzig, April, 1928), we

resolved to form a teachers' commission in colonial and semi-colonial countries. Two months ago we launched an appeal to our Indian colleagues to take part in this commission.

At the same time, we felt obliged to warn them against the World Federation of Teachers' Associations, to which, we are convinced they made a mistake in affiliating. We reminded them that this organisation founded in 1925, at San Francisco, is only an instrument of Anglo-Saxon Imperialism, the most insidious and most merciless of all, as is proved by the praise of Yankee "pacifism" at the Toronto Conference (1927), and the attempts to capture the educational organisations of Latin America, at the same time as the conquest of Anglo-Saxon financial capital.

We are convinced that, owing to your example and support, educational workers of India will be able to free themselves from the harmful influences, accomplices of Imperialism, and take their places as fighters on the anti-imperialist front; we are convinced that they will understand their duty of struggle for the well-being of the people and culture, both compromised by imperial barbarism.

We once more repeat our wishes for full success in your activities.

Long live independent India, economically and spiritually flourishing in a community of a world freed by the triumph of higher social and international relations.

Paris
December 5, 1928.

The General Secretary,
L. VERNOCHET.

Fraternal Delegates.

The Parti Constitutionaliste of French Indo-China sent two fraternal delegates to the Congress—Monsieur Bui Queng Chieu, the president of the party and Monsieur Duong Van Giao, the Secretary. Monsieur Chieu addressed the Congress in French and gave a message of goodwill and solidarity on behalf of his people.

Other fraternal delegates also came to the Congress. Mr. V. J. Kusha represented the London Branch of the Indian National Congress,

Mr. D. P. Mahabubani, the Kobe (Japan) Branch of the Indian National Congress and Mr. T. Bragança Cunha, of the Goa Branch.

It is understood that several additional messages were sent to the Congress but these did not reach their destination. One of the messages was from the Perhimpoean Indonesia, which is a federation of Indonesian Nationalist Parties.

Pundit Jahwarlal Nehru said: Fraternal delegates had been sent from the London Branch of the Indian National Congress, from the Japanese Branch at Kobe, and the Branch at French Indo-China. A fraternal delegate is on his way here and will arrive to-morrow. The League against Imperialism had sent to us Mr. Johnston, who, I am sorry to say, was arrested on his arrival and deported (Cries of "Shame, Shame"). Many other messages of sympathy from Egypt, Arabia, Mesopotamia and Palestine had been sent but as these messages have not reached us we can only take it that they have been intercepted and suppressed by interested parties. (Shame, Shame.)

Pundit Jahwarlal then translated the messages into Hindi.

The President, Pundit Motilal Nehru, addressed the Congress, speaking in Hindi.

भाइयो मैं एक बात आपलोगों से कहना चाहता हूँ। आप फिजूल में इतना शोर मचा रहे हैं। मुझे आपके इस वर्तन पर निहायत दुःख होता है। अभी आपने देखा होगा, थोड़ी देर हुई इसी पंडालमें हज़ारों मजदूरोंकी एक बड़ी भारी मीटिंग हुई थी, उनकी तादाद आप लोगों से कहीं ज्यादा थी, उन्होंने अपने काम को किस शान्ति और सहूलियत से निपटाया, सभी काम को शायद आप कई दिन खतम करने में लगते। निहायत अफसोस है कि आप पढ़े लिखे आदमी होने हुए भी शान्ति से बोलने में मजबूर हैं। जराभी बात कि 'हिन्दी में बालो' बात बहुत मामूली, यह बात शान्तिमें भी कही जा सकती है। लेकिन आप लोग ऐसा बोलते हैं कि कहीं लाठी चलती हो। हंसी) यह हंसने की बात नहीं यह रोने की बात है। आप

सैंकड़ों रुपया खर्च करके अपने देशकीमती वक्त को खर्च करके आज़ादी के लिये यहाँ आये हैं। मैं कल भी आपसे कह चुका हूँ और आज फिर आखिरी मर्तबा आप से कहता हूँ कि मुझको आपने सम्भाषित मुकर्रर किया है, जहाँ मैं दूसरों के हक के लिये लड़ता हूँ उसी तरह अपने हक पर भी लड़ना चाहता हूँ मेरा हक है कि मैं यहाँ शान्ति रखूँ और सब काम सहूलियत से होता देखूँ। मैं जो तामील कहूँ आप उसे करें। मैं नहीं अस्वागत कर सकता कि आप बिना किसी बजह से आये से बाहर हो जायँ आखिर तमीज़ भी तो कोई चीज़ होती है। मैं इस हाय हाय, गुलगपान्ने के मस्त खिलाफ हूँ, रहा यह कि कौन किस बोलीमें बोलें मैं आपके सामने एक क़ायदा रखता हूँ आप सब लोगों को उसको पाबन्दी करना होगा। मैं जानता हूँ कि हिन्दी

और उर्दू राष्ट्रीय भाषा क्रम दी गई है लेकिन क्या इसके मायने यह है कि दूमरों पर जो हिन्दी नहीं बोल सकते कोई जुर्म करार दिया जाय। मैं ऐसी उर्दू बोल सकता हूँ कि आप में से किसी को भी समझ में नहीं आयेगी और ऐसी ही हिन्दी बोल सकता हूँ। यह बिलकुल फ़र्ज़ है कि हिन्दी में ही बोलें और दूमरी ज़बान में नहीं जो शक्य स्ट्रेटफार्म पर अपने क़्यालात जाहिर करने आयेगा वह जिस ज़बान में चाहे जाहिर कर सकता है जिसमें वह बोल सके बोले उसे कोई रुकावट नहीं होनी चाहिये। जब ऐसा होगा तभी आप समझ सकते हैं। अभी हमारे मुल्क में ऐसे बहुत से हिस्से हैं जहाँ हिन्दी भाषा नहीं समझ सकते जैसे मद्रास, क्या आपकी राय

ऐसी है कि जो लोग मद्रास बम्बई से आये हैं यिना कुछ बोले चले सीधे बरंग चले जाय, क्या कुछ भी न बोले नहीं, तीनों भाषाओं में स्पीच होगी आप लोग कमसे कम मजदूरों की बराबरी तो कर लीजिये जैसे उन लोगों ने शान्ति से अपने काम को अंजाम दिया आप भी शान्ति से अपने कार्य को समाप्त करें। अब जैसा कायदा हुआ करता है कि जब कोई कार्य बाहो कोई समाज सोसायटी शुरू किया करता है तो अपने बंकुट सिधारे हुए नेताओं के कामों को याद कर लिया करें। यह काम President (प्रधान) को और से हुआ करता है अब मैं एक प्रस्ताव अपनी ओर से रखता हूँ इसे पहिले अज़रेज़ीमें पढ़ता हूँ और फिर हिन्दी में पढ़कर सुनादूंगा।

He moved the following resolution :—

" This Congress record its deep sorrow at the deaths of Hakim Ajmal Khan, Lord Sinha, Lala Lajpat Rai, Ex-Presidents of the Congress, and Shri Magan Lal Gandhi, Shri Gopalbandhu Das, Andhraratna Gopal Krishnayya and Shri Annandi Prasad Sinha and sends its respectful condolences to their families."

The resolution was carried with due solemnity all standing.

Sardar Sardul Singh Caveshar (Punjab) then moved the following resolution :—

" This Congress condemns the attack by the Lahore Police on Lala Lajpat Rai and other leaders near the Railway Station while leading the Boycott Procession on the arrival of the Simon Commission as deliberate and unprovoked and believes that the death of Lalaji was accelerated by the injuries he received at the hands of the Police."

He supported the resolution in a speech in Hindi.

हज़ाराह! जो रेज़ोल्यूशन अभी प्रधान जी की ओर से पेश किया गया था उसमें लाला जी की मृत्युकेसुतग्रहक अफ़सोस जाहिर कर दिया गया है और इसके साथ ही दूमरे नेताओं के सुतग्रहक भी अफ़सोस जाहिर किया गया है, क्या वजह है कि लालाजी की मृत्यु के बारेमें एक इंसान रेज़ोल्यूशन के द्वारा शोक प्रकट किया जा रहा है

यदि मामूली तौर पर जैसे हुआ करती है लालाजी की मृत्यु हो जाती तो इस इंसान प्रस्ताव की शायद इतनी ज़रूरत नहीं पड़ती लेकिन लालाजी की मृत्यु के साथ एक रहस्य है उस रहस्य का परदाफाश करना बहुत ज़रूरी है मैं साफ़ २ सुने तौर पर कहता हूँ और सरकार भी कान खोल कर समझे लालाजी को एक तरह से

क़त्ल किया गया (शोक-शोक) क्या हमारे नेताओं का हमी तरह से क़त्ल हुआ होगा और हम चुपचाप बैठे रहा करें में आप से यह नहीं कहता कि आप आप से बाहर हो जायं, हमें यह देखना है कि हमें करना क्या है इस प्रकार चुपचाप बैठने से क्या हमारा भला होगा, हमें सदियों गुज़र गई इस प्रकार की दशा देखने हुए, अब तक जो कुछ भी हमने किया है और जो कुछ भी हमारी तरफ़ से होता रहा है वह सिर्फ़ Agitation (आन्दोलन) होता रहा है, इस आन्दोलनका गवर्नमेंट पर बहुत ज्यादा असर नहीं पड़ा, हम आन्दोलन करते हैं अपने दुख दर्द का इज़हार करते हैं संसार को उसकी क्या परवाह। सरकार ने भी अब तक अपना खैय्या यह रक्खा कि वक्त से वक्त कुछ Concessions (मांगें) दिये जाय फिर repression (दबाव) शुरू हो, पिछली अज़मेज़ो हकूमत की तवारीख़ उठा कर आप देखेंगे यही गवर्नमेंट की policy (नीति) रही है। लेकिन जयसे Simon Commission (साइमन कमीशन) हमारे मुँह में आया है पिछली पालिसी विलकुल बदल दी गई, इसके ख़िलाफ़ देखने में क्या आरहा है कि हर जगह जहाँ भी इस कमीशन ने पदोपण किया लोगों पर पुलिसने ज़ुलम किये, शान्तिसे जालूस भी नहीं ठोक २ निकालने दिये, यानी गवर्नमेंट ने पहिले repression दबाव शुरू किया देखें इस दबाव के बाद क्या हमको Concessions (सुधार) मिलते हैं। यह पालिसी अब बदल दी गई है। गवर्नमेंट इस पालिसीसे लोगों को डराना चाहती है, उसका म्थाल है कि इस दबाव से लोग धररा जायंगे, लेकिन हमें यह समझना चाहिये कि गवर्नमेंट चाहे किसे ही ज़ुलम करे और अभी क्या देखिये हमसे भी ज्यादा अभी हम पर ज़ुलम किये जायंगे, हम ख़ाम नले जब तक कि हम आज्ञा न होजायं। (हर्ष हर्ष)

में थोड़ेसे लफ़्जोंमें आपको यह बातलाऊँ कि लालाजी की मृत्यु कैसे हुई आप लोग यह चाक़-यात एनने के बहुत दख़्खुक होंगे। मेरे मामने यह सब कुछ हुआ, मैं कह सकता हूँ कि लाला जीको चुनकर पीटा गया, गवर्नमेंट उस मौक़े की ताक़ में थी जय उसको ऐसा मौक़ा मिले अगर ऐसा नहीं था तो क्यों नहीं गवर्नमेंटने इसका तख़ला देह जवाब दिया, डाक्टर आलम-साहबने पंजाब कॉमिल में एक रेज़ाल्यूशन पेश किया कि लाला जीकी मृत्युके विषय में जांच काने को एक Independent Enquiry Committee (स्वतन्त्र अनुमन्धान समिति) बंटाई जाय जो यह मालूम करे कि दर असल लालाजी की मृत्यु का असली मयब क्या है, लेकिन गवर्नमेंट कोइ को सुनने लगी है? गवर्नमेंटने साफ़ इन्कार कर दिया कि वह ऐसी Enquiry के लिये तय्यार नहीं है। अब एक-चाल गवर्नमेंट की आपने और देखी होगी अज़यारों में पड़ा होगा कि पंजाब गवर्नमेंट यह कहती है कि सान्डर्स पर जो हमला हुआ है उसका सयब यह है कि उनने लालाजी पर हमला किया था, क्या लूब! उलटी गवर्नमेंट हम पर ही दोष लगाती है, हमारे नेता उंडोसे पीटे जायं, सिर्फ़ पीटे ही न जायं, बलिक दीदा-दानिस्ता उन पर हमले किये जायं, और अन्तकर दिया जाय उस पर उलटी हम पर हो मार। हम ज़ार की आयाज़से कहते हैं और गवर्नमेंट को आगाह कर देना चाहते हैं कि गवर्नमेंट को अब समझ लेना चाहिये कि ज़ुलम की भी हद होती है, ज़ुलम हमेशा नहीं फला करता, अब गवर्नमेंट के ज़ुलमों का प्याला भरगया है, हमने बहुतसे ज़ुलम सहे आख़िर कहां तक हम इन ज़ुलमों को सहेंगे। हम तो साफ़ २ लफ़्जों में फिर कहते हैं कि जो हमारा Creed (धर्म) है उस पर अपनी जान लड़ादेंगे, हम शान्तिसे स्वराज्य

लेंगे यह हमारा ध्येय है हम उसी पर जमे रहे अगर फिर भी कोई Provocation (उसकान) होते हैं तो इसकी जिम्मेदारी किस पर है, हम पर नहीं इसकी जिम्मेदारी उन्हींके सर पर है जिन्होंने लखनऊ और लाहौर में हमारे नेताओंके ऊपर डंडों की वर्षा की, क्या हमारे नेता इस तरह पिटने रहे और हम चुपरदें। हमको गवर्नमेंट मार २ कर भड़काती है, वह तो समझती है कि इनके पास है ही क्या, यह तो निहत्थे हैं अगर उंगली भी उठाई तो भूतझलेंगे। अगर हमारे में से कुछ भड़कने हैं तो हमलिये कि लालाजी, पं० मातीलाल और पं० मालवीयजी पर जो हमारे सरताज हैं अगर इन पर पुलिस जुल्म करती है तो हम कब तक इन जुल्मों को देख सकते हैं, अगर इस लिये कुछ लोग तंज़ी दिखलाते हैं, तो इसकी जिम्मेदारी हम पर नहीं गवर्नमेंट पर है, अब किसीको बेइन्तेहा दबाया जाता है तो आदर कब तक उस जुल्म को वह बर्दाश्त करगा, छोटे से छोटे कौड़ोंको भी जब दबाया जाता है वह भी अपना डंकुचलाता है, जो लोग ऐसा हमला करते हैं उनको समझना चाहिये कि वह दिन गये जब लोग चुपचाप जुल्मों को सह लिये करते थे अभी तो हमारा सरकार कानपुर के एक ही Memorial well मेमोरियल कुआँ।

लिये रोती है अगर गवर्नमेंट की यही रफ्तार रही और अपने जुल्म के पंजे को नहीं रोका तो गवर्नमेंट याद रखवे कि ज़माना दूर नहीं जब न जाने कितने Memorials मेमोरियल्स बनेंगे, हम तो यह चाहते हैं कि किसी प्रकारसे भी लोगों में अशान्ति न फैले लेकिन गवर्नमेंटकी पालिसी ज़रूर अशान्ति फेलायेगी। हमारा प्रोग्रामही अशान्ति नहीं सिख लाता यह सिर्फ भड़काने के लिये किया जाता है, क्या लाला जी को चुन कर नहीं पीटा गया, उनको चुन कर पीटा गया, कुछ लोग कहते हैं कि सान्डर्स के क़त्लसे लालाजी की मौत का बदला लेलिया गया यह त्रिकुल गलत है भला क्या इन वाक्यों से लालाजी के खूनका बदला लिया जा सकता है और दूसरे अभी यह तो निश्चय भी नहीं कि सान्डर्स पर हमला किसने किया क्या कहा जा सकता है, लालाजी की मौतका तो बदला एक ही हो सकता है और वह यह कि हम नहीं देख सकते कि एक भी अङ्ग्रेज़ हमारे मुल्कमें वहसिपत बादशाह Ruler के रहे जब हम यहकर के दिखादंगे तो समझेंगे कि लालाजी का मिशन हमने पूरा किया और तभी हम उनको मौतका बदला ले सकते हैं, इन अलफाज़ों के साथ मैं इस प्रस्ताव को रखता हूँ।

Professor Nripendro Nath Bannerji in seconding said :—

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, my knowledge of Hindi is so imperfect, if I attempted to address you in Hindi, I should speak disjointed Hindi without grammar and without idiom. I do not care for grammar, because the only grammar I know is the grammar of patriotism and the only idiom I know is the idiom of ardent and active Nationalism—I speak on behalf of Bengal when I say that no group of men and women have resented the Police hooliganism in Lahore more than we in Bengal. Let us give the British Government this timely warning that the country to-day, so far as this Congress is concerned, still holds to the creed of non-violence but there is such

a thing as action and re-action. That is an elementary law of mechanics; and on behalf of Bengal and on behalf of the youths of Bengal, I give the British Government this timely warning that a time is soon coming when an atmosphere of resistance to violence is likely to be created in this country. It is the paid hirelings of the British Government, paid out of our money, paid out of our hearts' blood, paid out of our taxes, who thus insult and assault our leaders. You remember the finding of the Boyd Enquiry Committee—that huge farce. What did they say there? That it is quite natural on the part of the masses of this nation (for the common people) to be kicked, cuffed and elbowed this way and that, if necessary; and that they do not murmur. They do not murmur, they do not repine, they do not growl! But in this case Lala Lajpat Rai was a member of the Legislative Assembly, and the other members assaulted were also members of the Legislative Assembly; others, pseudo honourable persons and therefore they made a hue and cry about it. Let us warn the hirelings of the Government out for a policy of the Crawling Lane and the Whipping Triangle. Let us remember that the only business for which we have met here is to devise a system and means by which this Satanic method of exploitation and humiliation will cease. We need not quarrel over Dominion Status or Independence. Let us devise conditions; let us create an army of National Volunteers that can die if necessary but which, whenever the time comes and when the mandate is given, can also make a brave stand against violence. (Applause.)

Set Gobinda Das of Jubbulpore supported the resolution. He spoke in Hindi.

महोदय सभापति जी, वन्दुओं और यहनो । जिस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करने के लिये मुझे कहा गया है, वह प्रस्ताव आप सब सुन चुके हैं । उस प्रस्तावको सरदार शम्भू लाल सिंहने आप लोगोंके सम्मुख पढ़ कर सुना दिया है, मैं आवश्यक नहीं समझता कि आपको फिर पढ़कर आप लोगोंको सुनाऊँ और न मुझे यह कहने की आवश्यकता है कि प्रस्ताव कितना आवश्यक है, उस समय की घटना को जब पूज्य लालाजी पर हमला हुआ था

दोहराने की आवश्यकता नहीं आप सरदारजीके मुखसे उसे सुन चुके हैं और भारत का अर्थ अथ उस घटनासे भलिभाँति परिचित हो गया है, उसे दोहराना समयका खोना होगा ।

सज्जनों ! आप यह समझें कि लाहौर की जिम्स्थितिमें लालाजी पर आक्रमण किया गया था वह कौसीस्थिति थी उन पर आक्रमण इसलिए नहीं किया गया कि उनकी वजहसे कोई भगवत फ़िराद होजाने की सम्भावना हो, यात

यह थी कि लाहौर में जिसरोज़ सार्मन कमीशन आया लालाजी एक जलूसका पथ प्रदर्शन कराते हुए स्टेशन पर पहुंचे वह सिर्फ अपनी नाराज़गी प्रकट करने गये थे, उनको लौप्यारियां ऐसी नहीं थी जिनसे लेशमात्र भी यह प्रकट होताहो कि कोई अशान्ति होजायगी, उनके हाथोंमें शस्त्र नहीं थे, डंडे भी नहीं थे न लाठियां थी फिर यह तो मानाही नहीं जा सकता कि उनसे किसी प्रकार की भी उपद्रव की आशा थी ऐसी दशामें 'बहादुर सरकार' क्या शक्ति दिवाती है, उन निहत्थों पर लाठियां की वर्षा की गई, इतनाही नहीं असह्यायों को घोड़ोंकी टापोंसे कुचला गया क्या यही बहादुरी है ? यह बहादुरी नहीं कायरपन है वेशर्मा है, इस प्रकार अख़हीन जनतापर पुलिस डंडे फटकारे और कोई चू भी न करे, गवर्नमेंट की इस बेहयाई को देखकर कर्नल बेजउडने ब्रिटिश पार्लामेन्ट में इस पर प्रश्न उठाये, बेजउडने कहा कि सरकार इसमें क्या करना चाहती है, क्या यह निहत्थों पर जुलूम नहीं था, उत्तर क्या मिलता है, पार्लामेन्टमें उत्तर दिया जाता है कि प्रत्येक सरकार को अपनी ताक़त आजमानेका पूर्ण अधिकार है। ठीक यह समय सरकार को अपनी ताक़त आजमाने का था, मैं मानता हूँ कि प्रत्येक गवर्नमेंटको यह अधिकार है, लेकिन कब ? क्या जब, जब कि निहत्थे भोले भाले लोग केवल अपने दिल के इज़हार करतेंहों ? हाँ अधिकार है जब बाहरसे आक्रमण होता हो या हो रहा हो, यहां कौन सा आक्रयण था क्या वह अख़ शस्त्रहीन मनुष्य कहीं भगदा बावला बनने जा रहे थे ? फिर जब पूछा गया कि लालाजी की मृत्यु उन घूसोंके लगनेसे हुई कही जाती है, क्या सरकार इसमें जांच करायेगी ? इसका उत्तर भी वही दिया जाता है कहा जाता है कि कहीं उन घूसोंसे मौत होती है मौत घूसोंसे नहीं हुई। कंसा अन्धेरे ह अन्धेरे २

डाक्टर कहते हैं कि उन घूसों के कारण ही मौत हुई और सरकार हम बेपरवाहीसे बातको कानों पर से टाल जाती है, इससे अधिक अन्याय क्या हो सकता है, मैं खूद मानता हूँ और मेरा पूर्ण विश्वास है कि लालाजी असामयिक मृत्यु उन घूसोंसे हुई, यदि उसदिन पुलिस यह ज्यादती नहीं करती तो कदापि भी लालाजी का अन्त न होता और अन्धेरे देखिये, जब कहीं किसी गांव इत्यादिमें कोई मनुष्य घूसों की चोट से मर जाता है, या बहुधा ऐसा देखा गया है कि ऐसी बहुतसी मिसालें हैं कि हिन्दुस्तानी कुली योरोपियन लोगों की बूट की ठोकरसे मरगये हैं, उनकी लाशे अस्पतालों में लाते हैं और कोई ही छोटे से छोटा डाक्टर कह देता है कि यह मनुष्य ठोकर या घूसों से नहीं मरा बल्कि इसकी तिहरी बढगई थी वह यात प्रमाण मानली जाती है और उसपर फेलला देदिया जाता है यहाँ होशियार से होशियार डाक्टर कह रहे हैं कि लालाजी की मृत्यु उस चोट के कारण हुई लेकिन कौन सुनता है वह डाक्टरजो वर्षों इज़लैगड में काम कर चुका है इसको ही ठहराता है लेकिन नहीं उनकी बात प्रमाण नहीं। यह बाते हैं जिनसे सरकार यह दिखाना चाहती है कि उसको हमारी ज़रा भी परवा नहीं।

सज्जनों ! एक बात और है यह सब देखते भालते हुए आप यह न समझें कि हमारी दशा सदैव ऐसी ही रहेगी सदैव किसीकी दशा एकसी नहीं रही, क्या हमारे दिन नहीं आयेगे जब इनसब बातोंको अन्तहोना पड़ेगा। हम आज कल महात्माजीके सिद्धान्त का अनुकरण करतें हैं Non-Violence हमारा ध्येय है, हम ऐसा क्यों मानते हैं इस लिये नहीं कि Violence बनना कोई अच्छी बात नहीं, हम महात्माजीके प्रोग्राम पर ही चलेंगे अभी हमारा देश Violence के प्रोग्राम को तैयार नहीं है यदि सरकार

की यही रफ्तार रही तो क्या वह सम्भती है कि हम इसी प्रकार निहत्थे पिटने रहेंगे, क्या ऐसे २ जुलूमों को देख कर हमारा खून उबाल नहीं लाता ऐसा दशा हमारी सदैव कैसे बनी रहेगी, सरकार को इस ड्रैफ्टमार्ग से चेतावनी दी जाती है कि हमारे लिये सदैव ऐसे ही बना रहना सम्भव नहीं रहेगा। इसकी जिम्मेदारी किसपर होगी, यह सरकार स्वयं सोचें अपना मेरा यह विश्वास है कि महात्माजीके प्रोग्राम की यजह से देशमें इतनी शान्ति है यदि महात्मा इस समय हमारे सामने यह शान्तिमम प्रोग्राम नहीं रखते तो न जाने आज हमारा प्रोग्राम और क्या ही होता अगर गवर्नमेंन्ट इसी प्रकार अन्याय हम पर करती रहे तो देशमें हवा दूधरी ही फल जायगी, नवयुवक फिर यदि कुछ भड़कने लगे तो किसका दोष होगा? सब दोष गवर्नमेंन्ट का ही होगा, और मैं तो कहे देता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंन्ट की यह नीति देश में बहुत दिनों तक शान्ति स्थापित नहीं रहने देगी, वह समय दूर नहीं, बल्क आयेगा और शीघ्र ही आयेगा जब अन्याय से पीड़ित होकर लोग आपसे बाहर हो जायंगे और गवर्नमेंन्ट हज़ार प्रयत्न करे तोभी शान्ति स्थापन होना दूर ही जायगा वह समय ऐसा होगा जब सरकार को महात्माजी की आग्रह्यकता पड़ेगी अब सरकार अपने नशकें मद में भले ही क्रिमी की न छने, इतिहास बतला रहा है कि जो चढ़ता है वह एक बार तो ऐसा चढ़ जाता है कि प्रतीत ऐसा होता है कि इसका पतन कभी होगा ही नहीं, पतंग कितनी ऊँचाई पर चढ़ जाता है फिर

Dr. Mohammed Alam, M.L.C., supported the resolution. He spoke in Hindi.

हज़ारात्! पेशतर इसके कि मैं आगे कुछ थोड़ा यह बतलाऊँ कि जैसा अभी मेरे लायक दास्त पं० जवाहरलाल नहरुने कहाँया है कि मेरा दृश्य रेज़ोल्यूशन पर बोलना कहाँ तक जायज

एकमद गिरता भी है, रोमन लोगोंका इतिहास बतलाता है कि एक समय रोम राज्य की तृती बोलती थी, वह अपनी ताकत के मदमें मन्त थे वह गिरे इसी प्रकार आज अज्ञेयज्ञ जाति अपनी ताकत के घमंडमें चूर हैं उसे भला बुरा सब बराबर है उनके अन्यायका प्याला भर गया है वह भी अवश्य गिरेंगे।

भाइयों! केवल एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ, समय भी अधिक हो गया है आज वैसेभी महासभाकी कार्यवाही देखते आरम्भ हुई है, मुझे यह कहना है कि हम लोगोंकी कुछ ऐसी आदत पड़ेगई है कि प्रस्ताव पास कर लेते हैं उस पर कार्य करना तो दूर रहा फिर कभी यह भी नहीं विचारते कि हमने क्या प्रतिज्ञा की है उसपर कार्य कहाँ तक हमने किया है और क्या करना है हमें यही नहीं समझना चाहिये कि केवल प्रस्ताव पास करलें और आगे कुछ न करें, इन प्रस्तावोंके दिन तो गये जब तक कुछ क्रियात्मक कार्य नहीं होगा तो यह थोथे प्रस्ताव क्या करेंगे। कल महात्माजी हमारे सामने प्रस्ताव रखेंगे कि हमें साल के अन्दर क्या करना है, हमें उस प्रोग्राम पर काम करने को पूरा सालभर मिलेगा हमने यदि महात्माजी के आदेशानुसार कार्य किया तो समझ लीजिये हम इस योग्य हो सकेंगे कि फिर आगे पग बढ़ावें उनके पदवात् फिर No-tax Campaign (टेक्स वन्द अन्दा लन) आरम्भ होगा। हमें उनके लिये पूर्णतया तैयार करनी चाहिये। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथमें मूल प्रस्तावका समर्थन करता हूँ।

है, मैं तो सच कहता हूँ कि अगर मुझ पर मार न पड़ी होती तो हरगिज़ भी इस रेज़ोल्यूशन पर मैं नहीं बोलता, मैं वहीं पर था और मैंने भी कुछ बड़े बग़रह, खाये थे लेकिन एक ही आफ़सो-

स रहा, उफ़ रंज है अगर कोई तो यही कि जो आफ़त हमारे पूज्य लाला लाजपतराय पर पड़ी वह मेरे ऊपर क्यों नहीं पड़ी (हर्ष हर्ष) लालाजी हमारे बीचमें नहीं है लेकिन उनके काम हमारे सामने पेश है उन्होंने एक बहादुर की मौत पाई जब तक ज़िन्दा रहे एक बहादुर सिपाही की तरह कौम की खिदमत में लगे रहे और आखिरी वक्त तक कौम की खिदमत करते रहे, उनकी मौतसे हम लोग एक सबक सीख सकते हैं वह यह कि बहादुर लोग अगर ज़िन्दा भी रहते हैं तो मुल्कके लिये, कौमके लिये और अगर मरते हैं तो भी दूसरों की भलाई करते हुए। हमारे नाज़वान लालाजी की ज़िन्दगीसे सबक हासिल करे और देखें कि उस बहादुर सिपाही की मौत अपनी मातृभूमि के लिये लड़ाई लड़ते हुए एक वीर सिपाही की तरह हुई, उनकी ज़िन्दगी शुरूसे आखिर तक पढ़ जाइये आप यही देखेंगे कि उसशेर पंजाबने अपनी नाज़वानीसे अब तक मुल्क के लिये क्या न सहा, और आखिरी वक्त भी अगर शहीद हुए तो मातृभूमि की इज्जत के लिये, नौकर शाहीका रोटीख़ोर एक पुलिस का आदमी लालाजी पर डंडे बरसाता है और दानिस्ता उनको छांटकर पीटा गया, मैं तो साफ़ २ कहता हूँ कि अगर उनके यहां चोट न आई होती तो अभी बहुत समय तक लालाजी हमारे रास्ता दिखलाते वह आज ऐसे मौक़े पर हमारे बीचमें नहीं है, आज मुल्ककी हालत बड़ी ही डांवा डोल है सिकड़ों फिकें मुल्कमें खड़े हैं सब अपनी २ चलाते हैं ठीक रास्ता अभी किसी को भी सूझ नहीं पड़ता जहां हमें आफ़सोस है कि ऐसे मौक़े पर वह हमारे बीचमें नहीं है लेकिन उनकी वफ़ात मुल्कके लिये हुई वह हमारे लिये एक सबक छोड़ गये, क्या अब भी हमारे मुल्कके नाज़वान अपना वक्त फज़ूल की बातोंमें खर्च करेंगे ? क्या उनके लिये यह बलिदान कुद्व भी

सबक नहीं छोड़ेंगे। अब वक्त गया कि छस्तीमें ही हमारे मुल्कके बाशिन्दे पड़े रहते थे हमे ऐसे काम करने वालों की ज़रूरत है जिनके दिल में ऐसे ही लगी हो जैसी लालाजी के दिल में लगी थी, कोई २ तो कहता है कि लालाजी अगर और ज़िन्दा रहते तो हकूमतके पजे जल्दही उखड़ जाते, हम इसको पुरा करके दिखला दें, उस जलती हुई आगसे जिससे लालाजी मरे हम एक सबक सीख सकते हैं कि यदि मरो भी तो मुल्क की खिदमत करते हुए वह आग बतला रही है कि ऐसे मरो जैसे लालाजी मरे। उनकी मौत ऐसी हुई कि मुल्कको बहुतही नुक़सान पहुंचा है उसे वही महसूस कर सकते हैं जो उनके साथ काम करते थे। साइमन कमीशन का लाहौरमें आना क्या हुआ कि मुल्क पर एक आफ़त ले आया, पंजाब लेजिसलेटिव कौंसिलमें उनकी वफ़ातके मुतअल्लक एक तज़वीज़ पेश की गई कि एक ऐसी गैर सरकारी कमेटी मुकर्रर की जाय कि जो उन पर उस दिन किये गये हमलों की जांच करे गवर्नमेंट कितनेही कहे कि नहीं ऐसा नहीं था हम कभी भी मान ने को तैय्यार नहीं होंगे जब तक कि गैर सरकारी कमेटी अपना फेसला न उनाड़ेगी, यह मैने पंजाब कौंसिल में पेश किया लेकिन हकूमत कहां सुनने वाली थी एक न भी नहीं सुनवाई हुई साफ़ तौर पर जवाब दे दिया कि हकूमत इसके लिये तैय्यार नहीं है तैय्यार कैसे होती अगर कहीं ऐसी कमेटी बैठाई जाती तो फिर साफ़ मालूम हो जाता कि लालाजी की का खून किसने किया, जब मैने यह तज़वीज़ कौंसिलमें पेशकी थी, साफ़ २ कहा था कि मैं हकूमत पर लाला लाजपतराय के खूनका हलज़ाम लगाता हूँ, हकूमत लालाजी के खूनकी जिम्मेदार हैं, हकूमत को डर था कि कहीं अगर ऐसी कमेटी मानली गई तो भेद खुल जायगा अगर यह बात नहीं थी तो फिर क्यों नहीं हकूमतने यह कमेटी

बेटाई, और उलटा कहा क्या गया कि लालाजी की मौत कुदरती तौर पर हुई है, क्या हकूमत को शरम नहीं आती जब ऐसा कहती है अगर ऐसा कहती है तो फिर क्यों ऐसी कमेटीसे डरती है, बात यह है कि हकूमत अच्छी तरह समझती है कि उसके सर पर लालाजीका खून है वह उसमें बरो नहीं हों खूनो चाहे कितनी ही सफाई दे सबसे बेहतरीन तरीका हकूमत के लिये यही है कि वह तंत्रार हो जाय कि ऐसी गंर-सरकारी कमेटी बेटाई जाय जो हमसय वाक्ये की जांच पड़ताल करे। जिस राज यह तजवीज़ कौंसिल में पेश थी पंजाय सरकार ने इसकी मुलासफत की हयलिये कि वह जानती थी कि वाक्येमें खून पंजाय सरकार केसर पर है वह इस खूनको ज़िम्मेदार है और उसी की माजिश से यह खून हुआ है अगर कोई कहता है कि नहीं यह खून गलत है और झूठ है तो Enquiry (अनुसन्धान) कमेटी बेटाती चाहिये थी, हकूमत को डर था कि कहीं ऐसा न हो जाय कि उसके खिलाफ फंसला न हो जाय और खून साधित हो जाय। क्या यह नहीं माना जा सकता सरकारको गैर सरकारी मंत्र्य रों में से ऐसे अगर आदमी नहीं मिल सकते थे जो कोई भी प्रेमला देते तो सरकार के हक में ही देते लेकिन हकूमत को तो पूरा २ डर था कि आखिर को अमली भेद खुल जायगा इस हकूमतकी कार्य वाहीसे यह साफ जाहिर हो गया कि इस खूनकी

ज़िम्मेदार वही है। फिर यह कहा जाता है कि सान्दर्भ की मौत जो हुई उसपर हमला इमो लिये हुआ कि लालाजी का बदला लिया गया, क्या खूब कहा है लालाजी की मौत का बदला यह सान्दर्भ देगा यह बेचारा क्या बदला चुकायेगा, लालाजी की मौतका तो बदला एक ही होगा और वह होगा हिन्दुस्तानसे अज़गंज़ी सलतनत का नेस्तनाबूद हो जाना। हकूमत याद रख्ये कि अज़गंज़ी हकूमत की तवागीज़ में यह वाक्यया आखिरी वाक्यया है। यह तवागीज़ जो हमारे बच्चोंको स्कूलों में पढ़ाई जाती है लिखा है कि Black Hole (ब्लैकहोल) हिन्दुस्तान में अज़गंज़ी हकूमत का इवतदाई वाक्यया है और यह वाक्यया आखिरी होगा। याद रख्यो, यड़ी २ सलतनतें उठी, बड़े २ जोशमें उठीं, हकूमतें आती हैं बननी है आखिर फना हो जाती हैं। इस तो फिर कहते हैं कि आज हकूमत अपने मद्में मस्त होकर भले ही हमारी न उने लेकिन लालाजी के खून का धव्या हकूमत के वामन पर रहेगा और हज़ार कोशिश हकूमत करे यह धव्या नहीं झूट सकता क्या हमेशा यही हकूमत बनी रहेगी। यह खून पुकार २ कर कह रहा है :—

कमर के क्रातिल के सिक्ये तू भी नहीं रहेगा,
न यह चिराफ ही रहेगा और न परवाना ही
रहेगा।

Srimati Jyotirmayee Ganguli supported the resolution.
in Bengali.

आमार एई वांथा नाथेर सेई सन महान
वांरा देशेर प्राण-सक्रप, विशेष करे वांथा
नाथेर नाथेर वांरा, वांरा उांथेर देश अननीव
पाथेर आपनाथेर पूजा-अर्घा निवेदन करते
एसेछेन—वांरा हिन्दि वा उद्गू जानेन ना.
ईथेरबींठ जानेन ना उांथेर उछ विशेष करे

आनि आज एथांथन वांङियेछि। आनि
उांथेरके अशुरोप करते एसेछि ये ईतिपूर्के
सक्रप नाद्वज सिंछी ये प्रांथाव उथापन
करेछेन, सेई प्रांथाथेर सधे निवेदरके
यूक करे' उांरा उांथेर अशुरेर जाना उ
वांथा सकथके जानन।

৮ বৎসর আগে পাঞ্জাবের যে কেশরী আনাদের এই মহানগরীতে অভ্যর্থিত হইয়াছিলেন, যাকে আমরা রাজসম্মানে ভূষিত করেছিলাম, আজ তাঁর জীবনের অবসান হয়েছে। তিনি যে কেবল পাঞ্জাবেরই কেশরী ছিলেন তা নয়—সমস্ত ভারতের তিনি মাথার মণি ছিলেন। মণিহারী ফনিগীর স্তায় ভারতমাতা তাই আজ নিফল আক্রোশে গর্জন করছেন। শৃঙ্খলিতার এ ছাড়া যে আর উপায় নাই।

আমাদের অর্থে পরিপুষ্ট যারা, যারা আমাদের রক্ষার ভার নিয়েছেন বলে গর্ব করেন, তাঁরাই আমাদের ভক্ষক হয়ে দাঁড়িয়েছেন। দিকে দিকে তাই আজ অত্যাচার ও উৎপীড়নের কথা শুনি। যাদেরকে আমরা পূজা ও শ্রেষ্ঠ বলে মনে নিয়েছি, মাথার করে রেখেছি যাদের তাঁদের মাথায়ই আজ অত্যাচারের লাঠি পড়েছে। যাদের উৎসর্গীকৃত জীবন দেশোদ্ধারের যাত্রাপথে আমাদেরকে চালিয়ে নিয়ে যাচ্ছে, যাদের কর্ত্তর অমৃতময়ী বাণী আমাদের কর্ণে প্রবৃত্ত করছে তাঁদেরকে অকালে কালের কবলে পতিত হতে দেখে আমরা কি আর নিশ্চিন্ত থাকতে পারি? তাই আজ আমাদের ডেকে

বলি, তাঁরা বুঝে দেখুন তাঁদের কর্তব্য কি? তাঁরা ভবে দেখুন—আর কতকাল তাঁরা এমন ভাবে পড়ে থাকবেন, দেশকে এ রকম হরে থাকতে দেবেন? দেশের নেতৃবৃন্দ আজ যে বাণী সকলকে পাঠালেন তার মর্ম্ম তাঁরা অন্তরে অনুভব করে দেখুন; মর্ম্মে মর্ম্মে আজ সকলে অনুভব করুন যে, দেশ যতদিন অধীনতা পাশে বদ্ধ থাকবে ততদিন এই রকম অত্যাচার চলবে। এর হাত থেকে উদ্ধার পাইবার অন্য “মুক্তিসংঘ” ভিন্ন অন্য পথ নাই। তাই আজ বলি—বল নারী বল, আপন পতি পুত্রকে বল—সেই পথ সকলে গ্রহণ কর। কারণ—

“নাস্তুঃ পন্থা বিহতে অয়নার।”

আমুন আজ আমরা সকলে মিলেই বলি—
“আমরা স্বাধীনতা লাভের পথে যাত্রা করলাম। আজ আমাদের যাত্রা হল সুরু; আমরা মাইভে: রবে এই পথে চলব। ভারত মাতার যে সুসন্তান আজ অকালে কালের কবলে পতিত হয়েছেন তাঁর বাণী শিরোধার্য্য করে’ তাঁর অসমাপ্ত কাজ সম্পন্ন করব। স্বাধীনতা লাভ ছাড়া আমাদের আর পথ নাই—
আর দ্বিতীয় কোনও পথ নাই”।

The motion was put to the vote and carried unanimously.

The Congress adjourned till 2 P.M. of Monday, the 31st

Forty-Third Indian National Congress

THIRD DAY—MONDAY, THE 31ST DECEMBER, 1928.

With the same impressive procession as on the previous day, the President was led to his seat. After the singing of the "Bande Mataram" and delightful rendering of other patriotic songs by the choir, Pundit Jawaharlal Nehru ascended the rostrum and said :—

The President has asked me to inform the House that in view of the fact that this is the third day of the Congress and that we have quite a lot of resolutions to go through, he proposes to limit the time to be allowed to speakers and seconders. Proposers of resolutions will have half an hour's time and the seconder will be allowed fifteen minutes. The proposer of the main amendment will have 20 minutes, the seconder ten minutes, and the other speakers will be allowed five minutes each. More time will be given when the President thinks that it is necessary. With regard to the other resolutions, the proposers as well as the other speakers will be allowed ten minutes each.

We have had an application for affiliation from the London Branch of the Indian National Congress and also from the New York Branch, the Portuguese Goa Branch and the Kobe Branch, Japan.

The resolution he moved ran thus :—

"This Congress recognises the London Branch of the Indian National Congress and authorises it to form subordinate committees in Great Britain. The Congress further recognises the New York Branch of the Congress and authorises it to form subordinate committees in America. The Congress also recognises the Committee of the Congress formed in Goa. The Working Committee is authorised to determine the number of delegates and the quota of subscription to be paid by those branches and the rights of such delegates to take part in the meetings of the Subjects Committee of the Congress. The Congress further authorises the Working Committee to consider the application of the Committee formed in Kobe, Japan, for affiliation and to recognise it after due enquiry if it so desires."

He said :—You will see that in regard to the formation of the Kobe Branch, as the Subjects Committee were not in full possession of the facts, they have left the matter over to the Working Committee.

They do not want to leave it for the next Session of the Congress. I trust that the Congress will pass this resolution.

He also explained the resolution in Hindi.

Lala Girdharilal in seconding said :—

The resolution which has been moved before you is self-explanatory and I have much pleasure in seconding it.

The motion was carried unanimously.

Pundit Jawaharlal Nehru then moved the following resolution :—

“ This Congress, being of opinion that the struggle of the Indian people for freedom is a part of the general world struggle against Imperialism and its manifestations, considers it desirable that India should develop contact with other countries and peoples who also suffer under Imperialism and desire to combat it. The Congress therefore calls upon the All-India Congress Committee to develop such contact and to open a Foreign Department in this behalf.”

He said :—In this Congress messages from distant parts of the world and from various oppressed nations and oppressed peoples have been read out to you. From them you will realise how India is gradually, even without this resolution, establishing foreign contacts. It is desirable however that you should give the full weight of your authority to this new development and call upon the Indian National Congress to encourage these contacts and to have a regular foreign department so that you might get into touch with all such organisations and all such peoples who are more or less in the same position and in the same boat as we are to-day, so that we might as far as possible co-operate with each other to combat this evil of Imperialism. I trust, therefore, that you will accept this resolution.

He also explained this resolution in Hindi.

Mr. Harisarabattam Rao in seconding said :—

It does not require a long speech to second this resolution. This is with a view to combine all oppressed peoples so that the oppressors may be brought to their senses. I therefore have great pleasure in seconding this resolution.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

Mr. Satyamurthi then moved the following resolution :—

“ This Congress directs the Working Committee to correspond with the leaders and representatives of the other Asiatic nations and to take other steps to summon the first Session of a Pan-Asiatic Federation in 1930 in India.”

He said :—Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, the resolution is one of the contributions to Indian political thought made by the late Deshbandhu Chittaranjan Das. Those of you who have read his writings and speeches may remember that Deshbandhu Das believed that India had her destiny as the leader in spiritual and cultural spheres certainly, and perhaps in political also of a renascent and reawakened Asia. This resolution wants India and the people of India represented in the Indian National Congress to feel that the time has arrived when India should no longer confine her activities within her own borders but should stretch out her hands of fellowship to other Asiatic nations. The resolution just moved by my friend Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru seeking to establish contact with nations suffering like ourselves under Imperialism, is complemented by this resolution. It asks you to enter into a Pan-Asiatic Federation. There are several countries in the continent of Asia which have already got an intimate and a long and continuous spiritual contact with India.

Time was, not very long ago, when there was the Greater India sending her spiritual messages all over Asia to the East and West of India. To-day we have almost forgotten that Greater India. More than that, the two great countries which are perhaps free in Asia, namely, China and Japan, with Ceylon owe their religion to India. The message which went from this country and preached the gospel of love and peace was that of Lord Buddha. Even, to-day in China, Japan and Ceylon, Buddhism is one of the greatest religions of those countries. We have therefore every right and every duty to establish spiritual and cultural contact with China and Japan. The people of India and China have become more and more intimate and are going to act together and in concert.

Besides these three countries we have our neighbour Afghanistan. Whatever the local troubles there may be, fomented by foreign powers in that country, I have no doubt in my mind that Afghanistan is going to be a first class modern power and the people of Afghanistan, I am

sure, want to live in perfect peace with the people of India. We must establish spiritual and cultural contact with other countries as well. We have again in Asia that huge country, I mean Russia, the better part of which is in Asia. Many false and malicious stories are being told about Russia since the Russian Revolution. But we in India have people like the General Secretary and an ex-President of the Congress, namely, Pandit Jawarharlal and Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar, who have returned recently from that country and have no such gloomy picture to give about the condition of that country. Then there is that country of Tibet which is very near to us and with which we must establish contact. Then there is the country of Japan which many believe to be and is believed by me to be tainted with Imperialism; but the people of Japan are beginning to realise that they must establish democracy and give up Imperialism. Whatever may be the views of certain people we cannot afford to forget that Japan is one of the first rate powers in the world to-day and which gave an arresting blow to what then was an outpost of Western Imperialism known as Russia, and thereby showed to the world that Europe can be defeated by Asia. Therefore we ought to establish our relations with those countries. This resolution does not contemplate our being in contact with autocratic kings or with autocratic monarchs but with the freedom loving people of other countries just like ourselves. This resolution asks the Working Committee to correspond with the popular leaders of other Asiatic nations, not with autocratic kings but with the people of those countries. We must take steps to summon this Pan-Asiatic Federation in 1930 in India. I know there are many distinguished workers who think that is not practicable. I feel in all humility that this is one of the most practicable things that we can do. I am sure that all those countries I have mentioned will be too glad and ready to co-operate with us in the formation of a Pan-Asiatic Federation. The number of fraternal greetings sent to this Congress from so many countries is proof positive that the World is going to realize the position of importance which India is bound to attain very soon. I only wish to say in conclusion that there are two or three ugly chapters in human history when some of the peoples of Asia had been submerged politically, economically and socially by Western Imperialism and the time has come for Asia to throw off the yoke of European Imperialism. As an Indian,

I see nothing less for the future of India than that she should be the leader of renescent Asia which will give to the world, what Europe has failed to give, namely, " On earth peace and good will to men."

I have therefore pleasure in commending this resolution to your acceptance.

Mr. V. V. Sathia supported the resolution, speaking in Hindi.

प्रधान महोदय और बन्धुओं, आपके सामने यह प्रस्ताव बड़ी विद्वत्ताके साथ श्री० मन्थमूर्तिने रक्खा है, और समझ गये होंगे, एशियाई संघकी कितनी आवश्यकता है। यह निर्विवाद सिद्ध है कि भारतका सम्पर्क दूसरे देशोंसे होके रहेगा, मैं इस प्रस्तावका समर्थन

करता हूँ। इस प्रस्तावमे यह साफ़ ज़ाहिर है कि भारतका सम्बन्ध बादशाहोंसे नहीं होगा, बल्कि उनके जनसमुदायमे होगा। हमारे पास बहुतसी बधाई आई हैं, हम एशियाके संघको सम्पूर्ण सहानुभूति की दृष्टिसे देखते हैं।

The resolution was carried unanimously.

On behalf of the Chair, Pandit Jawarharlal Nehru then put the following resolutions to the House, which were carried unanimously :—

(1) " This Congress sends its warmest greetings and its hearty congratulations to the people of China on their having attained full and complete freedom and nationhood and their having ended the era of foreign domination in their country."

(2) " This Congress sends its warmest greetings to the people of Egypt, Syria, Palestine and Iraq and its assurances of full sympathy in their struggle for emancipation from the grip of Western Imperialism which in the opinion of the Congress is a great meance to India's struggle for freedom."

(3) " This Congress welcomes the second World Congress of the League against Imperialism to be held next year and authorizes the Working Committee to appoint a representative on behalf of the Congress."

He said :—The first World Congress of the League against Imperialism was held in February two years ago, and I had the honour to represent the A. I. C. C., in Brussels. This is the Second World Congress of the League and they have asked us to send one or more representatives. This resolution authorises the Working Committee to make arrangements to send a representative.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

Dr. M. A. Ansari then moved the following resolution :—

“ This Congress reiterates the War Danger Resolution of the Madras Session of the Congress and wishes to declare that the present Government of India in no way represents the people of India and their policy has been traditionally guided by a consideration of holding India under subjection and not of protecting her frontiers. The people of India have no quarrel with the neighbouring states or the other nations of the world and they will not permit themselves to be exploited by England to further her imperialistic aims.”

In moving he said :—The resolution that I have placed before you is about the War Danger. Gentlemen, you all know the army in India is said to be kept for protecting India from foreign menace but it is really an army of occupation and this army as you all know is used in time and out of time for suppressing the liberty of the people of India. It is not necessary for me to enumerate the numerous occasions when the army was requisitioned to shoot down the citizens of India when they wanted to express their legitimate grievances or to make a demonstration. Well in the same way let me inform you if you do not already know that in the frontiers of India the army has been concentrated with the ostensible object of preventing an ingress from Afghanistan but in reality waiting in readiness to pounce upon Afghanistan, as soon as the internal affairs of Afghanistan will allow England to do so. Well Gentlemen, we in India have no quarrel with Afghanistan. I may venture to speak on your behalf that on the other hand we have got great sympathy and admiration for the people of Afghanistan. (Applause.) It is for that reason we should use every legitimate means in our power to prevent England from allowing the army which we are paying for to be let loose upon Afghanistan and to be utilised for suppressing the liberty of another nation and specially a nation which is our neighbour. Similarly you all know the quarrel which these imperialistic nations have against the Soviet Russia. We all know how preparations are being made at any suitable moment to crush the liberty of that nation.

Well, gentlemen, we Indians have no quarrel with Russia. We do not know really whether the quarrel that England has with Russia is really another pretext to perpetuate our own slavery. Therefore it

is as proper and right that we should not allow ourselves to be made tools in the hands of imperialistic England to conquer other nations. This resolution gives a warning which was sounded last year on your behalf at Madras that we are not going to allow our man-power and our resources to be utilised in subjugating other nations. This year we are again repeating that warning. You all know that repression has been started by the Government in the Punjab. The workers of the Nava Jiban Bharat Sabha and the energetic members of the provincial Congress have been taken into custody by the Police and are being harassed by them and many others have been arrested by them. What charges have they framed against them nobody knows. I have not the slightest doubt that the Government will soon start a regular campaign of repression throughout the Punjab, nay throughout the whole of India. Probably on the pretext of the country being in danger they have already mobilised their army and concentrated their forces. I do not know whether these forces have concentrated in order to fight against us or against some other country. It is time for us to be on the alert and to be prepared for the worst. And let us sound a note of warning and tell the whole world that so far as we are concerned we are not going to allow ourselves to be used for imperialistic purposes and for that we should get ready against that oppression which is sure and certain to come and the forerunners of which have already been started in the Punjab. Brother delegates, I am sure you will not only accept this resolution but make a firm determination to use every ounce of your energy to see that the resolution is carried into effect.

Dr. Ansari's resolution and speech were explained in Hindi.

Dr. Safiuddin Kitchlew in seconding the resolution said :—

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise to give my whole-hearted support to the resolution so eloquently moved and I assure you that I do not intend to take up much of your time. I want to draw your attention seriously to the importance of this resolution. This resolution to my mind is the declaration of policy from this National Congress of India calling upon this Government to understand that henceforth India does not want, the Indian people do not want to have any quarrel with any foreign nations. We have enough of our own

troubles at home. We have got to organise ourselves, we have got to prepare ourselves for the coming battle. We have no time to pick up a quarrel either with Russia or Afghanistan or any foreign power. We also declare that the British Government does not represent the interests of India, does not command the confidence of this country, and anything done by this Government in the name of the country we are here to solemnly and most emphatically repudiate, not only in this country but before the whole world. We want to send a message through this Congress to the people of Russia and other countries that we want to live absolutely on friendly terms with all of them and anything done by Britain to advance her imperialistic interest we shall not support. One thing more, in case of a declaration of war, I can say for myself that I will come forward, and go about the country and go about the country and ask the people of this land not to fight our neighbours and not to allow themselves to join the army or give money to the Government for expenses of the war. Government has already started its own tricks with a view to impress the British public and the Simon Commission may be—we have no concern with that body—that India is not fit to govern herself, that her frontiers require strong protection. We deny that. I do not think Russia intends to invade India, I do not think that Kabul wants to invade India. If Kabul or Russia or anybody else has the least intention to advance an army into India we shall rise as one man to defend our own freedom and stand against any such inroads. (Applause). As Dr. Ansari has so rightly pointed out that with a view to carrying out the policy of aggression, particularly in the frontiers of India, the Government has launched upon its own policy of repression. Some of our best workers are already under arrest. The Government has thrown their challenge to my province and through my province to the rest of India. So far as my province is concerned I can say without any fear of contradiction that we are ready to accept that challenge. Now get your jails ready for the sufficient accommodation for the men and women of the Punjab. (Applause.) I do not want to take up more of your time. I hope all of you will vote and support this resolution.

Sardar Sardul Singh supported the resolution in Hindi.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru then announced :—Before the next resolution is taken up, may I on behalf of the President say, that he has received draft chits of amendments which require some consideration because it is next to impossible to find out where these gentlemen who handed in these chits happen to be sitting.

Mr. Viswanatham then moved the following resolution :—

“ That this Congress should vigorously carry on the propaganda of boycotting all foreign cloth in general and British goods in particular.”

In moving he said :—Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, that this British Rule in India is unjust, irresponsible and absolutely devitalising is a proposition which you will easily concede. There have been a number of movements inaugurated to free the country. About eight years ago we agreed to the inauguration of the political weapon Non-violent Non-co-operation and we have adopted only non-violent methods. It is my contention before you that boycott of British goods is one of the biggest weapons, one of the strongest weapons, is one of the surest weapons to bring down British Imperialists to their knees. We all remember that in the year of 1923 the Coconada Congress passed a resolution in favour of the boycott of British goods. A sub-committee was appointed and that sub-committee made a report. Soon afterwards however Mahatmajee returned from imprisonment and he made a drastic criticism against that and the boycott was nipped in the bud. In 1927 again, however, the Congress at Madras adopted another resolution in favour of the boycott of British goods. I do realize that this resolution which was adopted by the Congress last year receives in general the support of the vast majority of my fellow-delegates here. But at the same time I have to reckon with a set of critics whose opinion carries great weight in this country, I mean the opposition of Mahatmajee and his followers. Mahatmajee believes that boycott of British goods means a continuation of the spirit of hatred towards the British Nation and as non-violent non-co-operation is based on love this boycott of British goods which engenders hatred towards the British ought not to be practised. Fellow-delegates, I appeal to you that there is nothing in this resolution which smacks of hatred. There is neither hatred nor love in

our non-violent fight with the British Government. The question of hatred does not arise. It is not our contention that by love we can get independence from the British people nor can it be contended that independence can be lost on account of hatred engendered by such movements as the boycott of British goods. Therefore, it is not a question of love or hatred. It is a very sure weapon to bring down the enemy to his knees. Having regard to the present political condition of the country what is it then that prevents us from reaffirming the Madras resolution devising more effective means to carry on this boycott of British goods more effectively. The resolution passed last year is on the statute book of the Congress and I have the great regret that we have not done much in that direction except in the province of Bengal. I submit that apart from political consideration, even on economic grounds boycott of British goods is an absolute necessity. But I do not want to dilate on these propositions which you have already accepted. Leave from your minds the idea of love or hatred. There is no ethics of love or hatred in politics. Let us not play into the hands of England. I appeal in the name of the Congress that you should not only unanimously adopt this resolution but put it into practice.

Mr. Rai Kumar Chakrabutty speaking in support said :—

I have great pleasure in seconding this resolution. Last year at Madras when I had the honour of moving the resolution regarding the boycott of British goods, I said let the year 1928 be a year of boycott,—boycott of the Simon Commission and boycott of British goods. Now to-day standing on this platform at the end of 1928, I am glad to say that the boycott programme has been successful. The boycott of the Simon Commission has been very effective in India and the boycott of British goods in many provinces, especially in Bengal, has been eminently successful. We may pass resolution after resolution, we may pass resolutions for independence or for Dominion Status, but that does not matter very much. There must be sanction behind these resolutions and we must not regard it as being worth nothing. Do you think that the British people will abandon their one ideal, their vested interests, without being forced into doing so? That great uproar in the Pandal was, I believe, made because you are very anxious

for the early attainment of Swaraj. In this country there are two ways of getting Swaraj. One is the way of violence and the other is the way of non-violence or something of that sort. In the present circumstances the creed of the Congress does not stand for violence and armed revolution is out of the question. Therefore let us look to the other way of bringing the British people to their knees and compel them to give us our birthright. The idea of resorting to Civil Disobedience and non-payment of taxes has been chucked out by you. As you know, the country is not yet prepared for Mass Civil Disobedience or for non-payment of taxes. The one thing that we can do very effectively is the boycott of British goods and the British people being a nation of shopkeepers, I am sure, nothing will hurt these people more than the new movement in this country. It was started and given a fair trial in America where they wrested their country from the British. It was started in China and by this movement the Chinese got their independence. In our own country you remember the stormy days of 1905 when one of the most autocratic Viceroy, Lord Curzon, partitioned Bengal and there was a tremendous agitation in this country. There was a wave of Nationalism in this country and let us not forget that Lord Morley was obliged to unsettle the settled fact. You will remember, in 1905 we started the boycott movement. We adopted the programme for attaining Swaraj. And I am sure that even after the attainment of Swaraj we shall not give up our programme of boycotting British goods. We want to see our trade and industry developed. This boycott movement must be a double-edged instrument in our hands, being both industrial and political, in its scope and character. On the one hand it will bring pressure to bear upon the British people and compel them to give us our birthright and on the other hand it will help us to revive our cotton industry which was ruthlessly destroyed by the British people in the early days of the rule of the East India Company. Why do we want this boycott? My answer is a very simple one. We want to put an end to the exploitation which the British people have been carrying on in this country for 150 years. We also adopt this boycott as an answer to the Simon Seven whose presence in the country is a calculated affront to the people of India. I ask you to take up this programme in answer to the very many things,

such as the Ordinance of 1925, which has been promulgated by the British Government.

(Great uproar, the entire audience standing up and greeting Mahatma Gandhi on his arrival with loud cries of "Bande Mataram.")

Mr. Makhanlal Chaturvedi supported the resolution in a Hindi speech.

सभापति महोदय ! श्रीर सज्जनो ! आपके सामने यह बहिष्कारका प्रस्ताव है, आपने यह प्रस्ताव सुन लिया है कि इसका क्या हालायां है, मैं इसका समर्थन करनेको उपस्थित हुआ हूँ, सज्जनो, इस प्रस्तावका आप क्या अर्थ लगाते हैं, इसका अर्थ आप यह न समझें कि हम इसे आज पास कर दें और अपने २ घर चले जाय, वहाँ चाहे कैसे ही वस्त्र पहनें, कौन देखता है कि हवां हम क्या पहनते हैं, यह प्रस्ताव हमें बाधित करता है कि हम जो कहा कर उने किया भी करें हम विद्वाने वयं हो यह प्रस्ताव पास कर चुके हैं, फिर हमें क्यों आवश्यकता पड़ी कि आज फिर इस प्रस्तावका लायें। बात यह है कि हम अपनी प्रतिज्ञाओंको बहुत जल्दी भूल जाते हैं। यह प्रस्ताव हमें स्मरण दिलाता है कि हम अपने जीवनमें जो सौगन्द खायें उसको पूरा करें। हम इस प्रस्तावके द्वारा जो सौगन्द खाते हैं उसे परा करें। हमें यह आदत घट गई है कि हम अपनी सौगन्द को बहुत जल्दी भूल जाते हैं। आपको मालूम है कि जो सौगन्द को पूरा नहीं करते वह विश्वासघाती कहलाते हैं, यही बात हम प्रस्तावके साथ है। हमने कई बार इस प्रस्तावके साथ विश्वासघात किया है जहाँ हमने इस प्रस्तावके साथ विश्वासघात किया है। इसका अर्थ है कि हमने अपने राष्ट्र के साथ विश्वासघात किया, और वास्तव में हम राष्ट्र के साथ कई बार विश्वासघात कर चुके हैं। आज फिर हम इस प्रस्तावको दोहरा रहे हैं। मैं नहीं समझता कि इस प्रकारसे बार २ उसी

प्रस्तावको लानेसे क्या लाभ आप सोचने हैं जब हम इस पर काम नहीं कर सकते तो क्यों व्यर्थमें इस पर वाद-विवाद और व्याख्यान देकर भी अपना समय बरबाद करें। हमारी तो आदत कुछ ऐसी पड़ गई है कि हमें मज़ाक बहुत पसंद है। जब हमें मज़ाक करने को दूसरा नहीं मिलता तो स्वयं अपने से ही मज़ाक करने लगते हैं। हमको आज फिर दोहराना एक प्रकार का मज़ाक है। लेकिन फिर भी एक बात है कि भारत पर संकट आनेवाले हैं और यह बात किपी से छिपी नहीं कि यह संकट बातकी बातमें दूर नहीं किये जा सकते हैं, उनके दूर करनेका हमें कोई उपाय करना होगा। यह क्या उपाय हो सकता है यही तो इस प्रस्तावमें बतलाया गया है। जिनको भारत पर आनेवाले संकटों का भय है, जो जानते हैं कि भारत पर संकट अवश्य आयेंगे वह हर अवस्थायें राष्ट्र को इसकी सौगन्द की चाहे देशी वस्त्र पहने या विदेशी, हम खुद अपनी इच्छा से विदेशी वस्तुओंका प्रयोग करते हैं हमें कोई भी बाधित नहीं करता। हम इस प्रस्ताव को पास करके एक बड़े खतर और जिम्मेदारी पोसिसो अव्यार कर रहे हैं। हम आज महात्मा गान्धी की तरहने अगर यह प्रण बर सकें तो हमें यह पास करना चाहिये अथवा नहीं, गान्धी जी की तरह से यह प्रण करें कि हम विदेशी वस्तुओंका विशेषकर वस्त्रों का बिलकुल भी प्रयोग नहीं करेंगे। हम चिह्नाते हैं कि साहमन कमीशनका बहिष्कार किया जाय, लेकिन हो क्या रहा है कि हम साहमन कमीशनका बहि-

ष्कार विलायती कपड़ा पहनकर कर रहे हैं। जब तक इंग्लैंड को यह मालूम है कि हमारे शरीर पर इंग्लैंड का कपड़ा है तब तक साइमन कमिशन यह यकीन नहीं कर सकता कि हम उसके विलाफ हैं। साइमन कमिशनका बहिष्कार भी पूर्ण तभी होगा जब हम मिश्र मालका बहिष्कार करकेदि खादें।

भाइयो, यदि हम यह बहिष्कार नहीं करते हैं तो हमका साफ़ अर्थ यही है कि हम उनको पूर्ण सहायता कर रहे हैं। हमने लालाजी की भी मृत्यु पर आंसू बहाये हैं, वह आंसू तब तक कारागार नहीं होंगे अगर हम अपने शरीर पर विदेशी कपड़ा ही पहने रहें अगर आप ऐसा करें तो सम्भियेगा कि लालाजी की भी आत्मा प्रसन्न होगी और हम लालाजीके प्रोपाम को पूरा

करेंगे। मैं अपने डेलिगेट साहबानु से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि वह विदेशी कपड़ेका बहिष्कार करें जो दुर्गक दृष्टि आये हैं उनमें भी प्रार्थना है कि इसमें शामिल हों, चाहे यह प्रस्ताव कितना ही पुराना हो यह द्रवत हुए सुरज की तरह नया है। मैं इन शब्दों के साथ हम प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ और आशा करता हूँ आप अवश्य पास करेंगे।

पं० जवाहरलाल० क्या आपकी इच्छा है कि प्रस्ताव पाम किया जाय, क्या कोई इसके विलाफ़ है। देखने पर मालूम हुआ दस वा १२ हाथ विरोधमें उठाये गये। पुनः पंडित जीने कहा कि सभापति जीने मुझे आदेश किया है कि उनकी आरामे यह प्रस्ताव रक्खू।

Mr. Akhil Chandra Dutt in further supporting the resolution said :—

I support this resolution with great pleasure. At the same time I do so not without a feeling of sorrow. This resolution is an old one that we have put forward before the country since the days of the Partition of Bengal. Still we must acknowledge that we have not been serious in carrying out this resolution which has already been explained to you. Gentlemen, there are two aspects of the question of boycott of British goods. The one is political and the other economic. As to the political side of the question it is well known that in order to enforce our national will, we must have sanction behind; we have got very little resources in our hands. We have tried many methods, we have tried non-violent non-co-operation which has failed so far as the direct results are concerned. We have tried village re-organisation, we have tried spinning and Khaddar, but up to this time we have not been remarkably successful. The boycott of British goods is a remarkable weapon in our hands if only you will use it vigorously. Gentlemen, Englishmen are a nation of shop-keepers, they are very sensitive about their pockets. If you can touch their pockets then and then only can you coerce them. And as regards the economic side, the fundamental principle is that you must make yourself strong and

make your enemy poor and weak. By the boycott of British goods and British cloth you will be uplifting your name and at the same time making yourself rich. Unless we do this we cannot fight the enemy very effectively. Now, gentlemen, you will not look at this question in the same manner in which you have looked at it so long. You must be a little more serious. Otherwise this resolution only brings ridicule and discredit to us. Gentlemen, I hope you will allow me to be a little more frank. It is a matter of profound regret that even among Congressmen there are any number of men who are using British cloth. (Shame, Shame). Apart from the merits of Khaddar they can at least use Indian mill-made cloth. But we have not got even that amount of self-respect. British people are taking money from this country by the sale of British goods and with the help of that money they are keeping us in perpetual bondage. Both politically and economically, as this matter is something which affects our national honour, you ought to be loyal to this resolution and I hope you will carry it unanimously.

The resolution was then put to the vote and carried by an overwhelming majority.

Pundit Jawaharlal Nehru then put the following resolution on behalf of the Chair :—

“ This Congress congratulates Shri Vallabhbhai Patel and the people of Bardoli on the great success achieved by them in their campaign of non-violent resistance to the unjust enhancement of land revenue by Government.”

Mr. Vallabhbhai Patel in response to the calls of the House then entered the rostrum and rendered thanks in a Hindi speech.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

Seth Govindas then moved :—

“ This Congress is of opinion that it is contrary to the spirit of the national struggle for freedom and derogatory to the nation's dignity for Congressmen to participate in any way in functions meant to consolidate foreign rule and do honour to alien rulers of India and their officials. The Congress therefore reiterates its advice to the people in general and to Congressmen in particular that they should abstain from

attending Government levees, durbars, and all other official and semi-official functions held by Government officials or in their honour."

He spoke in Hindi.

आपने प्रस्ताव उठाकर भाषण
भाषामें देने हुए कहा—

सभापतिजी वहनो और भाइयो! मुझे यह प्रस्ताव जो मैंने अभी पढ़ कर उनाया है आपके मन्मुख रखने की आज्ञा हुई है इस प्रस्ताव के सम्बन्धमें मैं आपको कुछ पिछले वर्षों के इतिहास का स्मरण दिलाना चाहता हूँ। मैं आप को ग्रामहयोग के समयका स्मरण दिलाता हूँ, जिस समय हमने ग्रामहयोग आन्दोलन प्रारम्भ किया था उसमें बहुतसा कार्यक्रम रक्खा था, उन बहुतसे कार्य क्रमों में से ग्रामहयोग आन्दोलनका एक यह भी कार्य क्रम था कि हम सरकारीयो जोमे भी ग्रामहयोग करें, जहाँ और बहुतसी वस्तुओं से हमें, ग्रामहयोग करने का वह कार्यक्रम आदेश देता था वहाँ यह भी आदेश बढ़ा ही आवश्यक था। आप जानते ही हैं कि हमने उस कार्यक्रम को जो ग्रामहयोग का कार्यक्रम था कहाँ तक पूर्ण किया हमने उस कार्यमें बड़ी ही स्थिरता दिखाई मैं कहता हूँ कि भाइयो जहाँ हमारे द्वारा कार्यक्रम में स्थिरता आई वहाँ कांग्रेस वालों ने हममें भी स्थिरता दिखाई कांग्रेस वालों ने सरकारी पार्टियोंमें भी भाग लेना शुरू किया। हमने यह प्रण किया था कि हम सरकारी भोजनों में भाग नहीं लेंगे परन्तु हमने उनका ध्यान नहीं रक्खा और आप जानते हैं इस विषय पर पत्रोंमें भी गूढ़ अन्धी तरह से वाद विवाद चल चुका है, कुछ लोगों ने यह भी कहा है कि भोजनों में भाग लेने से हानि ही क्या है। भाई बात यह है कि बुराई तो कुछ नहीं होती यदि हम भी स्वतन्त्र होते और जहाँ जाते वहाँ बराबर के हकदार समझे

जाने! अब क्या है, जहाँ भोजनों में हम जानें हैं यह तो हम गुलाम समझे जाते हैं, हममें अधिक बुराई और क्या हो सकती है; जब तक हम राज-नेतिक गुलामी में हैं तब तक हमारा यह प्रधान कर्तव्य है कि हम सरकारी किसी भी सामाजिक कार्य में हिस्सा न लें, इसका तत्पर्यो यही है कि हम तुम्हारे इन सामाजिक कार्यों का वृष्टिकार करते हैं। क्या जो काम हमारे आधीन है उसे करने में हमें आगा पीछा क्यों करना चाहिये। यह हमारी इच्छा पर निर्भर है कि हम किसी के भोजनों में जाय या नहीं, लोगों का यह विचार कि हममें बुराई ही क्या है। मैं नहीं समझ सकता किम प्रकारसे वह इस कार्य में कोई बुराई नहीं देखते, उन लोगों से पूछिये जो लोग इन पार्टियों में जाते हैं, जिनको वहाँ जानेका अवसर मिलता है वह जानते हैं कि वहाँ हिन्दुस्तानी भाइयों के साथ कैसे सलूक किया जाता है। यहाँ यह आवश्यकता नहीं कि मैं आपको ऐसे लोगों के साथ जो भिन्न २ अवसरों पर सलूक हुआ है वह बताऊँ, आप इससे ही समझ लें कि क्या सलूक होता होगा। साचिये तो सही, हम एक छोटे के रूपमें उनके सामने जाते हैं, यह हम भलि-भांति है कि हम राजनेतिक रूप में सरकार के गुलाम हैं, और फिर गुलाम के रूपमें ही अपने से बड़े के साथ में भोजनों में भाग लेते हैं क्या दिल्लगी है। यह समझ लीजिये कि सामाजिक सहयोग भी अगर हो सकता है तो बराबर वालों का बराबर वालों से ही हो सकता है, छोटीं का बड़ों के साथ, या बड़ों का छोटीं के साथ नहीं हो सकता। कोई अपने दिल में चाहे प्रसन्न होवे कि हम अपने से बड़े के साथ मिल कर भोजन खा रहे हैं परन्तु वास्तवमें बात यह है कि वह कुछ बड़प्पन

नहीं जब वह तो यह समझता है कि यह इसलिए बुलाने पर आया है कि कहीं हमारा मास्टर अपमज्ज न होजाय। और वास्तव में बात भी यही है बहुत से मनुष्य इन भोजों में इसीलिए भाग लेते हैं कि उन्हें यह डर लगा रहता है कि यदि इस भोजमें नहीं गये तो साहब बहादुर नाराज़ हो जायगा। कितनी गुलामी हमारे दिमागों में घुसी पड़ी है ? इस का असर क्या पड़ता है यह भी आप साचते हैं। इसका असर हमारी आंखें वाली सन्तानों पर कैसा भयकर पड़ता है, उनके दिमागों में भी हम गुलामी के बीज़ बाँ देते हैं। आप यह समझिये कि ज़ाँ इन पार्टियों में हिस्सा लेते हैं वह जानते हैं कि वहाँ क्या दुर्दशा होती होगी, आप जब कभी ऐसी पार्टी देते हैं और आपकी पार्टी में ऐसे लोग शामिल होते हैं जो आपसे किसी कारण वश छोड़े सम्भक्त जाते हैं क्या आप उनके साथ बराबरी का वर्ताव करते हैं ? कदापि नहीं। वह स्वम् भी अपने को छोटा महसूस करते हैं और स्वम् पिचे से रहते हैं। ठीक इसी प्रकार यह समझिये जब हम उनके भाजों में जाते हैं तो क्या वह हमें छोटा समझकर हम से घृणा नहीं करते हैं। पार्टियों, भाजों में हिस्सा लेना तबकी बात है जब हम राजनेतिक स्वतंत्रता प्रदण कर ले, यदि हम हर प्रकार से उनके कार्यों में सहयोग देते रहें तो यह हागा कि हम अपनी गुलामीको अधिक बुरा नहीं समझते। इसका दूसरा अर्थ यह भी हागा कि यदि हमने इन पार्टियों में भाग लेना छोड़ दिया तो हमें अपनी गुलामी की याद आती रहेगी, और प्रयत्न करेंगे कि इससे छुटकरा मिले। दूसरे वह भी यह समझेंगे कि हम उनके इन कार्यों से घृणा करते हैं। हम इस प्रस्ताव को पास करके यह प्रमाण करते हैं कि जब तक पूर्ण स्वतन्त्रतन हो जायगे, कभी भी सरकारी पार्टियों से सम्बन्ध नहीं रखेंगे जब आप स्वतन्त्र हो जाय सुशीसे आप बरा-

बरी की हैमियतके रूपमें उनके सब राजनेतिक तथा सामाजिक कार्यों में हिस्साले, स्वतन्त्र होने पर यदि कोई भाग लिया जाता है तो उसमें दूसरी ही बात है। आप इस प्रस्ताव की उपयागिता समझते हैं।

आपको महात्माजी के लब्ज याद हैं ? महात्माजीने कहा था कि कौंसिलमें भी भाग नहीं चाहिये चूंकि वहाँ भी एक प्रकारसे ज़हरीला वापु-मंडल रहता है। बात वास्तवमें ठीक ही है, कौंसिलोंमें भी हम चाहे कितने ही असहयोग का प्रमाण करके जाय, वहाँ का वापुमंडल हो ऐसा है कि सरकारी हवाँ खानो पड़ती है। जब महात्मा जी तो इतना तक कहते हैं फिर सरकारी पार्टियों की तो बात ही क्या है वहाँ तो सोलहा आना वापुमंडल इस रूपमें ज़हरीला रहता है। हमें यदि अपने कार्यक्रम पर विश्वास है और दिल से चाहते हैं कि वह कार्यक्रम सफल हो जो कार्यक्रम हम बनाते हैं तो यह स्मर्ण रखियेगा कि जब तक हम इन से अलहदा नहीं रहेगें हम कोई भी अपना कार्यक्रम ठीक ठीक नहीं बना सकते, हमें कार्यक्रम बनाने के लिये शुद्ध वायं तथा शुद्ध स्थान की आवश्यकता है यदि हम सरकारी चूज़ुलसे रहित होकर स्वतन्त्र रूपसे कार्यक्रम बनाना चाहते हैं तो अवश्य हमें इस पर कार्य करना चाहिये। एक ओरतो हमें कुली कहा जाता है, एक ओरतो हमें बार २ यह कहा जाता है कि तुम अभी राज्य की बाग डौर सम्भालने के योग्य नहीं और दूसरी ओर हमें कहा जाता है कि तुम हमारे मेहमान बन कर हमारे भोजों में शामिल हो, क्या बात है ! सम्भक्तमें नहीं आता, अब से यह साफ़ हो गया कि कांग्रेस में जो यह बहुधा वाद विवाद उठा करता था कि सरकारी भाजों में भागले या नले, कहीं तो कुछ लोग अपने जातीय सम्बन्धों के कारण भाग लेने में

झाना कानी नहीं कर सकते थे अथ इस प्रस्ताव के कारण यह निश्चय हो गया कि अथसे हम किसी प्रकार भी ऐसे उतन्त्रोंमें भाग न लेंगे।

अथ यह पूर्ण आशा की जाती है कि आप इस प्रस्ताव को समझ गये होंगे आप इसे पास करेंगे।

Mr. Santosh Kumar Bose seconding said :—

I must at the outset apologise to you that my knowledge of Hindi is not sufficiently good to enable me to put forward my views before you, the National Assembly, in the national language of India. This is a defect which time will certainly cure in all those who have not been able as yet to master the National language. The resolution which has been entrusted to me for seconding, speaks for itself. It is a resolution in which the national self-respect of India declares itself before this vast assembly. It is enough that we are living under an alien rule. Let it not be said that they rule India to-day by our own willing consent. Let it not be said that we go before our bureaucratic masters in a cringing, servile attitude and they are our masters with our agreeable consent. Only the other day our President unfurled the flag of self-respect, the National Flag, before which we bowed down our heads in obeisance. Will you go and bow down your heads and relinquish your sceptre because they happen to be your masters for the time being? Brothers and sisters, those men who prefer to take the opportunity of going to government durbars try to satisfy their consciences in the most amazing fashion. Even those amiable men have got consciences of their own. Sometimes fine distinctions are sought to be made between official functions and social functions. They try to satisfy their consciences by saying those are social functions to which they are invited. Gentlemen, can there be any social function when you cannot meet your masters on terms of perfect equality? When you go before them with the badge of servility on your foreheads can you say that you go to them for social functions? So long as the officials are your masters, and not your servants, as they are in all free countries, there cannot be any social functions in which you can participate. So long as India does not assert herself and regain her freedom, I venture to say no self-respecting Indian should go to these durbars and levees and proclaim to the world the servility which exists here to-day. I do not want to take up your time any longer. I hope that when you return to your respective homes in distant parts of India,

you shall carry this message home, to your friends and relations and to your brothers and sisters and say that the Congress to-day has repeated this resolution and that until we have achieved freedom and so long as we cannot go to official functions in the position of masters, we shall desist once for all from attending those functions.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

Mahatma Gandhi who received a tremendous ovation on mounting the rostrum then moved the following resolution :—

“ This Congress having considered the constitution recommended by the All-Parties’ Committee Report, welcomes it as a great contribution towards the solution of India’s political and communal problems, and congratulates the Committee on the virtual unanimity of its recommendations; and whilst adhering to the resolution relating to complete independence passed at the Madras Congress approves of the constitution drawn up by the Committee as a great step in political advance, especially as it represents the largest measure of agreement attained among the important parties in the country. Subject to the exigencies of the political situation this Congress will adopt the constitution in its entirety if it is accepted by the British Parliament on or before December 31st, 1929, but in the event of its non-acceptance by that date or its earlier rejection, Congress will organise a non-violent non-co-operation by advising the country to refuse taxation and in such other manner as is settled. Consistently with the above nothing in this resolution shall interfere with the carrying on, in the name of the Congress, of propaganda for complete independence.”

He spoke in Hindi.

Speaking in English he said :—I see that you cannot hear me as the sound amplifiers have gone out of order, therefore I am much troubled and I feel very sorry. What I have to say is that I have not said anything as yet which it was necessary for you to hear. (Laughter). I have only read the resolution. I wish to tell you in this respect that Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose has given notice of an amendment which he is going to put before you. Therefore I will not say anything now, but will say whatever I have to say afterwards. All I would say is that you should understand the resolution thoroughly and when it comes

हैं कुछ तो बहुत ताकतवर हैं जो बहुत आगे बढ़ना चाहते हैं, कुछ ऐसे हैं जो इतने ताकत वर नहीं हैं कुछ कमजोर अभी हैं वह इतना आगे इन्तम नहीं बढ़ा सकते हैं। तो फिर आप को तो ऐसा चाहिए कि सबको साथ लेकर चलें, जो ताकत बोलते हैं उस ताकत के मायने क्या हैं, उस ताकत के मायने तो यह है कि आप एसा काम करें कि आप में से जो कमजोर भाई हैं, उनको उतनी दूर लाकर खड़ा करें कि जितनी दूर वह आ सकते हैं। इस रेयूनयनके पास कर देने से हम यही से पायेंगे कि हम ऐसे लोगों को भी अपने साथ रख सकते हैं जो हूबहु हमारे कट्टरों के साथ तो चलानेको तय्यार नहीं हैं लेकिन हाँ वह चलनेको कोशिय इत्तर करते हैं। नौजवानों में से खास तौर पर यह कहुंगा कि वह इतने दतावल न हों कि अपने दूसरों कमजोर भाइयों को बिलकुल ही सुनाने। मुकम्मल अज़ादी किसको प्यारी नहीं, कौन चाहता है कि किसी दूसरे के माहत्तहल रहा जाय हर एक ज़्यादा से ज़्यादा अज़ादी चाहता है, इस वक्त हमारे मुल्क में कुछ ऐसा हुआ है कि लोग मिल कर सौजन्य लेंगे हैं, अगर आप पाँचल कुछ साल की तवारीख को देखेंगे तो पता चला कि कुछ कियर को जा रहे हैं और कुछ उधर का जा रहे हैं, हमें तो शुक्रमानना चाहिये कि अब हमें कुछ अक़द तो आई, अपने अगर अपने साथ इन कमजोर भाइयों को नहीं लिया तो साकीक आपक ताकत वर होने से क्या कायदा होगा, हम चाहते हैं आप इन भाइयों को रास्ता दिखा लायें और जो मदद भी आप उस अज़ादी के हाँमिल करने में इनसे ले सकें, इनके रास्ते में आप उनको रूकावट पैदा न करें। अगर आप उनको अपने साथ ले लेंगे तो आपको ताकत कुछ बढ़ांगी वंटगी नहीं, अगर साथ नहीं लिया तो पाद रलिये मुकमान अपना ही होगा मुल्क

को बेहतरी के लिये यह तजवीज़ आपके सामने रखनी गई है मुल्क की बेहतरी के तो इसीमें है कि जितनी परिस्थियाँ मुल्कमें मुल्क को अज़ाद करनेमें लगी हैं सब एक ही जाय, यह तो मानी हुई बात है कि आपमें कुछना कुछ न दे भाव इत्तर कायम रहेगा, सबका शोषाम हूबहु एक सा नहीं हो सकता। लेकिन जहाँ तक भी आप-समें इत्फाक राय हो सकती है वहाँ तक तो क़ली चाहिये, आप ताकतमें उन भाइयों जो आप के साथ नहीं चल सकते ज़्यादा हैं तो आप मुल्कमें काम करें, कौन आपको मुल्कमें काम करने से रोकता है, क्या वह भाई आपसे कहते हैं कि आप ऐसा न करें। और यह प्रस्ताव भी आपको पूरी अज़ादी देता है कि कौडआप मान चुके हैं उस पर काम करें कौन आपको रोकता है, मुल्कमें काम करने को इतना काम पड़ा है कि अगर आप उसे पूरा कर देंगे तो फिर यह सब झगड़ा ही मिट जायगा, आप नौ जवान है आप लोगों में जाय है और सब जाय है, आप इस जायमें मुल्क में काम कर सकते हैं आप करें और उन भाइयों से भी काम लें जो इस वक्त आपके साथ नहीं है वक्त आयागा वह भी आपके ही हो जायगा। आप उनको मदद करें। जो सिर्फ रूकावट ही डालना चाहते हैं वह कुछ फायदे मद काम कर सकते हैं भरा ख्याल तो ऐसा है कि रूकावट डालने वाले बहुत ज़्यादा काम नहीं किया करते। मैं चाहता हूँ कि उनलोगों की जो हम के हमी हैं पूरी तौर से मदद की जाय मैं इसीलिये इस तजवीज़ की ताईद करने को खड़ा हूँ मैं तो ज़ेमा कर चुका हूँ कि अगर हम उनकी मदद करेंगे तो अपनी ही ताकत बढ़ायेंगे और उनकी मदद करने के मायने यह कभी नहीं कि हम अपने रास्ते पास हट जाय या हमारे काममें कोई धक्का पहुँचांगे, मुझे तो ज़रा भी ताअम्युल नहीं कि हम रेजो-

लेखन के पास हो जाने से भेगे हम ग्याल वालों के काम में कोई रुकावट पड़ेगी या रुकावट हो सकती है, रुकावट क्यों पड़े में कोई सवध नहीं देखना है आप अपना काम करते रहें और जब उनको आपकी मदद को जरूरत पड़े आप उनको मदद दें कम आपके काममें रुकावट पड़े, हमको तो यह कोशिश करनी है कि इस सुत्तफिका सम-भांते को बनवाये जिसे हमने मान लिया है, अगर हम ही स्वयं अपना राय पर एक नहीं होंगे तो समझिये कैसे काम चल सकता है, फिर इस तज-वीज्ञ में तो साफ़ है कि एक साल के अन्दर गवर्न-मेन्ट इसको मानले, क्या एक साल का अग्रमा किमी मुल्क की आज़ादी की लड़ाई के लिये ज़्यादा है ? कभी नहीं। अगर हम ३१, एक साल के अन्दर वह चीज़ मिल सकती है जिसको हमने आज तें पाया है तो समझिये फिर हमको और भी अच्छा मौका होगा कि हम मुकम्मल आज़ादी के लिये कोशिश करें अगर एक साल के अन्दर यह सब कुछ मिल गया तो याद रखिये कि हम

6 Congress काँग्रेस का Commit मनवन।

करने को आमादा करेंगे कि वह इस मुकम्मल आज़ादी की तहरीर का माने, अगर कहीं ऐसा हुआ कि २६ में वह चीज़ जा हमने यहाँ करार पाई है नहीं होगई तो हम फिर उस चीज़ को शामिल करें जिसका तनुवी हम कर चुके हैं, फिर हमारे सामने यही पुरानी स्कीम होगी, वही पुराने बेग होंगे, हम फिर हटने वाले नहीं मुल्क का आज़ाद करने को वही Non-co-operation (असहयोग) Non-payment of taxes (कर न देना) करंगे, और सबसे तो वही प्रोग्राम हमारे मुल्क के लिये काम में लाना पड़ेगा। मैं इसी वजह से इसको तार्ईद करता हूँ मैं जिम्मेदारी दिलाता हूँ कि आप इसे पास करें और कुछ आगा पीछा न करें यह हमारे मुल्क की बेहतरी ही को स्कीम है, मैं महसूस करता हूँ कि शायद मेरे से कुछ भाई नाराज़ हो जायं लेकिन मैं तो यही कोशिश करूंगा कि उनसे यह रेजोलेशन और नहर रिपांटे मनवाऊं। मैं इन लख्तों के साथ इस रेजोलेशन की तार्ईद करता हूँ।

Mr. Subhas Chunder Bose :—The amendment which I have the honour to move is as follows :—

(1) This Congress adheres to the decision of the Madras Congress declaring complete independence to be the goal of the Indian people and is of opinion that there can be no true freedom till the British connection is severed.

(2) This Congress accepts the recommendations of the Nehru Committee as agreed to by the Lucknow All-Parties Conference for settlement of communal differences.

(3) This Congress congratulates the Nehru Committee on their patriotic labours and while it does not accept Dominion Status as the basis of the recommended constitution is of opinion that other recommendations contained in the Report constitute a great step towards political advance and without committing itself to every detail generally approves of them.

I am sorry that I have had to rise to move an amendment to the resolution moved by our revered Mahatma Gandhi which has the support of some, if not many, of our older leaders. The fact that I do rise to-day to move this amendment is an indication and a very clear indication of the cleavage, may be the fundamental cleavage, between the older school and the newer school in the Congress. (Cries of hear, hear). I have been asked by my friends, how I, being one of the signatories to the Nehru Committee's Report, have stood up to speak for independence. I would only refer my friends to a statement which appears in the body of the report wherein I, on behalf of the school which I have stood up here to present, made our position perfectly clear. In the report itself we have said in page 24, the principles of the constitution which we have suggested therein are more for a Dominion constitution but most of them of course can be applied in their entirety to a constitution of independence. Our deciding in favour of such a constitution simply means that a maximum degree of agreement was only obtainable on this basis. It does not mean that any individual Congressman, much less the Congress itself, has either given up or toned down the goal of Complete Independence. Those who believe in this goal retain the fullest right to work for it, and I therefore, in moving an amendment on behalf of independence, if I may say so, take my stand on the report itself. I do not think that by doing so my action can be construed as in any way inconsistent.

There is another matter to which I should refer by way of personal explanation before I proceed to deal with the merits of my amendment. You are all aware that in a private conversation at a meeting of the Subjects Committee and also in a press statement I said that I did not desire to stand in the way of our older leaders. The reason why I did so was that at the time I did not feel prepared to accept responsibility for the consequences of division in this house in case our amendment was carried. To-day I stand to move this amendment because I feel prepared to accept the consequences and to face the issue to the very end. There are certain incidents which have happened in the meantime which have made me somewhat alter my previous decision. I will of course say at the outset that even when I said that I did not desire to stand in the way of our older leaders, I made it perfectly clear that I did not accept the so-called Compromise resolution. (Loud

cheers and cries of hear, hear). Even when I told our revered leaders that I did not desire to stand in their way, even then I expressed myself in the strongest language possible with regard to the merits of that resolution. You are also aware that in the meantime Bengal delegates, or at least a majority of them, assembled and resolved to have this amendment moved on their behalf and they were prepared to accept the vote of the house whatever it might be. Even if I did not stand here to-day to move the amendment, I can assure you that some other member would have stood up to move the amendment on their behalf. There is another fact and a very significant fact to which I shall refer and that is the decision of the Independence for India League,—a decision arrived at by an overwhelming majority to support this amendment and to accept the vote of the house whatever it might be. We too have felt it our duty either to move or to support this amendment. We feel very sincerely that the time is now momentous and that India ought to express herself in a clear and unequivocal manner as to what she feels on the issue of Dominion Status versus Independence. I have told our older leaders and I say so once again that after the lamentable death of Lala Lajpat Rai, after the manner in which that death was brought about, after the happenings at Lucknow and Cawnpore, after that famous recent speech of His Excellency the Viceroy, we were inviting the Congress to take up a bold attitude—an attitude which would fit in with our self-respect. (Deafening cheers).

Instead of giving a bold lead to the country we find that a resolution has been placed before us which in our opinion amounts, at least in some measure, to a lowering of our flag (Loud applause). We are not prepared to lower the flag for even a single day. (Renewed applause). Whether we win or lose in this house does not matter so far as the young men of this country are concerned. They have accepted the responsibility of making India free. We want our older leaders—we revere them, we love them, but at the same time we want them to keep abreast of the times. I have told them on behalf of the younger school that I and my esteemed friend Pundit Jawharlal Nehru and others may be regarded as the Moderates among the Extremists and if our older leaders do not come to a compromise with even these Moderates, a breach between the old and the young will become irreparable. Thanks to this Youth Movement that a new self-cons-

consciousness has dawned upon the youths of India. They are no longer prepared to follow blindfolded any policy. They have realised that they are the heirs of the future, that it is for them to make India free. And with that self-consciousness they are preparing themselves for the arduous task that awaits them. I do hope that at this juncture the Congress will give a bold lead to the country. If unfortunately it does not, I am afraid, that other organisations which are coming into existence and are likely to come into existence soon, will draw up to themselves the most enthusiastic and virile of our workers, and if this course is allowed to be followed the Congress may go the same way of the Liberal Party in Great Britain. I do hope that the Congress will live up to its traditions and keep abreast of the times and recognise the new spirit and the new consciousness that have dawned upon the youth of this country.

There is one other argument which appeals to me very strongly, and that is the International situation. You are aware that after the Madras Congress, the independence resolution passed there gave us a new prestige and a new status in international politics. I am afraid that if this main resolution is carried, we shall lose at least a part, if not much, of the prestige that we acquired after the Madras Congress from distant parts of the world. You may be aware of the messages that have come to you from distant parts of the world and you may have heard the message that has come to you from the League against Imperialism. Last night I, as one of the Secretaries of the Congress, received a message from the British Committee of the League against Imperialism in which they made it clear that they expected us to make an advance towards independence. Are we to go back on the position that we took up at Madras or go ahead? Are we to respond in a true manner to the attitude of the government? After all what has been the attitude of the government during the last few months? We had the sad and lamented death of Lala Lajpat Rai, the happenings at Lucknow and Cawnpore and the outspoken speech of His Excellency the Viceroy. If after these happenings we do not feel called upon to take up a bold attitude I do not know when we shall do so. I would like to put a straight question to the supporters of the main resolution. You want to give the British Government twelve months' time. I ask you, can you lay your hands on your hearts and say that you believe there

is a reasonable chance of getting Dominion Status within twelve months? (Cries of No, No). I ask you in all seriousness to lay your hands on your hearts and say that you believe there is a reasonable chance of getting Dominion Status within twelve months. Pundit Motilal Nehru, our revered president, has made it clear that he does not believe it will be so. Why then shall we lower the flag even for twelve months? Why not say we have lost the last vestige of faith in the government and we are going to make a bold bid for freedom and independence.

You may say what do we gain by passing such a resolution for Independence? We gain a great deal. We develop a new mentality. After all what do we want? What is the fundamental cause of our political degradation? It is the slave mentality. If you want to overcome this slave mentality, you will do so only by inspiring our countrymen with a desire for complete independence. Therefore, I believe that simply by preaching honestly the ideal of independence even if we do not follow it up by action, we will create a new mentality and bring into being a new generation. But we are not going to sit down with folded hands and pass resolutions. I have said myself clearly that the younger generations have realised their responsibilities and are preparing themselves. We shall devise our own programme and to the best of our ability follow it up in the field of action so that there is absolutely no danger that our resolution is going to be a paper resolution.

Then there is one other matter to which I shall refer before I conclude. You know that events in world politics are tending towards another world war. Those who are familiar with the happenings, with the events, in different parts of the world and particularly in Europe, will agree that another world war, a gigantic war, is imminent. It is imminent for two reasons. The first reason is this: that the causes which contribute to a war are present in different parts of the world. The settlement brought about by the Treaty of Versailles has not satisfied the national aspirations of several peoples in this world. It has done injustice to the principles of Nationalism. Italy, the Balkans, Russia, Austria, Hungary and other countries have been nursing grievances since the Treaty of Versailles was signed. Then we have the Asiatic situation. Then we have the combination of Capitalist countries against Soviet Russia. All these factors are contributing to expedite

a world war. Then there is the race for armaments. The loudly proclaimed policy of disarmament is a huge fraud, and the fact is that all the free countries of the world are arming themselves for war. They are preparing for a fight and when so many free nations prepare themselves for a war, war becomes imminent.

If India is to awaken before another war overtakes us, we have to commence without the slightest delay the task of creating amongst our countrymen a new mentality which will say we want full and complete independence. This can be done only by proclaiming the ideal in a clear and unequivocal manner. I believe that preaching the ideal of independence is the task which is necessary if India is to prepare herself for the achievement of her own national freedom. I do not think that we can afford to lose a single day.

So far as Bengal is concerned, you are aware that since the dawn of the national movement in this province, by freedom we have always meant complete national independence. We have never interpreted in this province freedom to mean Dominion Status. So many of our countrymen have laid down their lives, so many poets have talked of freedom under the inspiration that freedom means a complete severance of the British connection. There is absolutely no doubt that a talk of Dominion Status, whatever appeal it may make to the older generation, does not make the slightest appeal to the generation that is growing up before our eyes. After all the younger generations are the heirs of the future and it is they who will have to achieve independence for India.

In conclusion I shall make a final appeal to this House to carry out this goal. I do not think it will mean the slightest disrespect to our leaders. Respect, personal admiration, adoration and love is one thing and respect for a principle is quite another thing. Even if they vote down the main resolution and carry the amendment, it will not mean the slightest disrespect to our leaders. I am glad to say that on more than one occasion our leaders (at least some of them) made it clear that they have not the slightest objection to make room for younger people and they are even prepared to hand over the reins of the Government to them. So knowing them as I do and adoring them as I do, I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that if

we pass this amendment we shall neither show disrespect to them nor shall we be hurting their feelings in any way. After all they do love us, they do respect our feelings and I make bold to say that the passing of this amendment, far from causing any dissatisfaction, may bring some solace to them and show them that the younger generation is inspired with a new consciousness. I thank you for the patience with which you have listened to me.

Mr. Satyamurthi in seconding the amendment moved by Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose said :—

I desire to draw attention to the main points in this amendment as contrasted with the resolution moved by Mahatma Gandhi and seconded by Dr. Ansari. We repeat here the decision of the Madras Congress declaring complete independence to be the goal of the Indian people. An amount of casuistry and special pleading has been wasted in the course of the last twelve months on the meaning of the word "goal" as if it meant only a distant goal. We say by means of this amendment, "goal" means here what it means elsewhere in the English language, namely, that it is the object of the endeavour of the Indian National Congress to attain independence immediately if possible, or as early as possible, and that it is not a distant or remote goal.

The second important point in this amendment is this. "We say that there can be no true freedom for India till the British connection is severed." I want to carry it home on two grounds, one on the ground of its merits and the other on the ground of very high authority. I am sure that the British connection for the last two centuries in India has come to mean ruthless exploitation of the masses in India (Cries of shame, shame.) And I can see no future for India as having any connection with Great Britain excepting of her own free will as an independent nation choosing her own foreign relations, choosing her own foreign friends, and rejecting her foreign enemies. I do not want to assure Great Britain in advance on behalf of the people of India that we shall remain connected with Britain under any circumstances that we can foresee at present. I think that is clear. More than that, I have very high authority for this interpretation of complete independence. That high authority says that these words merely explain what is

meant by complete independence. I never had any doubt in my mind as to what they were intended to convey. I was in Europe when the Madras Congress passed its resolution and adopted independence as its goal and the moment I came to know of it, I cabled my congratulations to the President. The Madras resolution contained these words, "There can be no true freedom for India until the British connection is severed." That high authority goes on to say, "I object to this making a fetish of the British connection, giving it the first and foremost place in our programme for independence." The Madras Congress resolution declaring for complete independence, will, I trust, remove that mentality and I therefore welcome it whole-heartedly. That high authority, I need hardly say, is the distinguished president of the Indian National Congress to-day.

The third point about this amendment is that it wholeheartedly accepts the communal settlement of the Nehru Report as it stands because I believe with several of my countrymen that the most notable and most valuable contribution made by the Nehru Committee is the solution of the communal problem it has offered. Communities may reject it to-day and they may not, but more or less on these lines with a slight amendment here or there, that I am convinced is the basis of a permanent and lasting solution of the communal problem in India to-day. We accept this for all time subject to its being disturbed by ourselves, whereas the resolution of the Mahatma puts it along with the political and other settlements of the Nehru Report and says that unless the Nehru Report is accepted in its entirety before the end of the next year, the whole thing will be rejected and the labour which has been spent upon it (unless the Congress re-affirms it) will be wasted. And if to-day the communal settlement is not accepted by the organisations like the Hindu Sabha, and the Moslem League, I venture to claim it as an argument against those who are obsessed with the fear that any modification of the Nehru Report which the Congress might suggest, for example the acceptance of the Nehru Report minus Dominion Status, may induce other communal organisations to say that they will accept the Nehru Report minus the demand for one-third seats in the Central Legislature; but fortunately that contingency has not arisen. The communal settle-

ment has not been accepted by the Moslem League and those who like me are anxious for a lasting and permanent settlement between the Hindus, Moslems and Sikhs, who by the way, I understand, have walked out of the Convention, need not have any scruples in our minds in keeping our flag aloft, because the Congress by passing this amendment will do nothing to jeopardise the communal settlement but on the other hand accept it for all time.

The next point is that the resolution says that it does not accept Dominion Status as the basis of the recommended constitution. I think we shall clear the position of the Indian National Congress. We admire the Nehru Committee on the splendid report it has produced. We thank them for their patriotic labours. We will not and we trust the delegates will not accept the Dominion Status as basis of this constitution. As my friend Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose pointed out, it is a new argument advanced by the supporters of the Nehru Report which was not advanced by its authors themselves or by the promoters of the All-Parties Conference at Lucknow or the supporters of the Nehru Report at Delhi in December last. At all these three meetings the opinion was held that any Congressman, much less the Congress itself, gives up or tones down its goal of independence. You must remember that at the All-Parties Conference at Lucknow a resolution was passed in these words "without restricting the liberty of action of those who believed in complete independence." And the Delhi resolution says "without prejudice to the Congress's goal of independence it approves of the main recommendations of the Nehru Report."

I ask you in all seriousness not to place the burden of proof upon those who are supporting the amendment. We are taking up the only logical position which the authors of the Nehru Report have always consistently taken until Calcutta. The burden of proof is on those who want to go back on the Nehru Report and on what the Lucknow and Delhi meetings have decided. I go further and submit to you that if to-day we reject the Dominion Status basis of constitution we do not reject the report because the distinguished authors of the report (themselves great constitutional lawyers) say these words: "Most of our recommendations can be applied in their entirety to a constitution based on independence." Therefore we do not reject the Nehru Report but we only reject the Dominion Status basis of constitution.

I will state very briefly why we reject Dominion Status. It has very frequently been said that Dominion Status itself is independence, but let me say from this platform with some knowledge of constitutional law that Dominion Status is not independence. I have the authority of Prof. Keith who says, when talking of these dominions, "*autonomous nations, free and equal partners*, is an odious phrase to which no person has yet ascribed any intelligible meaning. It appears to have some satisfying sound to certain types of men as the blessed word Mesopotamia." I venture to go further and say that the Nehru Report itself falls short of Dominion Status as it is understood to-day. "The provision with regard to Army control and maintenance and the powers of the governors and governor-general are a serious limitation, even on the limited conception of internal sovereignty otherwise called Dominion Status. Apart from these debatable points I strongly object from this platform to the Indian National Congress putting forward Dominion Status as a demand from the people of India. My reason is this that the people of India have not yet actively or openly accepted the British conquest of India as a moral fact, if I may use that phrase. We are bound to accept the conquest of India to-day because we are weak. This is what Lokemanya Tilak meant when he said "Swaraj is my birthright and I will have it." If to-day the delegates are going to put forward Dominion Status, it takes away the greatest sanction behind our demand for freedom, namely, that we look upon the British occupation of India as a sort of occupation against our will and against our consent and we shall throw it out the very first moment we can. Therefore if you accept Dominion Status you give away the best sanction for India's freedom.

I want to tell you that India cannot be a dominion within the British Empire either from the point of view of England or from the point of view of India. Secondly, we have nothing in common with Great Britain either in race, culture, traditions or interests and I refuse to commit India of the future generations to remain the outpost of Anglo-Saxon civilisation in the Far East. I do not think that that can be the message we should leave to our posterity. The destination I conceive for our countrymen and their children and their children's children is that India should be the leader of Asia and as such we cannot have anything to do with Dominion Status at all.

Lastly, I believe that India cannot fulfil her destiny as a Dominion of the British Empire. India has a message to deliver to the world; she has a contribution to make to the culture of the world, and she cannot make it if she ties herself up to the coat-tails of Great Britain. Moreover, the argument for independence is complete in the words of Charles Stuart Parnell, "No man has any right to set any limit to the progress of a nation, no man can say to a nation thus far and no further: We have never set any limits nor will we ever set up any limits to the progress of Ireland." I say independence is the only natural goal of India. Then again, so long as the Indian question is not internationalised, and you do not get into touch with the other nations aspiring for freedom, you will never come by your own in this world. To-day if India lowers the flag of Independence raised in Madras, permanently or temporarily, conditionally or unconditionally, she will make herself the laughing stock of the world. The Madras resolution has gone to the world as the declared will of the nation. What has happened between Madras and Calcutta that we should now lower the flag of Independence? I say nothing has happened. I say independence can catch the imagination of the masses. I believe "Dominion Status," merely a lawyers' phrase, will convey next to nothing to the masses of the people. What they want is not a transference of power from one bureaucracy to another, from a white bureaucracy to a black or a brown bureaucracy, but bread for the masses. (The bell announced the time limit and the speaker ceased amidst vociferous cheering).

Dr. Annie Besant then moved an amendment for the deletion of the words "whilst adhering to the resolution relating to Independence passed at the Madras Congress" in the original resolution.

In moving the amendment she said: "If you reject Dominion Status you must reject the Report, (Cries of No, No). You say "No, No" but I am only stating a fact.

Continuing she said that throughout her public life she had devoted herself to the freedom of India. One of their greatest men, Deshbandhu Chittaranjan Das, speaking at Faridpore, said that Independence—which meant isolation—was a lower ideal than a Federation of Free Nations. Dominion Status meant, if they would allow her to put it in that way, complete independence. It would make them free from the

Himalayas to Cape Comorin. They would have power over their own forces and would be able to control their own affairs and everything would be done by themselves; there would be no power on earth that could make any law which would have the right to run in the free dominion of India except themselves. No taxes could be levied here by anyone except themselves. No power in Great Britain could levy any taxes in any of the self-governing dominions. Their Army and Navy would be entirely their own and they would be entirely under their own control. This question of having their own Army and Navy was a very important one, and it would be under the control of their own Government.

They were talking about stopping the payment of taxes and of civil disobedience. That was because the Army and Navy were not in their own control. What would they do without their own Aeroplane service and long range guns which were the two greatest weapons of modern warfare? Even if they gained independence how would they be able to keep it? What means did they propose to take to get independence? They could do nothing until they changed the creed of the Congress. They could not gain it peacefully and by legitimate means and they had no right in this Congress to pass such a resolution as this until they had changed the creed of the Congress. So long as they proceeded by peaceful and legitimate means they could not have independence nor if they got it could they keep it.

They should not forget what Deshbandhu Das had told them, that the higher ideal was to be member of a Federation of Free Peoples and not seek independence which meant isolation. If they looked at the matter reasonably they would realise what their position of isolation would mean as an independent nation. There were many small States in Europe each claiming independence and this inevitably led to continuous war and since they had been broken up, most of those little States were now almost on the verge of war. Did they realise what civil disobedience and non-payment of taxes meant? It laid a burden on the poor people who refused to pay their taxes. If a rich man had a motor car and it was seized—if her own motor car was seized, some one else would give her another—but if the poor people refused, their lands and cattle would be seized and they would be placed in a most pitiable position. They could not take Dominion

Status out of the Nehru Report and leave the rest of it. Dominion Status was a glorious ideal, far more glorious than to ask for isolated independence. She, therefore, asked them to take the Nehru Report as a whole and adopt Dominion Status as their goal at any rate for the present.

Mr. R. S. Nimbkar then moved the following amendment :—

“ This Congress having considered the Constitution recommended by the All-Parties' Committee Report is of opinion that it is totally unsatisfactory and unacceptable for the following reasons :—

- (1) That it allows the bourgeoisie to compromise with British Imperialism by establishing a so-called Dominion Status which involves the safeguard of vested interest, land-owning, feudal and capitalist, and sacrifice of the interest of the masses.
- (2) That by recognising the titles of the Princes, it proposes to perpetuate the tyrannical and undemocratic system of Government, entailing unchecked exploitation of the masses, which exists in the Native States.
- (3) That it safeguards and acquiesces in the exploitation of the human and material resources of India by foreign capital.
- (4) That it guarantees and allows enjoyment of all titles to private and personal property, acquired by questionable means, which perpetuates the exploitation of the masses.
- (5) That it guarantees payment of all foreign State debts.
- (6) That it proposes to place the armed forces of the country under the control of a committee, which will consist partly of British officers, thus depriving the people of their inherent right of self-defence.
- (7) That it proposes to give executive powers and power of veto to Governor-General and Governors, nominated by the King, thus depriving the Indian people of their sovereign rights.

This Congress therefore declares that its aim is the attainment of complete National Independence based on political, economic and social equality, entirely free from British Imperialism.”

He said : My amendment on behalf of the people is for complete Independence based on political, social and economic equality. I am not an idealist. I am a practical man and as such I feel that to achieve independence is easier than to beg for Dominion Status which means nothing. I am told that Dominion Status is a half-way house to complete independence. I doubt it and I question it, and it is because I do so that I am moving this amendment. Secondly, we are also told that it is a step towards Independence. I do not entirely agree with that. I am here to plead the cause of those thousands of workers who came to this Pandal yesterday. The masses of this country do not want or say that they do not want paper independence. They want clean housing, decent clothes and land of their own and proper food. In our country we find that the masses have been bled white and exploited by four powers who are the friends of British Imperialism. Ninety per cent. of the masses have got to win their freedom from these powers, namely, British Imperialists, Indian Princes, Indian landlords and Indian and British Capitalists, which are united to-day as against the masses of this land. You know what the Nehru Report stands for. I need not waste your time by speaking about the British Imperialists. You know the misery they bring to the people. It is the British Army that helps the exploitation by Princes, landlords and capitalists. I ask you, what will become of the Permanent Settlement of Bengal which exploits the tenants. We have first to fight British Imperialism and side by side we have to stop the exploitation that is going on in the country by Princes, landlords and capitalists. Let us look at the figures. Eighty per cent. of these capitalists are foreign capitalists and 20 per cent. are Indian capitalists, and they are exploiting the workers all over India which is evidenced by the strike movement in Bombay, Jamshedpur and Lilloah and other places. Having seen that exploitation what are the safeguards in the Nehru Report? Let us have also clause 2 that I was forgetting, because that was thrown out at Lucknow at the instance of the taluqdars and zemindars. In the Nehru Report there is nothing said about the masses. I think Dominion Status is a movement in favour of British Imperialism.

Mahatma Gandhi referred to the Dominion Status of South Africa. But the whole argument is fallacious because General Smuts and the

Boers were not natives of South Africa, but they were Imperialists. They had to deal with the Negroes. The Negro question was ever present and we find the so-called Dominion Status which was another unholy alliance with the British Imperialists against the African peoples. If India is to copy the example of South Africa I ask Mahatma Gandhi why he spent 10 or 15 years in fighting the Indian question in South Africa? If Dominion Status means Independence to the masses in South Africa, there was no need of fighting for the Indians there. I will tell you the facts about Dominion Status in South Africa, and this applies equally to any sort of Dominion Status in the world. The Boers were afraid of the Negroes in South Africa and they thought that if to-morrow the Negroes revolted, they would be overwhelmed and so they were forced into an unholy alliance with British Imperialism, so that the British Army could safeguard the interests of the Dutch there. Let me give you another instance, that of Canada. My time is up and I am afraid I cannot discuss the analogy of Canada. But the analogy of South Africa and Canada will not be of any use in considering the case of India. I ask you to support this amendment whole-heartedly.

Mr. Syed Majid Bux then moved the following amendment:—

That the following be added before para. one of the original resolution. " This Congress reiterates that the goal of the Congress is attainment by stages of complete political independence as determined by the Madras Congress."

He also moved for the substitution of " would welcome " for " welcomes " in para. 1 ; for the deletion of " and communal " from the first para. of the original resolution and insertion of " provided that representation in legislative bodies be secured not on communal basis, but according to the numerical strength of the adult population of the workers and the classes " after the word " problems " in para. one of the original resolution ; for the deletion of the words from " specially as it represents," etc., to " in the country," at the end of the para. one ; and for substitution of " appreciates " for " approves of," in para. 1.

He moved further to insert " as amended as above " after " constitution " in para. 2.

He said:—Let me tell you in the beginning that I have come to support the resolution or amendment for complete independence.

Along with that I shall also move some other things. Briefly stated in a nutshell it is this. That in the Nehru Report we have got representation of the communities on a communal basis. I do not want that. I want that if representation by denomination is to be given to anybody it is the workers that need it. Representation is still given to workers on their numerical strength as against classes. The reason for that is plain. In your fight for freedom you will require the help of the masses. The classes cannot lead you anywhere. They will do so only so long as their interests are concerned. But in order to achieve complete independence you have got to get the help of the masses. If you want to have non-payment of taxation, it is the masses who will have to stop payment of the taxes. Therefore in order to hearten them up tell them that there ought to be Independence and comradeship. The proposition of complete independence does not require very great treatment at my hands. It has been dealt with by abler hands than mine. When I came to know in the Subjects Committee that Dominion Status was going to come up before you I gave notice of an amendment. I have happily learnt this morning that a person much greater than myself was coming forward to move it. So that as a matter of fact I am supporting the resolution of Independence rather than moving an independent resolution of mine. In our boyhood we have all read Sir Walter Scott's charming poem and our hearts have been moved to a great extent by those beautiful lines."

"Breathes there the man with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said
This is my own, my native land."

The love of freedom does not require any great oratory and in my opinion anyone who does not live for freedom does not deserve to live on this earth. After all, it must be remembered that your freedom lies in their freedom. It does not lie in British Imperialism. Therefore, I need hardly tell you that you should be good enough to vote for this amendment on behalf of freedom. It is not to be gained by people who are swayed by prudential considerations. It is only the man of strong faith who jumps before the fire who can get it. If this resolution is passed it will give you new life to begin with. You remember the message from Romain Rolland which was read to you

yesterday. I am confident that you will all agree with me that the Promethean spark is necessary. If you consider the pros and cons you will at once say that you want independence. People will no doubt come and say that we have got no weapons, no arms, how then are we going to win that freedom. If you look at history you will find that Savonarola in Italy without arms and without any army, by the sheer force of his fervour, won independence for his country. If Savonarola could do it there is no reason why we could not do it. My time is up; do not let the fair name of Bengal be tarnished by defeating this resolution. With your hands on your hearts pledge yourselves to it and a Merciful Providence will lead you to success.

Mr. Lalchand A. Jagtiani (Sind) moved as an amendment that the words "organise a campaign of non-violent non-co-operation" be deleted and the words "decide upon taking any action both direct and indirect as it may deem necessary having regard to circumstances prevailing in the country at the juncture."

He said: I have not much to say in support of my amendment. If there is any one in this Pandal who believes that the white Brahmins of England, residing thousands of miles away from here would, out of the generosity of their hearts, offer to us, the depressed class of India, Dominion Status, I would simply pity him. On the other hand I am not under any delusion on that point. I do not believe that the teeming millions of India would vote for Independence for I hold that they hardly know what it is to have two meals a day. All the same it becomes necessary to obtain freedom. My notion of freedom is a national government, a government of the people for the people. Brother Delegates, you will agree with me that there is a stiff uphill task before us. At present I am concerned with the amendment I have moved. I am not, therefore, opposing any other clause of Mahatma Gandhi's resolution. I want the words I have proposed to be put in so that the Congress will decide upon taking action both direct and indirect as may be necessary having regard to the conditions prevailing in this country at the juncture and I have these reasons to state.

What is meant by organising a campaign of non-co-operation? Do you mean to say that again you will call upon pleaders to cease pleading in the Courts of Justice instituted by the British Government? Do

you mean to say that you will call upon the student community to cease going to the schools aided by the Government? Do you mean to say that you will call upon title-holders to give up their titles; do you mean to say that you will carry on non-co-operation in the same manner as you did in 1921 and 1922? If that be the meaning of non-co-operation you may take it from me and I hope you will agree with me that it will again prove a dismal failure. For no councillor will cease going to the councils and no pleader will cease pleading in the courts and so on and so forth. It would be therefore idle at this juncture to talk of non-co-operation. On the other hand if by non-co-operation you mean non-payment of taxes you must understand and realise that it is not an easy job. You will tell me that you have succeeded in the Bardoli Satyagraha but do you know how much it has cost the country? I am against Bardolising the whole country. We can attempt it to-day but it is not possible to do so for one reason alone and that is because it is a costly affair. The Bardoli affair during the course of 4 or 5 months, I am told on reliable authority, cost about Rs. 2 lakhs. Are you prepared to pay this cost to Bardolise the whole country? You paid down Re. 1 crore to the Tilak Swaraj Fund and I know what complaints the people are making. Therefore, though we can Bardolise the whole country I think we should decide the question one year hence. We should not adopt non-co-operation. It would be a mere bluff. On the other hand I also want that we as the dictators should not place our cards before Government. We should sit and see how the Government behaves and after we have seen how it behaves, we shall have time enough to arrange our programme.

With these words I commend this amendment for your favourable consideration.

Mr. Jogendra Nath Guha Thakurta moved for the deletion of the whole of paragraph two beginning from the words " Subject to exigencies, etc."

He said :—I have come before you not to oppose the main resolution but my intention is to bring to your notice the 2nd part of the resolution as moved by Mahatma Gandhi. Rightly or wrongly you have boycotted the Simon Commission. That Commission has been appointed by the British Parliament and the moment you will put your

constitution before the British Parliament, the British Parliament will surely tell you that they cannot accept, they cannot listen to any demand which was not put before the Simon Commission. Either you must accept the Simon Commission or you must reject this resolution. You cannot accept this resolution because it is not an honourable position that you should submit anything before the British Parliament which in spite of the united voice of India has rejected all the prayers of India and has refused to consider anything that the people of India have put before them. Now what are we going to do? Dominion Status is very good as Mrs. Annie Besant has told you. She has told us that we shall get more advantages from Dominion Status than by getting independence. That is all very good. But can you think of the position that the British people will be so liberal minded as to give you complete control over the finances, over the army, over all your affairs, and that you will be able to stop commercial exploitation in India. It cannot be possible under any circumstances so long as you have the British connection. They keep that British connection because they send their sons to India. They have given their life blood to India simply because they wish to make provisions for their sons, simply because they are all for the commercial exploitation of India. Dominion Status such as obtains in Canada, Australia and South Africa, cannot be possible for India, because in those Dominions the people are of the same race, of the same nationality as the British. Here in India they would not be of the same race and nationality and therefore the exploitation of India would go on. So whether you accept Dominion Status or not, it cannot be of use to us because it would be what we call a "Horse's Egg." We, in India are inclined to think that we shall be helpless without the British connection. Happily the rising generation, happily the youths of India think otherwise. In any circumstances, as honourable men can you accept Dominion Status? You cannot degrade yourself so much after boycotting the Simon Commission as to beg for this mercy as a dog begs for its bone.

Mr. Bashir Ahmed moved an amendment to omit the words "and communal" in the resolution moved by Mahatma Gandhi.

He said :—The reason why I gave notice of this amendment is that the report of the Nehru Committee does not contribute anything

at all towards the solution of the communal problem. It may be a solution of the political problem, but as things stand to-day and as we have watched and followed from day to day the course of events, the report of the Nehru Committee has not found any solution to the communal question. If you compare the Madras resolution with the recommendations made in the the Nehru Committee's report, you will find that the recommendations have clearly gone back upon the resolution passed at the Madras Sessions of the Congress. Besides, I may also point out to you that ever since the Nehru report came out, the Mussulmans have been divided into factions and factions among themselves, not to speak of the disunity between the Hindus and the Moslems. The fundamental point is what is to be the nature of the future constitution of India? The Mussulmans do not subscribe to the idea of Dominion Status. If you read the Delhi Proposals the fundamental basis of these proposals, you will find, is the federal type of Government, not Dominion Status under the British Government. You will find that it contemplates a union of Free and United States of India, with special powers vested in each Province and the races in each of the Provinces. Unless and until this Congress is going to recommend the Federal type of constitution for this country, I beg to say that there will be no lasting unity. There may be a Moslem League and other Leagues, but to-day the Moslem mind is concentrated upon one point,—what shall be the future constitution of India? They do not want Dominion Status. The Moslem League has given a lead, but that lead has not materialised as yet. It is trying to protect itself on another point. To say that the Nehru Committee's report has contributed anything towards the solution of the communal problem is a falsehood. I therefore move that the words " and communal " be deleted from the resolution moved by Mr. Gandhi.

Swami Kumarananda then opposed the resolution :—

He said :—I shall not take up your time by delivering a long speech. The Madras Congress has passed a resolution to the effect that complete independence is our goal. The Nehru Report is now before the House and Mahatma Gandhi tells us to go on co-operating with the Government. What is the Nehru Report? We are boycotting the Simon Commission and fighting the British Bureaucracy. We can-

not adopt Dominion Status under the British Parliament. I have been asked to speak through the loud speaker. I do not think it is working well.

Continuing he said :—You all know that Mahatma Gandhi had said that if Dominion Status is not approved, then Mahatmaji is going to begin again his non-violent, non-co-operation. But if another Chauri-Chowra happens to-day, if there is another Jallianwala Bagh, what is going to happen? The Nehru Report is a compromise in the interests of capitalists like the Raja of Mahmudabad.

Pandit Jawharlal Nehru announced that the last resolution finished all the resolutions. There would now be a discussion on the main resolution.

Dr. Murarilal supported Mahatma Gandhi's main resolution. He spoke in Hindi.

मैं महात्माजी के रेज़ोल्यूशनका अनुमोदन करने आया हूँ (धन्य-धन्य) जो उन्होंने आप के सामने पेश किया है रेज़ोल्यूशनमें आपको साफ़ तौरपर भतला दिया गया है। कि इसके पास करनेके मापने यह नहीं होंगे कि जो लोग मुम्बल आज़ादीके लिये खड़े हों, उनके रास्तेमें यह किसी तरह भी एक हांवा जोसा रेज़ोल्यूशन मद्रास कांग्रेसने पूर्ण स्वतन्त्रताके विषयमें पास किया था। वह मौजूद है उसे काममें लायें, लोग जो यह कहते हैं कि यह उस रेज़ोल्यूशनके खिलाफ़ किसी तरह से भी पड़ेगा यह कहना फज़ूल है यह तो हम मान ही चुके हैं, कि पूर्ण स्वतन्त्रता हमारा लक्ष्य है फिर उसने हट कते हम सकते हैं। महात्माजी कभी भी आपके उस प्रस्तावका विरोध नहीं करते और न उसका विरोध हो यह रेज़ोल्यूशन करता है। मेरा अर्थना तो ऐसा है कि आप इसे अच्छी तरहसे सोचें कि क्या यह विचार जो लोगोंने फेंक रहा है कि यह पूर्ण स्वतन्त्रताके ध्येयको नीचे गिराता है, ठीक नहीं। बात यह है कि जो पूर्ण स्वतन्त्रताके

प्रोषामको काममें लाना चाहें वह उम पर काम करें। और जो इसमें यकीन रखते हों वह इस पर काम करें, हमें एक दूसरेके रास्तेमें ऐसे अटकाने नहीं चाहियें, और देखना चाहिये। कि हम एक दूसरे दलकी मदद बेहतरीन तरीके से कैसे कर सकते हैं। एक दूसरेकी मदद करना हमें सोखना चाहिये। महात्माजीने नहरे रिपोर्टके बारेमें जो कुछ भी कहा है कि नहरे रिपोर्ट जिसको सब Partci (दलों) ने मुत्फ़का रायसे माना है। मन्ज़ूर कर लिया जाय। हम सब भी यह मानते हैं कि यह रिपोर्ट मानली जाय, फिर इस बात पर भी अधिक कगड़ा नहीं रहा फिर सम्झमें नहीं आता कि क्यों हमारे बहुतसे भाई इस प्रस्तावसे सन्तुष्ट नहीं, हमने अपने सामने ऐसी ऐसी स्कॉप रखीं कि जिनसे बहुत लोग इकतिलाफ़ करते रहे, आज एक ऐसा वक्त आया है कि लोग एक ऐसी मांग पर एकमत हुए हैं, कि अगर इसका मान लिया जायगा तो काम करनेमें सहूलियत रहेगी, दूसरे ऐसी स्कॉप जब कांग्रेसके प्रोपोज़मेंसे रखी जाती

है। तो इसका वजन और भी बढ़ जाता है, और बढ़ जाना चाहिये भी। क्या आपके भरोसा है, कि गवर्नमेंट इस स्कीमको मान लेगी, क्या आप समझते हैं। कि जो मांग हमने उम्मेद सामने रखी है, वह माननी जायगी, भाईयो बात तो यह है, कि हमें इनको मानिके लिये भी खुत बहाना होगा, गर्दल कटानी पड़ेगी, कौन आसानीसे इतना भी दिये देता है। जितना इस प्रस्तावमें मांगा गया है। हम कितने वर्षोंसे मुल्ककी आजादी की मांग पेशकर रहे हैं। आप सोचें हमारी तरफ़ी क्या हुई, अभी उतने ही गुलाम हैं, जितने पहिले कभी थे। आपका मत सब भी इस रेजोलेशन्के ज़रियेसे हल हो सकता है। वह यह है कि जो समझते कि गवर्नमेंटमे वार्तानाप करके आजादी मिल सकती है, जिन को गवर्नमेंटके ऊपर भरोसा है, इस रेजोलेशन्में उनके लिये भी जगह है साफ़ कह दिया गया है। कि भाई अगर अभी भरोसा है, तो लो एक साल और देखलो क्या तुम्हारी सुनाई होती है, महात्माजीने कहा है कि एक साल और अजमा लीजिये देखिये गवर्नमेंट क्या देती है। यह विषय ऐसे लोगोंके लिये समझिये जिनको गवर्नमेंटसे कुछ आशा सगी हुई है, क्या हमें कुछ चिन्तने हुए नहीं होगई, और कहने आये हैं कि गवर्नमेंटमे अभी उम्मेद है वह देखें क्या मिला, गवर्नमेंटने हमसे कितने वायदे किये और हमने अभी गवर्नमेंटको हर वक्त मददकी खास तौर पर उम वक्त हमने मददकी, जब कि गवर्नमेंटकी किकती ढाँवाँ ढौल थी। खर वह समय भी निकल गया जहाँ यह सब उन लोगोंने देखा फिर भी उनकी आँवने नहीं खुली उनको फिर भी एक माल और दिया और उन्हें चाहिये। कि फिर खमटोक कर तैय्यार होजाय। आप भी तैय्यार हो जाइये, और उन्से कहिये कि आगे आपके साथ बढ़े।

आवाज़—क्या वह लोग जिनको यह बात माना चाहते हैं, कि एक सालका मौका और दिया जाता है, क्या वह हमारा साथ देंगे।

डाक्टर साहबने आपना भाषण जारी रखते हुए कहा, कि जो ऐसा करते हैं, कि एक सालका मौका गवर्नमेंटको और दिया जाय उन्से उम्मेद शतो हमें यही करना चाहिये। कि वह आगे चल कर हमारा साथ देंगे, और अगर ऐसा न हो तो यह समझिये कि मोशेवाच। माग मुल्क तो आजादीके लिये कभी भी तैय्यार नहीं हुआ। जब मुल्कको आजादीके लिये लड़ाई लड़ी जाती है, तो कुछ लड़ने हैं और कुछ पीछा चलाना करना है आप यही समझें कि यह अगर आपके साथ लड़े भी तो नहीं हमने कम पीछे ज़रूर चलेंगे। यह हमें तवारीख़ यिक्वाती है, आप किय मुल्ककी तवारीख़ उठा कर देखलें मालूम होगा कि सब कहीं भी लड़ाई के मैदानमें नहीं आये, यह काम तो नौजवानोंका ही होता है, मुल्कको आजाद करनेका तो बीड़ा आप पर ही है, यह लोग पुराने होगये उन्से आप संघाम में हिस्सा लेनेकी आशा छोड़ें। और वृत्ते आपकी तरह रिपोर्टको इन्से ताक़्त हो जायगी, यह तो हमने कम हो ही जायगा। कि फिर यह लोग किसी तरहकी मुलाजलफ़त तो नहीं करेंगे। आपके रास्तेमें पेड़े तो नहीं आटक़्योंगे। उनकी वह आदत तो छूट जायगी जैसा वह पहिले किया करते थे। क्या यह हमारी ताक़्त नहीं होगी, जस ताक़्त होगी। एक बात इस सम्बन्धमें और कहनी है, कि इस जो स्वगल्य लगे वह लगे तो इसी Material (सामान) से, कोई कर्मिने तो आयेगे ही नहीं, जब हमें ऐसा मौका मिलता है तो हम उसे हाथसे न जाने दें, एक बात और कहनी है मैं यह पूछता हूँ, कि क्या हममें ऐसे भी कारकुन हैं, जैसे महात्मा गान्धीजी और दूसरे ऐसे काम करने वाले, ऐसे काम करने वाले ऐसा

काम करते हैं, और अपने अनुभवमे कहते हैं, जो भी कहते हैं उनके अनुभवमे हमें फायदा उठाना चाहिये। और दूसरोंमे कहिये कि आये और आपके साथ काम करें, उनपर उनके Methods (तरीकों) पर हमें विश्वास है, उनके जो काम भी होते हैं, अच्छे होते हैं, जब उनके कहने से काम बनता हो तो क्यों न उनको माने। हमारे एक Group ग्रोह है जो महात्माजी के प्रस्तावके साथ है। उन्होंने इसके लाभमहसूस कर लिये हैं, हमलिये वह इसके साथ हैं, आप इस प्रस्तावको खूब देखने और जिन्हें इस पर विश्वास हो वह इस प्रस्ताव पर वोट दें। ज़रूर महा-

त्माजी कहते हैं कि उनके नामकी वजहमे वोट नदें लेकिन उनके अनुभवको क्यों न देखें, उनका अनुभव तो हमें बतलाता है, कि महात्माजीके कहने में फायदा होगा। जो लोग कहते हैं कि Independence (स्वतन्त्रता) का गोल मारा जाता है उनके लिये भी इसमें काफ़ी जगह है। वह गोल मारा नहीं जाता, यह रेज़ोल्यूशन महात्माजीका है, मैं इसका समर्थन करता हूँ और आशा करता हूँ कि आप सोच समझकर इस पर अपनी घोट देंगे, और पास करेंगे।

Jnanjan Neogy supported Mr. Subash Chandra Bose's amendment. He spoke in Bengali.

Pandit Jawharlal Nehru said :—I have been asked by the President to say that we have now been sitting for five hours and many of you must be tired, at the same time he desires to continue and terminate the debate so that it might be finished this evening. Therefore he proposes to have an interval of one and a half hours. We will meet again at a quarter past eight. There is another reason why this is necessary,—if there is any voting, in the present circumstances it is absolutely impossible because the delegates and visitors are hopelessly mixed up. It will therefore be necessary for the pandal to be cleared of all delegates and visitors, of those belonging to the Reception Committee and everybody else. Later on at a quarter past eight delegates only will be admitted and they will sit in their respective blocks to facilitate the counting of votes and to verify that they are the proper delegates. Some of you must have heard of the numerous complaints that have been made with regard to the irregularities in regard to delegates' tickets. A sub-committee consisting of Mr. Vallabhai Patel, and two others were appointed to enquire into the matter. This Committee sat for two whole days enquiring into this matter and they have presented their report. Having considered their report, the President has come to the conclusion that he cannot permit any delegate from Ajmere to take part in the voting except *ex-officio* delegates including the members of the All-India Congress Committee from Ajmere. The

other delegates of Ajmere have not been properly elected and therefore they will not be admitted to the Pandal at 8-15.

The Pandal was then cleared.

The Congress re-assembled at 8-15 P.M. when the discussion was continued.

Mr. Siva Prosad Gupta opposing Mahatma Gandhiji's resolution spoke in Hindi.

सभापति महोदय और भाइयो।

यह प्रस्ताव जैसा समझा जाता है कि महात्माजीका है वैसा समझना ठीक नहीं। वास्तवमें तो यह प्रस्ताव Compromise (समझौते) का प्रस्ताव है जिसे महात्माजीने पेश किया है, इसलिये इस प्रस्तावको महात्माजीका प्रस्ताव समझ कर वोट देना उचित नहीं होगा। असल प्रश्न तो स्वतन्त्रता और औपनिवेशिक स्वराज्य के बीचका है। जिन सजनोंको स्वतन्त्रताकी परवा हो उन्हें उभास वाचूके उभारके सम्बन्धमें सम्मति देनी चाहिये। जो इसके विपक्षमें हों वह इसके विरुद्ध मूल प्रस्तावके पक्षमें अपनी सम्मति दे सकते हैं। आपको हर एक को यह भलिभाँति समझलेना चाहिये कि उसकी सम्मतिका क्या अरथ पड़ेगा। यह कहा जाता है कि स्वतन्त्रता और औपनिवेशिक स्वराज्यमें कोई अन्तर नहीं तथा नहर रिपोर्टके स्वीकार करनेमें यह लाभ होगा कि देशके और और राजनीतिक दलोंके सदस्य भी साथ देंगे। क्या मैं यह पूछने की हृष्टता करूँ कि कल तक जो विपक्षीकी ओर थे क्या कलसे हो वह इस प्रस्तावके पास होने ही आपके साथ आ जायेंगे, क्या कोई भी यह समझ सकता है कि उदार दलके लोग खादी पहनना स्वीकार कर लेंगे और कल न देनेके आन्दोलनमें भाग लेंगे? ऐसा यदि कोई समझता है तो ऐसा समझना नितान्तभ्रम है। दूसरी बात मैं यह कहनी चाहता हूँ कि औपनिवेशिक स्वराज्य पानेके लिये भी हमें उतना ही कठिन युद्ध करना

पड़ेगा जितना कि शायद पूर्ण स्वतन्त्रताके लिये करना न पड़े। फिर हम एक उच्च आदर्शको छोड़ कर जिसके पीछे बहुतसे नौजवान आ सकते हैं इन आदर्शियोंकी परवा करके औपनिवेशिकके पीछे जो मरुभूमिकी एक मरोचिके भ्रम है अपनी शक्ति और समय क्यों गवायें। यह कहा जाता है कि औपनिवेशिक स्वराज्य पानेपर हमें हर एक प्रकारके नियम बनानेका अधिकार हो जायगा अगर ऐसा हुआ तो क्या हम तुरन्त ऐसे नियम बनायेंगे जिसमें जो आर्थिक लूट मार आजकल हमारे देशमें हो रही है बन्द हो जायगी? यदि ऐसा हुआ और हम अपने देशको लूट मार बन्द कर सके इसका अर्थ यह है कि अङ्गरेजोंको हमें लूट कर अपना घर भरनेका मौका न रह जायगा तो उन्हें हमसे रिस्ता बनाये रहनेका क्या प्रयोजन बाकी रह जायगा? अङ्गरेजोंका हिन्दुस्तानमें आकर हमारे ऊपर शासन करने में जहाँ तक मैं समझता हूँ केवल यही अभिप्राय है कि हमें लूटकर अपना घर भरे आज देहसो घरसे बही तो कर रहे हैं। जब यह लूट बन्द हो जायगी तो हमें सहायता देनेके लिये क्यों रहेंगे यह मेरी समझमें नहीं आता। मैं नहीं मानता कि कोई भी देश केवल परमार्थकी हृष्टिमें दूसरे की सहायता करने जाता है।

वह नीचेकी बात कहने ही वाला थे कि घंटी बजी, आपने तल्पूवात् कहा कि हमें विश्व शक्तिका सदुप्यवहार त्यागना नहीं चाहिये। और दूसरे देशोंकी महानुभूति उसी रूपमें प्राप्त

कर सकते हैं, जब पूर्ण स्वतन्त्रताके लिये लड़े हो, हमें अङ्गरेजोंका मित्र बनाकर अङ्गरेजों की शक्ति बढ़ाना किसी भी स्वतन्त्र देशको मञ्जूर नहीं है। और इस भाँति यदि हम अपने

आदर्गको पूर्ण स्वतन्त्रतासे हटा कर श्रौपनि-पेशिक कर लेंगे तो आदर्गको ही नीचा कर लेंगे, हमें स्वतन्त्र संसारको सानुभूतिसे हाथ धोना पड़गा।

Mr. Hari Sarvottamrao, supporting Mahatmaji, recalled the teaching of Lok Tilak that "Swaraj is our birthright and we shall die for it." That was for which Deshbandhu lived and died. It was for this that Lalaji lived and died. That is for which Mahatmaji and Panditji stand. After all these, who can say that Mahatmaji has lowered down the flag of Independence. (Cries of shame and counter-cheers from two sections of the House.) It was no use talking of big words. They must follow a man of action and Gandhiji is a man of action.

"I know there is great emotion surcharging the minds of the younger generation. It is regrettable that the bureaucracy was exasperating them. If there was any blood-shed in the country, if there was revolution in the country, the responsibility will be on the heads of the British Government and not on the heads of those who even commit violence.

"There is Mahatmaji ready to lead us and under political circumstances of a peculiar nature, he has come forward to sponsor the resolution which stands for the Madras resolution and for the Nehru Report which is the outcome of the Madras Congress resolution."

"Destroy the political side of the Nehru Report and you destroy the whole." (Cries of "No, no, no" from a section of the House).

"Situated as we are," concluded Mr. Hari Sarvottamrao, and trying to wrest our right from the British Government inch by inch, we are concentrating all the strength of the country, and not its weakness, by mobilising all our resources and bringing together the different parties in the country."

"Talking of Dominion Status does not mean the lowering of the flag. Men who have not the courage to carry on the propaganda against the Simon Commission, (cries of shame and counter-cheers greeted the speaker) let them not talk of big things. Let them sacrifice their all against the Simon Commission and we shall have our rights,"

Mr. Juglekar opposed the resolution of Mr. Gandhi. He said that the Nehru Report perpetuated that system of exploitation under which 99 percentage of the people of the country were labouring at the present moment. Should they support such a scheme, simply because they had been asked by their revered leaders to do so? Should they do that when their honour was under trial? The issue before them was, "Are you going to stand by the highest ideal of your life, or are you going to sell your country for the reverence of some individuals who have rendered the greatest service for us in the past?" Panditji and Gandhiji have given the mightiest services to the country in the past and are great men; but I say, the country is greater than they. No one who has got a conscience and whose conscience is palpitating with life should vote for Mahatmaji.

"We are under British subjection, but that is against our will. By accepting Dominion Status, we are going to sign our death-warrant. Let them remember this and vote accordingly."

Then Mr. Balkrishna Sharma spoke in Hindi:—

सभापतिजी और भाइयो। यह मेरी सम-
झमें नहीं आता कि किस प्रकार यह कहा जा
रहा है। कि महात्मा गान्धी और पं० मोती-
लालकी तिसको डूबाने जा रहे हैं यह बेवकूफी
है जो ऐसा कहते हैं, कि यह व्यक्तियाँ कांग्रेसको
गुलामीकी और ले जा रहे हैं। हमें इन पर
विश्वास करना चाहिये। आपने देखा होगा कि
श्री वल्लभ भाई मरेल जो महात्माजीके बायें
हाथ है, बगडौली सत्यप्रहमें कितना काम किया
है उन्होंने सैकड़ों स्वयं सेवक जेलमें भर दिये।

किसलिये सिफ इस लिये कि कांग्रेसका झंडा
नीचा होने न पाये। आप क्या इनसे कुछ
विश्वास नहीं रखते, एक सालकी ही अवधि तो
आपको दी है, फिर जैसा आप उचित समझे करें।
और कौन ऐसा होगा जो पूर्ण स्वाधीनता न
चाहता हो। लेकिन करनेमें, करनेमें बड़ा अन्तर
होता है। क्या श्रीनिवास रायज़र और सत्य-
मूर्ति कौंसिलोंसे अपनी सीर छोड़ देंगे। कदापि
नहीं फिर क्यों स्वाधीनता २ व्यर्थमें चिह्नाते हैं।
(हर्षम्-हृषम्)

Mr. Sarat Chandra Bose (Bengal) supporting the amendment remarked that the question before the House was not merely a question whether they in the Indian National Congress were prepared to lower the flag raised at Madras. (Applause.) It was a question of cold reasoning and not a question of sentiment.

A voice: Give up your practice first?

Proceeding Mr. Bose recalled the Presidential speech where Panditji had said that though they had striven honestly all these years, there

was no gesture from the other side. All the indications, Panditji had said, were on the contrary. That being so, Mr. Bose asked, what had happened during the last two days since the delivery of the Presidential address? (Cries of "Mahatmajji, Mahatmajji.")

Continuing Mr. Bose emphasised that so far as unity in the Congress ranks was concerned, it was there for every Congressman was zealous in upholding the ideal of independence. It was only when they talked of Dominion Status, that there was disagreement in their ranks.

The next point was, should the movement for independence receive a set-back even for an hour, not to speak of one year? He emphasised that the movement for independence was a movement which could not be kept in suspension even for a single hour. If it received a set-back, it would send back many into their field with broken hearts.

Finally Mr. Bose appealed to all to combine their forces to preach the gospel of independence. (Cheers and counter cheers.)

At this stage, the demand for closure was moved, but the President ruled that there would be some other speakers before he could put the closure motion to vote.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru supported Mr. Subash Bose's amendment in course of a speech in Hindi.

सभापतिजी, बहिनो और भाइयो ! आपके सामने महात्माजीका प्रस्ताव है, और उसे आपने अच्छी तरह समझ लिया होगा। इसे विरोधमें बहुतसे संशोधन पेश किया गये, एक संशोधन बोल वाचने भी पेश किया है। उसे भी आपने अच्छी तरहसे देख लिया होगा, दोनोंका मिलान आप कर चुके होंगे, बहुतसे सज्जन इन दोनों पर बोल चुके हैं, महात्माजीके प्रस्तावका विरोध करना आसान बात नहीं, यह बड़ा गम्भीर समय है। हम सोचें कि आगिर यह क्या है, बात तो यह है कि महात्मा गान्धी सबसे बड़े नागरिकोंमें से हैं, यदि इस प्रस्ताव पर आप विचार करेंगे तो आपको सातम होगा, कि हम क्या मांग रहे हैं, मैं तो यह भी कहता हूँ कि यदि यह कभी आवश्यकता आपकी कि हिन्दु-

स्तानको बचावत करनी पड़ी तो महात्मा गान्धी सबसे पहिले पुरुष होंगे, जो इस बचावतके अर्थको रास्ता दिखायेंगे वही नागरिकोंके सरदारका काय करेंगे। आप सोचें और विचारें कि प्रश्न आपके सामने बहुत सादा है, 'आया आप पूरी स्वतन्त्रता चाहते हैं, या औपनिवेशिक राज्य' कौनसी बात आपको पसंद है। यह दो प्रश्न हैं, इनमें जो जिसको पसंद होगा, वही उसके लिये लड़ेगा। मैं अपने बड़े लीडरोंसे एक छोटासा प्रश्न करता हूँ कि क्या दुनियामें ऐसा कोई देश है जहाँ इस प्रकारका औपनिवेशिक राज्य प्रणाली प्रचलित है। सिवाय ब्रिटेन साम्राज्यको छोड़कर, कहीं भी नहीं, फिर समझमें नहीं आता कि हमारे भाई एक ऐसी चीज़के पीछे क्यों पड़े हैं, जिसका अर्थ भी हमारे लिये एक अज

नवीं हो, अपने देशमें ही देख लीजिये, स्वतन्त्रताको सब समझते हैं, वह क्या जाने कि औपनिवेशिक राज्य क्या होता है। यह सिफ उनके लिये है, जो ब्रिटेनके वाशिंगटन दूसरी जगहोंमें जयसे हैं यहां कि परिस्थितिमें बहुत फर्क है, हिन्दुस्तान उनका औपनिवेशिक राज्य तो किसी हालतमें होहो नहीं सकता। दूसरे किसी कौमने भी ऐसे राज्यके लिये अपने लड़कोंकी बलि चढ़ाई, यह किसीको रुचिकर होही नहीं सकता।

आप जानते हो स्वतन्त्रताका झंडा मद्रास कांग्रेसमें फहराया गया था वहां यह हमारा गोल माना गया था, कि पूर्ण स्वतन्त्रता ही हमारा ध्येय हो तबसे आज तक नहर कमेटी बँधी रही और उस नहर कमेटीने यह नहर रिपोर्ट तैयारकी है। हम इस रिपोर्टकी इज्जत करते हैं, चूंकि इसमें बहुतसी ऐसी बातें हैं, जिनसे देशको लाभ पहुंचेगा। लेकिन इसको हम अपना ध्येय वा लक्ष्य नहीं मान सकते। जब हम एक साल पहिले ही आज़ादीके लिये खड़े होते हैं, और और एक साल पीछे फिर इस रिपोर्टको अपना

लक्ष्य मानलेंते हैं, तो हम कहाँ जा रहे हैं, आप सोचिये। दूसरी बात यह भी है कि हमारी आज़ादीका युद्धका सम्यन्ध केवल भारत वषसे ही नहीं है। यह विश्व व्यापी प्रश्न है, आपके सामने विदेशोंसे बहुतसे सन्देश आये हैं, सबमें यही कहा गया है, कि देखना अपनी आज़ादीकी मांगको नीचे न गिरने देना। किसीमें डोमिनियन स्टेट्सकी सिफारिश नहीं है। ब्रिटीश लोग हमारी मांगको कब सुनने वाले हैं, हम अपनी मांगका चोहे नीचा ही क्यों न गिरा लें। मैं नहीं चाहता कि आप केवल भावोंसे ही वह जाय आप गम्भीर होकर इस प्रश्न पर विचार करें। यदि आप चाहते हो कि भारत स्वतन्त्र हो और हम अपने देशको गुलामीसे जल्दी छुटा करें, तो स्वतन्त्रता ही हमारा मन्त्र होना चाहिये। काम केवल भावोंसे नहीं चलता, हमें यह देखना है कि हम किस तरहसे अपने काममें सफल हो सकते हैं। मेरा तो निजो विचार यही है कि भारतका ध्येय पूर्ण स्वतन्त्रता होना चाहिये। और उसे पूर्ण स्वतन्त्रताके लिये लड़ना चाहिये। मैं इन शब्दोंके साथ संसोधनका समर्थन करता हूँ।

Mr. Govinda Ballav Pant supported Gandhiji in Hindi.

सभापतिजी और भाइयो ! आपने प्रस्ताव देख लिया मेरो समझमें नहीं आता है, कि हमारे भाई प्रस्तावसे इतने क्यों डर रहे हैं। यह जो बात उठाई गई है कि हम स्वतन्त्रता चाहते हैं, औपनिवेशिक राज्य नहीं मैं नहीं समझता कि यह प्रस्ताव कब कहता है। कि तुम स्वतन्त्रताके लिये प्रयत्न न करो इसमें तो साफ़ कह दिया गया है, कि जो भाई स्वतन्त्रतामें काम करें और जो एक साल भी न टहर सकते हों वह काम करें उनके रास्तेमें कोई बाधा उपस्थित नहीं की जायगी। आप यह भी तो यकीन करें, कि हमारे नेता जो कुछ भी हमारे लिये कर रहे हैं वह ऐसा

नहीं कि आपके अहितका हो, क्या आपको पंडित मोतीलाल और महात्मा गान्धी पर विश्वास नहीं, मैं तो यही कहूंगा कि आप विश्वास करें, क्या आप समझते हैं कि महात्मा गान्धी और पंडितजी आपके मुलकको किसी प्रकार भी हानि होने देंगे। या वह कोई ऐसा बड़बन्ध थोड़ा ही रचेंगे, कि आपका देश सदैव गुलाम रहे, महात्माजी तो सदासे ही स्वतन्त्रताकी घोसणा करते आये हैं, और यह आप विश्वास रखें कि महात्माजी कोई भी ऐसा प्रस्ताव नहीं रखेंगे, जो स्वतन्त्रताके विरोधमें हो, दूसरी बात जो इस प्रस्तावमें कहीं गई है। वह तो यही है जिसे आप

सब एकमतसे मानते हैं। उस भागमें यही कहा गया है, कि यह कांग्रेस नहर रिपोर्टको स्वीकार करती है, क्योंकि उससे देशकी राजनैतिक प्रगतिमें सहायता मिली है। क्या आप समझते हैं, एक समय हमारे देशमें ऐसा नहीं था, जब हम यह नहीं कह सकते थे। कि भारतके लिये कौनसा शासन विधान है ? अब हम कह सकते हैं, कि नहर रिपोर्ट ही एक ऐसा पसांदा हमारे सामने है जिसे हम शासन विधान कह सकते हैं भारतके लिये, इसमें दूसरी बात यह भी है। कि इसको सब दलोंसे लगभग मान साही लिया है, अब-सब सब दल चिन्ताया करते थे, कि क्या शासन

विधान हो। और सब अपनी २ अलग २ ही अलाया करते थे, अब सब हम रिपोर्ट पर सह-यता हैं, क्या यह थोड़ी बात है। मैं आपसे कुछ अधिक नहीं कहता, मैं यही चाहता हूँ कि आप अपने नेताओं पर विश्वास करें। और अपनी शक्तियों पर विश्वास करें। क्या एक वर्ष बहुत कुछ होता है, देखिये हमें शीघ्र ही युद्धके लिये तैयार होना पड़ेगा। हम अपनी शक्तियोंका सन्तुलन इस समयके बीचमें करें। आप समझें कि यह एक वर्ष युद्धकी तैयारीके लिये ही मिला है। आप प्रस्तावका पास करें।

Mr. Srinam of Cochin State remarked that Dominion Status would not improve the lot of the State subjects. Nothing but complete independence would satisfy them.

At twenty minutes past ten, Mahatma Gandhi rose amidst deafening cries to reply to the debate.

Speaking in Hindi he urged all to remain silent so that they might hear what he had got to say.

Replying to the debate, Mahatma Gandhi said that his remarks were principally addressed to young Bengal and if they considered for one moment that a mere Gujrati could not understand young Bengal, then I say that Young Bengal would commit a most serious blunder.

Two or three voices cried : No, no.

Mahatma Gandhi : I will ask you not to interrupt me when I am endeavouring to address a few words to you as a fellow worker of yours. If, however, you want to interrupt me, I shall certainly retire and not address you. If on the other hand you want to listen to me, then listen to me in perfect silence. I want to make it absolutely clear that if you are wise, you will dismiss from your minds the bogey of Independence vs. Dominion Status. There is no opposition between Dominion Status and Independence. I do not want a Dominion Status that will interfere with my fullest growth, with my independence. These words, I suggest, are misleading. I would therefore suggest a better method. That is independence whereby we can grow to our

fullest height. We are the architects of our own destiny and I suggest that the architects of the Nehru Report are your own countrymen appointed by you. There is no hand on the part of the Government in the framing of this document. This document owes its origin to the Madras Congress and it is through the Madras Congress that this committee was appointed and it is this report which I ask you to stand by for the time being. The question has been agitating my mind since yesterday afternoon when I heard that there was going to be seriously put forward an amendment to this resolution on behalf of those who, I thought, were a party to the resolution that I moved.

The resolution that I have submitted to this House is the direct result of a compromise. The resolution that I originally framed you have not seen. And even the one that was printed and moved in the Subjects Committee was also in a way the result of informal compromise or some kind of understanding, whatever language you might wish to use. That resolution was not framed by me only; there were many heads behind that. There was an attempt to placate as many parties as it was possible to placate. That resolution was discussed by various men, men who were supposed to represent different parties. I do not want to suggest that you are bound by that resolution but I do want to say that those who were supposed to be behind that resolution were in honour bound to support it.

If anybody runs away with the idea that I am here appealing to sentiment, he is in the wrong. You can appeal to one's sense of honour and I am proud of having made my appeal to that sense of honour. I suggest that if those who were behind this compromise subsequently discovered that they had committed a blunder and that they must clear their position before the world and say that they are penitent for what they had done previously, I suggest that penitence is made of sterner stuff. It is not made by amendments. There are other drastic steps to be taken. If those who were behind this compromise consider that they have committed no such blunder but have committed only a tactical blunder or a blunder that involves the displeasure of some party, then I suggest that it is their bounden duty to swallow that blunder and to abide by that compromise. If you have not got that sense of honour and if in giving a word of honour you are not

sure that it should be kept at any cost, then I say that you will not be able to make this nation free.

You may take the name of Independence on your lips just as the Moslems utter the name of Allah or a pious Hindu utters the name of Krishna or Ram, but all that muttering will be an utterly empty formula if there is no honour behind it. If you are not prepared to stand by your own words, where will Independence be? Independence is after all a thing made of sterner stuff. It is not made by the juggling of words. I suggest that if you want to vindicate the honour of this nation, because the Viceroy insults us or the president of the European Chamber of Commerce insults us, if you say, we want our independence because we want to vindicate our honour,—then you are dragging independence into the mire. Do not imagine for a moment that I am trying to snatch a vote from you. Believe me there is no such thing behind my mind.

I would rather suffer defeat at the hands of youngmen, but I am zealous of their honour. If you, youngmen, who are behind this amendment understand the significance of the message I am delivering to you, you may say for the present that you have committed a blunder but that you want to abide by that compromise because our leaders have entered into a compromise. If you think it is not a matter of honour, if you think that the independence of the country will be lost if you accept my resolution, I invite you to throw out my resolution by an overwhelming majority. But if you accept my resolution by an overwhelming majority or even by any majority, whatsoever, then those who vote for this resolution should understand that it would be a matter of honour for them to work for it because they pledge themselves for it.

But why are you so oppressed? Why are you labouring under that inferiority complex that within a year we shall not be able to convince the British Parliament, that we shall not be able to marshal our forces and summon to ourselves the strength that we need. Swaraj is my birthright just as breathing through the lungs is my birthright. It must be as natural to you as your breath. Why are you so afraid?

I have got full faith. If you will help me and follow the programme honestly and intelligently, I promise that Swaraj will come within one year. I want you to die a proper death. I want you to

develop full courage and die with calculated courage. If you can stand with your breast bare before the bullet, then I promise, you will get all that you possibly desire. Do not be frightened by the shadow. Do not be afraid of the long drawn out agony. I admit that it is a long drawn out process, but under the present state of the country when we cannot trust our brothers and sisters, our parents, and party leaders, when we cannot trust any body, when we have no sense of honour, when we cannot allow our words to remain unaltered for 24 hours, do not talk of independence. But if you will develop that calm courage and honesty of purpose and that determination which will refuse to accept "No" for an answer to your demand, then I promise what the tallest among us can possibly desire.

Throughout these days we have heard a great deal that we are not able to carry on the Congress election campaign in an honest manner. It cut me to the quick when I heard that delegate tickets passed hands and were sold like bills of exchange and the rates increased as the days went on and a rupee ticket sold for Rs. 15. It is discreditable to the Congress and I tell you that you are not going to get independence by these methods. On the other hand, you are forging your own shackles, from which there will be no escape because it is of your own making.

May God direct you in coming to a decision.

I do not want you to decide the question, because I am the mover of the resolution or because Pandit Motilal is at the back of the resolution. It is you who must decide with calm reasoning but showing honour with it. (Loud Applause.)

Syed Majid Bux withdrew his amendment while the other amendments including the one moved by Dr. Annie Besant were declared lost.

The President then put the amendment of Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose to the vote amidst cheers and counter-cheers and great sensation prevailed.

Division on Sj. Subhas Chandra Bose's amendment took fully one hour and a half. Starting soon after half past eleven the division was over shortly after 1 A.M., with the result that Sj. Subhas Chandra Bose's

amendment was lost, 973 voting for and 1,350 voting against, while 48 remained neutral.

During the division delegates were asked to go to their respective provincial blocks and two tellers from each Province were appointed for each block. In addition the following six gentlemen were appointed supervisors:—Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose, Mr. J. M. Sen Gupta, Dr. Ansari, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, Mr. Girdharilal and Mr. B. Raja Rau. Dr. Satyapal was also requested to see that only the proper delegates from the Punjab voted, and a few votes of the Punjab delegates were declared to be invalid because their election was considered invalid. Both sides were equally represented both in tellers and supervisors. To delegates who raised the question as to whether persons not wearing Khaddar would be allowed to vote, Pandit Motilalji ruled that those not wearing Khaddar could not vote but that he would leave it to the honour of delegates to refrain from voting in case they were not Khaddar wearers. Pandit Motilalji also ruled that the Ajmere delegates were debarred from voting (excepting the A. I. C. C. members who are *ex-officio* delegates), in view of the serious irregularities reported about their election.

Mahatmaji's resolution was then separately put to the vote and adopted amidst deafening shouts of "Bande Mataram" and "Mahatma Gandhiji-ki-jai."

Indian National Congress

FOURTH DAY'S PROCEEDINGS, 1st JANUARY, 1929.

The Fourth Day's Proceedings commenced as usual with the procession headed by the Band leading in the President and prominent members. After the singing of "Bandemataram" and a capital programme of music well rendered, Mahatma Gandhi moved the second part of his resolution in connection with the Nehru Report.

The resolution ran as follows :—

Meanwhile the Congress shall engage in the following activities :—

(1) In the Legislatures and outside every attempt will be made to bring about total prohibition of intoxicating drugs and drinks ; picketing of liquor and drug shops shall be organised wherever desirable and possible.

(2) Inside and outside the Legislatures methods suited to respective environments shall be immediately adopted to bring about boycott of foreign cloth by advocating and stimulating production and adoption of handspun and hand-woven Khaddar.

(3) Specific grievances, wherever discovered and where people are ready, shall be sought to be redressed by non-violent action as was done recently at Bardoli.

(4) Members of Legislatures returned on the Congress ticket shall devote the bulk of their time to the constructive work settled from time to time by the Congress Committee.

(5) The Congress organization shall be perfected by enlisting members and enforcing stricter discipline.

(6) Measures shall be taken to remove the disabilities of women and they will be invited and encouraged to take their due share in national up-building.

(7) Measures shall be taken to rid the country of social abuses.

(8) It will be the duty of all Congressmen being Hindus, to do all they can to remove untouchability and help the so-called untouch-

ables in every possible way in their attempt to remove their disabilities and better their condition.

(9) Volunteers shall be enlisted to take up the work among the city labourers and village reconstruction in addition to that is being done through the spinning wheel and Khaddar.

(10) Such other work as may be deemed advisable in order to advance national building in all its departments and in order to enable the Congress to secure the co-operation in the national effort of the people engaged in different pursuits.

Besides the activities mentioned in the foregoing programme the Congress expects every Congressman to contribute to the Congress coffers monthly, a certain percentage of his or her income in accordance to his or her ability.

Mahatmaji first spoke in Hindi explaining the resolution.

Speaking in English he said :—

I do not want to detain you for long over the resolution which is an integral part of the first resolution which you were good enough to endorse yesterday. It was only for the sake of convenience that the Subjects Committee insisted upon dividing this one resolution into two parts; one in connection with the Nehru Committee Report and the second in connection with the programme of work based upon that Report. Hence it is that the second part of the first resolution I am now putting before you to-day. But it was after all a happy thing for "All's well that ends well," and that arrangement enables me to give you the welcome information that a complete agreement without any mental reservation has been accomplished. I don't propose to read that resolution to you because you have had that resolution before you and I am trying to economise as much of the National time as possible and I am trying also to economise my voice, energy and time as much as possible. Therefore, let us consider it an arrangement between yourselves and me that I do not read this resolution.

There are two amendments to the resolution and of these amendments Mr. Satyamurthi has chosen the second one. But now as I have agreed to the suggestion of his, he has authorised me to withdraw his alternative amendment and the suggestions I have accepted are these.

You will notice in his alternative resolution that he refers to the organisation of the peasantry and workers. So far as the peasantry is concerned you will find in my resolution there is a reference where the volunteers if called upon to enlist themselves in order to do village reconstruction work, and this village reconstruction work is nothing but the organisation of the peasantry and workers upon an economic basis. We want to enter into the hearts of the peasants. We want to identify ourselves completely with the masses. We want to make their woes our own. We want to feel with them in everything in order to better the lot of those on whose toil we the people of the city are really living. We must therefore make common cause with the workers. I do not want it for one moment to be understood that the city workers and labourers are to be neglected; I cannot possibly mean that because I am myself organising labour, and I have been identifying myself with labour for the last 30 or 35 years of my life. So I have no hesitation in accepting that part. The second suggestion that I have adopted is in connection with the tax; I suggested in my resolution of five per cent. on incomes exceeding Rs. 100. Personally, I would like that clause, but many of my friends and many Congressmen have suggested that it would work as a hardship upon people. People cannot really pay so much, they cannot really pay. If they cannot pay, there is a remedy in that clause itself. The suggestion was that they are not yet in the habit of conforming to that exact discipline whereby men or women would automatically recognise it as a compulsory obligation to pay. I have appreciated the force of that argument and therefore I have accepted the suggestion so that that clause will now be remodelled. I am not telling you how it is to be remodelled, because I have not really the text of that clause before me and you do not want me to worry you about it just now. But it will enable you to carry out the meaning of what I am telling you just now. That clause will be so worded as to carry out the formula that was suggested for another thing by Deshbhandu Das that the Congress expects every Congressman to contribute to the Congress coffers month by month in accordance with his ability, in order to advance the cause of the Congress, more especially in order to embark upon a programme that is set forth in the foregoing resolution. That will be the wording instead of the wording in the last clause of the printed paper. I do not want to take up your time any

longer but I cannot help giving you a warning note. I want you to take this resolution seriously and I want you to adhere with all seriousness to this resolution. I do not want you to raise your hands as accepting this resolution and then sleep over it for a solid twelve months and expect the A. I. C. C. or the Working Committee or the President to work wonders for you. Neither the President, nor the A. I. C. C., have a magic wand. There is no magic wand except your own iron determination and will and that is the magic wand that will alone bring Swaraj within your grasp and give the country peace and happiness. Therefore, I would beseech you not to accept the resolution with the two suggestions adopted unless every one here in his own person means seriously to carry out all the items of the programme which are applicable to them and unless you are determined to take the message of the Congress from door to door ceaselessly for these twelve months. At the end of this period I hope to see an atmosphere totally different from the atmosphere of distrust and despondency that I can read in the faces of everyone of us to-day.

With these words I leave this resolution in your hands and I thank you for giving me this very patient hearing. (Loud and continued applause.)

Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar in seconding the resolution said:—

I am glad to have this opportunity of seconding this resolution which has just been moved by Mahatma Gandhi. It is necessary to tell you that though I agreed to the compromise and though I feel bound by it, as the party decided to take a different view I could not support it except by a silent vote in favour of the compromise which had been agreed to. It enables me to explain my position to you that the party had decided to put forward a separate programme before you, but this programme has been adopted in substance by these two alterations having been agreed to by Mahatma Gandhi. These two alterations make it quite easy for me to second this resolution. I have no doubt whatever that this programme is the inevitable sequel of the resolution which was passed yesterday. I hope as the resolution was passed, all sections of Congressmen will feel loyally bound to carry out the terms of that resolution, and this resolution is a consequential resolution dealing with that programme. Whatever our differences may be—differ-

ences there must exist for the healthy growth of national feeling—there can be little doubt that ample co-operation will always be available from those who seek to carry out that programme with a view to achieve complete independence. I do not think that this programme is any the less calculated to achieve complete independence though it is now put forward only to achieve Dominion Status. Nor do I think that the compromise resolution to which I was a party and to which I hold myself bound, was in any way a surrender of the great principle with which I must continue to identify myself till the end of my days, that is, the completest independence. I have explained it in the Subjects Committee and I do not propose to add any word to that now. I therefore request you to carry out, as Gandhiji told you, loyally this programme if we mean business. And if we do carry out this programme I have every confidence that by the time we are able to meet together next December for the Congress Session we shall be able to take a big step forward. I do not believe the British Government is going to accept the Nehru Constitution either in its entirety or in any substantial measure, nor do I believe for a moment that the difference of opinion between the two groups in the Congress is going to be a permanent difference. It is only a difference in ideals between two wings of the Congress and I expect unity in action and unity in method will dispel all controversy when once both the sections will harness themselves to practical work.

I attach the greatest importance to the organisation of the peasantry on an economic basis. I have never doubted that Mahatmaji was in favour of it. I have not the slightest hesitation in thinking that both parties are now wholeheartedly joined on an economic basis so far as the levy of contribution is concerned. It has been altered so as to make it a feasible thing. I therefore second this resolution without any more words. I hope you will not only pass it here but you will also give effect to it in your villages, towns and provinces with the responsibility with which you must treat a resolution of this description. If you pass this resolution you must realise that you are bound to obey the text of it and carry it out to the very letter. I wish success to the new Programme. I do not know whether we shall be able to carry it out to the fullest extent but we must make an honest effort to carry out and if we do, I think, we shall be really able to advance a great

step. A perfect programme does not necessarily mean that perfection in work is also necessary. It is desirable no doubt, but a perfect programme unaccompanied by any work will certainly lead nowhere as has been the custom in the past. What is necessary is that as regards every item in the programme there will be an honest measure of earnest work done by the different groups of Congressmen and that it should be carried out without any hesitation or without any kind of mental reservation.

With these words I commend this proposition to you.

Pundit Jawharlal Nehru read out the resolution as corrected by Mahatmaji in consultation with Mr. Satyamurthi and he then explained it in Hindi, after which it was put to the vote and carried with only two dissentients.

Mr. Aftab Ali (Bengal) then moved the following resolution :—

“ This Congress expresses its emphatic protest at the Trades Disputes Bill and the Public Safety Bill which it regards as wholly reactionary attempt to relict the growth of organised labour movement and as an absolutely unjustifiable infringement upon the rights of the people.”

In moving he said :—You all know that in the last session of the Legislative Assembly the Government introduced the Public Safety Bill which was thrown off. But now I have reason to believe that the Bill is going to be revived and brought before the Assembly. So far as this Bill is concerned the resolution speaks for itself. In case the Bill is accepted the result will be that the Indian Labour will be prevented from the support and sympathy of foreign Trade Unionists who come to help in the building of a strong Indian Trade Union Movement and as a consequence the Indian Trade Union Movement will not be built at least for another 100 years. It is also known to you that there are two gentlemen, I hope everyone has heard of them,—I mean Mr. Bradley and Mr. Spratt, who are in our country for more than a year and side by side with the Indian workers are trying to build up a strong Trade Union Movement and who are trying to bring about a strong mass consciousness among the workers so that they may demand their birthright and demand complete independence

for the people of India. Now friends, if a Bureaucratic Government is going to wipe out such friends, how can we tolerate it. Now the Bureaucratic Government, as you all know, deported Mr. Johnstone, who came here as a fraternal delegate on behalf of the League Against Imperialism (Shame, Shame). And you have seen in the papers how that fraternal delegate of the League Against Imperialism with which this Congress is related, was snatched away just after the close of a Trade Union Meeting. How long, I ask the Congress, how long are we to tolerate this? They are fighters for freedom, who had come to India to help us and they are snatched away from us. What about Miss Mayo, who went from this part to that part of India and was writing all that nasty propoganda against India? What did the Government of India do in that connection? The Government gave all sorts of aid to her in order to show up the Indian people as badly as possible before the eyes of the world. I think I need not say much about this part of the resolution.

The Trade Disputes Bill has been discussed and the Bill is now in circulation. If this Bill is passed, general strikes in India will be difficult or illegal. If Indian Labour is not properly organised, if Indian labour is deprived of its right to strike, how are we going to get her grievances redressed? The time may come very soon when they will call upon the Military to go from this place to that place. Therefore we must fight tooth and nail against this vicious Bill. I hope you will give your whole-hearted support to my resolution.

Mr. Thengdi (Bombay) seconded the resolution speaking in Hindi

सभापति और भाइयो ! आपने बिल उन लिया है, और प्रस्ताव भी उन लिया है, उस प्रस्तावको गवर्नमेन्ट उने इस लिये हमने उसे यहां रक्खा है। अभी तो ऐसा मालूम होता है, कि यह बात बहुत छोटी है, चूंकि अभी यह बिल पास नहीं हुआ। लेकिन आप यह सोचें कि जब यह बिल पास हो जायगा। तो क्या क्या होगी, यह कोई मामूली बात नहीं, गवर्नमेन्ट चाहती है, कि इसके लिये Legislation कानून बनाया जाय, और वहपेमा करनेकी कोशिश भी कर रही है। जब यह पास हो जायगा तब आपको मालूम

होगा कि इसका असर हमारी मजदुरशक्ति पर क्या पड़ेगा। Strike हड़ताल। Illegal गैर-कानूनी। हां जायगे और हमारे मजदुरोंका संगठन करनेके हेतु से जो सज्जन बाहरसे आतं हैं, उनका आना बन्द हो जायगा।

भाइयो यह प्रस्ताव अखनेको मैं आपके सामने उपस्थित हुआ हूँ। आप यह समझें कि आपको स्वराज्यकी स्थापना करनी है। उसके लिये किन २ बातोंकी जरूरत है, यह एक प्रश्न है- क्या आप मानते हैं। कि बातोंसे ही स्वराज्य मिल जायगा, हम कितने ही प्रस्ताव यहां पास

काटे। जब तक हमारे हाथमें शक्ति नहीं होगा व कोई आपकी ओपनिवेशिक राज्यकी बात सुनेगा और न पूर्ण स्वतन्त्रताके यह तो सिर्फ एक बात ही बात है। हममें शक्ति हो, आप यह चाहते हैं, कि देशमें स्वराज्यकी स्थापना हो, वह Non-Violence (अहिंसा) से हो, मैं तो घेंसा नहीं हूँ, हम तो यह कहते हैं, कि जिस तरह से भी हो घेंसा ही स्वराज्यकी स्थापना होनी चाहिये। और यदि आपने अहिंसामें स्वराज्य लेलिया उनके लिये भी तो शक्ति चाहिये। क्या स्वराज्य बिना शक्तिके ही ठहर सकता है, और अब भी जो स्वराज्य मिलेगा क्या यह सिर्फ Non-Violence (अहिंसा) से ही होगा, मेरा तो अपना विचार ऐसा नहीं, हमें देशको

स्वतन्त्र करनेके लिये खून बहाना होगा। हम तबहमें किसी देशने भी स्वतन्त्रता नहीं ली, और स्वराज्य जो स्थापित होगा वह मजदूरोंमें, मजदूरोंके संगठनको मजबूत बनाने की आवश्यकता है। हम देखते हैं कि यह Bill (बिल) जो एसेम्बलीमें आरहा है, मजदूरोंके संगठनका नाश करनेके लिये है। हम जितना भी बाहर रहकर कर सकते हैं करें कि यह बिल पास न हो, सुना गया है। बिलको पास करानेकी कोशिश बहुत हो रही है, और यह हमारे मजदूरोंके संगठनके बड़ी चोट पहुंचायेगा। जो Assembly में हमारे मेम्बरने हैं उनको यह ताकोद करके कि वह हम बिलके चिरुद्ध अपनी अपनी वोट दें।

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

Mr. Jamnadas Mehta then moved the following resolution :—

“ This Congress congratulates the people of the country on the success of the boycott of the Statutory Commission and in particular the people of Lahore and Lucknow who despite the savage and brutal attack of the Police maintained discipline and peacefully continued their boycott demonstration and this triumphed over official lawlessness and brutality.

The Congress has noted however that some people have deliberately violated the nation's resolve to boycott the Commission and have in defiance of the nation's will co-operated with the Simon Commission and taken a leading part in welcoming it. In view of this anti-national conduct of some people and in view of the part taken by some official British and Indian in the brutal assault by the Police on the national workers this Congress advises the people to refrain, as far as possible, from having any social dealing with any such persons who assault national workers or who take a leading part in co-operating with the said Commission. In particular the Congress advises that such persons should not be invited to social functions and no function given by them or in their honour should be attended.

This Congress appeals to the people to make the boycott complete and effective in the provinces which the Commission may visit hereafter by organising among an other things ' hartals ' and mass demonstrations and advises the people to disobey all orders of the Government prohibiting such activities."

In moving the above resolution Mr. Mehta said :—

I do not think that I should try to flog into life a dead horse because I regard the Statutory Commission as dead and gone, due to the unanimous and universal demonstrations of our hostility to the Simon Commission wherever it has gone. It is now an admitted fact that the Simon Commission has been boycotted as effectively as the nation desired that it should be boycotted in its resolution passed at Madras last year. Some of us recall the fact that the Milner Commission was boycotted by the Egyptian people more effectively than the Simon Commission by the Indians. I would ask you respectfully not to belittle our efforts, but from the knowledge I have from books I have read regarding the boycott of the Milner Commission I can assure you that in Egypt also there were people like those who are now in the Central Committee, like Sir Sankar Nair and others, who are co-operating with the Commission. The only difference is that these people in our country are more shameless than the people in Egypt who co-operated with the Milner Commission. I am satisfied that the boycott of the Simon Commission by Indians has been more effective and has gone home to the people in England. When Sir John Simon came for the second time to Bombay, he was spirited away like a thief in the night from Bombay to Poona. Nowhere, where the Commission has gone to, have the people received it in a friendly manner. It has been nowhere welcomed in this country and wherever it has gone from the time it arrived in Bombay up to the present moment, Congressmen in many places have shown their abhorrence of the Commission, and wherever the Commission has gone it has left behind it a trail of bleeding heads and broken bones. As they went from place to place the Government and Police found it necessary to beat Congressmen including such eminent people like Lala Lajpat Rai and others. I hope this will not deter our friends in Calcutta from boycotting the Commissioners in the same determined manner as they

boycotted the Prince of Wales when he came here on the 17th November, 1921. I hope there will be an universal hartal when the Commission comes back again to Calcutta from Shillong; even the bazaars will be closed, and the *kitmagars* and servants will keep away from work and I hope that not even ayahs will nurse the children on that date. While carrying out this determination it might be that prohibitory orders might be passed, but I trust Indians will defy any such orders even at the risk of receiving bullets in their breasts. (Cheers and Applause.)

Dr. Satyapal seconded the motion in a Hindi speech.

जनायमदर ! भादयों और बहनों ! जिस समय यह कमीशन बनाया गया था और इसका Declaration (घोषणा) किया गया था हिन्दुस्तानियों को तो उसी समय इसके बायकाट करने का तर कर लिया था और हमने यह प्रण कर लिया था कि हम अङ्गरेजों के बनाये हुए कमीशन के साथ कभी भी सहयोग न करेंगे। हम क्यों इस कमीशन का साथ दें यह बात समझमें ही नहीं आती, यह कमी मज़ाक है कि मुल्क किसका और उसका किसमतका फयला करने आते हैं दूसरे, क्या अङ्गरेज यह मान लगे कि अङ्गरेजों के मुल्कमें हिन्दुस्तानी या जमनी जाकर उनकी किसमतका बतवारा करें। जब वह नहीं मान सकते तो हम क्यों तय्यार होनाय, हिन्दुस्तान हिन्दुस्तानियों का है, सिवाय हिन्दुस्तानियों के और किसी का भी हक नहीं कि हमारा Constitution विधान। बनाये, हम अगर लुदाकी दी हुई ताकतको बतकर अपने मुल्ककी गुलामीकी बरियोंको काटकर आजाद करना चाहते हैं तो हमारा फर्ज हो जाता है कि हम इस कमीशन का हर तरहसे बायकाट करें, अब यह बात किसीसे छिपी हुई नहीं, बायकाट का फयला मुल्कने खुने तौर पर किया और इसमें कामयाब रहा, हमारे मौलाना जफर अली

साहब के लवणों में कमीशन का साथ जो हज़ारों नहीं दिया।

जब दूसरी बार कमीशन लाहौर में आया तो गवर्नमेंटने क्या किया कि बड़ी यादतीका एक हुक्म निकाला कि कोई भी जलूस बगैर ! न निकाला जाय, रखने एक जवान होकर लाहौर में फंसला दिया कि डिस्ट्रीक्ट मजिस्ट्रेट के इस हुक्मको ऐंडीके तले रगड़दं एक जोश था उस दिनका कौन भूल सकता है। सबसे पहिले लाला लाजपतराय ही इस हुक्मको ऐंडीके तले रगड़नेको तय्यार थे (हपप्-हपप् को आवाज़) गवर्नमेंट जा कहती है कि कमीशन हिन्दुस्तानमें जहाँ भी जाता है उसका खेर मरुदम होता है अगर ऐसा ही था तो क्यों लाहौर में ऐसे हुक्म जारी किये गये फिर बायकाट करने वाले जब स्टेयन पर पहुँचे वहाँ गवर्नमेंटने तारोंका एक जङ्गल बना दिया था उसके पीछे लोगोंको खड़े होनेकी इजाज़त थी। यह ऐसा क्यों था, लालाजी उस तारोंके जङ्गलोंके पीछे खड़े थे, इसी बीचमें पुलिसका अफसर आया और उसने लाटियाँ मारनी शुरूकी। थिफार थिफार) में उस वक्त लालाजीके पास ही खड़ा था, मैंने उनसे कहा कि लालाजी आप पीछे हट जाय जब तक हम जवान हैं आप पर आच नहीं आनेदेंगे, लालाजीने

इस पर कहा कि आज जवान और नैजवानकी कोई बात नहीं पहिली गोली मुझे खानी चाहिये । साथ-साथ । हमने बहुत चाहा कि लालाजी पीछे हट जाय लेकिन लालाजी वहाँ पर डटे रहे, लालाजी सारे हिन्दुस्तानका Uncrowned (घेजात) का यादशाह था पुलिसने जान पूछ कर उन पर बार किया (धिकार-धिकार) हमें इस बातका तनिक भी रंज नहीं हम पर वाट होंगे और इससे सरस्त वाट होंगे । हमारे डंडे पड़ रहे थे लालाजीके चुन चुनका सोनेपर दंडे लगाये गये, लालाजीने उसी रातको अत्रयारोंमें यह एलाज शायी कराया कि यह डंडे मेरे नहीं मारे गये हैं बल्कि यह मिट्टिया साभ्राज्यके आद्विरो कफन की नेहे हैं । मैं तो कहूंगा कि पंजायने अपना हक निहायत वेहतरसे अदा किया, पुलिसकी ऐडोके सिवाय पंजायनेने और कुछ नहीं देखा यह तो हमने किया इतना ही नहीं पंजायमें कोई भी उनके सामने नहीं गया सिवाय जो हजूरोंको छोड़ कर, यह जरूर था कि पंजायमें कुछ लोगोंने कमीशनके सामने गवायियों दीं लेकिन हकूमतको मालूम होगया कि गवायियों देने वाले आपने ही नुमाइन्दा हैं, जहाँ भी कमीशन गया वहाँ उसके साथ ऐसा ही सलूक किया गया और जहाँ भी जायगा वहाँ भी ऐसा

Pundit Nekiram Sarma moved an amendment for the deletion of the rest of the 2nd para. of the resolution after the words " and taken a leading part in welcoming it." He spoke in Hindi.

आपने संशोधन पर हिन्दांमें बोलते हुए कहा प्रधानजी देवियो और सज्जनों ! अब तो यह किसीसे भी छिपा नहीं रहा है कि हमारे मुल्ककी हकूमतने हम पर अन्यायही करनेकी मोचली है, हम जानते हैं हमारे मुल्क पर एक ऐसी हकूमत राज्य कर रही है जो हमारी नहीं और न वह हमारे लिये राज्य ही करती है ऐसी हकूमत हमारे देश पर लगी हुई है इससे किसी तरह

ही सलूक किया जायगा । यह जूलम सिफ लाहौर नक ही महदूद नहीं रहे अगर लालाजी की मृत्युने गवर्नमैन्ट कुछ सबक सीखती और उसकी अकल दुस्त होजाती तोभी हम समझते कि उसको अकल आगई लाहौरमें गवर्नमैन्टने सब कुछ देखा हमारे बीच भारतका लाल छीन लिया इस पर सबर नहीं आया, घैसा ही जूलम लखनऊमें किया गया और तो क्या आब-बारोंके पढ़ने से तो मालूम होता है कि उससे कहीं ज्यादा जूलम हुआ । गवर्नमैन्ट यह समझी होगी कि लाहौरके जूलमोंको देख कर लोग धबरा जायगे लेकिन नहीं लागोंने तो दूने जोशसे काम लिया और गवर्नमैन्टको दिखला दिया कि हम तंग इन परवानोंकी इतनी भी कदर करते जितनेके कूड़ेकी सड़कों पर करते हैं । इस रेजोलेशनमें यह भी कहा गया है कि कमीशन जहाँ २ भी जाय उसके साथ ऐसा ही बर्ताव किया जाय, हम यह उम्मेद करते हैं कि कमीशन अभी बंगाल आसाम और मद्रासमें जाने वाला है, वहाँ तो इससे भी ज्यादा कमीशनकी महीपलीत होगी । हमें यह समझलेना चाहिये कि अपनीयात भूमिको स्वतन्त्र करानेके लिये हमें खून बहाना होगा ।

से छुटकारा मिले यह सब चाहते हैं, मैं समझता हूँ जिस देशपर हकूमत नहीं दूसरे लोग शासन करें इससे ज्यादा बढ़कर अपमान क्या हो सकता है, वह हमारे क्या लगते हैं उनसे तो हमारा कोई भी सम्बन्ध नहीं आप पिछला इतिहास उठाकर देख जाइये जबसे यह गवर्नमैन्ट आई है इसने हमारे अपमानके लिये क्या नहीं किया जबसे यह आई हर एक बात पर

हमारा अपमान किया गया हमने गवर्नमेंन्टको लड़ाईके अवसर हर प्रकारकी मददकी रूपसे, मनुष्यमे उसका फलतो मिला रौलपुट्ट और अब यह फल मिलरहा है और सबसे ताज़ा अपमान तो यह है कि हमारी तरुद्वीरका फेसला करनेके लिये हमारा हक नहीं, बल्कि सात समुद्रपारसे "सात ऋषि" Simon Commission (साईमन कमीशन) के नामसे हमारे मुल्कमें हमारा इम्तिहान लेने आते हैं, यह भी ठीक नहीं समझा गया कि कुछ एक हिन्दुस्तानी इन ३३ करोड़ोंमेंसे ऐसे निकल सकते हैं जो हमका बिल हों कि इस कमीशनके साथ बराबरीका दावा करके बैठ सकें, मैं तो अपने उन भाइयोंसे पूछता हूँ जो चिल्लाया करते थे कि हमें गवर्नमेंन्ट से बहुत कुछ आशा है अब वह आशा कहाँ गई, क्या यह अपमान नहीं तो क्या है, उन भाइयों की आंखें अब खुलनी चाहिये। वह जगह जगह घूमते हैं और यह देखते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तानके कितनी तरफकी क्या इन्टें और दिया जाय, हमारा इम्तिहान लेते फिरते हैं यही उनका काम है यात तो यह है कि जब यह कमीशन बना था तभी यह सब फेसला होगया था कि हिन्दुस्तान को क्या दिया जाय और साथही हमने भी यही फेसला कर लिया था कि हमारा इल कमीशनसे कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं लेकिन अफसोस है कि जब यह कमीशन हमारे बीचमें आया हमारे बीचमें ही कुछ आदमी ऐसे पैदा होगये जिन्होंने उनकी खातिर करना अपना धर्म समझा (धिकार-धिकार) धर्म उनके लिये कुछ नहीं, धर्म हमारे लिये है हम उनको समझा नहीं सकें उनका क्या कसूर। यह सब कुछ ठीक है कि स्वागत हमारी तरफसे नहीं हुआ, हमने तो यही किया जो हम तप कर चुके थे कुछ इन्के दुर्कोंने अगर उनकी खातिर भी की तो इसका अर्थ है स्वागत हुआ, कमीशनको मालूम होगया होगा कि हिन्दुस्ता-

नने तो काले भगडोंमे कमीशनका स्वागत किया, कुछ हमारे भाई पतनून पहनकर उनके पास पहुंचे वह संख्यमें कितने थे सो सबको मानूम ही है हर जगह उनकी संख्या १०, १५ से अधिक नहीं रही इसका भी फल यह हुआ कि गवर्नमेंन्ट मिटेनकी ओरसे यह छाप गया कि कमीशनका हिन्दुस्तानमें खूब स्वागत हुआ और साथ ही यह भी कहा गया कि तमाम हिन्दुस्तान कमीशनके साथ है। अगर तमाम हिन्दुस्तान उनके साथ ही होता तो हमारे देशमें जहाँ वह पहुंचा यह खून खगावी क्यों होती तमाम हिन्दुस्तानके नेता लाला लाजपतराय मारे गये। और इस पर यह कि डाक्टर्गोका कहना है कि उसी कारणसे उनका देहान्त हुआ, क्या वह लोग नहीं जानते जो उनके साथ बैठे हैं कि लालाजीको मृत्युका कारण यह साईमन कमीशन ही है, जो उनके साथ अब भी बैठे हैं उनका कतब्य था उन जगहमे आने और अपने किये हुए पर प्रापञ्चित करते, लेकिन धर्मकी बात है अब भी वहीं बैठे हैं ये देशके सामने अपमानके भागी हैं, जो संशोधन में आपके सामने लाया है वह इसलिये कि मैं महसूस करता हूँ कि इस प्रस्तावमे वह प्रापञ्चित नहीं करेगे। मेरी आत्मामें जो लगी है वह मुझे बाहम कर रही है कि यह संशोधन अवश्य पेश करूँ। इस Resolution (प्रस्ताव) में तो यही कहा-गया है कि उनका Social समाजिक बायकाट हो मेरी समझमें इस समाजिक बहिष्कारसे उनका कुछ ज्यादा बियगुता बनता नहीं, यह तो यही हुआ कि दो लड्डू मेरे लड्डूकेकी शादीमें खाये या नहीं खाये, कोई बड़ी बात नहीं, या आप ही ऐसी दावतोंमें शामिल नहीं हुए जहाँ जनको भी बुलाया गया हो तो क्या होता है, यह कोई बड़ी बात नहीं, उनका Political (राजनैतिक) बायकाट भी किया जाय, उनको

जगह छीन ली जाय यह जिन कौंसिलोंक मेम्बरों हों वहां से उनको जगह खाली करायो जाय, तब तो उन्हें पता चलेगा कि हां ब्रायकाट भी काई चीज़ हांतो है, इस प्रस्तावमें कहा गया गया है कि उनका हुक्का पानी बन्द हो, यह कांग्रेस Political body । राजनतिक संस्था है यह कियो

भ्रादरीकी सभा नहीं, हुक्का पानी बन्द करनेकी तो भ्रादरी सभाको पड़ा करती है। हमें तो उनका राजनेतिक बहिष्कार करना चाहिये। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि आप इसको ब्याल करके मेरा संशोधन स्वीकार करेंगे।

A Madras delegate said :—The resolution which has been so ably moved by Mr. Jamnadas Mehta I accord my humble support to. The Government with the advent of this unwanted Simon Commission in this country has created a grave situation and the Government have the temerity to say that the Indian Nation has created this grave situation. This is always the way with people who are not wanted, to put the blame on the other side. The Indian nation with one voice stated that they did not want the Commission. The Government because they felt that we would be helpless and would take very coolly all the insults that would be heaped upon us and have been heaped upon us for the last 40 years, have sent here this Commission to decide the future of our administration in this country. We have started from this platform that we do not want this Government in this country. As the mover of this resolution has so ably said there has been a secret march of this Commission from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin, leaving a trail of bleeding heads and broken bones of your brothers and sisters. My city Madras has contributed the life of one poor labourer who knew nothing about Indian public life except that out of three hundred millions of Indians he was one of those who wanted the country to be free from an unwanted Commission like the Simon Commission. He was shot down by a brute of a soldier under orders. Friends, there is no escape. Lahore has replied with the blood of Lalaji, Lucknow has replied with the insult inflicted on Jawharlal Nehru and similar deeds have occurred wherever the unwanted commission has gone, and the resolution says that the unwanted commission has had co-operation inspite of the great agitation in this country against the Commission of a few Indians for reasons which are known to all. We should not extend to them invitations to our social functions and that is what this resolution says, namely, that we shall not extend the courtesies of the nation or society to the few Indians who are co-

operating with them and that such persons should not be invited to any social function. To make the boycott effective in other places the Congress has ordained that we shall organise hartals. The Madras Government has passed orders under section 144 on about 6 lakhs of the citizens of Madras. That needs no commentary. That shows how the Commission was unwanted. Let me ask you and others to compare the reception Calcutta has given to Pundit Motilal Nehru with what Sir John Simon and his six friends received on their arrival in this country. I know the whole of Bengal and India is at one with Calcutta with regard to the reception to be given to Sir John Simon and the other unwanted six.

The amendment was put and negatived.

The original resolution of Mr. Jamnadas Mehta was then carried.

Mr. Manilal Kothari then moved the following resolution :—

“ This Congress urges on the Ruling Princes of the Indian States to introduce responsible government based on representative institutions in the states and to immediately issue proclamations or enact laws guaranteeing elementary and fundamental rights of citizenship such as rights of association, free speech, free press, and security of person and property. This Congress further assures the people of the Indian States of its sympathy with and support to their legitimate and peaceful struggle for the attainment of full responsible government in the States.”

In moving he said :—

You will remember that in the last session of the Congress held in Madras, we adopted for the first time a resolution of this character relating to the people of the Indian States and for the second time such a resolution has been moved from this platform to-day. Many of you know the state of things prevailing in Indian States. I personally belong to one of the Indian States and I claim to know something of the state of affairs prevailing in them. You all know that there is no responsible government in most of the States and in its stead personal rule prevails. The rulers of those Indian States think themselves to be the rulers and masters and owners not only of the state, not only of the revenues, but also of the people themselves. That is certainly a very wrong and erroneous conception of the position. The State comprises of both Princes and people but so far the princes

have treated the people as part and parcel of their estate. They feel that they are at liberty to spend the revenues of the state just as they like. They think themselves autocrats and they conduct their affairs like autocrats. Any subject of a State can be deprived of his liberty at any time and be cast into prison without a trial and without even the semblance of a trial and people can be deprived of their property at any time without any fault being established against them. I am prepared to name States where such acts are being perpetrated by rulers without the slightest hesitation and without compunction. The Government of India which is bound by treaty obligations to look after the people in charge of Indian rulers has done nothing to remove the grievances of the people. We, in Indian States, do not enjoy those elementary rights of citizenship which you enjoy in British India. In British India you can do something, but in the Indian States we can do nothing. We cannot even hold meetings without permission from the Administration, and in nine cases out of ten this permission is not given and in the one case in which it is given, it is saddled with all sorts of conditions which are well nigh impossible to fulfill. We have no printing presses in very many of the States. There are a large number of States where we do not have newspapers. We cannot form associations, we cannot hold meetings, we cannot issue newspapers, we cannot ventilate our grievances from the public platform. In one of the premier states of Central India, which I shall not name, lest it be said that I am casting all sorts of accusations against a particular state, my friend went to the Dewan and asked for such permission but the Dewan refused permission. He said he would have no objection to my staying in that place for some time for studying the problems, but he was not in favour of my addressing a meeting. There are so many places where we cannot hold meetings, but is our position. At the same time you know that out of the vast revenues of the state what allotment is made for education, and what allotment is made for nation-building subjects. If you see the amounts in proportion to the revenues you will be shocked. In a state the revenue of which is 50 to 60 lakhs you will find only 40,000 or 45,000 budgetted for education. How can you expect progress in these States under these circumstances, without any facilities being given by their rulers, who, for their own princely pleasures, spend any amount unchecked. The

people cannot speak and they cannot get the right people to speak on subjects like this for them. Now I tell you things have changed, and a great progress of democratic ideas in India has more or less created an awakening in these States. 70 millions of Indians can not be kept in hermetically sealed tins or watertight compartments for long. We must begin to agitate and in a short time things will be alright, but we want your co-operation and we are grateful to you for having a resolution of this character. You urge upon the princes the need to establish responsible Government in the States based on representative institutions. Failing that we have got to do something. They give us the rule of Law. What is that rule of law and good government which they are offering us. I, as a subject of an Indian State, refuse to accept that thing which is called "rule of Law and good government." It may be a rule of law but it does not satisfy the legitimate aspirations of my heart. I want full responsible government. We say that we want representative Government based upon representative institutions. We want to have District and Local Boards, we want municipalities, we want Legislative Councils, on an elective basis, and that is the constitution that we propose to evolve. We assure the members that we shall have a place of honour and dignity, and a place of power also if they only care to look into these things properly. In British India democratic ideas are making a great deal of progress and that will effect their position in the States. The Indian States form component parts of the whole of India and we must evolve a homogenous India out of these two parts. By this they will lose nothing but on the contrary they will stand to gain something substantial. At the present moment the Indian Princes are asking the British Government to protect them. Have you read the letter addressed to the President by Sir Leslie Scott. What does he say? Under treaty obligations the Paramount Power is under obligations to keep up an army for giving protection to the Indian States. I cannot understand for the life of me what right the Princes have to ask for protection from the Crown and what right the Crown has to extend that protection without giving the people of India the right to determine this. They have appointed a States Enquiry Committee, but I assure you that it is a misnomer to call it so. It is only a committee in which the Princes are given a hearing and facilities to place their view points before the committee.

but the 70 millions of their subjects in those Indian States are deliberately debarred from placing their view points before it. Therefore I say with all the emphasis that I can command that the findings of that committee would not affect us in the least. We do not even follow its deliberations and we the people of the Indian States will make our progress in spite of its decisions. My time is up and I must obey the Chair. I may tell you that we have given up the idea of placing our case before the Committee. Why do they want direct relations with the Crown and protections from the British Crown? That they might get protection against us and against the rising tide of Indian Nationalism. Now one word more and I have done. I want to be able to say from this platform in your name that the Indian Princes have no need for protection from outside. Instead, they should rely on the loyalty and affection of their own subjects. Their subjects are all animated by goodwill and affection for the Princes and they are willing to give the Princes all possible protection. In case of need we are prepared to shed the last drop of our blood for their sake and for the vindication of their honour, if they only trust us. They do not need the protection of the British bayonets. Suppose they have that protection, what is it like? How long will it endure and of what value will it be against the tide of rising Nationalism. How long will the British bayonets give the Indian princes any protection? By taking protection from the British they are placing themselves in a worse position than at present. The British say that they are not in India for their own good, but for the sake of suffering humanity, but we Indians say we do not want their protection. We say that it is not protection. We assure the Indian princes that if you trust us we shall worship you and love and we shall be loyal to you. The Maharaja of Bikanir in the course of a memorable speech which he made says that they are proud of their ancestry and blood. If he is proud of his blood and his ancestry we are prouder still. It is a matter of shame that to-day hardly anything of their noble ancestry and blood is visible in their acts. The Maharajah of Bikanir is a man of chivalry, of education and of progressive ideas, but let him show us these things in a tangible form and we shall be grateful to him. We are grateful to an enlightened ruler like the Nawab of Bhopal. We pray to God to help him to carry out all his wishes for the benefit of the people. I am

sorry my time is up and Mr. Girdhari Lal is pulling me from the back.

Mr. Satyamurthi seconded the resolution. In seconding he said :—

After the exhaustive and exhausting speech of my friend Monilal Kothari who moved this resolution I do not propose to detain you for more than a few minutes in seconding this resolution. Like him I also come from an Indian State from which I am practically to-day externed. Therefore I can speak on behalf of the people of Indian States with first hand knowledge. This resolution is in part a reiteration of the resolution which the Indian National Congress passed at Madras last year. It says that " it urges the Indian Princes to establish responsible Government based on representative institutions in their States." I want the Princes who are supposed to be ruling Indian States not to misunderstand me or the Indian National Congress when I say that the best friends that they have to-day or that they have had at any time are the people of British India, are the people of the Indian States themselves. They will be mistaken if they rely upon the support of the British Government in maintaining their autocratic powers in the States. I may also add that we have nothing but the utmost good will for these princes. We ask them from this platform to watch the signs of the times and not to imagine that they can keep back the wave of modern democracy. The Czar of All the Russians, Wilhelm II of Germany, The Tsar of Austria,—and all these mighty potentates have dropped out of political importance in Europe and the Princes of India must know that they cannot any longer go on governing their States as if they were autocrats. Let me tell them in all humility that they have no future as autocrats. Their best friends are the people of the states themselves. It is therefore as much in their interests as in ours that they should carry out the resolution in all friendship, and that they should establish responsible Government in the States. They have recently tried other methods like engaging costly counsels to plead their cause before the Butler Committee and the only reward they have got is the insulting statement of Sir Leslie Scott who said that as in the case of the untouchables . . . the British Government are the trustees for the Indian Princes and the British Government cannot give up their protection. I don't think the Indian Princes are going to accept any

such humiliating position. On the other hand we will offer them a noble partnership on free and equal terms in the Commonwealth of India for the people of India. But let me tell them that we in India cannot have anything to do with autocratic princes unless they speak in the name of their own people. Therefore in the interests of the people and in the interests of the future of the country, the Indian National Congress urges upon the Indian Princes to establish responsible government based on representative institutions in their states. The second part of this resolution wants a declaration of rights. There may be, and I grant there is, some rule of law in British India except when the Government chooses to defend the Simon Commission or loses its head as it often does. But I regret to say there are several Indian States and I will grant that there are several honourable exceptions,—that there are several Indian states where there is no rule of law, no freedom of speech, no security of property, no security of life and you must remember that in these Indian states these anchorisms cannot go any longer. But the third and most important part of this resolution is an assurance of sympathy and support on behalf of the Indian Nation as represented by the Indian National Congress to the people of Indian states in their struggle for freedom and responsible government in their states. I consider this an epoch in the history of the Congress. [If I may anticipate for a moment the decision of the Congress, this Congress will endeavour to remove the proviso in the constitution which says that the Congress shall not interfere in the internal affairs of the Indian states. We want to assure the people of the Indian states from this platform that all the resources of the Indian National Congress and all the sympathy and support of the Indian people are at the disposal of the people of Indian states in their manful and just struggle to get full and responsible government established in their states.] With these few words I have very great pleasure in seconding this resolution and commending it to the unanimous acceptance of this House.

Mr. Anusmya Panth supported the resolution. He spoke in Hindi.

सभापतिजी, मैं आज अपना बड़ा सौभाग्य समझता हूँ कि आज मुझे अपनी राष्ट्रीय महा-सभाके पदपरसे एक ऐसे प्रस्ताव पर बोलनेकी

आज्ञा मिली है जिसका सम्बन्ध सारे भारतवर्ष से है। हिन्दू लोग अपने राजाओंमें ईश्वरका अंशमानते हैं, यह इस लिये ऐसा मानते हैं कि

क्योंकि राजा लोग अपनी रैयतकी उन्नतीकी ऐसी ही फिक्र करते थे जैसे बाप अपनी बेटेकी करती है मैं उस प्रदेशका रहने वाला हूँ जहाँ देसी राज्या है वहाँ अङ्गरेजी राज्यका हाथ बहुत थोड़ा है आप लोगोंको मालूम होगा कि गढ़वाल कभी दिल्ली राज्यके अन्दर था लेकिन सब अपनी ही करतूतोंसे इन राजाओंने सब खो दिया। मैं आपको विश्वास दिलाता हूँ कि आप इन राजाओंसे कहें कि वह हमारे स्वत्व हमें दें। हमें उनसे कुछ भगड़ा नहीं, हमारे गढ़वालमें तो फिर भी बहुत आराम है मैं इस प्रस्तावका समर्थन करता हूँ, भाइयों यह कहा गया है कि राजा लोग अपनी प्रजा पर मन मानी करते हैं गढ़वालके राजा ऐसे हैं जिनके सामने सब नाचते हैं यह क्यों हैं इसलिये कि गढ़वालके राजा सब प्रजाका ख्याल रखते हैं, सबकी देख भाल रखते हैं।

सभापतिजी, प्यारे सज्जनों! जिन प्रस्तावका समर्थन मैं करने जा रहा हूँ उसपर बहुत कुछ सुन चुके हैं मैं आपका अधिक समय लेना नहीं चाहता मैं भी देसी रियासतका जन्म है प्रस्ताव सामने रखता है इसमें यही बतलाया गया है कि राजा लोग अपने राज्योंको सुधारलें। राजा लोग अपना समय इंग्लैंडमें गुजारते हैं उससे प्रजाकी हानि तो है ही उनको भी हानि है देसी रियासतोंके रहने वालोंको यह शिकायत बनी रहती है कि राजा लोग हम रे दुखों पर ध्यान नहीं देते अपने आराममें तो बहुत धन व्यय करते हैं, हम यह आगाह कर देते हैं कि देसी रियासतोंकी प्रजा हम है अगर तुम ऐसा नहीं करोगे तो हमें यह करना पड़ेगा। देसी रियासतकी प्रजा इसपर ध्यान देगी और अपनी हक लेनेको तैय्यार होगी आप भी इस प्रस्ताव पर ध्यान दें और चाहे कि देसी राज्योंकी प्रजा खुदी हो।

Mr. Sett Jammalal Bajaj also supported it in a Hindi speech.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru on behalf of the President said that a number of changes in the Constitution have been disposed of in the Subjects Committee.

He moved that :—The following additions and alterations are to be incorporated in the constitution :—

(1) Art. III (f). That the A. I. C. C. be authorised to affiliate Committees outside India.

He said that this was necessary in order to prevent applicants from being kept waiting till the next Session of the Congress.

The motion was carried.

(2) Art. V. Resolved that the N. W. F. Province be separated from the Punjab and formed into a separate Congress Province.

The motion was carried.

(3) Art. VIII, para. 3. Delete the proviso at the end of the clause after " 1921 " and put a fullstop.

He said :—The clause that is proposed to be deleted is the one which says that the Congress are not to interfere with the internal affairs of the Indian states.

The motion was carried.]

(4) Art. VIII, last para. Instead of " 10 days " substitute " 7 days." Omit the last two sentences.

He said :—Some changes have been made in regard to delegates or the sending of delegates. It is this. Most of you are aware that there are various difficulties and various complaints and objections have been made with regard to the election of delegates. It is proposed to make one or two changes which will result in a better arrangement in future. The proposal is that in future no interim vacancies will be allowed to be filled up, within seven days of the Congress. After that no change can be made.

The motion was carried.

(5) Art. IX. Instead of the words " from time to time " insert " at its first meeting after the Congress " and add the following sentence at the end :—

"In fixing the subscription the A. I. C. C. shall pay regard not merely to the population of the province but to its financial capacity."

The motion was carried.

(6) Art. XI. Resolved that the fee to be paid by each delegate to the Congress be Rs. 5/.

Mr. Shri Prokash moved :

That in Article XI " The delegation fees be raised from Re. 1 to Rs. 5."

He spoke in Hindi.

B. L. Sashtri :—I rise to oppose this resolution.

Though I have been advised by a few friends to the contrary, I still oppose this resolution. I believe that our leaders, the pilot of whom is Mahatmaji, have brought in this Congress democratic ideas, so that each poor delegate might take his proper share in its deliberations, call them workers or peasants, or whatever you like. The men cannot afford to pay more than one rupee in respect of delegation fees. If others are able to pay more let them do so. There is no rule or

constitution which debars them from paying more. This resolution has come up year after year and has been defeated year after year and I hope and trust it will be defeated again to-day. All that Shri Prokash has said with regard to the difficulties is true but the resolution should not be accepted. I do not know the opinion of the Mahatma. We need not think of this or that opinion or even the opinion of the Mahatma in this matter. My own humble submission is that the average man is not able to pay more than one rupee and let us not penalise a man for his poverty.

Mr. Nimbkar :—I rise to oppose this resolution for raising the delegation fee from Re. 1 to Rs. 5. It was at the instance of Mahatma Gandhi at the Cawnpore Congress that the delegation fee was reduced from Rs. 5 to Re. 1. The intention in reducing the fee was to draw the masses of the people into the Congress. You remember the other day when Mr. Sen Gupta delivered his address he said that the Indian National Congress is not a bourgeois body. If the sentence of Mr. Sen Gupta is admitted then I say you will have to keep the fees down; don't keep it a bourgeois body but keep it a mass body and the masses of this country cannot afford to pay Rs. 5. The question has been raised how will you defray the expenses of the Congress. I will answer that question. Mahatma Gandhi has got his programme passed to-day and that programme says that every member whose earnings are more than Rs. 100 shall pay five per cent. of his income. I am sure that if the members are honest with regard to that resolution a large amount of money will be collected. I would request you that if the Indian National Congress is to achieve its goal of independence, you must not bar the door against the masses. The poor workers earn from Rs. 10 to 15 a month and they cannot pay a fee of Rupees five. I ask you therefore unanimously to throw out this proposal which has been put before you.

Mr. Rajendro Prosad supported the resolution, speaking in Hindi.

Pundit Jawaharlal Nehru also supported the resolution speaking in Hindi.

The motion was then put to the vote and carried.

(7) Art. XVII (a) " One-fifth " instead of " half."

Pundit Jawaharlal Nehru :—The question now is how this Rs. 5 is to be distributed between the A. I. C. C. and the Reception Committee. The proposal adopted in the Subjects Committee was that the A. I. C. C. would get four and the Reception Committee Re. 1. Some friends have sent in notices of amendments that it should be divided half and half. The Secretary of the Punjab Congress Committee wants to say something as regards the Reception Committee getting something more, because the Congress will be sitting at Lahore next year. He suggests giving two to the Reception Committee and three to the A. I. C. C. This does not relate to this year's Reception Committee but it will apply to future years.

The proposition that the delegation fee of Rs. 5 should be divided giving Rs. 4 to the A. I. C. C. and Re. 1 to the Reception Committee was carried.

(8) Art. XVII (b). That 50% of the surplus remaining in the hands of the Congress Reception Committee be paid over to the A. I. C. C.

He said :—This will not apply to the Present Calcutta Sessions but will be applicable to the future.

The motion was carried.

At this stage the auditor's report, as appended at the end, was presented before the House. The report being accepted, Pundit Jawaharlal proceeded with the remaining motions for changes in the Congress Constitution.

(9) Art. XXIII, para. 1. Instead of " three " before " General Secretariats " insert " two."

He said : The number of secretaries have been reduced from three to two.

The motion was carried.

(10) He moved as a consequential amendment to Art. XXIV, line 3 : substitute " 10 " for " 9 " and " that the number of members of the Working Committee be increased by one."

The motion was carried.

(11) At the beginning of the second para. add the following.

THERE SHALL BE A PERMANENT FUND of the Congress the interest of which shall be used for the ordinary work of the All-India Congress Committee. The corpus of the fund shall not be spent.

The motion was carried.

(12) Add new para. 4. There shall be one permanent paid Secretary who shall be in charge of the office of the A. I. C. C.

The motion was carried.

(13) That the A. I. C. C. be authorised to elect General Secretaries and Treasurer and Auditor for the year 1929.

(14) Deportation of Mr. W. J. Johnston. This Congress condemns the action of the Government in arresting and deporting without trial Mr. W. J. Johnston, the fraternal delegate to the Congress from the League against Imperialism and considers this as a deliberate attempt on the part of the Government to prevent the Congress from developing international contacts.

The motion was carried.

Dr. Ansari said :—I want to introduce to you Monsieur Bui Kuang Chieu, Chief of the Nationalist Party of Anam, Indo-China. He has come to you to represent his party and his country. Whilst he was coming to attend the Indian National Congress he had been subjected to a good deal of hardship by the Police. (Shame). At Singapore he had actually to leave his steamer and get into a cargo boat, owing to which he was late in reaching here. Even to-day when he and his brother delegate arrived in Calcutta they were put to a great deal of trouble. Their papers were examined, and the letters they had from Pundit Jawaharlal Nehru were opened and read, and after a great deal of fuss these gentlemen have been allowed to come here. I hope you will allow me to welcome them on your behalf and to express our feelings of appreciation and gratitude for the trouble they have taken to come to us here. I will now ask Mr. Bui Kuang Chieu to address you.

Mr. Bui Kuang Chieu addressed the meeting in French. Pundit Jawaharlal Nehru translated his speech as follows :—“ He says he has arrived too late to assist in the deliberations of this Congress but still in the name of the Party he represents, the Constitutional Party of

Anam in Indo-China, he brings us the good wishes of his people for our welfare. You are 300 millions of people and he comes from a country of 20 millions. It was not a question of quantity but the quality of their sincerity. He says that the presence of himself and his friend who have come from Indo-China is a mark of their extreme sympathy in the cause of freedom for which we are fighting. He is full of admiration for this magnificent and fine gathering and he wishes you to remember, fighting as you are for your own liberty, that this work of emancipation is not the work of one country or one nation or one people, but it is the common work of all those who are oppressed and all those who suffer. In conclusion he says " Long live the freedom of India."

Pundit Jawaharlal Nehru then translated the speech in Hindi for the benefit of those who did not understand English.

Mr. Bejoy Krishna Bose moved that " The Congress conveys its sympathies to the families of the undermentioned brave sons of Bengal who underwent suffering and imprisonment without trial for the cause of the country and died during their imprisonment as a result of their incarceration—Anurup Chandra Sen, Ranjit Banerji, Noresh Chandra Choudhuri, Joshoda Ranjan Pal and Sib Sankar Bramachari.

In moving he said :—This is a resolution which is peculiar to Bengal. We feel very strongly and we want this Congress to extend its sympathy particularly to those who have died in incarceration and as a result of their incarceration. Of these five gentlemen whose names are mentioned here Anurup Chandra Sen, died of dysentery while he was incarcerated at Benares. Ranajit Banerji died of gastric ulcers while he was interned in the Faridpur Dist., Noresh Candra Choudhuri died of phthisis in the U. P. Joshoda Ranjan Pal died also of phthisis in the Rajshahi gaol, and Sib Sankar Bramachari died of small-pox in the Alipore gaol. Gentlemen who take interest in the proceedings of the Legislative Council of Bengal know very well that when interpellations were put in the Council for the purpose of eliciting information in regard to the case of each of these persons, the Member-in-Charge only gave evasive replies, and always relied on the reports of the gaol officers. These young men, these martyrs who died for the cause of the country, who died in the political fight and for their poli-

tical convictions, died a slow death in jail of tuberculosis, dysentery and other diseases and interpellations and discussion in the Council will show that they were not sufficiently medically treated when they were suffering from these diseases and in order that no blame might be attached to the Government, the Government with a shame-faced-ness tried to explain that the information about these men suffering from these diseases was not correct, but those in the Council who had better knowledge of these facts maintained that they were suffering with these diseases for a long time. I will not take up your time over this resolution, but I would ask the Congress to extend its sympathy and convey the same to the families of this martyrs. (Applause.)

Mr. N. C. Bardoli in seconding the resolution said :—

Bengal has suffered a great deal for the cause of our freedom. It is the blood of the Bengal martyrs which cemented the first steps towards our emancipation and to-day we are here to mourn the loss of some of the martyrs who died for the sake of their Motherland, smilingly, willingly inspite of so much suffering and so much torture. I must say that their deaths make all of us feel grieved. Let us join our feeble voices with the voices of people of other provinces that have felt for these martyrs and feel for suffering Bengal and I say that these men who have died for the sake of their country, who have died at the hands of the ruthless Bureaucracy that they have left a legacy to Bengal, —to the young men of Bengal, not only to Bengal but the whole of India and the legacy is that by their blood and sacrifice you must now pave the way for India's freedom. I express my heartfelt condolences to the families of these departed martyrs and I also say a word addressed to the authors of these outrages in their own language, "Rome shall perish, write that word in the blood that she has spilt."

The resolution was put and carried.

Mr. Sham Sunder Chakravarty then moved the following resolution :—

"In the opinion of the Congress the internment of the Ex-Maharajah of Nabha in Kodaikanal under Regulation III of 1818 is unjust, uncon-

stitutional and vindictive. The Congress assures the Maharajah and his family of its sympathy in the grave wrong done to them."

He said :—You need not apprehend from me a very long speech at the fag end of the day while moving this resolution. It is common knowledge among our politically minded people of to-day what the Maharajah of Nabha has suffered at the hands of the Bureaucracy. Take it from me one who has studied his case diligently, that the head and front of his offence is that he stands for independence, while as an Indian Prince he is expected to be a slave to be manipulated as the Bureaucracy likes. The cup of his humiliation has been filled to the brim and his heart is full of misery. You may have learnt that he was a King, he had no indication of the suffering he was to undergo and although born with a silver spoon in his mouth he has shown no signs of weakness. I have always felt that the measure of our political advance lies in our capacity to come to the rescue of our political prisoners. I am ashamed to say that we have never done much in that respect.

Lalchand A. Jagatiani seconded the resolution and said :—I rise to second the resolution which has now been brought before you by our friend Mr. Sham Sunder Chakravarty. I do not suppose the resolution stands in need of any argument from me. You all know very well how much this Maharajah has suffered at the hands of the British Bureaucracy. He has not been allowed to have his queen and his children with him. He was not allowed even to go and see his mother when she was on her death bed. He has been treated as a common prisoner. Regulation III of 1818 has been applied to this man's case. Other Indian Princes who are anxious to have direct connections with the Crown may learn a lesson from the treatment that is being meted out to this Maharajah. You will agree with me therefore that it is only in the fitness of things that delegates of the Indian National Congress should sympathise with the Maharajah of Nabha. You must understand that he is suffering at the hands of the Bureaucracy simply because he has been known to be the staunchest of Nationalists. Mr. Monilal Kothari gave you a woeful history of the doings of these Indian Princes. But the British Government would do nothing and would not touch them inspite of the fact that there were complaints against them by the subjects of those Princes. But in the case of Nabha, although there were no complaints from the subjects living in his state,

the British Government interned him first, at Dehra Dun, as I understand, and now at a place where the climate does not agree with him. I need not detain you long over this resolution. It does not require any eloquent words to bring you to a decision. I hope, therefore, that you will all support this resolution and pass it unanimously.

Baba Gurdit Singh supported the resolution speaking in Hindi.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

It was next moved from the Chair :—

“ This Congress emphatically condemns the action of the British Government in continuing the detention of Bhai Santa Singh, Bhai Gajjan Singh, Bhai Daswantha Singh under Regulation III and congratulates them on their heroic suffering.

This Congress also condemns the continued incarceration of the Punjab martial law prisoners including Messrs. Bugge and Ratto and of the martial law prisoner Shri M. P. Narayana Menon of Kerala who has spurned all offers of conditional release, and of the Moplah prisoners and the Congress congratulates them on their suffering and sacrifice.

“ This Congress strongly condemns the unwarranted raids, and searches in Lahore and the arrests of Lala Kedarnath Saigal and other prominent Nationalist workers of the Congress, the Naujawan Bharat Sabha and the Students' Union in the Punjab. It records its strong indignation at the behaviour of the police in torturing the arrested persons.

The motion was carried.

Lala Girdhari Lal :—The resolution which I have the pleasure to place before you is an invitation from the Punjab to hold the next Session of the Indian National Congress in Lahore. It reads thus :—
“ Resolved that the next Session of the Congress be held at Lahore.”

Brother delegates, it is not necessary for me to put before you any arguments in inviting your acceptance of this resolution. For the last four years the Punjab Provincial Congress Committee has been approaching the Congress for permission to hold its sessions in the Punjab, but for various reasons our invitation has not yet been accepted and we had to give in, and for other weighty reasons the Congress had to be held in other Provinces. For the next year we extend to you a hearty welcome in our Province. We may not offer you the palatial

buildings, the elaborate arrangements for comfort, which our friends of Bengal have provided. Our services which we shall offer you will be from the bottom of our hearts and we shall do all we can within the limited means which we possess to make the Session of the Congress there a success. It will depend on your co-operation and upon your overlooking our faults and our limitations. I hope I need not say anything further on this subject and I trust that all brother delegates and sisters will accept this our invitation with acclamation.

Sardar Sardul Singh :—I second the proposition put before you by Lala Girdhari Lal. In supporting this I have only one word to say and that is this. Only yesterday you passed a resolution saying in so many words that if the Government did not come to terms within the next year, you mean to declare for independence at the beginning of 1930 and that would be at Lahore. It was the Punjab that came into the possession of the British last, and it is in the fitness of things that the declaration should be made in the Punjab.

The resolution was carried with acclamation.

Mr. J. M. Sen Gupta :—Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, you will pardon me if I say I feel extremely happy to be able to breathe a sigh of relief at the fact that this Congress is about to end. Continuing he said :—

I was saying that in Calcutta this year the Congress week has lengthened into a fortnight. It has been our great honour to have you all here for such a long time and we do not at all regret that the week has lengthened itself into a fortnight. From day to day, from hour to hour, from minute to minute, situations were arising during the Congress period which were sometimes grave, sometimes serious, and sometimes almost unmanageable. You all know what anxious time we all went through during the last six or seven days. But I am glad to say that we have triumphed over all those difficulties. To-day I have to say that under the Presidentship of Pundit Motilal Nehru the Indian National Congress has taken, I hope the final step, for gaining complete independence for India. (Applause.) There were differences and there were fights but I hope at the end of this Session all of us who took part in these controversies will forget, when the programme

is going to be carried into action, that we have fought at all. If we have fought, and fought on controversies which arose in this Pandal, let us not remember any bitterness afterwards, remembering that outside the Congress Pandal the enemy is waiting outside to give us battle. Pundit Motilal Nehru has presided over this Congress with great efficiency and, if I may say so, with great courage. It was not only sitting here, giving rulings, ringing the bell, and fixing the time limit that he was called upon to do. But remember we were passing through a big and critical situation. There was the National Convention over which Dr. Ansari was presiding and there were other difficulties. There was the Simon Commission and there was the challenge of the British Government and there is no man in India to-day who was more and who is more worthy to fill the chair of the Indian National Congress, who is more worthy to fight the fight of the National independence than Pundit Motilal Nehru and I offer him on your behalf your thanks and the thanks of the Reception Committee and the thanks of the Indian National Congress and the thanks of the whole Indian Nation. In my opening address I told you that the work before the Reception Committee was indeed heavy. You must have realised that we were faced with tremendous difficulties. Not only had we this gigantic Congress, but we had the Exhibition to look after and an Exhibition, I make bold to say, the like of which has never been seen or attempted to be organised by Indians without the help of any other people. I do submit to you that you will from your own goodness forgive us for all the sins of commission and omission for which we might have been guilty. I must at the same time express one word of admiration for those volunteers, who might have used a little individual force,—little here or there,—but, who for a fortnight and most of them without rest for 48 hours, worked for you day and night. A word of appreciation from me and from all of you should be uttered in their favour. Remember, as I told you before, the difficulties were great and the services they rendered were not because they got anything in return for it, but it was simply because of their love and desire to serve their country. I can name any number of gentlemen who have helped the Reception Committee to make this organisation a success. We must not forget our General Secretary, Dr. Bidhan Chandra Roy. He was the man behind the scenes. He was

the brain of the Huge City. I must not omit Subhas Chandra Bose, the Officer, commanding the volunteers, and Mrs. Latika Basu, who was in charge of the lady volunteers. I may mention here that for the first time in the history of our national life have we seen in Calcutta during this period of national work, a number of organisations, meetings and conferences of ladies,—of ladies alone, where they have taken up important questions for discussion and decision. One of the things with which I am pleased and all of you must be pleased, is the way the Lady Volunteers were disciplined. (Applause). The two Secretaries Messrs. Suresh Chandra Mazumdar and Amar Ghose of the Kitchen Department are well known to you. They have given us very valuable services. Mr. Nalini Ranjan Sarkar, the Secretary of the Exhibition, along with the other secretaries, has not been having any sleep for the last fortnight. Therefore I beg of you to remember that all these people and many others, e.g., Mr. Kiron Sankar Roy, in charge of the Pandal,—all these gentlemen deserve our thanks. I must not forget also Mrs. Sarala Devi in charge of the music. It was a difficult matter to arrange the music so that it could be heard in all parts of the great Pandal. I would beg of you to remember our difficulties and whatever fault our workers, our officers, our volunteers, might be guilty of they were entirely due to the amount of work that was put upon their shoulders and not with any deliberate intention to annoy or insult anybody. With these words I offer a hearty vote of thanks to our President.

Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar in returning thanks on behalf of the Delegates said :—

It is now my most pleasant duty, to thank the Reception Committee and all its auxiliary organisations on behalf of the numerous delegates assembled in this Congress coming from the various provinces and the many visitors as well. I should like at the outset to say that this Congress, which is the first to be held in this city and in Bengal after our beloved Deshbandhu's death, is of the most memorable description. The Reception Committee had not only anxieties of various descriptions to contend with, in addition to their ordinary duties, which were onerous enough, but they had this year an exceptional assemblage and various conventions taxing their endurance to the utmost limits of humanity, and the number of days during

which we have forgathered here, are certainly far more than it has been given to any Reception Committee in any province to cope with. They have done their work splendidly. It is not a mere courtesy thanks, it is not a conventional word of praise; we must have realised, everyone of us, the very substantial comforts, which were very lavishly given to us. There was no kind of stint or grudge in the very complicated arrangements, which have so smoothly worked. The substantial nature of the accommodation, the provision of arrangements against the cold, deserves a special word of praise, more than that the admirable sanitary arrangements about which everyone with whom I have come in contact has testified to. It is a matter which the successors of this Congress Reception Committee must take note of. I must confess the Reception Committee of this Congress has made the task of its successors a very formidable one. It will be very difficult for any other Reception Committee to equal, - much less to surpass these arrangements. I must also praise them for the creature comforts as also for the way in which our wants in many directions have been attended to. I must at the outset thank the Chairman of the Reception Committee for the wonderful way in which he has made this Congress' arrangements a success and I have a personal word of appreciation as he is an old friend of mine and you will permit me to add that word of appreciation. I must also say that he has rendered my task easier by mentioning the names of his various colleagues. - He should have left it to me if I wanted to be somewhat punctilious, but he has rendered my task easier because I might not remember the names of all the members of the Reception Committee who have contributed to the success of the arrangements. To Dr. Bidhan Chandra Roy, the General Secretary, our warmest praise must be given. He must have spent many sleepless nights and his lot has been not only to attend to the business arrangements but other arrangements as well and to share the anxieties of delegates and other workers. To Nalini Ranjan Sarkar, the Exhibition Secretary, our thanks are equally given and to Subhas Bose, the G.O.C., my warmest congratulations and thanks are to be given for the splendid arrangements that he has made and the excellent way in which he has trained the volunteers, giving them the necessary discipline and the new spirit which he has imparted. He has taught the Bureaucracy

that Bengali youths can be trained under Indian leadership as well as European youths can be trained under European leadership. Altogether our volunteers have done admirable work. Of course there may be complaints here and there but in a vast assembly of this description you cannot expect that every delegate should receive the utmost courtesy and the best kind of treatment. They have all received courteous and kind treatment and there have been only a few instances in which complaints have been made about the arrangements in connection with the Volunteer Corps and this shows that the arrangements in connection with the Volunteer Corps has been an unexampled success and deserves our warmest and most unstinted praise. The musical arrangements under Mrs. Sarala Devi Dutt Chowdhury has been an unique addition to the many excellent features which we have witnessed during the last few days and that I hope will be paralleled by the successors of this Reception Committee elsewhere for I consider that martial music, the music of freedom and independence, the music of Swaraj is the one thing which is needed more than any other to make our blood leap and boil especially of the older people. It is that music that is necessary in every department in life more especially in political gatherings of this description. I hope that will be remembered by every Reception Committee. I have no personal knowledge of the work the ladies have done and not being a lady myself I cannot say much but I will say that they deserve our warmest gratitude for the services they have rendered in connection with this Assembly. The strain to which our lady volunteers have been put must have been very considerable and therefore exceptional gratitude is their meed. Then the Medical Corps is equally deserving of our gratitude and I think we must express our indebtedness to them. I do not think that anyone at all would hesitate to agree with me in giving our warmest acknowledgements and admiration to my friend Kiran Sankar Roy for the excellent arrangements he has made. The loud speakers have been more of a success than the loud speakers installed in Madras last year. I hope these loud speakers will continue to be a feature of our Congresses. Considering that there are 6,000 delegates and a huge mass of visitors loud speakers are necessary and I hope that the Lahore Congress Committee will do what the Calcutta Reception Committee has done whatever the cost of these loud speakers may be. I must also in addi-

tion express my gratitude to Mr. S. P. Gupta in surpassing the loud speakers and putting the resolutions before the House for the vote last night. To my friend Dr. Das Gupta, who was the Procession Secretary, we owe thanks. I understand that the procession was a most wonderful procession and even the Anglo-Indian papers have spoken of it. To Dr. K. S. Roy, who has been in charge of the Medical Corps, to Mrs. Latika Basu who was in command of the Lady Volunteers and Mr. Subhas Bose who was in charge of the Cavalry, and to Mr. Suresh Mazumdar who was in charge of the accommodation arrangements which have been most beautiful and Mr. Amar Ghose, who was in charge of the Kitchen arrangements our acknowledgements are equally due, and therefore all I can say is that warm-hearted, emotional Bengal has treated us all in her own generous way. I never expected anything less than this from my beloved Bengal, Deshbandhu's Bengal, and Bengal has surpassed herself in this Congress and therefore I conclude on your behalf with an expression of the profoundest gratitude to all those others whose names I have not been able to ascertain and whom I have not known, for the work they have done in the cause. To everyone of you who have been responsible for the work of this Reception our deep thanks are due. I think our thanks are equally due to the various representatives of the various foreign countries that have visited us here, to our fraternal delegates from London, Indo-China, and various other places. I must also congratulate the delegates on their passing this resolution raising the delegation fees from Re. 1 to Rs. 5. That has been marvellous and I wondered how you could have done that. This marvellous result was brought about by the courageous speech of Rajendra Prasad which decided the votes of the House. I do not propose to say anything about other matters because it is the Chairman of the Reception Committee's privilege to speak on that. I only say that the goal of complete independence is in sight and if it is not in sight it will be in sight at the next Congress at Lahore where the flag will be raised and there will not be any kind of hesitation or vacillation. With these words I ask you to accord your unanimous gratitude in acclamations of a resonant and sonorous character to the Chairman of the Reception Committee and to all those other friends I have forgotten to mention. I have forgotten to mention the name of my friend Mr.

Sarat Bose, who as Treasurer, must have made the work a success. I offer thanks to my friend Jawaharlal Nehru, the untiring man, who did good work and who does not require my praise and yours. I need not, therefore, detain you any further and I ask you to carry the vote with acclamation. In favour of warm-hearted Bengal, patriotic Bengal, Bengal which is as certain as anything can possibly be, in the forefront of politics, and which is not going to be left behind by any other province. I do not think Bengal has been provincial or parochial. Take it from me that Bengal is going to do its level best in the forthcoming year to bring about complete Independence for India. (Loud and prolonged applause).⁶

The President returned thanks in a speech delivered in Hindi.

[178]
REPORT OF THE GENERAL SECRETARIES OF THE CONGRESS
For The Year 1928

The Annual Report for 1928, as presented by the General Secretaries to the All-India Congress Committee in accordance with Article XXIII of the Congress Constitution, was adopted and ran as follows :—

The hand of death has fallen heavily on the country and the Congress during the year under report. Hardly had the Madras Sessions of the Congress ended when news came of the death of an ex-president, the loved and respected Hakim Ajmal Khan, than whom no one had laboured more for the removal of distrust and friction between Hindus and Muslims. Later in the year another ex-president, Lord Sinha, passed away, and on the 17th of November the whole country was shocked and deeply grieved to learn of the sudden death of a third ex-president, Lala Lajpat Rai. The tragedy of Lalaji's death was all the more felt and resented because it followed a wanton and unprovoked police assault on his person, which, according to his doctors, hastened the end.

Among other national workers who have passed away were Andhraratna Gopalakrishnayya, one time General Secretary of the Congress and the hero of the Chirala-Perala Satyagraha in 1921; Shri Gopabandhu Das, the selfless leader of Utkal; Shri Maganlal Gandhi, who laboured like none other in his quiet and unassuming way for the *charkha* and handspinning; and Shri Anandi Prasad Sinha.

2. The three outstanding events of the year have been the Bardoli Satyagraha, the boycott of the Simon Commission, and the All Parties Conference and Committee to draft a constitution for India in compliance with a resolution of the Madras Congress.

3. The Bardoli Satyagraha movement organised by the peasantry of Bardoli Taluq, under the able leadership of Shri Vallabhbhai Patel, was a remarkable example of the efficacy of well organised peaceful resistance to official oppression and violence. The peasants objected to the reassessment of the Taluq and declared that it had been carried out without any proper investigation, and was in fact utterly at variance with existing conditions. Their protests and petitions were however ignored and their request for an enquiry was refused. Having exhausted all gentler methods of persuasion they started Satyagraha and re-

fused to pay any revenue. Methods of terrorism were resorted to and land and cattle were sold for ridiculous prices. But the peasantry held together and refused to be cowed down into submission. They succeeded ultimately in making their organised strength felt and the government had to yield to their demand for an enquiry. This enquiry is still being held.

4. The Bardoli Satyagraha was not merely a local struggle for a local grievance. The whole question of an arbitrary system of land assessment was raised by it and hence the interest in it was nation wide. Every zamindar and *kisan* was affected by it, and the Satyagraha, ending in the victory of the peasantry, was hailed with joy by the peasantry all over the country. As the enquiry is still proceeding it cannot be said that the question is settled. But whatever the ultimate issue of this enquiry may be, the organised and peaceful courage of the Bardoli peasantry has had a great effect on the *kisans* all over the country.

5. The Madras Congress called upon the country to boycott completely the Statutory Commission, known commonly as the Simon Commission. A large number of other organisations in the country joined in this boycott. The Working Committee, in co-operation with other organisations, declared a *hartal* for February 3rd, the day the Commission was to land in Bombay. This *hartal* was observed all over the country and monster meetings were held. Successful *hartals* have also been held in the cities visited by the Commission.

6. The Legislative Assembly and some Provincial Councils also joined in the boycott and refused to co-operate with the Commission. Some Provincial Councils, largely with the help of official and nominated members, declared for co-operation. The elected members of all the Councils, however, have almost solidly stood for the boycott.

7. The boycott of the Commission has continued and has been intensified during their second visit to India. In spite of the tortuous manœuvres and tactics of the Chairman of the Commission and his transparent attempts to carry on propaganda for himself and his colleagues, and in spite of all manner of official pressure and duress, the boycott has stiffened and has demonstrated to the world that India will have nothing to do with the Commission.

8. The great success of the boycott induced the government to try methods of coercion and terrorism. In Lahore a vast gathering of people, headed by Lala Lajpat Rai, met to demonstrate against the Commission, was assaulted by policemen and many respected leaders were injured by baton blows. Lala Lajpat Rai was one of the sufferers and it is probable that his death was hastened by this cowardly assault. But in spite of this charge being made openly an impartial enquiry was denied by Government.

9. Lucknow experienced several wanton and unprovoked police charges on unarmed and peaceful gatherings on the occasion of the visit of the Commission. Mounted and foot police displayed their skill with the baton and the *lathi* on the heads and backs of well-known public workers of all parties and injured scores of people.

Lucknow was converted into an armed camp with thousands of mounted and foot police and on four days there were brutal attacks by the police. Private houses were invaded by the police and respected national workers were beaten and arrested there for daring to call out "Simon, Go Back." The citizens of Lucknow, however, refused to be cowed down by these brutalities and increased their demonstrations. They even added a touch of humour to them and set the whole city laughing at the discomfiture of the authorities. During a party given by some taluqadars to the Simon Commission, the Kaiserbagh was surrounded by thousands of police and no one who was suspected of being a boycotter was allowed to approach even the public roads near the Bagh. In spite of these precautions the harmony of the party was marred by the arrival from the skies of numerous black kites and balloons bearing the legends "Simon, go back," "India for Indians," etc.

10. The events of Lucknow make it clear that the authorities in the United Provinces at least are modelling themselves on the old Punjab model and Haileyism is coming to mean much the same thing as O'Dwyerism. O'Dwyerism was followed by non-co-operation and the greatest national awakening of modern times in India. That awakening shook the fabric of British rule. India is different to-day from what it was nine years ago and Haileyism is likely to lead to an even greater national response which may carry us to our goal.

11. The tremendous success of the boycott can be measured by these methods of terrorism adopted by the authorities. But as was to be expected these methods have served to increase the intensity of the boycott. They have resulted in the decision by the nationalist press not to publish the proceedings of the Commission; and proposals have been made to organise a social boycott of all officials, British and Indian, who take active part in wanton assaults on the public, and also of all those who, in defiance of the will of the nation, co-operate with and give entertainments to the Commission.

12. The Madras Congress authorised the Working Committee to prepare a Swaraj Constitution, based on a Declaration of Rights, in co-operation with other parties. Representatives of other organisations were invited and the All Parties Conference was held in Delhi in February, in Bombay in May and in Lucknow in August. It was not possible, as laid down in the Congress resolution, to convene a Special Convention in March. The work of drafting a constitution proved more arduous than was perhaps expected, chiefly because of the difficulty of reconciling conflicting claims. Ultimately a Committee, with Pandit Motilal Nehru as chairman, was appointed to determine the principles of the constitution. This Committee produced a report, which has come to be popularly known as the "Nehru Report," which attracted a great deal of attention in India and elsewhere. The Committee have in their report dealt very ably and skilfully with the communal problem and have succeeded in producing a solution which has met with a very large measure of approval all over the country.

13. The constitution drafted in the Report was based on the model of the dominions. This, it was urged by many Congressmen, was contrary to the Congress goal of Independence. It was stated, however, that the Congress goal remained unaffected, and the Report and the All Parties Conference decision only stated the largest measure of common agreement between various groups and organisations in the country. Many Provincial Conferences all over the country made this clear by declaring that they accepted the Report subject to the Congress goal of independence. The All India Congress Committee at their meeting held in Delhi on November 3rd considered the Report and the All Parties decisions. While welcoming the Report as a large step in advance, and specially endorsing the solution of the communal

problems in it, the Committee declared that the Congress stood for independence. It was further made clear that independence meant severance from the British Empire.

14. The publication of the All Parties Report gave rise to some controversy between those who favoured independence and those who were prepared to accept dominion status. Many Congressmen, who did not wish the ideal of independence to be toned down in any way, started a new organisation called the Independence for India League. This League is confined to members of the Congress and has for its object not only independence for the country but also the reconstruction of Indian society on the basis of social and economic equality.

15. The Special Convention, which according to the resolution of the Madras Congress, was to have been held in March last, is now proposed to be held in Calcutta just before the Congress sessions.

16. The ordinary work of the Congress was somewhat overshadowed during the year by the All Parties Conferences. There were few meetings of the A. I. C. C. and the Working Committee. Apart from the meeting held in Madras just after the Congress sessions there was only one other meeting of the A. I. C. C. which was held in Delhi on November 3rd and 4th. The Working Committee has so far met on five occasions, at Benares, Delhi, Bombay, Lucknow and again at Delhi, besides the meeting held at Madras soon after the Congress.

17. The Madras Congress, in pursuance of the boycott of the Simon Commission, restricted the work inside the Legislative Councils to a minimum. Difficulties, however, were experienced in carrying out this direction and the secretaries regret to say that it was more honoured in the breach than in the observance. Ultimately the Working Committee recommended to the A. I. C. C. to give greater freedom to members of the Assembly and the Provincial Councils. The A. I. C. C. accepted the recommendation of the Working Committee.

18. The Government attempted in the course of the year to rush through the Assembly and place on the Statute Book various repressive measures, in particular the Trades Disputes Bill and the Public Safety (Removal from India) Bill. The Working Committee directed the Congress Party in the Assembly to oppose these measures and they

succeeded, in co-operation with other groups, in having a tie in the voting on the Public Safety Bill. The President of the Assembly gave his casting vote against the measure, which was thus rejected. The Trades Disputes Bill has been referred to a committee. The two measures are likely to come up again before the Assembly. They aim at strangling the young Trade Union movement in India and at preventing all outsiders, who are not approved of by the Government, from entering India. They will have to be strenuously opposed.

19. The resolution of the Madras Congress on War Danger attracted considerable attention in India and foreign countries. Most Provincial Conferences repeated it and called upon the people to be prepared for this danger and to follow the lead given by the Congress in case a crisis arose. Reports of war preparations in India continue to come and it is apparent that every effort is being made to be ready for war. The situation in Europe appears to be getting worse specially since the recent Anglo-French Pact and a conflict may be precipitated at any moment. It is desirable for the Congress to watch developments so that if a crisis comes it may be ready to give the right lead.

20. The office of the A. I. C. C. has remained in constant touch during the year with the headquarters of the League against Imperialism in Berlin. The League has helped the A. I. C. C. office to keep in touch with nationalist, labour and progressive movements in other countries, and has carried on propaganda for the freedom of India, in Europe and elsewhere. The League is getting more affiliations from representative nationalist and labour organisations in Europe, America, Asia and Africa and is becoming a powerful centre for anti-imperialist activities. The League has decided to hold its second World Congress in July next year in Paris and has invited the National Congress to send representatives. This invitation will be considered by the Subjects Committee in Calcutta.

21. An outstanding feature of the year has been the rise of the Youth movement in the country. Youth Leagues and students' organisations have been formed all over the country and are specially strong in Bombay and Bengal. Delegates were sent by some of these organisations to the World Youth Congress held at Eerde in Holland in August last. Young men have also taken a very prominent part

in the Simon boycott demonstrations. In Lucknow they were the chief sufferers from police *lathi* and baton blows.

22. A Committee appointed by the A. I. C. C. to report on the revision of the Congress Constitution has made certain recommendations which have been referred to the Subjects Committee. The Committee has laid special stress on having a permanent office and a permanent staff. The secretaries feel that unless this is done it will be difficult to carry on Congress work with any efficiency or effectiveness. The Committee further recommended that the Congress should be prepared to affiliate other organisations which accept the objects of the Congress.

23. The Working Committee has decided to appoint research scholars to carry on research work on behalf of the Congress. This is an important decision which will be of great help in bringing together useful information on public questions and at the same time in training competent young men for national service. But research work can only be done properly in a permanent office with a good library attached to it.

24. The All-India Spinners' Association have been carrying on their good work with vigour and energy and are consolidating their position and extending the scope of their activities. Complete figures for the year are not yet available but from the information so far received, the value of production amounted to Rs. 23,75,757 and of sale to Rs. 32,22,122. At present there are 170 centres of production and 322 sale depots. The members on the rolls are 1,527 of the A. class and 279 of the B. class. Of these, 221 are also members of the Congress. Besides, the Association has enrolled 205 juveniles.

25. The Hindustani Seva Dal have started a physical culture institute at Bagalkot in the Karnatak. They have held several training camps in various parts of the country and they have added to their reputation for doing thorough work. It is unfortunate that Provincial Congress Committees do not encourage them as much as they might and so help in building up a well trained and efficient All-India Volunteer Corps. In Karnatak province alone they enrolled 4,796 members of the Congress.

26. The year 1928 stands out as a year of grave and unprecedented industrial trouble. Strikes and lockouts have followed each other in quick succession and have often been followed by police attacks and firing on strikers. Of the many important strikes the chief one was the strike of the Bombay textile workers who showed wonderful solidarity and tenacity in continuing the strike for six months in spite of hunger and every kind of pressure from the employers and the Government. The Government resorted on many occasions to firing on the strikers. The industrial troubles and strikes have stiffened the trade union movement and have given it a more militant outlook. The condition of the workers is so utterly bad that industrial troubles are bound to continue, specially as attempts are being made on behalf of the employers to reduce even their present deplorable standard of living.

27. It has been repeatedly pointed out that the A. I. C. C. has no permanent fund or sufficient income. It is not possible to carry on our activities for long on collections made in past years. The only two regular sources of income now are from Congress delegate fees and A. I. C. C. membership dues. These may bring in a sum of about Rs. 4,000 per annum. The Constitution Committee has laid stress on the Congress taking early steps to increase this regular income. An increase in the delegation fee to at least Rs. 5 is a desirable change.

28. The financial position of the A. I. C. C. would be considerably improved if the many outstandings were paid up. It is very unfortunate that Provincial Congress Committees and individual Congressmen should not pay the A. I. C. C. the moneys due to it. We attach to this report a list of outstandings. We would specially draw attention to the following sums due from Provincial Congress Committees: Bengal, Rs. 1,39,003; Bombay, Rs. 43,892; Sind, Rs. 19,672; Punjab, Rs. 8,412; Tamil Nad, Rs. 3,335. The Bengal P. C. C. has never paid any part of its T. S. F. collections to the A. I. C. C. Bombay on the other hand has made generous contributions to other provinces and has also paid substantial sums to the A. I. C. C. But there appears to be no reason why the amount now due from it should not be paid up. The Tamil Nad P. C. C. has a large surplus in hand from the last Congress and can easily pay.

29. Among the individuals who owe large sums to the A. I. C. C. we might mention Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and Mr. M. R. Jayakar, both of whom hold balances from the Punjab Relief Funds. Pandit Malaviya has fixed deposit receipts for Rs. 45,842. He agreed to transfer these receipts to the A. I. C. C. three years ago but unfortunately he has not done so yet. Mr. M. R. Jayakar has paid part of the balance with him but he has made no further payment for the last three years.

30. We would like to express our indebtedness to all our colleagues in the office of the A. I. C. C. for the earnestness and efficiency with which they have carried on the work of the office. We would specially like to express our gratitude to Shri B. Raja Rau, the Under Secretary, on whom the burden of the day to day work of the office has largely fallen. We would like to mention that Mr. Raja Rau was entitled to an increment in his salary of Rs. 25 per month from March, 1928. Mr. Raja Rau, however, waived his right to this increment for this year.

The Working Secretary desires to express his own indebtedness to Mr. Raja Rau and his other colleagues in the office for the uniform courtesy and co-operation which he received from them. The work of the All Parties Conference and the publication and sale of the All Parties Report put a heavy strain on the office staff. But whatever the work happened to be there was always a willing response.

31. Our colleague Mr. Shuaib Qureshi left India for Europe in September last. He is thus unable to sign this report.

52, Hewett Road,
Allahabad, Dec. 10th, 1928.

SUBHAS CHANDRA BOSE,
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU,
General Secretaries,
All-India Congress Committee.

AUDITORS' REPORT
OF THE CONGRESS FUNDS

ALL INDIA TILAK

STATEMENTS OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS FROM

RECEIPTS.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
Cash and investments as on 1-10-27		1,13,138 14 7
TILAK SWARAJ FUND :—		
General	245 5 0	
Earmarked	10 0 0	
MISCELLANEOUS RECEIPTS :—		255 5 0
A. I. C. C. Membership fees	1,113 0 0	
Madras Congress Delegation fees	1,623 0 0	
Interest received	4,170 8 6	
Brokerage	60 2 0	
All Party Conference Report	2,345 0 0	
Sale proceeds of Congress publications	950 8 0	10,262 2 6
ADVANCES RECOVERED AND ADJUSTED :—		
Emigrants' Enquiry Committee		11 13 0
Grants paid—refunded and adjusted		
General Secretary Office expenses	1,690 12 8	
Election Publicity	250 1 9	1,940 14 5
TOTAL		1,25,609 1 6

70, MEADOWS STREET,
FORT, BOMBAY. }

Examined and found Correct
DALAL & SHAH,
Incorporated Accountants (London).
Hon. Auditors, A. I. C. C.

MEMORIAL SWARAJYA FUND.

1ST OCTOBER, 1927 TO 30TH SEPTEMBER, 1928.

DISBURSEMENTS.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
GRANTS MADE TO :—		
Utkal Relief Fund	500 0 0	
Hindustani Seva Dal	1,000 0 0	
All Party Fund	1,000 0 0	
Fenner Brockway	1,333 5 4	
League Contribution	1,337 6 6	
Depressed Classes	54 8 0	
		5,225 3 10
PAID OUT OF :—		
Help to Akali fund	546 0 0	
Permanent Publicity Bureau	1,000 0 0	
Interest on Old B. P. C. C. fund distributed in equal Shares among Gujarat, Bombay, Maharashtra and Karnatak P. C. Cs.		1,546 0 0
President's Expenses		479 0 8
All Party Conference Expenses		753 9 0
Expenses of Working Committee Members		690 8 0
All Party report expenses		485 0 0
General Secretary's Office Transfer Expenses		1,936 2 6
Amount written off		802 9 0
Congress Report and Constitution printing		16 9 0
Rent for pavilion Storing		636 5 7
		324 13 6
TREASURER'S OFFICE EXPENSES :—		
Sal. 1,000-0-0, Mis. 13-5-0, Printing and St. 42-4-0 Exch. 3-12-0, Postage 16-7-0, Travelling 47-11-0		1,123 7 0
Advance to General Secretary		11,047 6 4
Legal Charges		25 0 0
CLOSING BALANCE :—		
In fixed deposits	80,853 0 0	
In Current accounts	19,661 0 10	
In hand	3 6 3	
		1,00,517 7 1
TOTAL Rs. ...		1,25,609 1 6

C. H. SHAH,
Accountant, A. I. C. C.

REVASHANKAR JAGJIVAN,
Hon. Working Treasurer, A. I. C. C.

THE ALL INDIA TILAK MEMORIAL SWARAJYA FUND

THE INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR ENDING 30TH SEPTEMBER, 1928.

EXPENDITURE.				INCOME.					
			Rs.	A. P.				Rs.	A. P.
To Grants made	5,225	3 10	By Tilak Swaraj Fund General	245	5 0
.. Interest paid to provinces on old B. P. C. C. Fund	479	0 8	.. Miscellaneous Receipts	10,262	2 6
.. President's expenses	753	9 0	.. Grants refunded	1,940	14 5
.. All Party Conference expenses	690	8 0	.. Excess of expenditure over income carried to Balance Sheet	11,650	7 3
.. Expenses of Working Committee Members	485	0 0					
.. All Party Report expenses	1,936	2 6					
.. General Secretary's Office transfer expenses	802	9 0					
.. Amount written off	16	9 0					
.. Congress Report and Constitution printing	636	5 7					
.. Rent for pavilion storing	324	13 6					
.. Legal charges	25	0 0					
.. Hon. Treasurer's Office expenses	1,123	7 0					
.. General Secretary's Office expenses as per audited statement	11,600	9 1					
			TOTAL Rs. ... 24,098 13 2					TOTAL Rs. ... 24,098 13 2	

70, MEDOWS STREET,
FORT, BOMBAY,

Examined and Found Correct,
DALAL & SHAH,
Incorporated Accountants (London),
Hon. Auditors, A. I. C. C.

C. H. SHAH,
Accountant.

REVASHANKER JAGJIVAN,
Hon. Working Treasurer, A. I. C. C.

EARMARKED FUNDS AS ON 30TH SEPTEMBER, 1928 :—

				Rs. A. P.
Khaddar Propaganda	1,001 0 0
Help to Akalis	199 6 1
Untouchability	10 0 0
Bengal National Workers	10 7 0
Swaraj Party Fund	14 12 0
South African Fund	200 0 0
Political Sufferers' Fund	3,838 0 0
Civil Resisters' Family Relief Fund	13,491 0 0
Parmanent Publicity Fund	13,220 0 0
Old B. P. C. C. Fund	9,581 0 0
TOTAL				Rs. ... 41,565 9 1

IN FIXED DEPOSITS WITH BANKS :—

				Rs. A. P.
Central Bank of India, Ltd., Bombay	9,581 0 0
Bank of Baroda, Ltd., Bombay	30,000 0 0
Bank of India, Ltd., Bombay	20,764 0 0
Punjab National Bank, Ltd., Bombay	20,508 0 0
TOTAL				Rs. ... 80,853 0 0

IN CURRENT ACCOUNTS WITH BANKS :—

				Rs. A. P.
Central Bank of India, Ltd., Bombay	1,066 1 3
Bank of Baroda, Ltd., Bombay	906 4 2
Shilotri Bank Ltd. (doubtful), Bombay	9 11 4
Allahabad Bank, Ltd., Bombay	2 11 1
Bank of India, Ltd., Bombay	1,053 15 9
Punjab National Bank, Ltd., Bombay	16,622 5 3
TOTAL				Rs. ... 19,661 0 10

LIST OF REALISATIONS.

made by the All-India Congress Committee from 1-12-27 to 20-11-28.

	Rs.	A.	P.
All-India Congress Committee membership subscription ...	1,575	0	0
Messrs. Ganesh & Co., Madras, being sale-proceeds of copies of Punjab Martial Law report and evidence supplied to them	850	0	0
Delegate fees at Madras Congress ...	3,246	0	0
Sale-proceeds of Congress publications ...	100	3	6
Price of copies of All Parties Committee's report (includes postage on V. Ps. ...)	5,383	9	6
Sale-proceeds of copies of Congress reports, realized by Messrs. Taraporevala Sons & Co., Bombay ...	10	8	0
TOTAL ...	11,165	5	0

LIST OF OUTSTANDINGS

of the All-India Congress Committee as on 20th November, 1928.

(1) *Moneys due from Individuals*

		Rs.	A.	P.	
Srimati Sarojini Naidu ...	20	2	0		Balance of advance given for Publicity and Propaganda work in foreign countries.
Mr. V. R. Naik ...	5,288	2	0		Balance of Hyderabad.
Mr. Badru Hassan ...	27,911	14	0		Khaddar Loan advanced by the Trustees, Tilak Swaraj Fund, Bombay.
Mr. Sampurnanand ...	13	12	6		Balance of advance made for inquiry into the condition of returned emigrants.
Mr. K. M. Panikkar ...	249	1	11		Balance of Akali Prisoners' Families Relief Fund.
Mr. Manilal Avasthi, Cawnpore	39	0	0		Price of Congress publications supplied to him.

Mr. T. Prakasam	500 0 0	Balance of loan advanced in December, 1926.
Mr. Marudavanam Pillai	96 2 0	Price of leaflets supplied during General Elections in 1926.

(2) *Moneys due from Committees*

	Rs.	A.	P.	
Assam, P. C. C.	489	8	0	Loan for printing of Assam Opium Enquiry report. (368 copies of report are received on this account from Association Press, Calcutta).
Kerala, P. C. C.	1,500	0	0	Loan advanced in 1921 through Mr. C. Rajagopalachariar.
.. ..	564	10	2	Balance of Malabar Relief Fund.
Behar, P. C. C.	17	8	0	Sale-proceeds of Congress publications sold by them in 1925.
Punjab, P. C. C.	1,500	0	0	Temporary loan advanced in 1927.
Congress Party in the Assembly	72	4	0	Advance made in 1927.
	T. S. F. quota.		Yarn quota.	
Andhra P. C. C.	2,630	8	2	110 6 0
Assam P. C. C.	3	12	0	70 8 0
Behar P. C. C.	539	15	2	...
Bengal P. C. C.	1,39,003	3	9	...
Bombay P. C. C.	43,892	12	2	...
Burma P. C. C.	462	5	6	...
C. P. Hindustani P. C. C.	1,222	15	6	...
C. P. Marathi P. C. C.	3,305	7	2	27 3 6
Karnatak P. C. C.	1,129	8	6	90 12 0
Punjab P. C. C.	8,412	9	5	...
Ajmer P. C. C.	114	9	9	...
Sind P. C. C.	19,672	15	10	...
Tamil Nadu P. C. C.	3,335	4	10	...
Kerala P. C. C.	161	3	0	32 10 0
U. P. P. C. C.	1,311	7	5	194 8 6
Utkal P. C. C.	39	12	3	...

NOTE.—The foregoing list shows the quotas due to All-India Congress Committee at the end of 1925. No later statement is prepared as practically no collections have been made by P. C. Cs. since 1925.

(3) *Punjab Relief Funds.*

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya	45,842	0	0
Syt. M. R. Jayakar	...	2,137	4 0
		<hr/>	
		47,979	4 0

Mr. Jayakar has been repeatedly reminded of this balance due from him but he has not so far remitted it.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya promised in 1925 to transfer the fixed deposit receipts for Rs. 45,842 to the All-India Congress Committee but the transfer has not been made yet.

The Balance of the Punjab Relief Funds with the Seva Samiti Allahabad, and with Mr. Jehangir B. Petit, Bombay, are not included in the foregoing statement.

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU,
General Secretary.

GRESS COMMITTEE

30th Sept. 1928 in the All India Congress Com. Office, Allahabad.

DISBURSEMENTS.

	Rs.	as.	p.	Rs.	as.	p.
7. Salaries	7,093	4	0
8. Postage and telegrams	1,147	0	0
9. Printing and Stationery	888	3	5
10. Travelling expenses of staff	...	593	13	9		
" " of Secretary	...	256	9	0		
" Syt. A. Rangaswami Iyengar	...	82	12	0		
" Secretary Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru	...				933	2
						9
11. Rents and taxes	934	7	5
12. Library	...	93	2	0		
Less amount realised on account of a lost book	...	6	0	0		
					87	2
						0
13. Furniture :—						
Typewriter	...	367	0	0		
Other furniture	...	360	12	6		
		727	12	6		
Less amount realised by sale of furniture of previous year	...	189	4	9		
					538	7
						9
14. Miscellaneous	442	8	0
15. Amounts written off :—						
Advance to peon Subbavva Pillai	...	16	9	0		
" to Mr. Hafiz Alam Jumaidy for translation and printing of Congress resolutions in Urdu	...	8	2	0		
					24	11
						0
16. Advances :—						
Syt. N. Raghavachari	...	20	0	0		
Peon Ahmed Husain	...	10	0	0		
Secretary, Congress Assembly Party	...	72	4	0		
					102	4
						0
17. All Parties Conference account (to be recovered from the All Parties Conference Fund Account)	230	4	6
18. Closing balances —						
(a) Cash in hand	...	171	2	6		
(b) Cash in Bank less uncashed cheques	...	677	9	3		
(c) With Bombay P.C.C.	...	52	10	6		
(d) With Mr. Mahalinga Sarma at Madras including advance of Rs. 4/-	...	13	6	6		
(e) Postage in hand	...	25	11	3		
					938	8
						0
					13,359	15
						7

Examined and found correct.

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU,

General Secretary,

R. K. TEWARI,

Auditor