

# All-India States' Subjects' Conference 1927.

*President.*

**S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR, M.L.A.**



**MADRAS**

**PRINTED AT THE INDIA PRINTING WORKS.**

**1928.**

# All India States' Subjects' Conference 1927

(Gokhale Hall, Madras.)

Monday, 26th December—1st Day.

---

The All India States' Subjects' Conference commenced its session at 9 A.M. on Monday 26th December, 1927 in the Gokhale Hall, Madras. Besides a large number of delegates from Sandur, Pudukottah, Cochin, Travancore, Hyderabad, Baroda, Indore, Bikaner, Gujerat, Deccan, Ujjain, Kathiawar, Rajaputana, Nabha, there were delegates present from almost all the important States in India. The total delegates numbered 248, and of these some were ladies. There was a very large number of visitors and many of them were subjects of Indian States. Prominent among those on the dais were Dewan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao, President of the States' People's Conference held at Bombay, the Hon'ble Mr. V. Ramadoss Pantulu, Mr. N.S. Aney M.L.A., Dewan Bahadur C. Krishnaswami Rao, Mr. T. Adinarayana Chetty, M. L. C. (Madras), and Sir. K. V. Reddi.

Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar, President-elect was received with music at the gate and the conference began at 9.10 A.M.

---

## WELCOME ADDRESS.

BY

Mr. S. Satyamurthi, M.L.C.

(Chairman, Reception Committee).

Brother Delegates, Ladies, and Gentlemen,—This is the first session of the All-India States' Subjects' Conference held at Madras. As Chairman of the

Reception Committee, I have very great pleasure in offering you all a hearty welcome to this Conference. While, during this week, the greatest brains and hearts of India will be engaged on national problems of the highest importance, I make no apologies for inviting you all to share in the deliberations of this Conference, which I consider no less important than any other, except of course the Indian National Congress. I think the time has arrived when the Indian National Congress must include within its scope the affairs of the Indian States as well. There were historical reasons why the Congress did not deal with such affairs; but with the march of events in British India and in Indian States, it has become imperative for their mutual advancement and for the rapid realisation of Swaraj by India that the greatest national assembly of India should deal with both the subjects.

There may be a fear on the part of some Indian Princes or their friends that such inclusion of the affairs of Indian States in its scope by the Congress may adversely affect their position or their status, but I venture to emphatically state that the Indian States, have nothing to fear from the Indian National Congress, and that the Indian Princes will find the leaders of India at least as friendly to them as the Government of India. Moreover, you cannot build China walls between Indian States and British India. Swaraj for British India is bound to come and the new awakening in British India cannot but affect deeply the people of the Indian States.

But, until the Indian National Congress thus widens its scope, it is the duty of the subjects of Indian States to meet and take counsel together, to chalk out a programme of political work for themselves, by following which we shall be able to achieve Swaraj for the Indian States, as also help ourselves to play our part as partners of a free federated India.

Lord Birkenhead and his friends naturally have no use for our views on this matter, and in the wake of the

Simon Commission, have appointed a Commission for Indian States, which of course cannot and does not command our confidence. I trust that, as a result of the deliberations of this Conference, we shall be able to put before the Indian National Congress and before the world our demands for our future.

The Indian States cover roughly an area of 686,000 square miles and contain a population of 62,500,000. Their total revenues are estimated at about 15 millions sterling. Counting them all, there are nearly 700 of them. These facts by themselves give them an importance which British India cannot ignore. They also form part of India as such, for according to the Interpretation Act of 1889, "the expression 'India' shall mean British India, together with any territories of any Native Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of Her Majesty exercised through the Governor-General of India or through any Governor of India".

When any scheme of federation for India is discussed, there are not wanting critics who say that we must provide for the 'sovereignty' of the Indian States, being unaffected. Especially our enemies, who are anxious to set the Indian States as against British India, betray an amount of concern for the future of the Indian States which is very unconvincing. Lovat Fraser in his book "India under Curzon and After" says: "I do not foresee the day when the great Maharajas will sit supine within their places, while the fate of India passes into the hands of lawyers and school-masters, even though the new legislators have a Viceroy and a phalanx of British officials at their back, nor do I discern the time when they will relinquish their ancient powers and prerogatives and entrust their fortunes to representative assemblies on the western model, permitting themselves to sink to the level of superior Zamindars." Ignorant people may be deceived by such specious arguments, but when we know what exactly the position of these States is, the futility of such arguments will become plain as a pikestaff. Sir

William Hunter in his "Indian Empire" says: "The English Government has respected the position of the Native Chiefs and more than one-third of the country still remains in the hands of the hereditary rulers. That Government, as Suzerain in India, does not allow its feudatories to make war upon one another or to have any relations with foreign States. It interferes when any Chief misgoverns his people, rebukes, and if needful, removes the oppressor, protects the weak and firmly imposes peace upon all." Professor Westlake in his book on "Public International Law" says: "They (the Indian Princes) have no official intercourse either with one another, or with any power outside the Empire. They cannot even send representatives to Calcutta (now Delhi) but must communicate with the British Government through the British representatives at their Courts. When it is necessary to establish a case of extradition or of any other dealings between two of them, each has to make an agreement with the British Government to that effect, or according to the practice now preferred, the British Government frames rules to which both the Native Princes are invited to consent, and for the execution of these rules each of them pledges himself to comply with the demands of the other when intimated through the Resident at his Court. They cannot unite in any representation to the Government of India when having identical interests on any question, but each must approach it separately. Not only can they not receive for themselves even the commercial agents from foreign states, but may have no direct communication with Consuls or commercial agents accredited by foreign States to the Government of India. They are precluded from receiving foreign decorations or even academic distinctions, except through the British Government and from conferring any honours or privileges on any person but their own subjects. They cannot employ Europeans or Americans without the consent of the British Government."

Thus, it is clear that these Indian States have no real 'sovereignty', and that therefore all ideas of their being deprived of their 'sovereignty' consequent on Swaraj for India are thoroughly unsound. If Indian States can reconcile their dignity with this subordinate position to a foreign Government wholly irresponsible to the people of British India, and maintained solely by the British bayonets, I have no doubt in my mind that they will very much more easily reconcile themselves to their position as partners in a free and self-governing India. Indeed, so far as Indian Princes have spoken on this matter, they have expressed themselves definitely in favour of Swaraj for India. I have no doubt that the leaders of India will reciprocate that compliment, and will find for the Indian princes an honoured place in Swaraj India.

But to-day there is no doubt whatever that in these Indian States personal rule is the one dominant fact. The Imperial Gazetteer states: "There are States in almost every stage of development, tribal, feudal and constitutional, but the common features of all of them, even of those which are most advanced, are the personal rule of the chief and his control over legislation and the administration of justice". This may have its advantages, but undoubtedly it has its disadvantages. As Sir Henry Laurence said many years ago, "if ever there was a device for ensuring mal-administration, it was that of an Indian ruler backed up by British bayonets and directed by a British Resident". Again, Sir John Strachey says: "There are not many positions in which a man has larger powers for good, than that of the enlightened ruler of a Native State. He is protected by the British Government from all anxiety outside his own territory. He requires no armed force except for the maintenance of order among his own people. He has at his disposal in many cases very considerable resources. His State shares as a rule, without any charges being imposed on it, the benefits derived from the railways and other public works constructed by our Government. He has no difficulties such

as those which beset on all sides our own administration. Wise and upright chiefs followed by worthy successors might bring their States into a condition of almost utopian prosperity, but if the opportunities are great, so have the temptations which lead to failure and dishonour, and unrestricted personal power is inevitably doomed in India to the same ultimate fate which has attended it elsewhere."

Another feature and consequence of this rule is stated by Lovat Fraser: "While some Princes never leave India and others rarely cross the borders of their States, a few are in the habit of departing on long foreign tours at frequent intervals. Occasionally, these tours are made the occasion for reckless extravagance in expenditure, and in such cases the ultimate sufferers are the rulers' own subjects who have to pay".

I should like to give an example from my own personal knowledge of the evils of this personal rule. I come from the State of Pudukotah in this province, whose ruler has been more or less continuously absent from his State for nearly twenty years, who therefore does not know his subjects, and whom his subjects do not know. Some years ago, he 'abdicated' his powers and appointed his own brother as Regent. As a solatium for this 'abdication,' a sum of Rs. 20 lakhs, one half of the accumulated surplus of this poor State, whose annual revenue does not exceed Rs. 20 lakhs, was given to him as a gift. To-day, although he does not devote a second of his time to the affairs of the State, he is in receipt of his usual civil list.

The question then is, what are the reforms which we immediately need in the Indian States? To put it in one phrase, the most immediate need is to substitute the rule of law for personal rule in all the Indian States.

1. A clear distinction must be drawn and permanently maintained between the private fortune of the Chief and the public revenues of the State. A civil list of fixed amount must be assigned to the Chief, and the rest of the

revenues must remain available for public purposes only through appropriation by constituted authorities.

2. There must be permanent security for the observance of established laws, rights and usages, and the laws must only be altered by suitable legislative machinery.

3. Provision must be made for the judiciary, independent of the civil and criminal courts, and justice must be dispensed by regularly constituted tribunals.

4. The assessment and collection of the revenues must be made under fixed rules ; all rights in the land must be defined and maintained, and no fresh taxation imposed except in accordance with law.

5. The ruler must take no personal part in the Executive Government of the State which must be entrusted to a Minister or Ministers appointed by him but responsible to an elected Legislature.

6. Personal liberty, freedom of speech, freedom of association and freedom of religious worship must be guaranteed to the subjects of the Indian States.

If these reforms are carried out, the Indian Princes have nothing to fear from them. It is true that they will no longer be able to satisfy their freaks or indulge their passions or prejudices. But subject to and within those limitations, they can play a useful and dignified part in guiding the destinies of their States, even as the King of Great Britain is playing in the affairs of Great Britain. Provided these princes have ability, character and a high sense of duty, they will have far more scope for the display of those characteristics under the scheme above outlined than in their present position.

Indeed the best of their friends never looked forward to their present state being perpetuated. Lord Curzon, no unfriend of the Indian Princes, said once: " I therefore think and I lose no opportunity of impressing on the Indian Chiefs that a very clear and positive duty devolves upon them. It is not limited to the perpetuation of their dynasties or the maintenance of their Raj. They must



not rest content with keeping things going in their time. Their duty is one not of passive acceptance of an established place in the Imperial system, but of active and vigorous co-operation in the discharge of its onerous responsibilities. When things go wrong in British India, the light of public criticism beats fiercely upon the offending person or system. Native States have no right to claim any immunity from the same process".

I therefore invite the Indian Princes to themselves inaugurate those democratic reforms in their States. I want them to remember that to-day they have no moral right to exist, unless their rule is broad-based on the will of their people. They do not have the justification of the ancient or mediaeval Indian States who fought for their existence and survived because they were fit to survive. To-day the naked truth is that these Indian States are kept up, as I have pointed out already, by the British bayonets. It is a position undignified at once to the Ruler and to his subjects. The time for Indian States to fight among themselves or with the British Government is gone. Therefore, the only dignified course for them is to prove that they have a moral right to exist by bringing themselves into line with the modern States whose one purpose is to secure the greatest happiness of the greatest number, not according to the notions of their rulers, but according to the notions of the peoples themselves.

Equally important is the question of the future of Indian States in free and self-governing India. So far as the British Government is concerned, I am convinced that they would like to keep the Indian States more or less in their present state as a bulwark of British Rule. Lovat Fraser frankly says: "The interests of the sovereign power and of the Princes and Chiefs grow more nearly identical as the years pass; both are concerned to preserve the existing system because both realise that failure to resist the enemies of order and good Government might plunge them into common ruin. There are

very few Native States as at present constituted which could be expected to survive the disappearance of British Rule. On the other hand, the generous loyalty of the Princes and Chiefs to the British Crown is a solid factor which helps materially to preserve stability at a time when such assurances are of the utmost value". Reading between the lines, it is clear that our rulers would like the Indian rulers to range themselves on their side against Swaraj for India. In the words of Lord Canning: "These patches of Native Governments serve as a breakwater to the storm which would otherwise have swept over us in one great wave".

But nobody can resist the onward march of time, and I have no doubt in my mind that the Indian States must and will more and more range themselves on the side of those who are fighting for Swaraj for India rather than against them. The problem however remains: What shall be the exact position of the Indian States in free India? A very large number of them which are too small to continue their existence must, in their own interests, get absorbed in the neighbouring provinces; but I would leave it entirely to their own will and pleasure. If they desire to continue their separate existence as political entities, room must be found for them in the Swaraj scheme of Government for India. As for the bigger States, they must form part of a federal India. As Lord Oliver says in his fore-word to Mr. Panikker's book on "Indian States and the Government of India": "In any modification of Indian Government in the direction of the establishment of Dominion Status, it is obvious that a double process of centralization and decentralization must be provided for. In regard to all those services which may be agreed can be best commonly dealt with on behalf of the whole peninsula, the most important of which is obviously the question of defence in regard to which a national organization has already been very carefully elaborated and among which railway, postal service and customs are other obvious instances, it is only conceivable

that the rights of sovereignty now exercised by the British Government will be transferred to the National Government under the machinery of a federal constitution; that is to say the right to deal with those particular matters will be specifically assigned by the state to an Executive responsible to a National parliament to which the Native States will have their fair representation in proportion to their importance and population side by side with the present Provinces of British India. And correspondingly, all other services except those which are thus delegated to the Federal Government must in the British Provinces be devolved to the provincial Legislatures." I would add all other services except those who are thus delegated by the Indian Native States to the Federal Government must in the case of the Indian States be devolved on the Legislatures of those Indian States.

There have been attempts made in the past to constitute some kind of common assembly for the Princes of India, but its functions are admittedly limited. The message of the King Emperor on the inauguration of the Chamber of Princes in February 1921, says *inter alia*: "My Viceroy will take its counsel freely in matters relating to the territories of Indian States generally and in matters that affect these territories jointly with British India or with the rest of my Empire. It will have no concern with the internal affairs of Indian States or their rulers or with the relations of individual States to my Government, while the existing rights of the States and their freedom of action will be in no way prejudiced or impaired." Such a truncated body can really do no good either to the Indian States or to British India. That the Chamber does not commend itself to the most important rulers of India is clear from the fact that several of them have given that Chamber the cold shoulder. It can at best be only a stop-gap arrangement. I do not propose in the course of this address to lay down the lines of the constitution in which a proper and dignified place will be found for the Indian States along with the British

Provinces. I recommend that this Conference do appoint a Committee for drafting such a constitution, in consultation with similar committees which may be appointed by the Congress and other bodies, which may be published along with the Swaraj constitution for India, which is bound to be adopted in the course of next year by the Indian National Congress.

There is one problem, however, relating to succession to these Indian States on which I should like to say a few words before I conclude my address. "The succession to a Native State is invalid" wrote the Government of India in 1884 "until it receives in some form the sanction of the British authorities." Almost the same terms were used by the Secretary of State in 1891, "Every succession must be recognised by the British Government, and no succession is valid until recognition has been given." Again, the right of adoption of an heir by Hindu Rajas with the sanction of the Crown was recognised, special Sanads being issued by Lord Canning. The preservation of any Hindu ruling house can no longer be regarded as dependent on the accident of the continuance of the direct male line. On the failure of natural heirs, any succession that is valid under Hindu law, must be recognised. A similar guarantee was given to Muhammadan States. Succession valid by Muhammadan law is recognised. I refer to this question because I am very deeply interested in the question of succession to the Pudukottah State. It also raises a broad question of principle which may equally affect other States, if similar circumstances arise. The son of the Raja of Pudukottah by his Australian wife is not a Hindu, nor is he a *Dasiputra* as defined in the *Mithakshara*. He cannot therefore succeed to the State. If such succession be recognised by the British Government, it will soon be possible for the thrones of several Indian States being occupied by people who are neither Hindus nor Mussalmans, whatever else they may be or they may not be. The people of Pudukottah do not want this illegal and

un-Hindu succession to that pre-eminently Hindu State. Repression in Pudukotah is making it impossible for the people's voice to be heard. But I should like to say from my place here to the authorities of Pudukottah as well as to the Government of India, that they dare not trample upon the deep religious sentiments and susceptibilities of the people of Pudukottah.

Whether our enemies like it or not, India is bound to have Swaraj very soon. I want that our rulers and ourselves should play our rightful and legitimate part in the struggle for and the achievement of Swaraj for India, so that our place in a Swaraj India may be secure. His Highness the Maharaja of Alwar is declared: "My goal is the United States of India where every province, every State working out its own destiny in accordance with its own environment, its tradition, history and religion, will combine together for higher and imperial purposes, each subscribing its little quota of knowledge and experience in a labour of love freely given for a noble and higher cause." My dream of the political future of India is that we shall have a strong central Government at Delhi, entirely responsible to a wholly elected Parliament in which Indian States will be adequately represented, so far as the administration of common affairs is concerned, with provinces rearranged as far as possible on a linguistic basis, and Indian States, or small federations of smaller Indian States enjoying internal autonomy, and vying, one with the other, in serving the common interests of the Motherland.

I now invite you to proceed with the deliberations of the Conference under the distinguished presidentship of my friend and leader Mr. S. Srinivasa Ayengar, a tried servant of the Motherland, one, who by his distinguished services to India, by his great political sagacity, and his eminence as a constitutional lawyer, is exceptionally fitted to guide those deliberations. I pray that God may crown our labours with success.

VANDE MATARAM.

Pandit Taranath Rao seconded by Mr. Manilal Kotari proposed Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar, President-elect to the Chair. Mr. D. V. Gokhale, Srimathi Kamalabai Saheb Kibe, Mr. Hosakoppa Krishna Rao, Mr. B. S. Pathik and a few others also spoke in support of the motion.

Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar was then garlanded and installed in the Chair. Dewan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao, President of the Bombay Conference was also garlanded.

---

## The Presidential Address

BY

Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar, M.L.A.

Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar rising amidst cheers said as follows:—

The subject of this Conference was one which has been familiar to him for many years and in connection with the Indian Constitution and Swaraj movement, he had the privilege of becoming acquainted with some of the speakers who are fighting for the emancipation of the so-called subjects of the Indian States. He had also the advantage of having thought about it in connection with the Swaraj Constitution of India. They had a very thoughtful and elaborate speech read by Mr. Satyamurti who knows the subject very much more from close contact. He was surprised when it became known that a warrant for his arrest had been issued by the Pudukottah State (Shame). He is not one of their arm-chair politicians with whom Government does not concern itself. He has spoken with the dynamic force characteristic of him. He has in his address stated the points upon which attention should be concentrated. Therefore to that extent the task which has been left to him to speak about this subject has been made easier. Mr. Ramachandra Rao, with all his years of practice and experience has also recently dealt with the subject.

He only lived for two things. That is for independence of India, for complete national independence and complete national solidarity. These are the two things that make it possible for him to stand. In the course of his Presidential address at Gauhati he had pointed out how this matter must be dealt with. He studied this subject and this has enabled him to see that there is no difference between people of Indian States and people of British India. He did not like the word "subjects" of Indian States nor the word "subjects" of British States. They are citizens of a free kingdom. (Hear, hear). They must get rid of these words and he asked them to do so. That general observation has struck him.

#### **British Indians and the States.**

The people of British India should cease to be indifferent to the people of the Indian States. The affairs of the people of the Indian States had been most astonishingly and painfully neglected. They must break that indifference. If the people of British India did not interest themselves in the affairs of the Indian States, then they were not fit for Swaraj. The States in North India were in a far worse condition than the States in South India. There was a feeling in British India that people in Indian States were comparatively less burdened with taxation and that they had greater access to the authorities because there were no racial barriers. That notion must altogether be given up. They had to-day no Press in some of these Indian States or if there was a good and independent Press there, it did not reach British India. They were still in the A. B. C. of their agitation on this question. There should be an inter-change of courtesies between British Indian people and the people of Indian States. He would suggest that frequent conferences like this must be held alternately in British India and in Indian States. He protested against travesties of religion and misquotation of things in attributing divinity to Indian Rulers. In the Manu-Smriti, it was said that bad rulers had been dethroned. The ancient idea of Dharma was

actually lived up to and that satisfied the aspirations of the people then. But to-day after contact with western civilizations it was grotesque to hark back to the ideal of religious or self-controlled king who would keep dharma above his head. It was impossible for them any longer to recapture that Aryan type of sovereignty. This idea of a self-controlled king was no longer realised in practice. He considered that the time had come for the people of Indian States to have a clear programme and they must take a lesson from British India. They must make up their minds to ask for Responsible Government in a technical sense. There could not be any such thing as Responsible Government in a real or technical sense, unless they had first a fully elected Parliament. In the second place they must have full powers of legislation. In the third place the Executive must be responsible to that Parliament and if the Executive did not command the confidence of the majority in Parliament, the Executive must resign their offices. From the very beginning they must have what was known as full representative institutions which were the basis of a system of responsible government. It did not matter whether the propertied classes or the peasant classes first got rights. The idea of a conflict of interests among the people of the States should be avoided in the settlement of the franchise. The dream of a perfect electorate was still a dream even in the West. They must also discard the demon of communal strife in Indian States and they should never have any special electorates. Nomination corrupted the Government, the recipient and the neighbour. He was not a patriotic, honourable and trustworthy man who wanted to be a nominated man. They should insist upon the power of the purse. From the beginning they must agitate only for full responsible government. Let the objective be clear enough, and let them never work for anything less than what they were entitled to. He would ask them not to pursue a merely pusillanimous policy. If they should win freedom, they must be prepared to



sacrifice and it was not possible to win freedom without some measure of suffering.

### **Status of Ruler.**

They must make up their minds to recognise the status of the rulers to this extent, namely, they being Indians he would allow them the position of hereditary Governors and administrators of their States, if they agreed to it. He did not think that the subjects would lose anything by reconciling themselves to that position. It was safe to allow Indian States to be federated among themselves. He wanted them to be federated with the Indian provinces. They must have a universal citizenship for the whole of India. For the present, it might seem difficult, but he foresaw a time when the citizen of an Indian State must be a citizen of India. He was against flinging mud against officials either in British India or in Indian States. Indian officials had a hard time, and the people must win their sympathy and good-will and not antagonise them. It was a question of temperament and character. Let there be no difference therefore between an official and a non-official. There were good officials and bad officials. Trust, sympathy, and good will of official classes were absolutely necessary. In British India the biggest office was in the hands of the bureaucracy but that was not so in the Indian States. There must be an association of good men against an association of bad men. Many rulers of Indian States had come to grief because they trusted untrustworthy favourites and allowed themselves to be misinformed and misadvised. Public opinion in Indian States should be so assert itself, that it should be made impossible for a ruler to employ bad men in his service. They should boycott evil wherever it was. Discriminating social boycott was the most effective weapon to bring about a strong public opinion.

Let them beware of the numerous pits into which patriots of this country had fallen. If they had to set themselves to the task of emancipating their country, they must remember three things. It was a thankless task

when they took up the work of emancipating their country. Their indispensability consisted in their being continuous servants and constant public workers. If they got disappointed they should take up their failures merrily and cheerfully and go on without feeling disappointed. Let them be stern in their fight but let them not indulge in private grievances. Let them also not pursue moderate methods. Mania for titles should disappear. The methods of liberating British India and the Indian States were identical. If they should succeed they should have faith in themselves and in the cause which they had at heart. His conviction had been strained through adversity with the result that his conviction was now stronger than it ever was before. Methods might change, plans might change, but their faith should stand for ever.

In conclusion he warned the subjects of Indian States not to introduce religion into politics, but to strive and struggle with faith in their cause and in themselves and if they made up their minds to succeed, they would succeed.



## Tuesday, 27th December—2nd Day.

The Conference resumed its sitting at 8-30 A.M. on Tuesday, 27th December in the Gokhale Hall. In the absence of Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar, Mr. S. Satyamurthi presided and the following resolutions were passed:

### Resolutions.

(1) This Conference hereby declares that Swaraj or full Responsible Government is the goal to be attained in all Indian States and exhorts the people of the States to strenuously work for the same by all legitimate and peaceful means.

Proposed by—*Mr. A. B. Salem.*

Seconded by—*Mr. Hosakoppa Krishna Rao.*

(2) " This Conference strongly recommends to the people of the States the starting and organising of strong popular bodies for the purpose of securing and conserving the rights of people and trusts that rulers thereof would sympathise with and help such movements."

Proposed by—*Mr. K. T. Matthew.*

Seconded by—*Mr. K. T. Rashyam Iyengar.*

(3) " This Conference is of opinion that the future constitution of India should be on a genuine federal basis on the lines of Canada or Australia with a central Government having common responsibilities though in varying degrees for both British provinces and Native States."

*From the Chair.*

(4) " This Conference hereby appoints a Committee consisting of the following members to confer with similar Committees to be appointed by the National Congress and other political bodies for the purpose of framing a Swaraj Constitution for India with a view to secure for the States their proper place in a full and Self-Governing India."

- (1) Mr. S. Satyamurti.
- (2) „ Hosakoppa Krishna Rao.
- (3) „ V. Atchuta Menon.
- (4) „ V. R. Naick.
- (5) „ D. V. Gokhale.
- (6) „ S. Viswanatha Iyer.
- (7) „ B. S. Pathik.
- (8) „ Manilal Kotari.
- (9) „ Raghavendra Rao Sarma.
- (10) „ S. T. Dravid.
- (11) „ Pustaki.
- (12) „ G. R. Abhyankar.
- (13) „ K. T. Bashyam Iyengar.
- (14) „ A. B. Salem.
- (15) „ K. T. Matthew (*Secretary*).

Proposed by—*Mr. V. Atchutha Menon.*

Seconded by—*Mr. Belur Srinivasa Iyengar.*

5. “This Conference enters its emphatic protest against the appointment of the Expert Committee to inquire into and determine upon the future relationship of Indian States with the Government of India since the labours of such a Committee are admittedly confined to the determination of the rights, privileges and prerogatives of the princes and since they do not cover the question of rights and privileges of the people of the States.”

Proposed by—*Mr. A. B. Salem.*

Seconded by—*Mr. J. Bhima Rao.*

6. “This Conference recommends to the Indian National Congress that it should widen its scope of activities so as to include the internal affairs of Indian States by making suitable amendments in the Congress Constitution and to provide for adequate representation of the States on the Congress organisation.”

Proposed by—*Dr. A. R. Mehon.*

Seconded by—*Mr. K. Kumar.*

7. This Conference is of opinion that the following reforms should be immediately introduced into the States:

(1) A clear distinction must be made between the private fortune of the Chief and the public revenues of the State and a civil list of fixed amount be assigned to the Chief and the rest of the revenues be subjected to the vote of the Legislature.

(2) There must be permanent security for the observance of established laws, rights and usages and the laws must only be altered by suitable Legislative machinery.

(3) Provision for independent judiciary to dispense justice by regularly constituted tribunal should be made.

(4) Assessment and collection of revenues must be made by fixed rules and rights. All rights in the land must be defined and maintained and no fresh taxation should be imposed except by a vote of the Legislature.

(5) The Executive Government must be carried on by a Minister or Ministers appointed by the Ruler and responsible to the Legislature.

(6) Personal liberty, freedom of speech freedom of the Press, association and religious worship should be recognised and all repressive laws should be abolished.

(7) Fully elected Legislatures should be established.

Proposed by—*Mr. S. Viswanatha Iyer.*

Seconded by—*Mr. Raghavendra Rao Sarma.*

(8) "This Conference strongly condemns the permanent or continued absence of Indian rulers from their States as such absence, besides being inconsistent with their responsibilities as rulers, is incompatible with their interests of their subjects and a drain on the resources of the State."

Proposed by—*Mr. Raghavendra Rao Sarma.*

Seconded by—*Mr. J. S. Karandikar.*

(9) "This Conference resolves that a Standing Executive Committee consisting of the following members with power to co-opt be appointed to organise and educate

public opinion on the aims and objects of this Conference, to give effect to the resolutions passed by this Conference and collect funds and frame a draft constitution in accordance with the aims and objects of this Conference to be submitted at the session of the Conference to be held next year.\*

- (1) Mr. K. Swaminatha Iyer.
- (2) „ S. Viswanatha Iyer.
- (3) „ G. Gundu Rao.
- (4) „ A. B. Salem.
- (5) „ A. R. Menon.
- (6) „ K. Kumar.
- (7) „ V. Atchuta Menon.
- (8) „ P. E. Eapen.
- (9) „ M. Siva Thanu Pillai.
- (10) „ Hosakoppa Krishna Rao.
- (11) „ K. T. Bashyam Iyengar.
- (12) „ K. Ranga Iyengar.
- (13) „ K. T. Satyanarayana Shetty.
- (14) „ V. R. Naick.
- (15) „ Raghavendra Rao Sarma.
- (16) „ M. Hanumantha Rao.
- (17) „ B. Rama Krishna Rao.
- (18) „ Manilal Kotari.
- (19) „ G. R. Abhyankar.
- (20) „ Ram Bax Arya.
- (21) „ Motilal Sharma.
- (22) „ Amritlal Sheth.
- (23) „ N. C. Kelkar.
- (24) „ D. V. Gokhale.
- (25) Pt. Nayanu Ram Sharma.
- (26) Dr. Sumant Mehta.
- \* (27) Mr. J. Bhima Rao.
- \* (28) „ S. Satyamurthi.
- \* (29) „ S. Srinivasa Iyengar.
- (30) „ K. T. Matthew (*Secretary*).

*From the Chair.*

---

\* These members were co-opted at the Executive Committee meeting held on 27th December, 1927.

(10) " This Conference is emphatically against the recognition of any succession to any Indian State which is against Hindu or Mohamedan Law and custom according as the ruler is Hindu or Mohamedan and particularly against the recognition of the issue of mixed marriages against Hindu or Mohamedan Laws.

" This Conference particularly protests against the attempts made to secure the succession of the Pudukkotta State in the Madras Presidency to the son of the Raja by his Australian wife as it is opposed to the interests of the people, to Hindu law and long established usage and custom in the State.

" This Conference strongly condemns in particular the campaign of ruthless repression inaugurated in the Pudukkottah State for stifling public opinion."

Proposed by—*Mr. V. R. Naick,*

Seconded by—*Mr. K. Ranga Iyengar,*

Supported by—*Mr. K. Lakshmana Sarma.*

(11) "This Conference is of opinion that in accordance with the wishes of the people of Sandur State in the Madras Presidency, the succession to the State by Raja. kumari Susila Raju should be recognised."

Proposed by—*Mr. G. Gundu Rao,*

Seconded by—*Pandit Taranath.*

Supported by—*Mr. V S. Sanjeeva Rao,*

*Mrs. Kamala Bhat.*

12. " That this conference is of opinion that the Gudwa and Paigah States in the Nizam's dominions should be restored to the ruling families immediately."

*From the Chair.*

13. " This Conference strongly condemns the policy of persecution pursued by the Nabha Administration against the Nabha exiles and is of opinion that the Nabha question can only be solved by the restoration of their popular prince to the gadi of their fathers."

*From the Chair.*

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

*From the Chair.*

### Concluding Address.

Mr. Satyamurty in winding up the proceedings of the Conference made a lengthy speech, in the course of which he congratulated the conference on the successful session of two days and on the nature and scope of the resolutions adopted and especially Mr. K. T. Matthew, General Secretary of the Conference who spared no pains to make the Conference a real success. It was also a matter for congratulation that they had as their president Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar. Though he was absent, the speaker would assure them that they could always count upon the help of Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar in all their difficulties. Continuing he said that British Indians had only one master but they had two masters. The dignity of the Indian rulers depended upon the goodwill of the people. He would ask the rulers as a sincere friend to look to them for their support and not to the British Government who wanted to use them as their slaves. The States should form themselves into a federation so that they could be partners in self-governing India. For the people of British India the problem of Swaraj was difficult. But to them, people of Indian States, it was simple. If the people were united and strong, the rulers must bow down before their united strength. The rulers should remember that in spite of the flatteries and toadism their days of rule were numbered unless they based their Government on the Will of the people. He then exhorted the subjects of the States to organise themselves and not to fear repression that was bound to come from Government. In conclusion, he assured them of the co-oper-



ation of the people of British India and the Congress in all there legitimate aspirations.

The Chairman was then garlanded and with a vote of thanks, the Conference came to an end.

Messages wishing the Conference all success were received from

- (1) Sir M. Visvesvarayya.
- (2) Mr. N. C. Kelkar.
- (3) „ Subash Chandra Bose.
- (4) „ G. Gundappa.
- (5) „ G. R. Josyer.
- (6) Dr. A. G. Menon.

#### **Indian States Subjects Conference.**

The resolutions passed at the Indian States Subjects Conference, which we publish elsewhere, give us an idea not only of the aims and ideals of the people of the Indian States, but also of the methods which they propose to pursue. They show that our fellow-countrymen in the States are animated by the same high ideals which the Indian National Congress cherishes and that it is their endeavour to get their States and organisations closely affiliated to ours. The Conference, rightly directed, attended first on the demand for the rule of law, for that is the foundation on which alike progress and freedom rest. The separation of the revenues of the State from those of the sovereign as such which is another of the demands of the Conference is an essential preliminary reform to healthy progress. No prince has the right to treat State revenues as part and parcel of his privy purse which he might put to whatever use he pleases. Every enlightened ruler ought to be content with a civil list strictly in keeping with his legitimate needs and dignity on the one hand and the total resources of the State on the other. It is time that the Indian princes gave up the idea that the State is their private

property. That the more progressive at any rate of the rulers have begun to realise the wisdom of accepting a well-defined civil list is once of the pleasing signs of the times. The resolution of the Conference demanding Responsible Government to be introduced, if necessary by definite and well-defined stages, is a well-conceived one with which no progressive thinker may quarrel. So is the decision of the Conference on the Expert Enquiry regarding the treaty rights and privileges of Indian rulers. The Conference condemned this body for the same reason for which the Congress resolved to boycott the Simon Commission. The terms of reference to the Butler Committee are extremely one-sided. They do not take account of the rights and privileges of the subjects which, according to the traditional law of the land, are in many cases correlative to those of the princes. What with the apathy of the princes and of the paramount power, the subjects of the States have to fall back upon support elsewhere and it is natural that they should approach the Indian National Congress to lend them a helping hand. We daresay the Congress will do all in its power to assist the subjects of the States to realise their goal. In the ultimate analysis, that goal is the goal of the Congress—a united India of which the States are parts organically related to the whole and functioning as a single, well-knit unit. Geography has set a common goal for both and history and common culture have ratified it. As regards the methods of attaining that goal, the Conference suggested joint action on the part of the Congress and of the subjects of the States and resolved to establish a standing committee to collect funds and do propoganda work regarding the aims of the Conference. This decision is wise, for success not a little depends on continuous and sustained activity.

“Hindu”

## THE INDIAN STATES.

".....In the States' Subjects's Conference held in the City this week, many a vigorous indictment was made about the general insecurity of life and property in a good number of the States. The charges levelled were legion. For instance, it was stated that in several States, the will of the Ruler was a supreme law transcending all other laws in his territory. The princes led extravagant lives caring for nothing but their own pleasures, and squandering the public revenues in all kinds of fantastic and spectacular luxuries in foreign lands. There were no constitutional provisions for the association of the subjects in the work of Government. Some States more fortunate than others possessed benevolent monarchs, but the luckies among them could not count on any guarantee for the continuance of a good regime. Hanging over their destinies, there was always the Democle's sword of a relapse to tyrannical rule at any time when there is a change in succession, or sometimes indeed in the life time of the same ruler. As for the princes, their position, although imposing, is not always enviable. One of the speakers on the Congress platform observed that as between the Indian princes and the people of British India, there was no distinction in subjection; the only distinction being that whereas the people's chains of slavery were of iron and hence they strove to cast them off, the princes wore golden chains which bound them just as effectively, but which they foolishly flaunted as ornaments. A temperament such as this is a menace to the cause of freedom all around. There is invariably an alliance in politics between reactionaries and weaklings against political workers striving for national liberty. The inevitable interaction between the politics of Indian States and that of British India cannot be defeated by a policy of self-imposed isolation on the part of the Congress....."

"Swarajyya".