



Indian Round Table Conference

12th November, 1930—19th January, 1931

PROCEEDINGS

Government of Madras

SECRETARIAT LIBRARY

Class X X - P No. 200

Ch. S. 111-1-1,500-1-12-31

EUROPE.

OFFICE OF THE HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR INDIA,
INDIA HOUSE, ALDWYCH, LONDON, W. C. 2.

And at all Booksellers.

INDIA AND CEYLON : Provincial Book Depôts.

MADRAS :— Superintendent, Government Press, Mount Road, Madras.
BOMBAY :— Superintendent, Government Printing and Stationery, Queen's Road, Bombay.
SIND :— Library attached to the Office of the Commissioner in Sind, Karachi.
BENGAL :— Bengal Secretariat Book Depôt, Writers' Buildings, Room No. 1, Ground Floor, Calcutta.
UNITED PROVINCES OF AGRHA AND OUDH :— Superintendent of Government Press, United Provinces of Agra and Oudh, Allahabad.
PUNJAB :— Superintendent, Government Printing, Punjab, Lahore.
BURMA :— Superintendent, Government Printing, Burma, Rangoon.
CENTRAL PROVINCES AND BERRAR :— Superintendent, Government Printing, Central Provinces, Nagpur.
ASSAM :— Superintendent, Assam Secretariat Press, Shillong.
BIRAR AND ORISSA :— Superintendent, Government Printing, Bihar and Orissa, P. O. Gulerbagh, Patna.
NORTH-WEST FRONTIER PROVINCE :— Manager, Government Printing and Stationery, Peshawar.

Thacker Spink & Co., Calcutta and Simla.
W. Newman & Co., Ltd., Calcutta.
S. K. Lahiri & Co., Calcutta.
The Indian School Supply Depôt, 309, Bow Bazar Street, Calcutta.
Butterworth & Co. (India), Ltd., Calcutta.
M. C. Sear & Sons, 15, College Square, Calcutta.
Standard Literature Company, Limited, Calcutta.
Association Press, Calcutta.
Chakraverty, Chatterjee & Co., Ltd., 13, College Square, Calcutta.
The Book Company, Calcutta.
James Murray & Co., 12, Government Place, Calcutta. (Per Meteorological Publications only.)
Ray Choudhury & Co., 68-5, Asutosh Mukherji Road, Calcutta.
Scientific Publishing Co., 9, Taltola Lane, Calcutta.
Chatterjee & Co., 3-1, Bacharam Chatterjee Lane, Calcutta.
Standard Law Book Society, 8-2, Hastings Street, Calcutta.
The Hindu Library, 3, Nandlal Mullick Lane, Calcutta.
Kamala Book Depôt, Ltd., 15, College Square, Calcutta.
Bengal Flying Club, Dum Dum Cantt., on Aviation.
Kali Charan & Co., Municipal Market, Calcutta.
B. C. Basak, Esq., Proprietor, Albert Library, Dacca.
Mitra Brothers, Rajshahi.
Higginbothams, Madras.
Rochouse and Sons, Madras.
G. A. Watson & Co., Publishers, George Town, Madras.
Theosophical Publishing House, Adyar, Madras.
P. Varadachary & Co., Madras.
S. Murthy & Co., Madras.
City Book Co., Madras.
Law Publishing Co., Mylapore, Madras.
Bright & Co., Trivandrum.
The Booklover's Resort, Talkad, Trivandrum, South India.
E. M. Gopalakrishna Kone, Pudumandapam, Madras.
Central Book Depôt, Madras.
Vijapur & Co., Vizagapatnam.
Thacker & Co., Ltd., Bombay.
D. B. Taraporevala Sons & Co., Bombay.
Sunder Pandurang, Bombay.
Ram Chandra Govind & Sons, Kalbadevi Road, Bombay.
N. M. Tripathi & Co., Booksellers, Princess Street, Kalbadevi Road, Bombay.
New and Secondhand Bookshop, Kalbadevi Road, Bombay.
Mrs. Radhabai Atmaram Nagoon, Kalbadevi Road, Bombay.
J. M. Pandia & Co., Bombay.
Gatula & Co., Bombay.
A. H. Wheeler & Co., Allahabad, Calcutta and Bombay.
S. Govind & Co., Sandhurst Road, Calcutta, Bombay.
Bombay Book Depôt, Girgaon, Bombay.
Bennett Coleman & Co., Ltd., Times of India Press, Bombay.
Proprietor, New Kitabkhana, Poona.
The Manager, Oriental Book Supplying Agency, 15, Shukrawar, Poona City.
Rama Krishna Bros., Opposite Vishrambag, Poona City.
S. P. Bookstall, 21, Budhiwar, Poona.
Mangaldas & Sons, Booksellers and Publishers, Bhaga Talao, Surat.
The Standard Book and Stationery Co., 32-33, Arbab Road, Peshawar.
R. B. Umadikar & Co., The Bharat Book Depôt, Dharwar.
The Students' Own Book Depôt, Dharwar.
Shri Shankar Karnataka Pustaka Bhandara, Malambadi, Dharwar.
The Standard Bookstall, Karachi, Quetta, Delhi, Murree and Rawalpindi.

The Karachi Book Depôt, Elphinstone Street, Camp, Karachi.
The English Bookstall, Karachi.
The Standard Bookstall, Quetta.
U. B. Malik & Co., Quetta.
J. Ray & Sons, 43 K. & L. Edwardes Road, Lahore.
Murree and Lahore.
The Standard Book Depôt, Lahore, Nainital, Dalhousie, Ambala Cantonment and Delhi.
N. B. Mathur, Supdt., Nazir Kanan Hind Press, The North India Christian Tract and Book Society, Road, Allahabad.
Ram Daxal Agarwala, 184, Katra, Allahabad.
Ram Narain Lal, Katra, Allahabad.
The Indian Army Book Depôt, Dayallagh, Agra.
Narayan & Co., Weston Road, Cawnpore.
The Indian Army Book Depôt, Jullundur City—Delhi.
Manager, Newal Kishore Press, Lucknow.
The Upper India Publishing House, Ltd., Literature, Amnandaula Park, Lucknow.
Raj Sahib M. Ghah Singh & Sons, Mufid-Aam Press, and Allahabad.
Rama Krishna & Sons, Booksellers, Anarkali, Lahore.
Paul Brothers, Booksellers and Publishers, Katoh, Lahore.
The Hindu School Press, Lahore.
The Standard Bookstall, Lahore.
The Proprietor, Punjab Sanskrit Book Depôt, Saldmaha, Lahore.
The Insurance Publicity Co., Ltd., Lahore.
The Punjab Religious Book Society, Lahore.
The Commercial Book Co., Lahore.
The University Book Agency, Kachari Road, Lahore.
Manager of the Imperial Book Depôt, 63, Chandney Street, Delhi.
J. M. Jaina & Bros., Delhi.
Foto Book Agency, New Delhi and Simla.
Oxford Book and Stationery Company, Delhi, Lahore, Meerut and Calcutta.
Supdt., American Baptist Mission Press, Rangoon.
The Modern Publishing House, Ltd., 30, Phayre Street, Rangoon.
Burma Book Club, Ltd., Rangoon.
Manager, The "Hittavada", Nagpur.
Bible Brothers, Booksellers and Stationers, Sitabaldi, S. C. Talukdar, Proprietor, Students & Co., Cooch Behar.
The Manager, Ceylon Observer, Colombo.
The Manager, The Indian Book Shop, Benares City.
Nandkishore & Bros., Chowk, Benares City.
The Srivilliputtur Cooperative Trading Union, Ltd., puttur (S. I. R.).
Raghunath Prasad & Sons, Patna City.
The Students' Emporium, Patna.
K. L. Mathur & Sons, Gurd, Patna City.
Kamla Book Stores, Bankipore, Patna.
G. S. Banerji, Patna.
Punjab Bookstall, Patna City.
Punjab Bookstall, Patna City.
M. C. Kothari, Rajpura, Patna.
The Hyderabad Book Depôt, Chaderghat, Hyderabad (M.).
Thakur & Co., Amritsar.
S. K. Bhawanji & Co., Tollygunge, P. O., Trichinopoly.
National College Teachers' Union Book Depôt, Trichinopoly.
Superintendent, Bangalore Press, Lake View, Mysore, Bangalore City.

AGENT IN PALESTINE :—Steinmetzky, Jerusalem.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
Introductory Note	1-4
List of Delegates, etc.	5-10
1st Plenary Meeting (Opening Ceremony). (19th Nov., 1930.)	11-12
H.M. King Emperor	12
H.H. Maharaja of Patiala	12
H.H. Aga Khan	12-14
Mr. Ramsay MacDonald	14-15
H.H. Maharaja Gaekwar of Baroda	15
H.H. Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir	16
Sir Muhammad Akbar Hydari	16-17
Mr. Srinivasa Sastri	17-18
Mr. M. A. Jinnah	18-19
Mr. Ba Pe	19
Appointment of Business Committee	
2nd Plenary Meeting (The General Discussion). (17th Nov., 1930.)	21-28
Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru	28-34
H.H. Maharaja of Bikaner	34-40
Mr. M. R. Jayakar	
3rd Plenary Meeting (The General Discussion)—contd. (18th Nov., 1930.)	41-46
H.H. Maharaja of Alwar	46-51
Sir Muhammad Shafi	51-55
H.H. Maharaja of Rewa	55-63
Lord Peel	63-64
H.H. Chola of Sangli	64-66
Sir Hubert Carr	66-70
Mr. Col. H. A. J. Gidney	
4th Plenary Meeting (The General Discussion)—contd. (19th Nov., 1930.)	71-74
H.H. Maharaja of Patiala	74-81
Dr. Meenig	81-85
Sardar Ujjal Singh	85-89
Sir A. P. Patro	89-99
Mawlana Muhammad Ali	

5th Plenary Meeting (The General Discussion)—*contd.*
(20th Nov., 1950.)

	PAGE.
H.H. Nawab of Bhopal	100—103
Mr. N. M. Joshi	103—105
Begum Shah Nawaz	106—108
Sir Mirza M. Ismail	108—110
Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar	110—112
Lord Reading	112—114
H.H. Maharaja of Nawanagar	116—120
Sir P. C. Mitter	120—123
Dr. Ambedkar	123—129
Mr. K. T. Paul	129—131
Sir Abdul Qaiyum	132—136
Mr. M. A. Jinnah	136—141
Mr. Srinivasa Sastri	141—143
Sardar Sahibzada Sultan Ahmed Khan	143—145
Mr. H. P. Mody	145—147
Mr. Fazl-ul-Huq	147—150
Sir Phiroze Sethna	150—154
Sir Akbar Hydari	154
Sir Chimanlal Setalvad	154—156

6th Plenary Meeting (The General Discussion)—*contd.*
(21st Nov., 1950.)

Raja Sher Muhammad Khan	157—160
Mr. C. Y. Chintamani	160—164
Mr. B. V. Jadhav	164—166
Colonel K. N. Haksar	166—169
H.H. Aga Khan	169—170
Mr. Ramsay MacDonald	170—175

Burma—Discussion in Committee of Whole Conference.
(1st Dec., 1950.)

Mr. Ba Pe	176—179
Mr. C. Y. Chintamani	179—181
Raja Sher Muhammad Khan	181—182
Lord Reading	182—184
H.H. Maharaja of Alwar	184
Lord Peel	184—185
H.H. Maharaja of Bikaner	186

Committee of Whole Conference—Discussion of sub-Committees' Reports.

SUB-COMMITTEE No. I (FEDERAL STRUCTURE).

(16th Dec., 1950, and 15th Jan., 1951.)

	PAGE.
Interim Report	188—192
Discussion of Interim Report	193—195
Second Report	196—223
General discussion	224—254
Discussion, paras. 1—6	254—256
" " 7—10	256
" " 11	256—259
" " 12	259—260
" " 13—15	260—261
" " 16—17	261—262
" " 18—20	262—271
" " 21	272—273
" " 22—24	273
" " 25	273—274
" " 26	274—275
" " 27—29	275—276
" " 30	276—277
" " 31	277
" " 32	277—278
" " 33	278
" " 34	278—282
" " 35	282—283
" " 36	283—284
" " 37—39	284—285
" " Appendices	285—286

SUB-COMMITTEE No. II (PROVINCIAL CONSTITUTION).

(16th Dec., 1950.)

Report	287—290
Discussion, paras. 1—4	291—293
" " 5 (a)	293
" " 5 (b)	293—298
" " 5 (c)	298—304
" " 6 (a)	304
" " 6 (b) (1)	304
" " 6 (b) (2)	304—305
" " 6 (c) (1)	305
" " 6 (c) (2)	305—312
" " 6 (d)	312—313
" " 7	313—314

SUB-COMMITTEE No. III (MINORITIES).

(16th and 19th Jan., 1931.)

	PAGE.
Report	315—319
Discussion, paras. 1—13	320
" " 14	320—336
" " 15—18	336
" " 14 (contd.)	337

SUB-COMMITTEE No. IV (BURMA).

(16th Jan., 1931.)

Report	338—340
General discussion	341—346
Discussion, paras. 1	346—357
" " 2—3	357
" " 4	357
" " 5	358—359
" " 6	359

SUB-COMMITTEE No. V (NORTH-WEST FRONTIER PROVINCE).

(16th Jan., 1931.)

Report	360—362
Discussion	362—366

SUB-COMMITTEE No. VI (FRANCHISE).

(16th Jan., 1931.)

Report	367—370
Discussion	371—372

SUB-COMMITTEE No. VII (DEFENCE).

(16th Jan., 1931.)

Report	373—376
Discussion, paras. 1—3 and 4 (1)	377
" " 4 (2)	377—382
" " 5—7	383

SUB-COMMITTEE No. VIII (SERVICES).

(16th Jan., 1931.)

Report	384—389
Discussion, paras. 1—3	390
" " 4	390—391
" " 5	391—392
" " 6—7	392

SUB-COMMITTEE No. IX (SIND).

(16th Jan., 1931.)

Report	393—394
Discussion*	395—396

7th Plenary Meeting (General Review of Work of Conference).

(16th Jan., 1931.)

	398
Draft Resolution	399—402
H.H. Maharaja of Rewa	402—403
Mr. J. N. Basu	403—404
Khan Bahadur Hafiz Hidayat Husain	404—406
H.H. Maharaja of Dholpur	406—407
Lt.-Col. H. A. J. Gidney	407—410
Mr. T. F. Gavin Jones	411—413
Dr. Shariat Ahmed Khan	413—414
Mr. Shiva Rao	414—417
Diwan Bahadur Ramachandra Rao	417—419
Sardar Ujjal Singh	419—420
Sardar Sampuran Singh	

8th Plenary Meeting (General Review)—contd.

(19th Jan., 1931.)

	421—423
H.H. Maharaja of Patiala	423—425
Mrs. Subbarayan	425—428
Lord Peel	428—438
H.H. Maharaja of Alwar	438—441
Dr. Ambedkar	441—442
Rao Bahadur A. T. Pannir Selvam	442—443
Mr. H. P. Mody	443
Dr. Narendra Nath Law	443—445
Sir Hubert Carr	445—446
H.H. Chief of Sangli	446—450
Sir Manubhai Mehta	550—452
Col. K. N. Haksar	452—453
Raja of Parlakimedi	453—454
Raja Narendra Nath	454—456
Mr. B. V. Jadhav	456—457
Sir Cowasji Jehangir	457—459
Sir Mirza M. Ismail	459—460
Sir Akbar Hydari	460—463
Srijut Chandradhar Barooah	463—465
Lord Reading	465—467
H.H. Maharaja of Gaekwar of Baroda	467—469
Mr. Zafrullah Khan	469—470
Diwan Bahadur Ramaswami Mudaliyar	470—473
Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru	473

Resolution by Conference	474
Loyal Message to His Majesty the King-Emperor	

* Including question of the creation of an Oriya Province.

Final Session.

	PAGE.
Mr. Ramsay MacDonald	475—495
Mr. Ramsay MacDonald (Statement on behalf of His Majesty's Government)	482—485
H.H. Maharaja of Patiala	485
Sir Muhammad Shafi	486
Mr. Srinivasa Sastri	486—487
Begum Shah Nawaz	487—488
Reply from H.M. King-Emperor to Loyal Message from the Conference	488—489

INDIAN ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

1. The Indian Round Table Conference was inaugurated by His Majesty the King-Emperor, at a public session in the Royal Gallery of the House of Lords, on 12th November, 1930.

The full proceedings at this session are printed on pages 11 to 19.

2. After the opening ceremony, the Conference decided, on the advice of the Business Committee (appointed at the close of the first session), to proceed to a general discussion in Plenary Session "On the question whether the future constitution of India should be on a federal or unitary basis." The Chairman stated that he would put a liberal interpretation on the subject thus placed before the Conference, and would allow reference to cognate questions and to questions which the Conference might think were involved in the decision between a constitution of the federal or unitary type. The Conference did not intend that any conclusions should be reached in this general discussion, but it was expected that the general trend of it would enable the Conference to frame its programme for further discussion in Committee.

The general discussion, which lasted for five days, is contained in pages 21 to 175.

The debate ranged over a wide field, but its most striking feature was declarations from Delegates from the Indian States opening the way to the consideration of a new federal constitution for India, embracing both British India and Indian States.

3. On the conclusion of the general discussion the Conference, on the advice of the Business Committee, decided to set up a "Federal Relations Committee to consider the structure of a federal system of government in India as regards relations between Indian States and British India, and relations between Provinces of British India and the Centre, including the question of responsibility at the Centre, and to recommend the main principles to be applied".

The Lord Chancellor framed the following Heads of Discussion for the Federal Relations Committee:—

1.

The component elements of the Federation.

2.

The type of Federal Legislature and the number of Chambers of which it should consist.

3.

The powers of the Federal Legislature.

4.

The number of members composing the Federal Legislature, and if the Legislature is of more than one Chamber, of each Chamber, and their distribution among the federating units.

5.

The method whereby representatives from British India and from the Indian States are to be chosen.

6.

The constitution, character, powers and responsibilities of the Federal Executive.

7.

The powers of the Provincial Legislatures.

8.

The constitution, character, powers and responsibilities of the Provincial Executives.

9.

The provision to be made to secure the willing co-operation of the minorities and the special interests.

10.

The question of establishing a Supreme Court and its jurisdiction.

11.

The Defence Forces.

12.

The relation of the Federal Executive and of the Provincial Executives to the Crown.

4. It was, however, found more convenient to work through a Committee of the Whole Conference, instead of through the Federal Relations Committee, and the Committee of the Whole set up nine sub-Committees to consider the following questions:

No.	Name of sub-Committee.	Subject or terms of Reference.	Page in this vol.
I	Federal Structure	1. The Component elements of the Federation. 2. The type of Federal Legislature and the number of Chambers of which it should consist. 3. The powers of the Federal Legislature. 4. The number of members composing the Federal Legislature, and if the Legislature is of more than one Chamber, of each Chamber and their distribution among the federating units. 5. The method whereby representatives from British India and from the Indian States are to be chosen. 6. The constitution, character, powers and responsibilities of the Federal Executive	188— 286

No.	Name of sub-Committee.	Subject or terms of Reference.	Page in this vol.
II	Provincial Constitution.	The powers of the Provincial Legislatures. The constitution, character, powers and responsibilities of the Provincial Executives.	287— 314
III	Minorities	The provision to be made to secure the willing co-operation of the minorities and the special interests.	315— 337
IV	Burma	To consider the nature of the conditions which would enable Burma to be separated from British India on equitable terms and to recommend the best way of securing this end.	338— 359
V	North-West Frontier Province.	To consider what modifications, if any, are to be made in the General Provincial Constitution to meet the special circumstances of the North-West Frontier Province.	360— 366
VI	Franchise	On what main principles is the Franchise to be based for men and women.	367— 372
VII	Defence	To consider questions of political principle relating to Defence, other than strictly constitutional aspects to be considered under Heads 6 (Powers of Executive) and 12 (Relations with the Crown).	373— 383
VIII	Services	The relations of the Services to the new political structures.	384— 392
IX	Sind	The question of constituting Sind as a separate Province.	393— 397

5. It will be seen that the first six of the Lord Chancellor's Heads were referred to the Federal Structure sub-Committee, Heads 7 and 8 to the Provincial Constitution sub-Committee, Head 9 to the Minorities sub-Committee and Head 11 (so far as it is separable from Heads 6 and 12) to the Defence sub-Committee. It was agreed that Head 10 should also be examined by the Federal Structure sub-Committee. Lack of time prevented this being done, but the Lord Chancellor made a statement on the subject in the closing Plenary Sessions (*see* page 398). Head 12 was not formally discussed as a separate subject by the Federal Structure sub-Committee (or Provincial Constitution sub-Committee), but was considered in relation to the discussions which took place on Head 6.

It will also be seen that sub-Committees IV, V, VI, VIII and IX dealt with subjects outside the range of the original Federal Relations Committee.

6. The Committee of the Whole Conference, in remitting the above subjects to its sub-Committees, did not hold any previous discussion in Committee of the Whole on the subject matter so referred, except in the case of the question of the separation of Burma. The discussion in the Committee of the Whole which preceded the setting up of sub-Committee IV is contained in pages 176 to 186 of this Volume.

7. The Reports of the sub-Committees were received by the Committee of the Whole and noted by it after observations had been made on each. The Chairman gave a ruling on the procedure of the Committee of the Whole Conference with regard to the Reports of sub-Committees, namely, that the Committee would not proceed to pass the Reports as decisions of the Committee, but would note them as presented by the various sub-Committees; observations made on the sub-Committees' reports in the Committee of the Whole Conference were also to be noted and used for the guidance of those who would be finally responsible for taking account of the proceedings of the Conference.

The text of the Report of each sub-Committee, immediately followed by the proceedings in Committee of the Whole Conference when it was presented, is printed in the section of this volume comprised in pages 188 to 397.

8. The Conference in Plenary Session received and noted the Reports of the nine sub-Committees submitted by the Committee of the Whole Conference, with the comments thereon, and a final debate in Plenary Session took place on 16th and 19th Jan., 1931, ranging over the whole of the work of the Conference, at the close of which the Conference unanimously adopted the Resolution printed on page 473 accepting the Reports of the sub-Committees (and comments thereon in Committee of the Whole) as "material of the highest value for use in the framing of a constitution for India, embodying as they do a substantial measure of agreement on the main ground-plan".

9. The Prime Minister's closing speech on 19th January contained a declaration on behalf of His Majesty's Government. The full proceedings of the final Plenary Sessions are contained on pages 398 to 489.

10. As stated above, the opening session was held in public. The press were also admitted to the last session of the Conference, at which the Prime Minister's speech was made. Neither press nor public were admitted to other sessions, but information as to the proceedings was given to the press by the Information Officers of the Conference acting under the general control of a Committee, appointed by the Conference, consisting of Mr. Wedgwood Benn, Mr. Chintamani and Mr. Rushbrook Williams.

11. A supplementary Volume will be made available, in due course, containing proceedings in the sub-Committees and the memoranda circulated to the Conference or its Committees.

(The Reports of the sub-Committees, the Conference Resolution of 19th January, and the Prime Minister's closing speech—which are contained in this Volume—have already been presented to Parliament in the preliminary Command Paper Cmd. 3772 of 1931.)
27th January, 1931.

INDIAN ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE.

LIST OF DELEGATES.

BRITISH DELEGATIONS.

†THE RIGHT HON. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD, M.P.

‡THE RIGHT HON. LORD SANKEY, G.B.E.

THE RIGHT HON. WEDGWOOD BENN, D.S.O., D.F.C., M.P.

THE RIGHT HON. ARTHUR HENDERSON, M.P.

THE RIGHT HON. J. H. THOMAS, M.P.

SIR WILLIAM JOWITT, K.C., M.P.

MR. H. B. LEES SMITH, M.P.

THE RIGHT HON. EARL RUSSELL.

§THE RIGHT HON. EARL PEEL, G.B.E.

THE MOST HON. THE MARQUESS OF ZETLAND, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E.

THE RIGHT HON. SIR SAMUEL HOARE, BART., G.B.E., C.M.G., M.P.

MAJOR THE HON. OLIVER STANLEY, M.C., M.P.

§THE MOST HON. THE MARQUESS OF READING, G.C.B., G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., G.C.V.O.

THE MOST HON. THE MARQUESS OF LOTHIAN, C.H.

SIR ROBERT HAMILTON, M.P.

MR. ISAAC FOOT, M.P.

INDIAN STATES DELEGATION.

COLONEL HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF ALWAR, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E.

*HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA GAEKWAR OF BARODA, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E.

§LIEUTENANT-COLONEL HIS HIGHNESS THE NAWAB OF BHOPAL, G.C.I.E., C.S.I., C.V.O.

§LIEUTENANT-GENERAL HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF BIKANER, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., G.C.V.O., G.B.E., K.C.B., A.D.C.

* Rao Bahadur Krishnama Chari, C.I.E., acted as a Delegate when H.H. the Maharaja of Gaekwar of Baroda was absent.

† Elected President of the Conference at Plenary Session of 12th Nov., 1930.

‡ Elected Deputy President of the Conference at Plenary Session of 17th Nov., 1930.

§ Elected "Chairmen" of the Conference at Plenary Session of 17th Nov., 1930.

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJ RANA OF DHOLPUR, G.C.I.E., K.C.S.I., K.C.V.O.

COLONEL HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF JAMMU AND KASHMIR, G.C.I.E., K.C.V.O.

LIENTENANT-COLONEL HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF NAWAN-AGAR, G.C.S.I., G.B.E.

MAJOR-GENERAL HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF PATIALA, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., G.C.V.O., G.B.E., A.D.C.

HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF REWA, G.C.I.E., K.C.S.I.

HIS HIGHNESS THE CHIEF SAHIB OF SANGLI, K.C.I.E.

SIR PRABHASHANKAR PATTANI, K.C.I.E.

SIR MANUBHAI MEHTA, C.S.I.

SARDAR SAHIBZADA SULTAN AHMED KHAN, C.I.E.

NAWAB SIR MUHAMMAD AKBAR HYDARI.

SIR MIRZA M. ISMAIL, C.I.E., O.B.E.

*COLONEL K. N. HAKSAR, C.I.E.

BRITISH INDIA DELEGATION.

§HIS HIGHNESS THE AGA KHAN, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., G.C.V.O.

SIR C. P. RAMASWAMI AIYAR, K.C.I.E.

†MAULANA MUHAMMAD ALI.

DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR.

U AUNG THIN, K.S.M.

U BA YE

SRIJUT CHANDRADHAR BAROOAH.

MR. J. N. BASU.

SIR SHAH NAWAZ KHAN BHUTTO, C.I.E., O.B.E.

SIR HUBERT CARR.

MR. C. Y. CHINTAMANI.

CAPTAIN NAWAB SIR AHMAD SAID KHAN, OF CHHITARI, K.C.I.E., M.B.E.

MAHARAJADHIRAJA OF DARBHANGA.

CAPTAIN RAJA SHER MUHAMMAD KHAN.

MR. FAZL-UL-HUQ.

MR. M. M. OHN GHINE.

MR. A. H. GHUZZAVI.

* Also acted as "Secretary-General" to the Indian States Delegation.

† Died 4th January 1931.

§ Elected "Chairmen" of the Conference at Plenary Session of 17th Nov., 1930.

LIEUT.-COL. H. A. J. GIDNEY, I.M.S. (Retired).

SIR O. DE GLANVILLE, C.I.E., O.B.E.

SIR GHULAM HUSSAIN HIDAYATULLAH.

KHAN BAHADUR HAFIZ HIDAYAT HUSAIN.

MR. B. V. JADHAV.

MR. M. R. JAYAKAR.

SIR COWASJI JEHangIR, K.C.I.E., O.B.E.

MR. M. A. JINNAH.

MR. T. F. GAVIN JONES.

MR. N. M. JOSHI.

DR. NARENDRA NATH LAW.

SIR B. N. MITRA, K.C.S.I., K.C.I.E., C.B.E.

SIR P. C. MITTER, C.I.E.

MR. H. P. MODY.

DR. B. S. MOONJE.

DIWAN BAHADUR RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR.

DIWAN BAHADUR RAJA NARENDRA NATH.

RAO BAHADUR A. T. PANNIR SELVAM.

RAJA OF PARLAKIMEDI.

RAO BAHADUR SIR A. P. PATRO.

MR. K. T. PAUL, O.B.E.

NAWAB SIR ABDUL QAIYUM, K.C.I.E.

DIWAN BAHADUR M. RAMACHANDRA RAO.

MR. B. SHIVA RAO.

SIR SAYED SULTAN AHMED.

SIR TEJ BAHADUR SAPRU, K.C.S.I.

SIR MUHAMMAD SHAFI, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.

SARDAR SAMPURAN SINGH.

§THE RIGHT HON. SRINIVASA SASTRI, C.H.

SIR CHIMANLAL SETALVAD, K.C.I.E.

RAI BAHADUR KUNWAR BISHESHWAR DAYAL SETH.

SIR PHIROZE SETHNA, O.B.E.

DR. SHAFAT AHMAD KHAN.

BEGUM SHAH NAWAZ.

M. R. RY. RAO BAHADUR SRINIVASAN.

MRS. SUBBARAYAN.

MR. S. B. TAMBE.

SARDAR SAHIB SARDAR UJJAL SINGH.

§ Elected "Chairmen" of the Conference at Plenary Session of 17th Nov., 1930.

SIR C. E. WOOD.

MR. ZAFRULLAH KHAN.

OFFICIALS ATTENDING IN A CONSULTATIVE CAPACITY.

SIR W. M. HAILEY, G.C.I.E., K.C.S.I., I.C.S.

SIR C. A. INNES, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., I.C.S.

SIR A. C. MACWATTERS, C.I.E., I.C.S.

MR. H. G. HAIG, C.S.I., C.I.E., I.C.S.

MR. L. W. REYNOLDS, C.S.I., C.I.E., M.C.

INDIAN STATES ADVISERS.

Advisers to the Delegate for Hyderabad.

LIEUT.-COL. SIR RICHARD CHENIVIX-TRENCH, C.I.E., O.B.E.

NAWAB MAHDI YAR JUNG.

SIR AHMAD HUSAIN, AMIN JUNG, K.C.I.E., C.S.I.

SIR REGINALD GLANCY, K.C.I.E., C.S.I.

Adviser to the Delegate for the S. Indian States.

DIWAN BAHADUR T. RAGHAVIAH, C.S.I.

Adviser to His Highness the Maharaja Gaekwar of Baroda.

RAO BAHADUR KRISHNAMA CHARI, C.I.E.

Adviser for the Orissa States.

MR. K. C. NEOGY, M.L.A.

Advisers nominated by the Chamber of Princes Special Organisation.

MR. L. F. RUSHBROOK WILLIAMS, C.B.E.

QAZI ALI HAIDAR ABBASI.

SIRDAR JARMANI DAS, O.B.E.

DIWAN BAHADUR A. B. LATTHE.

RAO SAHIB D. A. SURVE.

SECRETARIATS.

Government.

MR. S. K. BROWN, C.V.O.

MR. V. DAWSON, C.I.E.

MR. K. S. FITZE, I.C.S.

MR. W. H. LEWIS, C.I.E., I.C.S.

Conservative.

MR. R. J. STOPFORD.

Liberal.

PROF. J. COATMAN, C.I.E.

Indian States.

MR. M. PICKTHALL.

MR. K. M. PANIKKAR.

MR. N. S. SUBBA RAO.

British India Delegation.

SIR GEOFFREY CORBETT, K.B.E., C.I.E., I.C.S.

MR. A. LATIFI, O.B.E., I.C.S.

MR. G. S. BAJPAI, C.I.E., C.B.E., I.C.S.

SECRETARIAT-GENERAL.

MR. R. H. A. CARTER, C.B., *Secretary-General.*

KHAN BAHADUR MIAN ABDUL AZIZ, C.B.E.,
PUNJAB C.S.

MR. W. D. CROFT

MR. G. E. J. GENT, D.S.O., M.C.

MR. B. G. HOLDSWORTH, I.C.S.

MR. R. F. MUDIE, O.B.E., I.C.S.

MR. G. S. RAJADHYAKSHA, I.C.S.

} *Secretaries.*

PUBLICITY OFFICERS.

MR. HUGH MACGREGOR.

MR. G. F. STEWARD, C.B.E.

MR. A. H. JOYCE.

INDIAN ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE.

Opening Speeches, 12th November, 1930.

SPEECH DELIVERED BY HIS MAJESTY THE KING-EMPEROR.

It affords Me much satisfaction to welcome in the Capital of My Empire the representatives of the Princes, Chiefs and People of India, and to inaugurate their Conference with My Ministers and with representatives of the other Parties composing the Parliament in whose precincts we are assembled.

More than once the Sovereign has summoned historic assemblies on the soil of India, but never before have British and Indian Statesmen and Rulers of Indian States met, as you now meet, in one place and round one table, to discuss the future system of government for India and seek agreement for the guidance of My Parliament as to the foundations upon which it must stand.

Nearly ten years ago, in a message to My Indian Legislature, I dwelt upon the significance of its establishment in the constitutional progress of India. Ten years is but a brief span in the life of any Nation, but this decade has witnessed, not only in India but throughout all the Nations forming the British Commonwealth, a quickening and growth in ideals and aspirations of Nationhood which defy the customary measurement of time. It should therefore be no matter of surprise to the men of this generation that, as was then contemplated, it should have become necessary to estimate and review the results of what was begun ten years ago and to make further provision for the future. Such a review has been lately carried out by the Statutory Commission appointed by Me for that purpose and you will have before you the outcome of their labours, together with other contributions which have been or can be made to the solution of the great problem confronting you.

No words of Mine are needed to bring home to you the momentous character of the task to which you have set your hands. Each one of you will, with Me, be profoundly conscious how much depends, for the whole of the British Commonwealth, on the issue of your consultations. This community of interest leads Me to count it as of happy augury that there should be present to-day the representatives of My Governments in all the Sister States of that Commonwealth.

I shall follow the course of your proceedings with the closest and most sympathetic interest, not indeed without anxiety but with a greater confidence. The material conditions which surround the lives of My subjects in India affect Me nearly, and will be ever present in your thoughts during your forthcoming deliberations.

I have also in mind the just claims of majorities and minorities, of men and women, of town dwellers and tillers of the soil, of landlords and tenants, of the strong and the weak, of the rich and the poor, of the races, castes and creeds of which the body politic is composed. For these things I care deeply. I cannot doubt that the true foundation of self-government is in the fusion of such divergent claims into mutual obligations and in their recognition and fulfilment. It is My hope that the future government of India based on this foundation will give expression to her honourable aspirations.

May your discussions point the way to the sure achievement of this end, and may your names go down to history as those of men who served India well, and whose endeavours advanced the happiness and prosperity of all My beloved People.

I pray that Providence may grant you in bounteous measure, wisdom, patience and goodwill.

After His Majesty had left the Royal Gallery and after the Company had resumed their seats, HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF PATIALA (Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes) said:—

The gracious Address which His Majesty The King-Emperor has just delivered strikes a responsive chord in our hearts, and if we can succeed in following the lead which he has given us, I feel confident that our deliberations will be crowned with success. In proposing that the Prime Minister of Great Britain, The Rt. Hon. Mr. James Ramsay MacDonald, should be appointed Chairman to preside over the deliberations of the Conference, I know I am voicing the wish of all present. I can assure you, Mr. Prime Minister, that all of us, whether we are Princes or Ministers, who represent the Indian States, will co-operate most heartily with Great Britain and with British India in working for the solution of the problems which jointly confront us. As Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes I have the honour to propose that the Prime Minister should be appointed as Chairman of the Conference to preside over our deliberations.

HIS HIGHNESS THE AGA KHAN.

I have great pleasure in seconding the proposal of His Highness the Maharaja of Patiala.

The motion was carried with acclamation.

(The Chair was then taken by the Prime Minister.)

SPEECH DELIVERED BY MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD.

I have, first of all, to thank the Maharaja of Patiala and His Highness the Aga Khan for the very generous and hearty way in which they moved the proposition which has been carried so unanimously.

My first duty as Chairman of this Conference is to ask your consent—and I know it will be forthcoming in full measure—that I should convey our humble duty to His Majesty, and an expression of the loyal gratitude with which we have welcomed his gracious presence here and of the inspiration which his words have given us. I know also that you would have me include in your message our loyal and grateful appreciation of the kindly solicitude of Her Majesty the Queen which my Indian friends have been privileged to experience already. Nor are we unmindful that it is to His Majesty's gracious permission that we owe the honour of holding our meeting in this Chamber to-day and hereafter in the Royal Palace of St. James's. We are deeply sensible of these signal marks of Their Majesties' sympathy and favour.

I am very conscious of the responsibility you have put upon me. But responsibility lies heavily on us all at this Conference. For we are now at the very birth of a new history. The declarations made by British Sovereigns and Statesmen from time to time that Great Britain's work in India was to prepare her for self-government have been plain. If some say that they have been applied with woeful tardiness, I reply that no permanent evolution has seemed to anyone going through it to be anything but tardy. I am never disturbed by people who say I have not fulfilled my pledges, provided I *am fulfilling* them. We have met to try and register by agreement a recognition of the fact that India has reached a distinctive point in her constitutional evolution. Whatever that agreement may be, there will be some who will say that it is not good enough or that it goes too far. Let them say so. We must boldly come out and appeal to an intelligent and informed public opinion. The men who co-operate are the pioneers of progress. Civil disorder is the way of reaction. It destroys the social mentality from which all constitutional development derives its source and upon which all stable internal administration is based.

The task that lies ahead of us is beset by difficulties for the solution of which the past affords no ready-made guide; there are stubborn diversities of view that have still to be brought together, and conflicting interests that have hitherto proved irreconcilable.

Could any issues be more momentous than those we are facing this morning? Could any, at the same time, be more enticing to men who love to make the rough places smooth? We must bring to our task all the resources of mutual trust, of practical sagacity, of statesmanship, which we can command.

This is not the time even for reciting, to say nothing of prejudging, our problems. We shall meet them as we proceed. Let us face them as men determined to surmount them. Why not? What problems of growth and of development in liberty and institutions have our peoples not faced, and united we remain, in spite of all our diversities, because of our skill in harmonising differences by reasonable mutual accommodation. Proof of that is that very goodly array of distinguished Prime Ministers who have been with us for the last few weeks consulting about Dominion affairs.

His Majesty's presence at the opening of our deliberations enabled us to understand both the strength and the flexibility of the bond which binds our whole Commonwealth of Nations together in loyalty and devotion to the Crown. The attendance of representatives of the Dominion Governments is an earnest of the interest and goodwill with which the sister-States in the Commonwealth of Nations will follow our labours. The association of the Princes for the first time in joint conclave with representatives of the people of British India is symbolical of the gradual moulding together of India into one whole. And when I turn to the representatives of British India, I am mindful, it is true, of India's different communities and languages and interests, but I am reminded still more of the quickening and unifying influences which have grown up irresistibly from her contact with Great Britain, and also, and still deeper, of the aspirations for a united India which were in the minds of her philosophers and her rulers before the first English trader set foot on her shores. Nor is it without significance that we, who, though not of India, also seek India's honour, are drawn from all three Parties in this Parliament, on the inter-play of whose rivalries, no less than ideals, is built up our British system of Government. But apart from these things, surely, the simple fact that we have come here to sit at one table with the set and sole purpose of India's advancement within the companionship of the Commonwealth, is in itself an undeniable sign of progress towards that end, and also an inspiring challenge to reach agreement.

We must now begin our labours. Things have been said in the past, whether in anger, in blindness or for mischief, which we had better forget at this table. Whatever be the story that is to be written of this Conference, be assured a story *will* be written. Let us strive to make it worthy of the best political genius of our peoples and to add by it to the respect paid by the world to both our nations.

SPEECH DELIVERED BY HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA GAEKWAR OF BARODA.

On this momentous occasion in the history of India and the Empire, it is my privilege to address to you a few words on behalf of the Indian States Delegation here assembled to take part in the Conference which His Majesty the King-Emperor has to-day been graciously pleased to open.

We are deeply beholden to His Majesty to whom I beg you, Mr. Prime Minister, to convey our sentiments of Loyalty to his Throne and Person.

These historic precincts have witnessed many Conferences fraught with import: but I doubt if ever before they have been the scene of such a one as this, when the issues at stake involve the prosperity and contentment of India's millions and the greatness of the British Empire.

By the concession in generous measure of the aspirations of the Princes and Peoples of India, and by that alone, can realisation

be given to the noble words of Victoria, the great Queen, as expressed in a famous Proclamation:—

They are these:—

“In their prosperity will be Our strength; in their contentment Our security; in their gratitude Our best reward.”

May we all labour whole-heartedly, with mutual trust and goodwill, for the attainment of so great an end.

SPEECH DELIVERED BY HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF JAMMU AND KASHMIR (Pro-Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes).

I must express our deep gratitude to His Most Gracious Majesty for the cordial welcome tendered to us, and I pray that Providence may grant to us the vision and the will to realise the hopes expressed in those inspiring words uttered this morning by our beloved King-Emperor.

This is the first occasion on which the Princes of India in person sit at the Conference Table along with representatives of British India and of His Majesty's Government to discuss the political future of India. Allied by treaty with the British Crown and within our territories independent rulers, we have come here with a full sense of responsibility to our States and to all India. As allies of Britain, we stand solidly by the British connexion. As Indians and loyal to the Land whence we derive our birth and infant nurture, we stand as solidly as the rest of our countrymen for our Land's enjoyment of a position of honour and equality in the British Commonwealth of Nations. Our desire to co-operate to the best of our ability with all sections of this Conference is a genuine desire; so too is genuine our determination to base our co-operation upon the realities of the present situation.

Neither England nor India can afford to see this Conference end in failure. We must approach our task resolved to succeed and to overcome all difficulties. We all will have to exercise much patience, tact and forbearance; we must be inspired by mutual understanding and good-will. We needs must give and take. If we succeed, it is England no less than India which gains. If we fail, it is India no less than England which loses. We are not assembled to dictate or accept terms; we are met together to adjust mutual interests for the common benefit.

The task confronting this Conference is a gigantic one. In the case of no people would such an aim as ours be easy of accomplishment. In the case of India, the complexity of the factors is unique. But we believe that difficulties exist only to be surmounted, and, by the Grace of God, with good-will and sympathy on both sides, surmounted they shall be.

With the noble words of the King-Emperor's speech still ringing in our ears, we Princes affirm that this Conference shall not fail through any fault of ours.

SPEECH DELIVERED BY SIR MUHAMMAD AKBAR HYDARI.

The address which we have been privileged to hear to-day from the lips of His Majesty The King-Emperor, full as it is of that personal sympathy to which every Indian heart readily responds, will prove an inspiration and a guide for all of us.

His Exalted Highness the Nizam, whose representative on the Indian States Delegation I have the honour to be, counts amongst his proudest titles that of "Faithful Ally of the British Government." For 150 years the Nizams have held steadfast to this alliance—"an alliance in perpetuity," as the treaties proudly proclaim it to be.

As with Hyderabad, so with all States; and I can assure the peoples of the Empire and the world at large that no hand shall sever the ties which bind the Princes to the Crown.

At the same time the States, autonomous within their own borders, can fully sympathise with the aims and ideals of the peoples of British India and are ready to work in harmony with them for the Greater and United India, which we all hope may be the outcome of our deliberations.

It is in this spirit we enter the Conference, and in this spirit we shall do all that lies in our power to assist in the solution of the problems of our country and the satisfaction of her aspirations.

Every race, creed and region has its own distinct contribution to make to the common weal, and we of the States for our part bring with us no mean inheritance—the traditions and culture handed down from spacious days, when in politics, arts and science India stood amongst the foremost peoples of the world.

We approach our task, which is beset with so many difficulties, in all humility, trusting not in our own power, but in the guiding hand of the Divine Providence.

SPEECH DELIVERED BY MR. Y. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI.

We all feel heartened to our task by the gracious and inspiring words of His Majesty. They contain lessons which we must practise if we would succeed in the enterprise about to begin, Sir, under your sagacious and often proved guidance. The Crown is the symbol both of power and of unity and draws our hearts in willing homage and reverence. It is more. It is the fountain of justice, freedom and equality among the various peoples of the Commonwealth. Loyalty, therefore, enjoins the faithful and unceasing pursuit of these ideals and we should be failing in our duty to the Crown if we knowingly tolerated, anywhere under the British flag, conditions that produced injustice, inequality or undue restrictions on the growth of communities. This Conference will enable all parties interested in India to bring together their ideas on the subject of her contentment and peaceful advance to the fulfilment of her destiny. Bold and candid speech is required, but also moderation, forbearance and readiness to appreciate differing views. Above

all the vision of India as a whole must shine brightly in our hearts, and her strength and prosperity must be the sovereign consideration governing all our plans. You will hear, Sir, many claims and counsels, and some of them may be in partial conflict. Our united prayer is that somehow, through the magic of your personality, these discordant claims will be reconciled and these fragmentary counsels may be gathered into one complete scheme so that this table, whatever its exact physical shape, may be hereafter remembered in history as the table of rounded wisdom and statesmanship. Through all the clouds of prejudice and misunderstanding that darken the problem two statements of policy shine like bright stars by whose light we can guide ourselves. They both have the indisputable authority of His Majesty's Government. One was made by His Excellency the Viceroy just a year ago: it was to the effect that the natural issue of India's constitutional progress, as contemplated in the declaration of August, 1917, is the attainment of Dominion Status. The other was made by him in July this year. It promised India the enjoyment of as large a degree of management of her own affairs as could be shown to be compatible with the necessity of making provision for those matters in regard to which she was not yet in a position to assume responsibility. Our allotted task is to interpret these statements liberally and translate them courageously into concrete proposals for the benefit of India and the increased glory of the Commonwealth.

SPEECH DELIVERED BY MR. M. A. JINNAH.

May I, at the very outset, say that we appreciate greatly the signal marks of sympathy and kindness on the part of Their Majesties referred to by you and I am sure we all consent in full measure that you should convey our grateful acknowledgments as proposed by you.

This is not an occasion for long speeches nor can I here at this moment discuss some of the vital issues which are uppermost in our minds; but every one here will agree with me when I say that it is very fortunate indeed that a Statesman of your calibre and experience, Sir, has honoured us by agreeing to preside over our deliberations, notwithstanding your other multifarious and responsible duties; and I sincerely pray that your expression of confidence in the ultimate success of this Conference may prove true.

I am glad, Mr. President, that you referred to the fact that "the declarations made by British Sovereigns and Statesmen from time to time that Great Britain's work in India was to prepare her for self-government have been plain", and may I point out further, that the announcement made as recently as 31st October, 1929, by His Excellency the Viceroy on behalf of His Majesty's Government, declared that in their judgment it was implicit in the Declaration of 1917 that the natural issue of India's constitutional progress as there contemplated is the attainment of Dominion Status.

But I must emphasise that India now expects translation and fulfilment of these declarations into action.

There never was a more momentous or graver issue in the history of our two nations than the one we are called upon to face to-day and upon the solution of which hangs the fate of nearly one-fifth of the population of the world.

We welcome the association of the Princes with the representatives of the people of British India and I share the hope with you, Mr. Prime Minister, that all parties and interests and communities concerned will bring to bear upon the task before us—to use your words—all the resources of mutual trust, practical sagacity and statesmanship which they can command.

In conclusion, I must express my pleasure at the presence of the Dominion Prime Ministers and Representatives. I am glad that they are here to witness the birth of a new Dominion of India which would be ready to march along with them within the British Commonwealth of Nations.

SPEECH DELIVERED BY MR. BA PE.

The Burmese Delegates are deeply sensible of the signal honour which has been done to Burma by the selection of a Burman to speak on this momentous and historic occasion. It is an honour which will cause genuine pleasure and satisfaction to our countrymen; and on their behalf I wish to say how grateful we are to His Majesty The King for the gracious words he has spoken to us to-day; and I humbly beg leave to assure him of our loyalty to him and his Royal Consort. It has caused us heartfelt satisfaction to see him restored to health and we pray that he may live long to preside over the destinies of this great Empire.

The people of Burma are very grateful to His Majesty's Government for arranging this Round Table Conference, and we believe that a frank and full and friendly discussion can only result in good, both for the people of Britain and of Burma. We believe that friendly discussion will remove obstacles and solve problems that, viewed from one standpoint, only appear insurmountable or insoluble.

We desire to thank His Majesty's Government, the political Parties and leaders and the people of England for the hearty welcome they have given to us and for the generous hospitality they have extended to us.

The case of Burma is in some ways a special one, but we bring to the Conference in the fullest measure goodwill and co-operation, confident that the result of our joint deliberations will promote the political progress of Burma and satisfy the aspirations of its people and increase their prosperity and happiness. We have come to the Conference with high hopes that, if I may be permitted to adopt the words that you, Sir, used on another occasion only two days ago, our liberty will be broadened, so that we may live with you under the same Crown, enjoying that freedom in self-government which is essential for national self respect and contentment. As Burmans we love Burma our country. We believe in it and in the

greatness that lies before it. We look to England with friendship and affection and hope that we shall soon take our place with other Dominions as equal partners in the great British Empire.

Chairman: Your Highness, My Lords, Ladies and Gentlemen: We have a little piece of business to do which will only keep us in this sitting for a few minutes. I understand that, as a result of the exchange of views privately, an agreement has been come to which enables me to propose this resolution:—

“ That a Committee to advise the Conference on the conduct of business shall be constituted, composed of the following sixteen Delegates, each of whom shall have the right to nominate another Delegate to take his place in his absence:

His Highness The Maharaja of Alwar.

Mr. Benn.

His Highness The Maharaja of Bikaner.

Sir Hubert Carr.

Colonel Haksar.

Sir Samuel Hoare.

Sir Akbar Hydari.

Sir Mirza Muhammad Ismail.

Mr. Jayakar.

Mr. Jinnah.

Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra.

The Marquess of Reading.

Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru.

Sir Muhammad Shafi.

Mr. Srinivasa Sastri.

Sardar Sahib Ujjal Singh.”

The resolution was then put and carried unanimously.

Chairman: That resolution having been adopted, the Session will now adjourn. The first sitting of the Committee that has just been appointed will be held at 3-30 this afternoon at St. James's Palace, and this Conference itself is adjourned until Monday, the 17th November, at 10-30 A.M., at St. James's Palace.

Plenary Session, 17th November, 1930.

Chairman: It is my honour, first of all, to read to you a communication which I have received from His Majesty's Private Secretary, Lord Stamfordham:—

"The King has received the Prime Minister's submission of the message of yesterday from the Indian Round Table Conference expressing gratitude to His Majesty for undertaking the opening ceremony and also thanking the Queen for the kindly solicitude which Her Majesty has displayed towards the Delegates. This communication* has been received with much satisfaction by Their Majesties."

There is nothing for me to say to-day except to welcome you most heartily to this Conference. My friends, there are two things that we will keep in mind. First of all, we are going to co-operate together; secondly, every one of us must be animated by the determination to succeed.

* The text of this was as follows:—

The Delegates to the Indian Round Table Conference at their first meeting, and as their first official act, desire to present their respectful duty to the King. The Delegates join in loyal gratitude to His Majesty for having honoured the opening of the Conference with His gracious presence, and for the inspiration which the words of His Speech have given them. They are most sensible of the kindly solicitude which Her Majesty The Queen has displayed towards them; and they desire to submit their grateful appreciation for the honour which, by these and other marks of favour, Their Majesties have done to the Conference.

THE GENERAL DISCUSSION.*

Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru: Mr. Prime Minister, the responsibility which has been cast upon my shoulders in presenting the case of my country to you is very great, but I will beg some patience on your part, for the subject is great and complicated. It involves many delicate issues affecting not only India but the relations of India to England.

Let me tell you at the outset that we are here to add, if we can, a bright chapter to the history of the relations of England and India.

Mr. Prime Minister, you and other British statesmen have, in the long course of your political experience and duties, been accustomed to preside over, or to be associated with, so many Conferences of an international character that it ill becomes a humble politician like me from across the seas to tell you that so many hopes are bound up with the success of this Conference. An anxious, restless India is watching you. May I also add that the eyes of the whole world are on you. Not only are we Indians on our trial, but, if I may respectfully say so, and if I may beg you not to misunderstand me, the whole of British statesmanship is on its trial.

This is absolutely the first time in the history of the connection of India with England that such a big gesture has been made by England towards India. It is a gesture which means that Indians and Englishmen should sit round the table, not to enter merely into a clash of ideas, but, if possible, to evolve a constitution for the country, which may settle our difficulties for all time to come, and which may enable us to settle down to constructive work.

Mr. Chairman, I will only ask you to bear with me when I remind you of the circumstances under which this Conference has been called. Last year—I believe it was on the 31st October, 1929—His Excellency Lord Irwin, for whom, let me tell you frankly, I have a genuine admiration—a Viceroy who is very much misunderstood, to my surprise, in his country, and let me say also in my country, but whose heart is with us—I feel assured about it—made that famous announcement. The secret history as to how that announcement came to be made has yet to be written, but we must take that announcement as an accomplished fact. You pledged yourself there to certain ideas, to a certain policy, and this Conference has been convened to implement that policy. In his speech, which Lord Irwin delivered on the 9th July last to the Indian Legislature, he again referred to that matter in these words, that the purpose of this Conference was that the spokesmen of Great Britain and India would take free counsel together upon the measures which his Government would later present to Parliament, and if I may be permitted to refer to a letter which Lord Irwin addressed to my distinguished friend,

* See paragraph 2 of Introductory Note (p. 1).

Mr. Jayakar, and myself when we started on a mission which unfortunately has failed, His Excellency wrote as follows:—

“ It remains my earnest desire, as it is that of my Government and, I have no doubt, also that of His Majesty's Government to do everything that we can in our respective spheres to assist the people of India to obtain as large a degree of management of their own affairs as can be shown to be consistent with making provision for those matters in regard to which they are not at present in a position to assume responsibility. What those measures may be, and what provisions may be made for them, will engage the attention of the Conference; but I have never believed that, with mutual confidence on both sides, it should be impossible to reach agreement.”

It is in that spirit and for that purpose that we have come; and let me tell you, Sir, that we have come here across the seas in the midst of the gibes and ridicule of our own countrymen. We have already been described, in our country, as traitors to the cause. We have come here in the midst of that opposition, but we have brought with us a determination to argue with you, to discuss with you frankly and freely, to make our contribution to the solution of the problem, to make ourselves heard, but also to hear you, to invite you to make your contribution, so that in the end we may say that those who have already forecast the future were really false prophets.

It is in that spirit that I wish to present my case before you. Let me tell you that no greater mistake can be made by British statesmen and by my British friends—and I claim that I do possess some friends among the British—than to imagine that India stands to-day where she did even ten years ago. I think the idea of the progress that India has made during the last ten years could not have been better described than in the gracious words of our Sovereign on that opening day of this Conference. We have travelled a very long distance. Let that be realised. Let this time-worn theory that we are only a handful of men be abolished for good. Mr. Jayakar and I, during the months of July, August and September, were constantly travelling from one end of the country to the other, and we saw with our own eyes, we heard with our own ears, signs and cries which it would have been impossible for me or for him to imagine. When I read in the English Press descriptions of the situation in India my heart sinks. I am not making reference to these things with the object of frightening you. I am not holding out any threat. I am simply stating facts. I make a confession, an absolutely honest confession, that, so far as I am concerned, I have realised from the beginning the grave dangers of the Civil Disobedience movement to my country. But while I have realised the grave dangers of that movement, I have also realised the importance of placing a true interpretation on what it really represents. I beg of you on this occasion to rise superior to the small administrative view of this question and to take a broad and statesmen-like view and measure of the unrest that you find in

India. I beg of you to think like this. Never before in the history of India, never before even in the Mogul period of history, has India been governed by agents and sub-agents. The Moguls or the Muhammadans might have come as invaders, but they settled down and became men of the same country, became part and parcel of our social system. What is the system that you have established? It is the system of Parliamentary Sovereignty, sovereignty exercised by some 600 odd members of Parliament on behalf of a population of forty-five millions—you will correct me I hope if I have got the wrong figures of that population—and you are attempting to exercise that sovereignty over 320 million people living 6,000 miles away from the centre of your political power. I speak with the utmost deference in the presence of the Secretary of State, but I do say that the ordinary Member of Parliament has neither the necessary time, nor the necessary capacity, nor the necessary vision to understand the mind or the feelings of India, and, if Mr. Wedgwood Benn will excuse me, I will say that the Secretary of State, however distinguished he may be, is one of those 600 men. Necessarily he has to depend upon the advice of men in the India Office. Let me tell you quite frankly that, while I have great admiration for the Civil Service—whether it is your Civil Service or the Civil Service of my own country—I cannot forget that while Civil Servants can be very good servants they are very bad masters. Therefore I say that ultimately it comes down not to Parliamentary Sovereignty, but to the sovereignty of half a dozen men in England and half a dozen men in India. That is how the theory of Parliamentary Sovereignty works out. Can you expect a country like mine, brought into contact with Western ideas, vibrating with the new movement of the East, to remain content with that sort of government? Certainly not. I say, therefore, that it is perfectly natural that we should seek freedom, freedom within our own borders as an integral part of the British Commonwealth of Nations. You will ask me what is it exactly that you want. When I have talked to my British friends—and some of them are very highly placed statesmen—when I have used in the course of conversation that forbidden phrase “ Dominion Status”, some of them have asked me “ What does it all mean? ” I have been asked that question in fact by one of your biggest statesmen—I shall not name him—in private. When we talk about Dominion Status the average Englishman stands up in the middle of the road and asks “ What does it all mean? ” I would respectfully ask whether in 1865, when you had to tackle the question of Canada, or in 1900, when you had to tackle the problem of Australia, or in 1909, when you were face to face with the problem of South Africa after that terrible war, whether the average Englishman stood up in the middle of the road and asked “ What does it all mean? ” When you ask me what are the implications of Dominion Status, I am ready to give an answer to that question, but let me tell you what we want before I proceed further. Avoiding that expression which is unpleasant to some ears, I will put my case like this: India wants, and is determined to achieve, a status of equality—equality with the other three members of the

British Commonwealth, an equality which will give it a Government not merely responsive to, but responsible to the popular voice. Speaking for myself, I say—and I say it with all the conviction I possess, conviction based not merely on theory but on experience derived, if I may respectfully say so, from my official life, however brief it may have been—that it will not do for you to take a provincial view and offer provincial autonomy or anything of that kind, unless you couple with it a decided and clear change in the constitution of the Central Government. You must make that responsible to the Legislature. At this stage you may ask me, “Assuming that India wants a responsible Central Government, what is going to be the relation of that responsible Central Government to the Provinces, and what is going to be the relation of the responsible Central Government to the States?” That at once gives rise to the question whether our constitution should be of a federal character.

Sir, before I express any views may I make a very respectful appeal to some of my illustrious countrymen who are patriots first and Princes afterwards? It will not do for Their Highnesses—and I know that they are far from conceiving such a thing—to say that they are here only for the protection of their rights. Let me respectfully tell them that they are Indians first and Indian Princes next, and that they owe as much duty to the common Motherland as we do. I am not one of those who have a horror of Indian Princes. I make that confession publicly. I think the Indian Prince is every inch as patriotic as any one of us, and I take an earnest appeal to them not to confine their vision merely to what is called “One-third India.” I ask them to say whether at any time in history India was so arbitrarily divided as it is now geographically—British India or Indian India. I say we are one India. Let them move forward with the vision of an India which will be one single whole, each part of which may be autonomous and may enjoy absolute independence within its own borders, regulated by proper relations with the rest. I therefore ask them to come forth on this occasion and say whether they are prepared to join an All-India Federation. I express no definite opinion; I will not commit this Conference to any particular issue on this point. These issues have to be examined carefully and minutely. I do suggest, however, that, so far as we are concerned, we have a vision of a united India, and not merely of an India divided into so many compartments. I have no doubt that when H. H. The Maharaja of Bikaner addresses this Conference he will advert to these questions and that he will take us now into his confidence.

It seems to me that if you agree that there has got to be responsibility in the Centre, it is inevitable that you must ask yourself the question unitary or federal. Speaking for myself—and I speak in regard to this matter in my individual capacity—I am a very strong believer in the federal form of government. I believe that therein lies the solution of the difficulty and the salvation of India; and if I were to express my opinion freely I would welcome the

association of the Indian States with British India mainly for three reasons. I say that they will furnish a stabilising factor in our constitution. I further say that the process of unification will begin at once. I lastly say that, in regard to matters of defence, they will furnish a practical experience which is yet wanting in British India.

For all these reasons I invite them to join this bigger Federation. The details of that have to be worked out. They were not present to the mind of the Government of India when they wrote their Despatch. The Government of India in their Despatch vaguely speak of a far-off distant Federation. With us it is a real live issue now. If we can come to some solution of that, I frankly think that nothing better can be achieved at this Conference.

Having said that much, if you will permit me, I will revert to the question of the form of government. I may be reminded by some of my friends that an absolutely unrestricted responsible government at the Centre is at the present moment an impossibility. I may be reminded that there is the question of law and order involved. I may be reminded that there are European interests involved; that there is the entire system of commerce involved; that there is finance, which is the basis of all constitution, involved. My answer is this. If these are difficulties, by all means face them; find a solution for them. But you ought not, and you cannot, treat them as insurmountable difficulties—difficulties which make it imperative on you to say “No, gentlemen, we shall not admit your claim to responsibility at the Centre, because these are difficulties for which our combined statesmanship is unable to find any solution.” I do not want my friends of the British Delegations to take that position. No one can be more interested in the maintenance of law and order than we Indians. I admit there may be difficulties; but what has been your history during the last 25 years ever since the partition of Bengal? Every five years there has sprung up an agitation of an acute character, and we have had—and by “we” I mean the Europeans and the Indians—either to resort to extraordinary powers or to shut up thousands of men, and to put up with grave breaches of the law. Is this what you call the maintenance of law and order? Surely no Indian Minister could have made graver blunders than have been made in dealing with a situation of this character. I do say that that is a position which has got to be fairly faced, and you will never be able to maintain law and order so long as you do not satisfy political aspirations, so long as the question of minorities is not settled, so long as the untouchables and the Depressed Classes do not feel they have a definite position of honourable equality. Solve these problems and then the whole problem of law and order becomes very much simpler.

I come now to commerce. What is the trouble about commerce? I am quite aware that there is a very large amount of European capital invested in India, but let me tell you that I am not one of those—and I believe there is not a single man here—who

would like to have any expropriatory legislation. We do not want to rob the Europeans of their capital. On the contrary, we are most anxious that our friends the Europeans, who have settled down in India or who carry on their business there, should feel that they have the same rights and privileges which genuine born Indians have. They are quite welcome to suggest any safeguards for their rights and interests, and we shall be more than willing to meet them.

You talk of finance, Sir, as being an obstacle, and you talk of the absence of a Reserve Bank. My answer to that is, by all means establish a Reserve Bank—a Bank based not on a political basis, but on a purely financial and economic basis. When we know that the constitution is going to be ours, that the government is going to be ours, why should we adopt a *non-possumus* attitude?

It seems to me that there is not very much force in the argument that the credit of India will disappear in the London market if finance comes into Indian hands. I know of instances in which private individuals have raised money in London. I know that your country has advanced big loans to small countries which are not within your Empire. Surely after 150 years of association with Great Britain, after having enjoyed a system of government which has established stability in the country, do you mean to say that the credit of India in the London market will disappear simply because our finances pass into other hands? Did you ever raise this question in the case of other countries? I therefore ask you, if you feel that there is any real genuine difficulty with regard to these matters, please do not use them as obstacles in our way but as difficulties to be surmounted.

I now come to the question of the Army. May I remind you of a very striking speech which the late Mr. Montagu—for whom everyone of us here has not merely respect but a deep, genuine affection—in which he said “Having kept Indians out of commissioned ranks for 70 or 80 years, having deprived them of the opportunity to build up their own Army and to receive training, does it in fairness lie in your mouth to say now ‘India must not get self-government because it cannot defend its own borders; it cannot maintain its own peace’?” The argument is neither fair nor, from a practical point of view, can it be maintained. As practical politics, we realise that there is a difficulty about the Army. We realise that we have got to train a sufficient number of our men, and we have to be patient about that; but all we say is “Give us the opportunity to train our own men; give us the freedom to establish institutions”. So far as your Army is concerned, by all means keep it in the hands of the Viceroy. Let him exercise control over the Army through the Commander-in-Chief or through a Minister whom he may appoint, and we on our part are willing to provide the funds and to agree to statutory charges in respect of the Army. These are matters which have got to be finally adjusted and examined. I have been told privately, and I have read it in documents—and it causes me some despair—that no British

Minister will agree to transfer the British Army to the control of Indian Ministers. That question to my mind is not of immediate importance, but I do hope that people who talk like that do not mean to imply that no British officer will be willing to serve under any Indian fellow subject. At the present moment it so happens—and it has happened repeatedly during the last few years—that Indians hold the highest offices under the Crown, and I have not yet known a single instance in which a member of the Indian Civil Service or of any other Service has declined to take orders from his Indian superior on the ground that he is an Indian. I appeal to my late chief, Lord Reading. I had the honour at one time, if I may be permitted to say so, to be a Member of his Government, and I appeal to him to say whether the relations between the European Members of the Executive Council and the Indian Members of the Executive Council on the one hand, and between the Indian Members of the Executive Council and the Secretaries, most of whom were members of the Indian Civil Service, were cordial or otherwise. I should like to refer to a remarkable case which exists in India at the present moment. In Lahore the Chief Justice of the High Court happens to be a distinguished countryman of mine, Sir S. Lall, one of the most striking personalities in India. I have never heard a single Judge of the High Court say that he feels it a matter of disgrace that he should be presided over by an Indian Chief Justice.

I say, therefore, let us put it on the practical ground, but do not introduce the racial element into it. After all, the point of view that we take is this: You and we are subjects of the same King—Emperor; you and we belong to the same Commonwealth of Nations; and there ought not to be any feeling of superiority or inferiority, because so long as there is that feeling of superiority or inferiority India can never be happy and can never be contented.

Let us deal with the problem of the Army, therefore, in the manner in which practical statesmanship requires it to be done; but do not say to us that, because of these obstacles, we ought to go back to our own countrymen and say the utmost that we have been able to achieve by going six thousand miles and by talking to British statesmen of all the three Parties, is provincial autonomy.

Let me ask you only one thing. I would make a personal appeal to Lord Reading on this matter, because I believe, if there is one man in this assembly who understands the constitution of India from the legal and political point of view, it is my late chief, Lord Reading. I would ask him to consider this. Do you really think that it will make for peace and harmonious action if you give the Provinces provincial autonomy, which means responsible government and on the top of that have an irresponsible Central Government? Quite apart from questions of sentiment, quite apart from questions of a political character, I say that that machinery will break down in the course of a week. It will give rise to so many deadlocks, it will cause so many occasions of friction, that the machinery will break down.

The position is therefore plain and simple, and it is this. Take your courage in your hands; provide as many safeguards as you can, so long as those safeguards do not destroy the vital principle, and then go ahead with courage and with faith. Courage and faith, together with the common sense of the people of India, will come to your rescue. Their whole future is at stake. But do not say "You shall march so many paces". The time has long since passed by when India could be told to hold its soul in patience and to march to that far-off ideal through the ages. I very respectfully beg of you to change your outlook on the whole situation.

Mr. Prime Minister, I have already taken much more time than I intended, but before I resume my seat I should like to express the hope that you and we may work in the closest possible co-operation and that we may speak without mental reservations, because I believe there can be no greater crime against England or India than to speak with mental reservations on an occasion like this. I hope that you and we may succeed in evolving a constitution which will bring peace and contentment to my country, which will make the youth of my country look on their country with pride, with confidence and with assurance, and which will make your office and your name immortal in the history of India and of England.

H. H. The Maharaja of Bikaner: Mr. Chairman, we meet in no ordinary times to attempt no ordinary task. In our immediate concern is the peace, happiness and good government of three hundred and nineteen millions of people, looking to whatever government may be established for some relief from their present distresses, who I venture once again to assert—certain unhappy circumstances notwithstanding—are loyal to the core. What then would be the results if from any irresolution on our part—from unreason on one side, or reaction on the other, from timidity in one party and a refusal to recognise the essentials of constitutional government in another—we blenched from the work and failed of our duty to secure the greater contentment of India? It goes without saying that a very heavy responsibility rests on each and every one of us taking part in this Conference, and that the issues involved are really tremendous. It is impossible to minimise the magnitude of the task that lies before us; nor do I desire to under-rate the complexity of some of the problems involved. I am an optimist, but there is no use in shutting one's eyes to facts. I have seen in Bombay and elsewhere during my travels in British India how the masses in the districts are being affected. I wish I could adequately express the gravity of the situation. I have always declined to be moved by threats of dire consequences, nor have I submitted to being dictated to at the muzzle of the pistol. But undue regard for preconceived ideas and false notions of prestige or exaggerated fear of some possible consequences have, I feel it will be agreed, also to be guarded against; and I, for one—and here I feel that I speak for my Order as well as for the representatives

of British India who are gathered round this ancient hall—refuse to be made fearful by the difficulties ahead. Rather I find in them an inspiration to put forth the uttermost that is in me, in a spirit of confidence and of courage. The very immensity of the work makes it worth doing well.

His Majesty the King-Emperor was pleased to remind us at the opening of this Conference that "the last decade has witnessed . . . a quickening and growth in ideals and aspirations of Nationhood which defy the customary measurements of time". I venture to appeal to you, Prime Minister and other Members of His Majesty's Government, and to our colleagues here representing the British Political Parties, to take their courage in both hands, to throw their hearts over the fence and follow boldly after, in the conviction that the greater our vision and determination, the greater is our success likely to be and the richer in consequence the harvest which we all—British India and the Indian States, and Great Britain and the Empire—shall reap. The ultimate attainment of Dominion Status under the Crown is inherent in the declaration of policy in 1917, and has more recently received authoritative endorsement. Let us hitch our wagon to that star, fully realising that our sister States did not reach the end at one stride, but after evolution based on experience, that in the intervening stage certain safeguards and guarantees are imperatively necessary for the security of the body politic and all parts thereof, but looking straight on. Nothing worth having can be attained without facing some risks. These were taken when Lord Durham laid the foundations for the proud position which Canada enjoys to-day as the premier Dominion in our great Commonwealth, to the mutual benefit of Great Britain and Canada. Similar risks were run when Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman secured Dominion Status for South Africa with the happiest results, for which we had every reason to be grateful during the Great War only some five years later. I am equally convinced that if this Conference will but do the right thing by India, justly and magnanimously, my country will be a willing and contented partner in the Commonwealth. She will then be only too glad, side by side with the benefits of an honourable and independent position internally, to have all the power and resources of our mighty Empire always at her back. No half-hearted measures, and no tinkering with the constitution will. I beg you to believe me, meet the situation. Many of our troubles in the past, and our troubles of the present, have arisen from these causes. Moreover when, in response to irresistible demands, some constitutional advance was made, it was often too late; and it wore the appearance of having been conceded with a bad grace and wrested from the British Government. So there never was a time in the history of India and of the Empire when courage—courage in thought, in aim, in constructive statesmanship—was more needed than now, when the great ambitions stirring India are struggling for constitutional expression. It is in the spirit of courage, confidence, imagination and liberal statesmanship, that I pray our deliberations may be guided.

From what standpoint then do we of the States approach this great task? I speak primarily for myself, though I believe I shall have the general agreement of the Princes and the Ministers representing our Indian States at this historic gathering. We are here specially to present the policies of the Indian States. First and foremost in those policies is an unflinching and unqualified loyalty to the Throne and Person of His Majesty the King-Emperor of India. With the traditions of centuries of kingship and with the instincts and responsibilities of hereditary rule ingrained in our being, the kingly idea and the monarchical system are bone of our bone, flesh of our flesh. Even if we were tempted to waken from this principle—which is impossible—the thought of the intense devotion of the Imperial House of Windsor to the interests of India would rekindle our faith. Three notable and encouraging messages from His Majesty still ring in our ears—the earnest plea for sympathy in dealing with Indian problems made at the close of the Indian tour as Prince of Wales; the watchword of hope given six years later at Calcutta; and the pledge that the Princes' privileges, rights and dignities are inviolate and inviolable renewed when the Chamber of Princes was inaugurated. In this threefold spirit of sympathy, hope and justice, encouraged by the gracious words addressed to this Conference when it was inaugurated on Wednesday, we bend with the greater optimism to the work that lies before us.

Linked with this devotion to the Crown is an unfaltering adherence to the British Commonwealth of Nations. The old idea of Empire as signifying "dominion over palm and pine" has vanished; the concept of Empire as overlordship based on force was never true and now has not even the pale shadow of reality. The unity of the Empire was signally vindicated in the Great War. The basis of that unity was reshaped at the Imperial Conference of 1926, when it was declared that the constituent States are autonomous communities within the British Empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to another in any respect of their domestic or external affairs, though united by a common allegiance to the Crown. Our attachment to the Empire or Commonwealth, call it what we may, is no mere matter of sentiment. It is based on the profound conviction that not only can each constituent State reach its full expression within these bonds and under the Crown, but a higher development, politically and economically, than it could attain as an isolated independent unit.

Thirdly, we stand without compromise on our treaty rights and all that they involve. Those Treaties are with the British Crown, and obviously cannot be transferred to any other authority without our free agreement and assent. But do not conclude from this that I am one of those people who think that things never change. The States rightly maintain that Treaties concluded in honour and friendship are binding until they may be amended, and they can only be amended by negotiation and honourable agreement on both sides. Nor must it be concluded that we of the Indian States are under the belief that changes in British India will have no reflex action on ourselves and on our relations with our own subjects.

The territories of the Indian States are so interwoven with British India, so many of the more enterprising of our traders have business in the new commercial centres on the seaboard, which have grown up under the *Pax Britannica* and the opening of the Suez Canal, that we must be influenced by the development of political ideas and institutions beyond our frontiers. But this is our affair. We know our States and our people; we live amongst our own folk and are in the most intimate contact with their needs and possibilities. We shall know how and when to adjust our system to any changing conditions; but we will do it in our own time and in our own way, free from all external interference.

Is there anything in adherence to these principles either opposed to, or inconsistent with, the fullest development of India until she takes her equal place as a constituent State in the British Commonwealth with the other Dominions, welded into an indivisible whole under the ægis of the Crown? I say, "No—a thousand times No." It is sometimes said that there are two Indias, British India and the India under the rule of her own Princes. That is true in a political sense; but India is a single geographical unit and we are all members one of another. We, the Princes, are Indians—we have our roots deep down in her historic past, we are racy of the soil. Everything which tends to the honour and prosperity of India has for us a vital concern. Everything which retards her prosperity and shakes the stability of her institutions retards our own growth and lowers our stature. We claim that we are on the side of progress. One of the most welcome signs of the times is the material weakening of the idea that the Princes are opposed to the political growth of British India, and would range themselves—or allow themselves to be arrayed—against the realisation of the just hopes of their fellow-countrymen in British India. We have, therefore, watched with the most sympathetic interest the rise of that passion for an equal position in the eyes of the world, expressed in the desire for Dominion Status, which is the dominant force amongst all thinking Indians to-day. Those of us who have grown grey under the responsibilities of rule and the practical work of administration—and thirty-two years have passed since I assumed the active governance of the State of Bikaner—deplore some of the expressions of this urge. We appreciate the fact that when contracts are broken under the impulse of revolutionary fervour, they have to be re-knit in blood and tears, and a weary path of suffering and loss trodden before society marches forward again. But behind these untoward developments, which we hope and pray is only a passing phase, lies the struggle for equality springing from our ancient culture and quickened by years of contact with the liberty-loving and constitutionally minded British people.

It is, I submit, our duty to bend our energies to the task of satisfying this righteous demand without impairing the majestic fabric of law. How best can this be achieved? My own conviction is that if we are to build well and truly, we must recognise that associated with this geographical unity India is a land of some diversity. Our starting point, therefore, must be a recognition of this diversity;

our unity must be sought not in the dead hand of an impossible uniformity but in an associated diversity. For these reasons, the establishment of a unitary State, with a sovereign parliament sitting at Delhi, to which the whole people would look in small things as in large, is to my mind impossible. There would be no room in such a constitution for the Indian States; moreover, such a government would crack under its own imponderability. Would it not mean the harnessing of the most advanced to the chariot wheels of the least developed, and the slowing down of the general tide of progress? We of the Indian States are willing to take our part in, and make our contribution to, the greater prosperity and contentment of India as a whole. I am convinced that we can best make that contribution through a federal system of government composed of the States and British India. These two partners are of different status. The Indian States are already sovereign and autonomous of right, having the honour of being linked with the Crown by means of Treaties of "perpetual alliance and friendship" and unity of interests; British India derives whatever measure of authority it may possess by devolution. But it will not be beyond the wealth of experience available at this Table to devise a means of linking these differing units into a powerful federal administration.

As to the question whether, if a federal government is devised for India, the Princes and States will enter into association with it, the final answer must obviously depend on the structure of the government indicated and on other points involved, such, for instance, as certain necessary safeguards—constitutional and fiscal—for the preservation of the rights and interests of the States and their subjects. Federalism is an elastic term: there are several forms of federal government. Conditions in India are unique. We have no historical precedents to guide us; and the position of the Indian States is, I believe I am correct in saying, absolutely without parallel. All these and many other grave questions of policy and of detail will have to be examined and defined and settled first in Committee and in informal discussions. But, speaking broadly, the Princes and States realise that an All-India Federation is likely to prove the only satisfactory solution of India's problem. A Federation, on the lines I have attempted to sketch on other occasions, has, as I have previously said, no terrors for the Princes and Governments of the Indian States. We, however, recognise that a period of transition will necessarily intervene before the Federal Government is fully constituted, and that federation cannot be achieved by coercion of the States in any form. The Indian Princes will only come into the Federation of their own free will, and on terms which will secure the just rights of their States and subjects.

I would not venture on the impertinence of even suggesting what course is best for British India. As we demand freedom from interference in our own affairs, equally we shall refrain from thrusting our oars into matters which are not our direct concern; the arrangements between the Central and Provincial Governments in British India are matters primarily outside the purview of the Indian States. If our co-operation is sought, it will, I am sure, be gladly

and freely and honestly given. Our duty is to contribute so far as we can to the evolution of a system of government which will lead to the close and effective association of the Indian States with British India whose constitution is to be hammered out here. At the same time the rights in certain directions of the Rulers of the Indian States arising from their Treaties require to be more precisely defined. The Princes and States naturally want to know where they stand. However sincerely desirous of making their contribution to a happy settlement, they will obviously find it difficult to enter into new bonds so long as their rights are left tottering on the shifting sands of expediency deemed paramount at the moment. I think I can best elucidate what is referred to by quoting from a speech I made in the Chamber of Princes on behalf of my Order, on the 27th February last:—

"New-fangled theories about the ultimate powers regarding Paramountcy, and such matters, before the appointment of the Butler Committee, and the extravagant and exaggerated imperialist claims, inconsistent with the plighted word and good faith of Great Britain, or sound statesmanship, advanced on behalf of the Paramount Power—claims more wide, more frequent, more insistent and, I respectfully submit, based on varied and not infrequently untenable grounds and opposed to constitutional and historical facts and to the provisions of our Treaties and other Engagements, and in direct contradiction of the solemn and clear pledges and assurances in the famous gracious Proclamation of Queen Victoria, repeatedly reiterated and affirmed by successive British Sovereigns in numerous Proclamations—have not helped to ease the situation or to allay the anxieties of the States or their Rulers, Governments or people."

The Princes and States fortified by the legal opinion obtained from some of the most eminent Counsel in Great Britain have found themselves unable particularly to accept such claims on the principles enunciated in this connection by the Indian States Committee, and have already taken up the matter with the Viceroy and British Government. Starting with the basic recognition that our Treaty Rights exist and must be respected; that they are with the Crown and cannot be transferred to any other authority without our agreement; and that they can be modified only with our free assent; three developments of the existing administrative machinery are essential for the smooth working of the new system, and indeed of any system: It is an open matter of complaint that our Treaty Rights have been infringed. I need not stress this point, for it has been publicly admitted by no less an authority than the Viceroy and Governor-General of India that the Treaty Rights of the States have been encroached upon, and that in some cases an arbitrary body of usage and political practice has come into being. The time has passed when issues of this importance can be decided *ex parte* by any government. We therefore attach the utmost importance to the establishment of a Supreme Court, with full powers to

entertain and adjudicate upon all disputes of a justiciable nature as to our rights and obligations guaranteed under our Treaties. This is another point which I need not labour, for it is a principle to which the leaders of political thought in British India have, I believe I am right in saying, lent their full support. Next, we claim that in the questions which arise concerning the purely internal affairs of the States their case should not go by default. That will be of still greater importance in the future. The King's Vicegerent in India is even now burdened with many and grievous responsibilities, which will be weighted under the new system of government; and here I would once again like to be associated in a respectful tribute to, and to express our deep admiration and gratitude for that great Viceroy, Lord Irwin. We think that it will be impossible for any man, however able, amid these grave pre-occupations, to give adequate personal attention to those questions affecting the States which come up for day to day decision, and for which he will be directly responsible to the Crown. For these reasons some of us press for the appointment of an Indian States Council, to work with the Political Secretary and to advise the Viceroy of the day. Thirdly, there will be the need for the classification of those administrative questions which are of common concern to British India and the Indian States. This classification will require the previous consent of the States. As we advance further on the road to Federation there are other issues which will need safeguarding; as they are in the nature of details they are not our main concern to-day.

With this contribution to the common task before us I have done. Before I sit down, may I ask forgiveness if, as an old soldier, I have unwittingly given offence to anyone by any bluntness of speech? I am inspired by one thought—service to my beloved King-Emperor and devotion to my Motherland. Akbar, the greatest of the Moguls, when he set out on the crowning adventure of his crowded life placed his foot in the stirrup of opportunity and his hands on the reins of confidence in God. I would commend to you on the threshold of our great enterprise—the conquest of anarchy and reaction in Hindustan and the assurance of our contentment and prosperity as a co-equal partner in our great Commonwealth—the words of Abraham Lincoln in circumstances not altogether remote from these:—

“With malice towards none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work that we are in.”

Mr. Jayakar: I did not expect to be called upon at such an early stage of the debate, and I was under the impression that, representing as I do the younger generation, I was to be the last of the three speakers on behalf of the British India Delegation. However, Sir, as you have commanded me to speak at this stage I shall accept your invitation in the sense that I shall put before you a few sentiments from the point of view of the younger men in India who are looking on the Round Table Conference. You have

been told by my esteemed friend, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, under what circumstances the Round Table Conference has been convened. I remember the debate in the Legislative Assembly in 1924, when the most important political party in India, over which my esteemed friend Pandit Motilal Nehru presided, passed a resolution—in 1924 and 1925, two successive years—calling the attention of British statesmen to the desirability of holding a round table conference. It may surprise British statesmanship that the very men who then desired the holding of a round table conference are to-day averse to attending the session of that round table conference. To me it is no wonder, and it is one instance of what an esteemed countryman of mine, the late Mr. Gokhale, said many years ago very pithily: “On all the portals of the Government of India is written in large letters the words ‘Too late’.” What would have satisfied India in the year 1924 is not satisfying India to-day, and, if I may say so, what will satisfy India to-day will not satisfy India a year hence. That is the lesson that I wish to put before this assembly, august as it is; and I can say with perfect confidence that we must proceed fast with our work, because time is, as the lawyers say, “of the essence of the contract.” I repeat, without giving it as a threat, that time is of the utmost importance, because if India gets to-day what she wants she will be satisfied with many things which will not satisfy her six months hence.

Sir, I come from a Province where as possibly you have heard, the greatest activity of the Congress is going on. I have seen many things which very few have been privileged to see in the course of their political experience. I say with great confidence that the choice before your Government in India is a choice between constitutional government and chaos and disorder. How you will accept this choice it is for you to decide, but it is my duty to place before you the extreme gravity of the situation in India. As Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru has stated, to-day we are standing on the threshold of great events in India. Whether you make them great in the constitutional field, or whether you make them great in the field of revolution and anarchy, it is for this Conference to decide. I can only say that great events are going to take place in India, whether they are great in the field of responsibility, constructive work and comradeship, or whether they are great in the field of opposition, bitterness, hatred and anarchy—that will depend very largely upon what we achieve at this Round Table Conference.

Since coming here I have had frequent talks with friends. I used to be a student in this city, many years ago, and I still retain most pleasant impressions of my days as a pupil in the rooms of one of your foremost Judges in the Court of Appeal to-day. I carried back with me 25 years ago pleasant memories of my experience as a pupil sitting cheek by jowl with my English friends, one or two of whom have since become great Judges of your Courts. A few have died. One or two have become eminent King's Counsel, and others have become great Englishmen. I therefore claim to have a few friends in England, and talking with them I have discovered that

the chief obstacles to India getting Dominion status can be put into three categories. I have met friends who say: "How can India have Dominion Status when she talks of severance with the Empire, and claims independence?" Many of my English friends have spoken of their fears as follows: "If we give you the first installment of Reforms, namely, Dominion Status, you will make it a most powerful lever for severance from the Empire—the cry of independence." I do not know whether there are any friends on the opposite side in whose minds this threat is in operation; I can only say, knowing as I do my Congress friends intimately—and I was in contact with them only three months ago—that if you give India Dominion Status to-day, in the course of a few months the cry of independence will die of itself. If, on the other hand, we return empty handed from our labours in this Conference, it will be the surest way of raising in volume and in intensity this demand for independence.

I say, without any disrespect to my friends in India, that the cry of independence is a cry of despair, distrust and suspicion. It is a cry emanating from those who have convinced themselves, by reason of their past experience, that England does not mean to fulfil her promises to India. We have had several promises time after time. Only to take a recent experience; this time last year there was the Viceroy's great declaration. I was then in Bombay. It created very great enthusiasm. The idea of meeting British representatives face to face always appeals to a lawyer. There is a great fascination to a man bred in the law, as I am, to come in contact with men and to discuss face to face with them controversial questions. As I say, the Viceroy's declaration at that time created great enthusiasm in the city to which I belong, but unfortunately one damper after another came on that enthusiasm. Many of my political friends wanted to know the purpose for which this Round Table Conference was called. The great Viceroy, whose name we will always cherish, found himself in difficulty. He said, "I am not at liberty to mention what is the purpose of this Round Table Conference. Go to the Round Table Conference, face the members and ask them to define the purpose of their labours by being present at the Round Table Conference." I am an old cricketer. I believe in playing the game. I have therefore accepted the invitation and I have come here; but I would emphasise that, before we proceed with our labours, it is necessary for us to decide that India might feel satisfied as to what is the purpose of the Round Table Conference. If I may say so in all humility, the purpose is to make it possible for India to enter the British Commonwealth. If that is done to-day—and I am sure my friends on my right will agree—you will kill the cry of independence at once. That is a slogan in which, in the language of the bargainer, you ask for 16 annas in order that 14 annas may come to you. All business men know it. The cry of independence is proceeding from those who either do not believe that England wishes to give India Dominion Status or who very tactfully ask for independence in order that Dominion Status might come.

The second obstacle which has been put before me by my friends in England is the Army: how can Indians manage the Army? As Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru mentioned in his memorable words, we are quite agreeable to listen to any safeguards that may be suggested during the period of transition, in order that such transition may be made more easy and more safe for both sides. I am surprised that this talk about the Army arises in connection with a country in which there is all the fighting material for which one could wish. My Muhammadan friends, the Indian States, my own community, the Mahrattas, and the Sikhs, are all fighting people. India is a country which possesses traditional fighting talent which has continued over centuries, and which is quite capable of furnishing the Empire, if ever the time comes, with all the fighting material she may want. You talk of India as wanting in fighting talent—as wanting fighting talent even in defending herself. I am surprised that such talk should take place. It reminds me of a little episode which happened when Mr. Gokhale came here for the great Coronation, and which he was never tired of reciting to me. He was taken to one of your beautiful parks to see a review of the Sikh and Mahratta soldiers—and beautiful, tall and stalwart men they were. They marched past to the admiration of all the Englishmen and women present and they were clapped. Mr. Gokhale refused to clap. An English friend standing near said, "Why don't you clap?" Mr. Gokhale replied, "I reserve my admiration for that mighty people who have turned these soldiers into their hirelings." That is the sentiment of the younger men in the country. There is splendid material in the land which you could harness, if you could only instil a little sentiment, patriotism, courage and self-government into their midst.

The third difficulty which was mentioned to me was "You are so divided amongst yourselves. You have your minorities—Muslims, Depressed Classes, Brahmins and non-Brahmins." With regard to that I wish to mention one circumstance. I do not know whether my English friends will appreciate it, because possibly you have no minorities problem among you. Certainly you have not had that problem within the last 30 or 40 years. My solution of this minorities question is this—give them opportunities of common endeavour for their country, and then much of this difficulty will disappear. Give them opportunities of feeling that side by side they are working for their one country, that they have a common patriotism, a common patria, for which they can all work together. Do that, and a great deal of the difficulty will disappear. That is my solution, and the reason I suggest it is this: under the present system of government we very rarely get any chances of working together in the sense of working for our common country. Create that feeling. It can be created only by giving India complete freedom in the form of Dominion Status. Harness all these minorities together, and I have no doubt that a great deal of the discontent which arises at present will disappear. That is the solution for the question of minorities.

Lastly, I come to an obstacle which has been mentioned to me. It is said, "Suppose India is given Dominion Status; what about the Indian States? Do they feel like you? Are they prepared to come into a Federation? Are they patriotic? Do they feel that they are Indians?" The answer to that has just been given by the noble scion of the house of Bikaner, who spoke before me. As Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru rightly remarked, the Indian Princes are first Indians and then Princes. Our deliberations during the next few days will make it perfectly clear that a common patriotism actuates them, as it actuates British Indians.

Let me say that we are quite ready to do this in order to create a foothold for the Indian States: we will not insist on impossible terms of Federation. I do not wish to go into the vexed question of Federation or a unitary form of government; although that question has been stated as the subject-matter of discussion, you, Sir, have very wisely ruled that we may speak on any constitutional question. Therefore I do not wish to go into that question because that is for the experts to decide in Committee. I can only say, speaking for those whom I represent in this Conference, and speaking with great confidence and assurance, that we will not insist on impossible terms of Federation so far as the Indian States are concerned. We shall insist only on such terms as most of the Indian States are prepared to accept at present. We have no desire to interfere unduly at all in the internal affairs of the Indian States; we are quite prepared to wait until they of themselves come into line with our ways.

I remember a characteristic paragraph in that memorable Montagu-Chelmsford Report, as we called it in India, where, ten years ago, this problem was anticipated, and in a memorable paragraph almost poetic like an epic, the authors of that Report stated what is eternally found true, and what has certainly been found true in India. They said that when you create these processes of reformation in one part of India you cannot have any barriers or frontiers beyond which they will not go. Create these forces of reformation, set these processes to work, and the Indian States will not remain immune from their progress for long. It is impossible to conceive of a free British India without conceiving of free Indian States in the course of the next ten, fifteen or twenty years. We are content to wait, so that these slow processes may operate, and so that in the course of time Their Highnesses can think of an Assembly in their own territory and of handing over responsibility to their own subjects. That is a question of time. We are a very patient set of politicians in British India, and we are content to wait.

We shall therefore not insist on impossible terms, and all that we say to the Indian States is this: "There are concerns of a common character; sit alongside us and thrash them out. We have nothing to do with your internal affairs." If they will accept a supreme tribunal, a supreme court of justice, and if all matters which are in dispute between the Indian States and British India

and between them and their subjects, can be referred to this supreme court of justice—over which I hope in course of time a man of the eminence and erudition of Lord Sankey will preside—as long as the Indian States agree to this mode of arbitrament between themselves and their subjects and with British India and say: "We voluntarily submit to the jurisdiction of this tribunal"—by what name it is called is immaterial—as soon as that is admitted, then, to a politician of my mind, the question is solved. I will therefore not insist on tinkering with their internal administration; I leave that to the processes of time, and I have no doubt that in the course of time, when the rest of India is progressive, is free, is democratic, and has ideas of right and wrong based on human dignity and personal rights, the same processes will go beyond the frontiers of British India, because these processes recognise no frontiers and admit no barriers.

This is an invitation which I am privileged to make to the States, and let me give them an assurance that so far as we are concerned, we will raise no obstacles. I wish to give a similar assurance to those friends in front of me who represent British interests in India. I am aware, Sir, that a great many commercial interests are at stake in British India. I have a few friends in commercial circles who have invested millions and millions of rupees in British trade. There is no desire at all that there should be any kind of inroad upon the rights of the commercial people at all. All that they wish to do they can do as citizens of India. We may include them in a definition of the law so that they become domiciled Indians. That is a matter merely of phrasing, a matter of definition. But I can assure them that we are quite willing to sit down and accept safeguards which will give them an equal chance with British Indians. Let me, however, give them one warning—that they will not enjoy the monopoly they have enjoyed, so far as it was enjoyed, on the simple ground that in their skin there is less pigment than in mine. Monopolies they have enjoyed on that ground they will find very difficult to maintain, but any other rights they have as citizens of India will remain. We are quite prepared to accept any safeguards, and I think there is enough intelligence in this gathering to devise safeguards to protect all legitimate interests. I say that England's main interest in India is commercial. I think there are five hundred or one thousand families who send their younger sons to India to make a career for themselves, but that is a problem affecting only a few families. The problem of the ordinary man in dealing with India is mainly commercial. If you exclude these families to whom I have alluded, who are only a handful compared with the rest of the population, then I say your main problem in India is commercial. You want your productions to be sold in that country, and the consuming power of 330 million people is a powerful asset in our hands. It is a country in which your products can be sold. You have just ended a Conference at which Imperial Preference was discussed. May I say that I believe that, from the point of view of the commercial man, a contented community is a much better customer than a discontented one?

Already your trade is in great jeopardy. In one city only, *viz.*, Bombay, there are British goods worth five crores lying in the warehouses. Those goods cannot be moved, much less sold. Do you want this state of things to be intensified? Your interests are mainly commercial, and therefore it is surely better for you to have a contented customer, a rich customer, who can put his hand in his pockets and bring out pounds with which to buy your goods, rather than a poor and discontented customer. I submit that prosperity is necessary for the improvement of your trade. I am not speaking of the other moral forces, like friendliness, like comradeship—because they come under the terms of psychology of the mind—but even from the point of view simply of material interests, you should give absolute Dominion freedom, Dominion Status, to India in order that your trade might prosper.

THE GENERAL DISCUSSION—(continued).

Plenary Session, 18th November, 1930.

H. H. The Maharaja of Alwar: The longest night seems to be passing away and the sorest trouble seems to be coming to and end at last. The seeming corpse appears to be awakening, and a voice is coming to us away back where history and even tradition fails to peep into the gloom of the past, coming down from there—reflected as it were from peak to peak of the infinite Himalaya of knowledge, of love and of work.

From India, this Motherland of ours, a voice is coming unto us, gentle, firm and yet unmistakable in its utterances, and is gaining volume as it passes by, and behold! the sleeper is awakened. Like the breeze from the mountains it is bringing life into the almost dead bones and muscles. The lethargy is passing away, and only the blind cannot see, or the perverted will not see, that she is awakening, this Mother of ours, from her deep, long sleep.

None can resist her any more; never is she going to sleep any more. No outward powers can hold her back any more, for the infinite giant is rising to her feet.

Mr. Chairman, Members of His Majesty's Parliaments and Fellow Sons of our great Motherland, I greet you in these words.

I invoke the highest blessing of Providence, that wisdom, strength, dignity and co-operation may guide our deliberations for the service of our country. Remember that this Conference at which we have assembled, has to some extent the destinies of 300 millions—one-fifth of the population of the human race—in its hands. This India is the ancient land where philosophy and spirituality founded their first home. It is here that they dared to peep into the very mysteries of Heaven. It is the same India, which, through its inherent structure being on true and solid foundations, has withstood the shocks of centuries, of hundreds of evils, of manners and customs. It is the same land which has been firmer than any rock in the world with its indestructible life. Many times is one told that looking into the past only degenerates and leads to nothing; but surely it is out of the past, it is on the past, that the future must be built. Look back, therefore, as far as you can; drink deep of the eternal foundations of Divine Love and Spirituality that are behind and, after that, look forward with heads held erect and march onward to make India brighter, greater and much higher than she has ever been. Remember the blood that courses in our veins. We must have faith in that blood that we build an India yet greater than she was.

The problems in India are more complicated, more momentous than the problems in any other country. Race, Religion, Language, Government, all these together make a nation. We see how in Asia, and especially in India, race difficulties, linguistic difficulties, social difficulties, and national difficulties all melt away before the

unifying power of spirituality. Therefore, for the well-doing of our national cause we must give up all our little quarrels and differences. Remember above all things that our ancestors look down upon us, and they will do so with contempt on their children if they quarrel about minute differences. It is when the national body is weak that the disease germs—in a physical, social or political state, or even in an intellectual state—crowd into the system. To remedy it, therefore, we must go to the roots of the disease, and the one tendency will be to strengthen the man, the mind and the body. It is culture that withstands shocks, not a simple mass of knowledge. Therefore, my friends, let us do nothing that will divide us, for divisions will weaken us and degrade us all the more. You all know that at this psychological moment the whole world is watching us. The solution will not be obtained by dragging down the higher, but by raising the lower up to a higher level. To make a great India, therefore, the secret lies in organisation, accumulation of power, but above all in the co-ordination of wills. Have that faith in ourselves, in that eternal power, first lodged in our soul, and then we shall revive the whole of India. Let this be our determination, and may He the Lord Who comes again and again for the salvation of His own people—as is described by many of the different Scriptures of the world—lead us all to the fulfilment of our aim—the uplift of India, the good of the Empire.

We must now come down to mundane affairs, and Federation is the question before us. I am not enchanted with that word as a mere form of expression; to me "the United States of India" sounds more grand. Here are the representatives of two Indias, to-day each possessing different religions but united in the common bond of patriotism which permeates throughout our respective territories and provinces. We are united in the service of our country; united in our co-operation with the British Empire, of which we form a part—the highest symbol of whose political link is the King-Emperor. The two Indias are politically separate in their administration, and in order to understand the source of their existence we must—but for only a few brief moments—peep into history. The East India Company, towards the downfall of the Mogul Empire, consolidated its organisation and marched forward, conquering territories that in those days were divided between the decaying central sovereignty and States, some of which had existed for a long time, and others which had come into being through new opportunities. It is in such conditions that this Company carved out for itself territories which, excluding Burma, now amount to one-half of India—called British India. This Company, on the other hand, instructed by its directors, entered upon Treaty Alliances, Engagements, Sanads and Agreements with Indian States, which still exist, as the result of which at the present day the other half is called Indian States. With regard to the India of the States, when opportunities come we shall put forward our points of view in greater detail, but here I will content myself with stating that we seek no new territories; we seek no new powers but the practical application of our Treaties and Alliances—consecrated by several

Proclamations and speeches from Queen Victoria and all the succeeding Sovereigns of England, the British Parliament and Viceroys to the present day. I will conclude this statement in two sentences. Usage, sufferance and political practice have, for diverse reasons, encroached upon these sacred domains of our Treaties, and what we desire is that such extra rights outside our Treaties, assumed without our consent, and sometimes without our knowledge, may be frankly and openly discussed, and should be decided only by mutual consent; otherwise our Treaties between the Crown and ourselves have no meaning. We know how sacred the Crown and the British people respect their pledged word and so we have faith that when the British peoples recognise the simple truth that we want no more than that those solemn Treaties with us should be observed in practice also, they will, we feel sure, appreciate that we make no new demands but desire that the simple truth should be recognised and practised.

I now turn to British India. Those who are its representatives are perhaps best able to speak on this subject; but there are two alternatives, which I can best define by the terms "Eastern and Western" conceptions. Talking of the first, there are many who hold the view—however prosaic or antiquated it may sound—that British India may be formed again into Indian States. I will not occupy your time in discussing the details of the problem, however logical and interesting they may be, because I have not the time on the first day except to state (a) that it brings true Swaraj as a living reality considerably nearer; (b) that it perpetuates the link with the Crown through its representative, the Viceroy of India. With Hindu, Muhammadan, Sikh and other States so formed it would set at rest communal questions. Above all, it maintains in strong bonds commercial and trade relations with England. It necessitates an Imperial Army to safeguard the Crown's obligations and to protect the ports and frontiers, with the internal army of the States maintained for security and assistance in emergencies. It ensures religious liberties to every section of India's population, and it carries on the tradition of India's rule according to her past history of hundreds of centuries. And finally, coming to Federation, or what I prefer to call "The United States of India," it immediately simplifies the problem of the Rulers uniting in a common body to work out the problems of India. Here is the shortest and the quickest way to Dominion Status. This is what would be an indigenous growth.

The alternative to this had its first seeds sown in a little known Despatch by Sir Charles Wood, the grandfather of the present Viceroy, who was then Secretary of State, and who initiated the idea of the English language being the medium of education and government. This was followed by Lord Macaulay, who strengthened this theory. Gradually this system has grown, which culminated first in the Minto-Morley Reforms, where the latter statesman, however, was opposed to the introduction of democratic organisations in India. It is from the time of Mr. Montagu, that passionate

lover of India—my country—that events took a definite turn towards responsible self-government. Here the irony of fate exhibits itself, for, as we learn from Lord Ronaldshay's book, this term was devised by Lord Curzon, who was no less opposed than Lord Morley to democratic institutions for India. This I am sure will be generally acknowledged to be a Western system of rule and, therefore, in India not a growth but a graft. But having said so much I now come to my main point, that, if this system is now accepted by British India as the best method for her advance, if that is, as declared also, the final policy of the British peoples towards India, what do I conceive to be the opinion of the States? We realise all that this innovation implies in an Eastern country. We know that one word, "Franchise," alone has originated communal friction. We are not oblivious how it has created complexities of adjusting the future relations of a democratic India with the Indian States. There is, further, the proposition of this ideal truly permeating down to the masses and grasping them in its hold for the good of all.

May I frankly state with all good-will that when I first began to know of the path that was chalked out before British India on these lines, I was reluctantly reminded of an old Irish tune "It's a long, long way to Tipperary." However, when I have said this I have said enough. I have deliberately done so; for how else could I reconcile myself with the statements that I am going to make regarding British India's future, and the other India of the States, administered on ancient and traditional lines? I have certainly sought in doing so no popularity or favours. Now, if, as I have said, this is the goal that British India chooses, and if this is the goal which the British people have decided to place definitely and perpetually before British India, let me say equally truthfully that I wish British India God speed. I wish—and most earnestly wish—that the goal of India's freedom within the Empire, as a self-governing Dominion may be reached as early as possible. Personally speaking, the sooner that goal is achieved, the happier I shall be; for who is there of India that does not wish our Motherland to achieve her rightful place alongside the other sister Dominions? Understand me: why I emphatically state this is because I have the inherent conviction that the sooner British India has freedom within these boundaries, the sooner will India be able to have her own constitution through which it can revitalise into a true and traditional India. I go so far as to say, without any hesitation—and I would not be true to myself or to the land of my birth could I hold opinions to the contrary—that India should achieve her position on a footing of equality with her sister Dominions within the Empire, and arrive at the situation of a fully blossomed Dominion Status as early as possible. My aim in saying so is no other than that the larger Empire may find a grateful India, an India co-operating whole-heartedly in making this Empire, to which we are proud to belong, something even greater.

A united India will be the finest and truest jewel and the strongest force in the cause of our Empire. Under this system I come

again to the proposition, called at present by the name of Federation, where my ideal is the "United States of India" within the Empire. We are assembled at this table to devise means and ways in order to achieve this end by co-operation, and I am sure you will not find our States lagging behind in joining hands in order to arrive at a happy solution.

We are quite conscious of what it means. We know what all big changes imply. It may necessitate at first a little more injustice. It may mean a little less efficiency at first. It must mean larger sacrifices on everyone's part—the States, and, perhaps, some of the majorities and minorities. But for our country's cause, for the cause of India, for the cause of the Empire, shall we stop short for personal, communal or narrow-viewed considerations? Our lives will pass away, but our country will remain. Then at least let it be said we were the true Sons of our Motherland, India.

I will conclude this statement with these words. When British India and Indian Princes came together on the first occasion within my memory to discuss problems of the Empire, it was during the War, at a Conference, where Lord Chelmsford invited representatives from both Indias to discuss questions regarding the performance by India of her duties towards the great cause that in those momentous days hung in the balance. I stated then that there would be people standing outside the doors of that house to ask what we had gained in this War Conference. I further stated that my reply would be that we had come at a time when the Empire was in need, and that was no occasion for demands or gains. We came with the will to give whole-heartedly of what lay in our power for the Empire's cause, and we asked for nothing. Indeed, that was the time when it was our duty to give—however great or small our capacity—of what lay in us to the British Government.

Mr. Chairman—and through you I speak to England—to-day has come the hour of India's need, and to-day British India and the Indian States have assembled together for the second time at another Conference in the centre of the Empire. Mr. MacDonald is the first Prime Minister, in my time, who has visited India. He knows her more intimately than many of his colleagues. We can appreciate that he may not have a very large majority in Parliament. But we know he has a tender corner in his heart for my land as we, many of us, have for his. We have no desire to take the bit between our teeth and to run away, which means going astray. Nay, we are with you, with England, but it is now England's turn to come to our assistance and to help India to reach that position beyond which we have no desire to go—India a sister Dominion within the Empire.

We are grateful to the Prime Minister for what he has already clearly stated in his Guildhall speech, when he said, "With the representatives of India and with the Princes we shall be engaged in the same task of broadening liberty, so that we may live with them under the same Crown, they enjoying the freedom in self-government which is essential to national self-respect and contentment."

This will surely make a grateful India that will be England's greatest strength. Then we will prove to the world that our connection of the East with the West, that came through Destiny, has worked out the great problems of life in harmony. Surely then we shall evolve a civilisation which may well be the envy of the world. This ideal will be achieved for the glory of Britain and India. Then Oh! England and India, as God's great children, unite in that aim, and work according to the design of Providence to produce that result, which may go down in the annals of the world as the purpose of God, namely, service of His Creation—Humanity.

Oh! England, rise above your immediate political or trade interests, hold India's hand in her hour of need and make India great that England may be greater; and, Oh! India, submerge all your communal or political differences and embrace the hand of England and make her great in order that India may be greater. Thus, both united in bonds of unity and friendship, fulfil that destiny that Christ, Muhammad and the Vedas taught, the destiny of self-realisation, and through it the cause of Man throughout the world. May we thus leave some footprints behind so that our progeny may know that East and West, which were differentiated by races, colours and religions, have, through friendship with England, arrived at that great position which will be the glory of God and the pride of Man.

(At this point the Prime Minister left the Meeting, and the Deputy President, Lord Sankey, took the Chair.)

Sir Muhammad Shafi: My Lord Chancellor, when, on his return to India, His Excellency Lord Irwin made the historic announcement of 31st October, 1929, giving a more precise definition of the policy of His Majesty's Government towards the ultimate goal of India than had been done in the declaration of 20th August, 1917, and stating that His Majesty's Government intended to invite the representatives of British India and Indian India to a Round Table Conference in London, so that an agreed settlement of the Indian constitutional problem might be arrived at, the two great organisations of the Indian Mussalmans—the All-India Muslim League and the All-India Muslim Conference—welcomed that announcement in the main for two reasons. In the first place, they realised that when the Government and the people of a country are confronted with such difficult and complicated political problems as is the case now in India, a round table conference, at which the representatives of the parties concerned may have a full and frank exchange of views in order to bring about an agreed settlement, is the most effective way of realising the end in view. In the second place, they believed that where the political situation is so grave as it is at present in India, calling for immediate solution, a round table conference is also the most expeditious way of meeting the situation.

And now that this Round Table Conference has been opened by His Majesty our King-Emperor in person, in a gracious speech vibrating with the love of India and with sympathy for the legiti-

mate aspirations of her people, I, for one, refuse to believe that, with some of the best brains of England and of India assembled round this table, we shall not arrive at a satisfactory solution of the problems which both India and England have to face; a solution which, while satisfying the legitimate aspiration of the Indian peoples, will thereby strengthen the link which binds England and India together.

My Lord Chancellor, ninety-seven years ago, during the debate on the first Government of India Bill of 1833, the late Thomas Babbington Macaulay, who had taken a prominent part in the preparation of that Bill, observed as follows:—

“The destinies of our Indian Empire are covered with thick darkness. It is difficult to form any conjecture as to the fateful result for a State which resembles no other in history, and which forms by itself a separate class of political phenomena. The laws which regulate its growth and decay are still unknown to us. It may be that the mind of India may expand under our system till it has outgrown that system, that by good government we may educate our subjects into a capacity for better government, that having become instructed in European knowledge they may in some future age demand European institutions. Whether such a day will ever come I know not, but never will I attempt to avert it or retard it. Whenever it comes, it will be the proudest day in English history.”

That was the glorious vision which the late Lord Macaulay saw when introducing that measure in the House of Commons. The dawn of the day when that vision may be realised has now come.

Unfortunately thereafter, if I may venture so to put it, the British Parliament succumbed to what can only be described as sleeping sickness in its relations with India, for we find that it was not until 1861, some thirty years after, that a Bill was introduced in the House of Commons for the first time recognising the need for associating Indian Representatives in the work of legislation in that country. But that association was a very limited one, secured only through nomination. Again the British Parliament went to sleep, and slept for over forty years, and it was not until the year 1909 that the elective principle was introduced into the Legislative Councils of India. Meanwhile India had gone on advancing rapidly. The influence of Western education, the study of British constitutional history, the study of French and Italian history had aroused in the minds of educated Indians dreams which Macaulay, at any rate, had contemplated when the Bill of 1833 was introduced.

The result was that the tardy measures taken at such long intervals by the British Parliament, instead of satisfying the aspirations of the Indian peoples, gave further impetus to those aspirations. It is a curious fact in history that political aspirations have a very strange way of growing. What may satisfy a people to-day, if not given in time, will not satisfy them to-morrow. That is what has happened in India.

Shortly after the Act of 1909, a great war broke out—a war which gradually drew into it almost all the leading nations of the world. During that war India came forward to prove her devotion to the British connection in that life and death struggle in which the very existence of the Empire itself was in danger. India came forward to prove her devotion to the British connection by taking her share of the burden spontaneously, and by providing for the armies of England over one million recruits—soldiers who vindicated the honour and the name of their country on the various battlefields of Europe, Asia and Africa.

The part taken by India during this unparalleled world conflagration gained for her her legitimate position in the international affairs of the world as a signatory to the Treaty of Versailles and an original member of the League of Nations. But within the British Commonwealth of Nations, curious as it may appear, she still continued to occupy an inferior position. After the conclusion of peace, until the appointment of the Royal Commission, unfortunately a succession of events took place in India which added to the various causes of unrest in that country influencing the Indian mind. When His Majesty's Government was pleased to appoint the Royal Commission, India was absolutely excluded from it. No representatives of India were appointed to it, with the result that the unrest in that country increased tenfold. And now we have to face a situation which in all earnestness is indeed grave.

When I see articles in the newspapers stating that all the unrest in India is confined only to the educated classes, and that the uneducated masses, or Indians living in rural areas, have no sympathy whatever with the National movement which is going on in India, I am more than surprised. It would be very amusing if it were not so tragic. Do writers who indulge in that sort of writing realise that hundreds of thousands of India's soldiers, who took part in the Great War and who have seen with their own eyes what other people are in their own countries, have returned to India, and after demobilisation, have dispersed all over the rural areas of the country, living in villages, talking to their fellow villagers? They have told their fellow villagers what they have seen in Europe and in the Near and Middle East. Do these writers realise what a deep and widespread effect the stories which these demobilised soldiers have told their countrymen have had in the villages and remote corners of rural India; what a deep and widespread effect they have had on the minds of Indian villagers?

Just look for a moment at what is going on now in India. This Civil Disobedience, which we have openly condemned not only in England but in India, is that movement limited to the educated classes? No doubt the movement is led by the educated classes, but who are the men who are facing all the trials, all the troubles, which this Civil Disobedience movement has given rise to? They belong to the uneducated masses. To say that the uneducated masses are entirely out of touch with the national movement that is going on in India is, if I may venture to say so, the action—

according to the Oriental saying—of a pigeon who closes his eyes when the cat is approaching him, thinking that thereby he is safe.

Fortunately among the British Delegations here there are at least three statesmen who know that I am a Punjabi, and that we Punjabis are not easily alarmed. Indeed, the greater the difficulty, the more firm, the more cool and the more calm Punjabis become. They also know that I have been, in the last 40 years of my public life in India, the strongest supporter of the British connection in India—so much so that on occasions I have been called a reactionary by my own countrymen. It is I who say that the situation in India is grave, very grave.

If a solution, calculated to satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the Indian peoples and thereby to strengthen the tie which binds England and India together, is not attained by this Conference, I tremble to think what the situation will be. Now that we have met in order to try to find that solution, it is my business, as spokesman to-day of my community, of the Muslim group, to tell you what we, the representatives of the Muslim community in this Conference, think. Our position is very simple. To repeat what I said in the Viceregal Lodge at Delhi in November, 1924, we want our countrymen in India to rise to that stature to which other people have risen in their own countries. We want India to attain Dominion Status as an equal partner in the British Commonwealth of Nations.

I say we want India to rise to her full stature within the British Commonwealth of Nations for this reason. In the new conditions which have been brought into existence, as a result of the wonderful progress which science has made, and as a result of the world forces which are now actually in operation as a consequence of the Great War, no country in the world, however rich or powerful, can afford to lead an isolated life. The tendency of modern international movements is towards the association of nations and countries for the purposes of security, of mutual help, and co-ordination of effort. Therefore we Mussalmans of India realise that the British Commonwealth of Nations is there for India to be associated with it, and to continue to be associated with it, for her own benefit and in her own interests. That is the deep-rooted conviction in our minds, and that is the reason of our traditional loyalty to the British connection. At the same time, it is perfectly natural for the seventy-one millions of His Majesty's Mussalman subjects to insist upon this—that in the constitutional and administrative evolution of India they must have their legitimate share both in the Provincial and in the Central Government. I do not desire on the present occasion to enter into the details of the claims which the Mussalman community has to put forward in this connection. That is a matter which will have to be discussed in the Committees. Some of our own Committees are already considering that matter, and I trust they will be able to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion.

To our mind, in view of India's vast extent, in view of her territorial divisions well recognised for centuries past, and in view of the other complicated conditions which obtain in India, there is only one form of government, one basis for the future constitution of India, which alone will suit the circumstances of the case—and that is the federal system. We, therefore, welcome the declarations, made by their Highnesses the Maharaja of Bikaner and the Maharaja of Alwar on behalf of their Princely Order, that the Indian States are willing to come into an All-India Federation. To me, as a constitutional lawyer, a self-governing India side by side with an Indian India, having its relations with the Crown, is a hopelessly impossible conception. A Federation of India must include both British India as well as Indian India. In so far as British India is concerned, we must, as is the case in every other kind of structure, build upwards and not downwards. Therefore I welcome the recommendation made in certain quarters of granting provincial autonomy to the Provinces. These will be the federal units of our All-India Federation in the future. But the Mussalman group have no hesitation in saying that that is not enough—that responsibility must also be introduced in the Centre. How far that responsibility should go is a matter which will be discussed in the Committees hereafter. We are willing that for the transitional period certain vital reservations might be made. That is to the interests of India itself, and, in consequence, we have no objection to that. You have seen that the Report of the Royal Commission has been condemned in India by every school of political thought, mainly on the ground that it does not propose to introduce responsibility in the Centre.

(At this point the Prime Minister returned to the Meeting and resumed the Chair.)

To the British Delegations I have one final appeal to make before I sit down. Believe me, a happy and contented India will be a source of immense strength to the British Commonwealth of Nations. Take your courage in your two hands. The situation is grave. When a situation is grave far-sighted statesmanship requires that it should be handled with wisdom and generosity. Taking your courage in your two hands, do what you did in South Africa shortly after the conclusion of the South African War. What has been the result? During the sittings of the Imperial Conference, which I had the honour of attending on behalf of my country, nothing struck me more than the way in which the representatives of South Africa, throughout the deliberations of the Conference, upheld the tie which binds South Africa and England together. Believe me, the satisfaction of legitimate aspirations brings contentment, and contentment awakens feelings of love and affection for those who have satisfied those legitimate aspirations. If the aspirations of educated India are satisfied, the result will be that the tie between India and England will be strengthened. Then all your Imperial problems—the problem of Empire defence, the

problem of inter-Imperial trade, even the problem of Empire unemployment—will be solved within a measurable distance of time.

That is my appeal to the members of the British Delegations. Wisdom and sympathy is what is required on this occasion—that wisdom and sympathy with which Lord Irwin is handling the situation in India to-day. To those who have been attacking Lord Irwin I would say this: but for Lord Irwin's handling the situation as he has done in India, to-day the situation would have been ten times worse.

In the name of India, and in the name of the British Commonwealth of Nations, of which India forms an integral part, and hopes to be an equal partner with the other Dominions, I earnestly beg of you, representatives of the British Delegations, representatives of the Indian States Delegation and representatives of the British India Delegation, to realise the gravity of the situation and to give your undivided attention to a satisfactory solution of the grave problem with which we are confronted—a solution which, while satisfying the legitimate aspirations of the people of India, will at the same time strengthen the link which binds England and India.

H.H. The Maharaja of Rewa : Mr. Chairman, I find that now my turn comes to speak after so many eminent brother Delegates from India have spoken before me. We have heard most illustrious speeches made by the Indian Princes and by the most capable British India leaders—leaders who have a command of law and advocacy—and it will be a somewhat difficult task for me to express the claims of India, and my own views, in any better language than has already been used.

When I was asked to attend this Conference to represent the conservative element among the Indian States, I was aware that the occasion would be one of the first importance. I am forced to confess, however, that the extreme importance of the occasion has been very much more fully brought home to me by the opening speeches to which I listened yesterday and to-day. It seems to me, without exaggeration, that a nation is being brought to birth. More than ever before, I am conscious of the measure of the task before us, and I realise that we shall require every ounce of wisdom, patience, goodwill, adaptability and imagination which everyone of us has to contribute, if these great problems are to be successfully solved.

I am conscious that a heavy burden of responsibility has been laid on me. It must seem strange to some that, in a country whose ways of life are so ruled by custom and tradition as India, there should be no political party which calls itself Conservative. Yet I believe that there is scarcely one of my fellow Delegates who would submit without protest to the designation of Conservative. So far, at least, as designation goes, I stand alone. My task is in some ways a thankless one. It is made more difficult by the fact that, on the personal side, I am entirely without experience of the public discussion of affairs; and I ask the forbearance of all here, and of

those in India for whom I speak, if through inexperience I prove an indifferent advocate of my cause. At the same time I feel greatly honoured that I have been chosen to take part in these deliberations, and however faulty my advocacy may be, I am encouraged and upheld by the conviction that half humanity shares the views which it falls to me to propound. I feel certain that not only among the millions who till the soil of India, but among all sober-minded politicians and statesmen there must be a large measure of support for, and sympathy with, those who counsel a cautious advance, and preach the dangers of precipitation and short-cuts. I believe, moreover, that when once power is given to India to shape her own destinies, a strong party of experienced and responsible politicians will emerge, which will call itself the Conservative Party; for the chief ingredient in Conservatism is, in my view, a sense of responsibility. Such a sense of responsibility has not so far had an opportunity to develop, and the constitutional advancement of India will provide it with the opportunity for which it is waiting. The energy that is now being devoted to gaining that advancement will, when the victory is won, be converted to the consolidation and preservation of the position that has been gained. I do not claim that the conservative point of view has a monopoly of wisdom and foresight; but I do not, on the other hand, admit that the progressive point of view rallies to its banners the whole available stock of energy or idealism. I do, however, suggest that in the world at large, the conservative elements are the great repository of experience, and that they have therefore much of value to contribute to the common stock.

In this country of England, where one of the great parties of the State has been for many years known as the Conservative Party, it may appear to many to be mere waste of time and breath to say that the conservative attitude does not begin and end with blind and obstinate resistance to all changes of any kind. I believe, none the less, that there are in India those who suspect the conservative attitude to consist merely in distrust of, and opposition to, change as such, and I wish, therefore, to begin with a sincere assurance that this is not the case. The Princes, whatever their views, whether conservative or advanced, are in the fullest sympathy with all the legitimate aspirations of the leaders of thought in British India. The Princes of India welcome the emergence of India as a nation among the nations of the world, and gladly and wholeheartedly support the efforts of representative Indians by which this claim to nationhood is being established.

There are, however, I will confess, some aspects of our Indian problem in regard to which the men of conservative principles will, I believe, obstinately, though not blindly, resist all change. They will resist with all their power any sign of failing in loyalty to the Crown, and any attempt to sever India's destinies from the British Empire of which we are proud to be a part. I hope and believe, however, that to this extent every member of this Conference is a Conservative; and I content myself with saying that I yield to

none in my loyalty to these ties, and in the sincerity of my desire for India's happiness and prosperity in the future.

Before I begin to state my position I wish to make one point clear. To guard against possible misunderstanding, let me say here that in my approach to these problems I am dealing mainly with those aspects which concern the States.

Perhaps I can best define the conservative attitude by saying that we differ from other schools of thought less as to the object to be achieved than as to the pace and method of achievement. A good car needs a brake as well as an accelerator; a ship requires an anchor as well as engines. The proverbial difference between "haste" and "speed" is a truth so commonplace that we are apt to be impatient when we are reminded of it, but it is the function of the Conservative to insist on the truth of truths, so old that they are sometimes forgotten. Each one of us as an individual learns such truths for himself by experience, sometimes bitter; I merely ask that we should apply to the problems of statecraft the caution and restraint which we exercise in the daily round of our individual lives.

One of the most difficult aspects of the problem which concerns us all is in my view the variety of the interests which have to be reconciled. We are met, not to prove before an impartial tribunal that one view and not the other is true, that one policy should be adopted, one community or one set of interests should be favoured, and the other set aside, overlooked or suppressed. We have to reconcile all points of view and achieve a measure of agreement. It is possible to coax into the parlour those who cannot be driven into the fold. For this purpose the quality which we require in the largest measure is mutual confidence. This quality of confidence is a plant of slow growth. It is not a commodity that can be weighed out in parcels and distributed. Its growth cannot be artificially forced. It grows in the soil of safety and it requires a peaceful atmosphere of security for its nourishment. Until this spirit of mutual confidence and goodwill animates us all, the path of the Indian nation will be a difficult one to tread. I feel so strongly the danger of pressing ahead in disregard of the health of this tender plant, on whose life and growth our safety depends, that I make no apology for my insistence on the danger of precipitancy and the need for caution in our rate of advance.

The Indian States—I speak for the conservative element—wish to safeguard their individual existence. They ask for guarantees that the changes in the Government of India, which are foreshadowed, will leave them free to pursue their own ideals in the manner of their heritage and tradition. They ask that their position will not be modified without their own consent, that changes will not be forced on them, and that the treaties into which they entered with the British Power in India will be honoured in the spirit and in the letter.

It may be thought by some that there is a sinister intention underlying the request for guarantees and safeguards—the inten-

tion to make permanent the divisions which exist in India, and so to prevent her from attaining the full stature of a nation. This is not the desire of the States. We have no desire to stand in the way of reforms for British India. We wish only to be assured that the reforms which the Indians of British India desire do not impose on us changes which we do not desire. We wish to preserve the individual and historical identity of the States which our forefathers carved out for themselves and handed down to us. If these interests can be secured, we make no further claims. If these interests can be secured without our participating in the common councils of India, we have no wish to thrust ourselves in simply for the sake of participation. If, as may well be the case, they cannot be secured except by participation, we desire no greater measure of participation than is needed to achieve these ends. Similarly, as to the pace of the advance, if the changes which are decided on for British India necessitate changes in the relations between the Government of India and the States, we desire that such changes may be made step by step; that they shall be restricted at each stage to a minimum and that the effect of each step shall be carefully considered before a fresh step is taken. Many of the changes which are adumbrated are from the conservative point of view in the nature of an experiment. The more fundamental the changes, the greater and more daring will the experiment be. There is a Latin proverb which teaches us that experiments should be made on objects of comparatively little value. The States do not regard themselves as objects of comparatively little value, and they are reluctant to be the subjects of experiment, because the daring nature of an experiment, even its brilliant success, are slight consolation to the object whose existence is sacrificed for it. We wish to know the nature of our destination. We are unwilling to set out for a destination hereafter to be revealed.

There are those who see in visions of the future a picture of an India united in religion, race and creed, pursuing one ideal and standing as one nation without diversity of interests or outlook among its peoples. This hope the future may bring true, but in the world of the present we desire that the interests of the present shall not be completely subordinated to those of the future; and we are not willing to surrender the substance of our position to-day for the shadow of a position which we may one day achieve in a Federated India. We do not desire Federation if this involves the gradual disappearance of all that the States have stood for in the past.

I have one more thing to say. Rights and obligations are complementary. They are the two sides of one medal. This is as true of the nation as of the individual. It is perhaps inevitable that in negotiations such as these the rights should be emphasised by one side or the other, and the obligations glossed over. Let us, I mean everyone here, recognise that every right involves an obligation. If we ask for rights, let us honestly and squarely face the implications of our claims. Let us strive, not in a spirit of bargaining, but in a statesmanlike spirit of compromise and accommoda-

tion, to satisfy each other's anxieties, in the confident hope that, by concessions to the fears or prejudices of the doubting, a rich harvest is to be won; for, by the confidence thus inspired, the ground is prepared for that spirit of mutual trust and goodwill, to create which is the real aim of all concession.

His Majesty The King-Emperor reminded us, in the gracious words with which he opened this Conference, that "ten years is but a brief span in the life of a nation." These are weighty words which I hope will be pondered deeply by all who share in the decisions of our destinies. I have singled them out, not because I would have the Indian nation mark time, even for a moment, when the way is clear to go forward, but because I feel that, however rapid the pace of development which the facts may admit, the distance that we have to travel is more than a day's journey. It requires stages for its completion. If I may vary my metaphor, the structure of a constitution is so massive that it cannot be erected on a fragile foundation, and it is in the laying of the foundations that the greatest foresight, caution and sagacity are imperatively necessary. If by the united labours of the experienced statesmen of our two countries the foundations of a worthy edifice can be well and truly laid, we can the more safely hope that the youth of India may be left to complete the building.

The state of India to-day is such as to bring tears to the eyes of all who love her. It may be that in the inscrutable ways of Providence she is being led through pain and travail to a future of joy and happiness. I pray that this may be so. I am reminded on this occasion of the words of a great British orator, Edmund Burke, when the fate of another nation was in the balance—"I think," he said, "we ought to inaugurate our discussions on this subject with the ancient invocation of the Church, 'Sursum Corda'—'Lift up your hearts' " and I conclude my speech with some memorable words of his—"Magnanimity in politics is not seldom the truest wisdom, and a great Empire and little minds go ill together."

Lord Peel: No one is more sensible than myself of the profound interest and importance of this Conference; and I think no man can contemplate without emotion this assembly here of so many representatives of India, with the Princes and the British Delegations, gathered together in this old Palace of St. James in order to deliberate on these great questions affecting the constitution and the future of India. Indeed, I feel in listening to the speeches of my old colleagues, the Maharaja of Alwar and Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, as if we were back again, seven or eight years ago, to the time when we were colleagues in an Imperial Conference, and when we battled together and fought together—I believe not unsuccessfully—for the further recognition of the position of Indians in the Dominions and elsewhere.

I think and I know that those gentlemen and others who know me will not imagine that I am lacking in sympathy with the ideals and aspirations that have been expressed here and in India, and in

whatever I say I am impressed solely by the duty of speaking courageously and frankly to the audience here. My hopes and views about India's future do not differ greatly from those who have expressed most passionately their own aspirations.

May I interpolate this, and may I say first of all how extremely interested I am in the last speech we heard, from the Maharaja of Rewa—how well he understood Conservatives and Conservatism. They hold on to what is best in the past, and they look forward to what is best in the future; and, at the same time, with a lack of arrogance, which I hope you will note, we do not claim to have a monopoly of all the virtues.

Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru made some observations about the interest of Members of Parliament in Indian affairs and about the very small number of men who control matters both here and in India. There seemed to be implied in his observations the suggestion that, while many Members of Parliament knew very little about India, there was not a deep and profound interest among the people of this country in the affairs and in the future of India, and in their connection with India.

Speaking in the presence of Members of Parliament I would not lie to suggest that there are those outside who know more about political affairs than they do; but I do assure you of this—and it would be a great mistake for anybody in this assembly to form a contrary impression—that the pride of Englishmen in the history of their achievements and of their connection with India, and in the future of India, is deep and profound. Do not let any man go away from this assembly with the impression that the interest, the profound and even instructed interest, in Indian affairs is confined to half a dozen men in Parliament or in the Services.

I comment for a moment, if I may, on the observation made by Mr. Jayakar, because I wish to hang a remark upon it. His observation was to the effect that England's main interest in India is commercial. He said "There are 500 or 1,000 families who send their younger sons to India to make a career for themselves." Here again, though I have no doubt he did not intend it, I seemed to note a view somewhat depreciatory of those great Services which have worked for so many years with, in so many cases, a selfless devotion to Indian interests and Indian causes. May I say that I felt a little hurt at that observation. Like others, my own family has sent out many men to India who have devoted themselves to the cause of India, and I think it a pity, when we are gathered here to talk about the relations of these countries, that we should say anything that would depreciate, to however small an extent, what I believe to have been the devoted services rendered by so many of my countrymen in the building up of India. Anyhow, I can assure you of this, that no observation of mine will depreciate the services rendered by Indians to the Empire. I know, and I can speak not merely for a Party in this, but on behalf of my countrymen, that, whatever may be the constitutional issues, they feel most strongly and most deeply the contributions that India has made

to the Empire, and they are full of sympathy with, and full of gratitude for, the great devotion and the great energy with which Indians, Princes and peoples alike, threw themselves into their great contribution to the war. Therefore, when we are approaching what is no doubt a very great subject, let us at least free our minds, if we can, from any idea that there exists, either in my own Party or in the country, any indifference or lack of zeal or lack of sympathy towards the problems which you, gentlemen, are here discussing.

Naturally, we must come down to practical affairs—though I myself have listened with profound interest and sympathy to some of the emotional appeals that have been made to us by the eloquent speakers who have preceded me, because I am not at all one of those who think that these matters can be settled by dry and hard legal or constitutional formulæ. I am very sensible and sensitive indeed to the great part which sentiment and emotion play in the building up of human affairs. But, of course, we have to consider that the result of our deliberations may be embodied in a Bill and that that Bill is to be presented to Parliament for its consideration or for its criticism or adoption, and, that being so, I think it may be my duty to say a word or two as to the attitude or the feeling in many conservative circles towards some of the impressions they have formed, or which have been shaped in their minds by the happenings of recent years, because I want to pay the only compliment that I can pay to this assembly, the compliment of frankness, and I believe that any contributions that we can make should be, not only sincere, but should be true, as far as we can make them, so that we may join together, as it were, in building up on that basis of frankness, sincerity and fact the structure which we do hope to build.

I shall have to say a word or two on that in a moment, but let me make a quotation from the Viceroy's declaration itself. I was very glad to hear the enthusiasm and applause with which our present Viceroy's name was received, and it is therefore with all the more confidence that I want to read out to you, to refresh our memory, shall we say a passage in that address delivered on the 15th January, 1930, to the Members of the Legislative Assembly:—

"I have never sought to delude Indian opinion into the belief that a definition of purpose, however plainly stated, would of itself, by the enunciation of a phrase, provide a solution for the problems which have to be solved before that purpose is fully realised. The assertion of a goal, however precise its terms, is of necessity a different thing from the goal's attainment. No sensible traveller would feel that the clear definition of his destination was the same thing as the completion of his journey; but it is an assurance of direction."

I lay special stress upon those words, because I think there has been, certainly in some political circles in India, though not mentioned here, a misinterpretation of them, and they have regarded the statement of the goal as the same thing as the statement of the

immediate purpose. Criticisms of statements as bad faith or breach of faith are often very easy to make, and, even though denied, travel far, and I wish to state here that there is no promise in that statement of the immediate translation into fact of the full measure of Dominion Status, and that it is pointed out there as a goal which may be attained in a swifter way or in a shorter time if things go well with the political development of India, and therefore, while we are united on the goal, we may, as the Maharaja stated, differ as to the pace or rapidity with which we may attain that goal.

Now I have one or two things to say, if you will allow me to say them to you, on the recent events in India which have, to some extent, disturbed and harassed and upset the more conservative bodies or conservative opinion in this country. I have to say so, because, unless we deal frankly with these matters, we cannot really form a conception of the attitude which Parliament may adopt towards subsequent Bills. In many ways conservative feeling has been deeply moved by recent events in India. It has been deeply disturbed by the great non-co-operation movement. Conservatives have never believed that non-co-operation on a large scale could be non-violent. They have never believed that the experiments, already tried in India some years ago with unfortunate results, could be tried again in India with more fortunate results. They are harassed also by an anxiety that, if we agree here upon some constitution, and if the representatives of India go back to work it, there is a party, a very strong party and an organised party, in India which will, as it were, wrest the opportunity from the hands of those who are here, and will merely use those powers that are granted, for furthering their own separatist and independent ends.

We were told that that independence and those declarations of independence by the Congress were due to frustrated ambition, frustrated desire for further self-government. I am not going for a moment into the psychology of those declarations. I will only say that declarations of that sort of independence and separation from the Empire have been made. I regret that they have been made, but they have had some definite influence upon conservative opinion in this country. Further than that, declarations have been made even about repudiation of debts, or in the milder form—but coming to exactly the same thing as far as credit is concerned—of an examination into the debts incurred by India to see that they have been properly incurred. One can easily see, and one knows, that that has had a most unfortunate effect among the commercial and trading classes of this country. It has given a shock to their confidence, possibly made them rather more conservative in their views than they were before.

We have had an observation about monopolies from Mr. Jayakar. I do not know quite what he meant by these monopolies. Referring to what would be done if India had self-government, he said, "Let me give them one warning—that they will not enjoy the monopoly they have, in so far as it is enjoyed, on the simple ground that in

their skin there is less pigment than in mine". What are those monopolies? I submit that there is no monopoly—legal, constitutional or of any other kind—except that monopoly which is obtained by skill, by energy and by commercial success. I say advisedly that there is no single commercial operation in India which cannot be undertaken just as well by any Indian as by any Britisher. Therefore I submit, without fear of contradiction or challenge, that there is no such thing as a monopoly such as has been referred to. Then, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru told us that the Moguls were conquerors and that they became domiciled. He seemed to draw some distinction between the position of the British in India and the Moguls in that respect. What I am going to say is this—and our feeling in regard to this point is strong—that, quite apart from any legal constitutional rights founded on Acts of Parliament, our position in India, and our services to India, have given us a strong claim on moral grounds alone to be considered, a claim, which, I think, has not been fully dealt with by any of the speakers who have addressed us. I am not going to allude—because they are so familiar to you—to our achievements on the material side, our work in the destruction or diminution of famine, or the great works of irrigation, or what we have done for law and order and the whole machinery of government. All that long history of education in political theory has been, as I think many Indians will admit, one of the great contributing causes to the growth of that national sentiment to which such eloquent expression has been given in this Conference already. Therefore, when we are talking of the British position in India, let us remember that we have been there now a long time. Do not talk of us, as one or two speakers have done, as aliens. Talk of us as those who have contributed greatly to the constitution and to the growth, moral and material, of India, as those who have won in India a place of consideration—of partnership, if you like to use that word—on account of our previous services.

I want to allude with some—I was going to say hesitation—to the work of the Statutory Commission, because we have been told by one speaker already that it has met with general condemnation in India. I assume that everybody here present has read carefully and pondered both volumes of the Report of the Statutory Commission, and really I am often amazed, when I look at it, that so little regard appears to have been paid by some people to that Report. I am one of those unrepentant persons who, having read it and studied it, consider it to be a great contribution, both in thought and report, to the great Indian problem. It has been treated in some respects as a reactionary document. I contend that in many respects it might be called a very revolutionary document, and I want to make that statement good. Just take the position as regards the Provinces. Take the question of the proposed introduction of full self-government in the Provinces. (*A delegate: Absolutely bogus.*) I will come presently to the question of whether it is bogus. These proposals, I submit, are very wide and far-reaching. What is to be done by these pro-

posals? First of all dyarchy is to be swept entirely away and the Councils in the Provinces are to be furnished with exceedingly wide powers over the great populations in those Provinces. Really they are not Provinces, they are countries. They are countries with 20, or 30 or 40 millions of people. Is it nothing that these wide powers are to be fully transferred to Indian Ministers, whose laws and whose administrative acts will touch most closely the intimate lives of these millions of people in the different Provinces in education, in local government, in health, in agriculture, and even in regard to the more disagreeable subject of taxation? I submit that a change of that kind proposed in the self-government of the Provinces is more far-reaching than many have given it credit for.

Under these circumstances, is there really anything inherently unreasonable in proposing that, while the Provinces are adjusting themselves to these new conditions, settling down, learning their new powers applying the arts of government to these great populations, that during that time—not a long time perhaps—these should be no substantial change in the Central Government? I know that Sir Tej Bahadur Saprú said it would be strange if responsible Ministers in the Provinces were to be under the control of an irresponsible Government at the Centre. Many Governors of Provinces will tell you that they are very little under the control of the Government at the Centre, whether responsible or irresponsible, but surely at this time of day it is a little late to talk of irresponsible governments? All Governments, whatever their form, are very well aware of, and are extremely sensitive to the opinions, the thousand and one sympathies and interests and movements of thought, which govern them, as they govern more technically responsible Governments.

Again—I am still dealing with the rather conservative side of opinion in this country—take the question of police. Many must be aware that the transfer of the police is viewed with very great anxiety in many quarters, not only in this country but also by some of the Governments in India. While we have every hope that what was suggested by Sir Muhammad Shafi may come to pass, and that, with agreement, all these old difficulties and communal troubles may disappear, yet we must at the same time be well aware that, even in the last few years, we have seen most unfortunate exhibitions of communal troubles; and that there are some people who think that perhaps that impartiality, which European or British control over the police can give, may be of some advantage. Possibly conservative opinion may to some extent put too high a value on the length of time during which some countries have enjoyed representative institutions, and may think that the habits acquired by those countries can only be attained by the long experience of years. It may be that they think that those habits must be deeply rooted before the full strain of self-government in a vast country like India can be thrown upon them. We have seen recently in other countries, where parliamentary institutions have been too rapidly set up, that they have failed and withered because they

had not the roots on which they might grow. We feel this, not from any desire to delay in India the realisation of her aspirations, but because Parliament does feel, and must feel, a tremendous responsibility towards India.

It is not by any means forgetful of its promises and declarations; but its long association with India has laid great responsibility upon it, and it cannot therefore, by lassitude or easy good nature, telescope too rapidly the process by which self-government is attained. As has been observed to-day already, it may be that parliamentary institutions in India are not a growth but a graft, and I have always been one of those who were not anxious for the too rapid development of a particular form of parliamentary institutions in India, because I felt that India itself might have a strong contribution of its own to bring to constitutional problems and that it was a pity to stereotype too early the particular form which that constitution ought to take.

May I, before I sit down, say a few words on what I think is really the subject we are discussing—whether the future constitution of India should be unitary or federal? On the unitary point I have not much to say. I can hardly conceive myself that, in a country so vast, so diversified and so populous, it is possible to set up or maintain what is called a unitary government. You would have, I am sure, the centre of government so far removed from living contact with the peoples of India that there could be very little sympathy—that sympathy which must be established—between the ruler and the ruled. I, therefore, incline most strongly to that federal idea which builds up units, of great variety if need be, within the whole and which contributes to the whole something of the richness and the variety which they themselves contain. It might be useful to meditate upon the relation that could be established between the Princes and the States of India, and the Provinces. One would be impressed, I think, by the fact that some unity must be established between them, because otherwise one might see the Princes on the one side with their States, and the Provinces on the other side, moving in separate orbits, almost in opposite directions, not towards that unity which seems to be necessitated by the growing forces of civilisation with the practical application of science and industry drawing them together. This idea has been planted, has flourished, and has grown rapidly. With all respect, I should say that in this matter the Report of the Government of India seems to me to be somewhat out of date. It seems to contemplate the setting up of such a scheme as being a remote possibility in the future, but not, I think, in the present.

I feel—as I think has been indicated by some of the speeches delivered during these two days, notably that of The Maharaja of Bikaner, which met with answering sympathy from other speakers—that this idea of some sort of federal union between Princes and Provinces has grown rapidly and has enlisted a large amount of sympathy from great sections of opinion. That seems to be a tremendous gain, because it is very difficult to see how it is possible

to get an organised unity in India except on some federal basis. It certainly would be one of the most remarkable Federations in history. You have had federal government with the grant of powers from the Centre to the units, and on the other hand units seeking to get more power. Here you would have the movement both ways, both from the States and from the Centre to the Provinces.

Of course, many grave questions remain to be considered—the question of what should be the powers of the Central Government, and whether those powers should be equal as regards the Provinces and the States, or whether, as regards the States, the powers of the Central Government should be greater than as regards the Provinces whether on the basis of that, you can construct assemblies and constitutions which would give full play to the different feelings and claims of the Provinces and of the States.

We have listened very carefully to the claims made by the Princes for their States, and everyone will see that great problems arise in the attempt, it may be, to harmonise the interests in this way of Princes and of Provinces. I will not say a word about the “residuary powers”—that is one of those phrases so dear to constitutional lawyers—which may, perhaps, disappear altogether and be found to have been divided equally, or in some proportion, between the States and the Provinces.

I argue, therefore, that though many problems have got to be faced, yet so fruitful is this idea that it would be a misfortune if anyhow some of the foundations for carrying out that idea could not be laid in this Conference; because what one is afraid of is this—that when you set up institutions in a country they tend to gather round them sentiment, feeling, knowledge, sympathy and interest which, once they are started, are hard to bend away from the course on which they were started. Therefore if we really do want, as I believe this great assembly does want, to exhibit its sympathy in practical action, for these great constitutional changes leading in a federal direction, I submit that our minds should work in that direction—that we should attempt not only to do nothing contrary to the federal idea, as the Report of the Statutory Commission suggests, or as the Government of India's Despatch suggests, but we should attempt perhaps to lay some stones immediately on which that great federal idea can be built.

India indeed is amazing in the extent and in the variety of its resources, in the beauty of its scenery, in the contrast of its races and its religions and its peoples. I do not think it is merely a dream to suggest that that variety and that contrast within a unity should be reflected in the great constitution combining Provinces and Princes together in one common whole.

I have made some criticisms. I have had to say something about conservative opinion in this country, about provincial developments and the question of development at the Centre; but I should like to affirm in my last few sentences that at the same time there is no one who feels more strongly than I do, and I believe the

Party also, the vast importance of bringing India, sooner or later, by processes quicker or slower as the case may be, into its equal part in the great community of the British Commonwealth. I am not one of those who can see the British Empire, with its great constituent nations, without India in it. I am certain the loss would be great to that Commonwealth of Nations. I am equally certain—I am confident—that the loss would be great to India as well. We can be of great use and service to each other. I say, speaking here to so many representatives of India, that the contribution which they can bring in thought, in knowledge not merely on the material side but on the spiritual side as well, will enormously enrich the content of what may be in the future the community of British Nations. It is the very variety, which we find in India, from the other Dominions which constitutes the great attraction for the resources of constructive statesmanship.

In this strange world where, as we grow older, we are more impressed perhaps by the fleeting and the transitory aspect of things than by permanence and stability, I trust that this fruitful vision of unity may endure—and may endure so long as human hearts beat to the music of noble causes. All men's imaginations are stirred by high conception to great achievement.

H.H. The Chief of Sangli: Mr. Chairman, I associate myself whole-heartedly with the speakers who have preceded me in their expression of sympathy and devotion to His Majesty the King, of the sympathy of the Ruling Princes and Chiefs of India with the aspirations of British India, and of hope and faith that, in the solution of the issues which confront us, we shall be animated by the goodwill, patience and wisdom which His Majesty commended; and in doing so I feel sure I am echoing the sentiments of those who no less than others are amongst the Rulers of States.

As regards the main question that we are discussing to-day, namely, whether the future constitution of India should be unitary or federal, Their Highnesses who have spoken before me have already shown that a United and Greater India can only be created with the consent and association of the sovereign States of India with the Government of British India. I need not therefore deal with that point. I would only say that if Federation be agreed upon, those whom I represent would be willing to assist in the achievement of the goal.

At this stage, it might be well to state in broad outline the problem of the smaller States. Their essential features are identical with those of the other States, namely, (1) they are not British territory; their subjects are not British subjects; and they are not governed by the law of British India; and (2) the British Crown is responsible for their external relations and territorial integrity. They all manage their internal affairs and maintain their troops or police forces, except the very small estates and jagirs. For international purposes the territories of these States are in the same

position as those of British India, and their subjects are in the same position as British subjects. These facts establish that their rights, and indeed their interests, are identical with those of the rest of the States. It will thus be plain that the methods of All-India co-operation that may be devised by the Conference would apply to these States. It is true that some of the States—especially those which are included in the group known as “estates, jagirs, and others”—are very small, and their cases will require investigation in order to fit them into the scheme that may be ultimately framed in order that they may enjoy all its benefits in common with the rest of the States.

In this connection I may remark that the importance of the smaller States is not to be judged by the size of individual units but by the aggregate figures of their area and population, their widespread territorial distribution and their large number. I would ask this House to remember that, if a little over twenty States be excepted, no one of the remaining States has a population exceeding half a million; and yet they include in their number States which have as ancient a lineage, as proud a history, as large a jurisdiction and as rich potentialities of development as any other. They further share in the general political awakening, the stirrings of new life and new hopes—or, in His Majesty's words, “the quickening and growth in ideals and aspirations”—which characterise the whole country, and they are animated by the common ideal of being placed firmly on the road to the political stature which is their due. The fact that His Majesty The King-Emperor has emphasized the wisdom of paying due regard to the just claims of minorities at once shows his deep interest in them and inspires the hope that the legitimate claims of all States, regardless of size, will receive due recognition, and that at this birth of a new history, the foundations will be well and truly laid, and an enduring union of the States and British India will be brought into being.

Sir Hubert Carr: Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that the section of the British India Delegation to which I belong approaches this question from rather a different standpoint to that of many of the previous speakers. I feel strongly, however, that although we are racially separated we are united in a desire for the welfare and progress of India. It would be absurd for me to suggest that we have the same impelling urge in that desire as those who are born in India, but we do have a very sincere sympathy with that desire, not from any standpoint of superiority, but because we recognise in that genuine desire that which we ourselves would entertain were we sons of India. I think—perhaps we all think—that the keenness of the desire has led to India travelling faster than any of us had expected, and we are inclined to think that she has arrived at the present point a little out of breath. We feel that it is a most happy condition that we are drawn here to-day really to get away from the turmoil which is liable to warp judgment and really to look at the whole problem in the surroundings which have been laid for us here.

We are, of course, very largely actuated by anxiety that the present order should not give way to immature ideas which would lead to a breakdown. Everybody must feel the risks which are facing India, and little excuse is wanted when one looks at the appalling conditions which happened from too rapid changes of government in Asia.

Much has already been said by Lord Peel which represents the views of the British community in India. I will not attempt to follow him, but with regard to the main question of federal or unitary government, we are united in believing that federal government is the line which offers the best chances of successful progress to a united India. We believe in the full application of federal principles, not only in bringing the States and the Provinces together at the Centre, but also in its application to other departments of government—finance, railways, and so on.

When we come to the question of responsibility at the Centre, we are frankly doubtful whether that is possible at the present time. It has been said, that, given responsibility, many of the difficulties with which the present Government has to contend will disappear. I do not think experience warrants us placing great faith in that, nor do I think the remarks that have already been made here really induce us to follow that line of thought. It was said yesterday that that which satisfied India twelve months ago does not satisfy her to-day; that which satisfies her to-day will not satisfy her six months hence. I rather agree with that, but it does not induce in me faith to say that now is the time to make any great move. I should like to see further consolidation of thought in Indian political opinion as to what is best at the Centre before any strong move is made.

There are several points which lead me to take that view, but I will only touch on them briefly, as I do not want to occupy your time too long. For instance, in the matter of dealing with disturbances and maintaining law and order, I have no doubt that the present Government and system of government is perfectly capable of taking care of the country at present. We do not advocate, any more than the most ardent patriot here, that the methods of force are the methods we wish to see applied; but they are methods which may have to be applied at times, not only by the Government as constituted at present, but by any national Government of the future. It must be admitted that, hitherto, the Legislative Assembly has not proved itself ready to grant the Government such powers as they have often found necessary for coping with the conditions that prevail in the country.

The talk about the repudiation of debt and the examination of national indebtedness has, as has already been pointed out, not helped to inspire confidence in those whose future is wrapped up in India, and we feel very strongly that any Government, that is going to be for the good of India, must retain not only the confidence of its own nationals, but also international confidence.

I have mentioned some of the difficulties and considerations which build up our present attitude. It is not one of lack of sympathy; it is not one of wishing to go back or to stand still; we recognise the impossibility of that. But we do most sincerely hope for the fullest consideration of the schemes that are going to be put forward, before any minds are closed to the possibility that pace of realisation is not the best criterion.

Our community are entirely unrepentant still as to the Statutory Commission and its formation. We believe that Parliament had every right and was wise to find out the conditions in India as visualised by their own members; but, with that feeling, we were intensely strong that no legislation should take place before all schools of Indian thought had had the opportunity of expressing their views. That is why my community, when first the calling of this Conference was announced, immediately welcomed it, as ensuring that use of Indian experience, without which none of us can hope to attain to the aim we seek to achieve in the future.

As regards our own position out there, it is one of friendship and common interests, and we have welcomed the assurances as to the way in which it is intended to treat British interests in India in the future. It makes it easier for us to welcome forward moves in the political field, and we do welcome India's claims to a position in the Empire as a Dominion. There are admittedly grave difficulties which call for time to overcome, but we are proud as members of the British India Delegation to face those difficulties with the certain hope that we are going to overcome them.

Lt.-Col. Gidney: I address this Conference in a dual capacity, as an Indian, speaking for India, and as a member of the Anglo-Indian community, representing my views with regard to the future constitution of India. I should be indulging in a truism were I to say that both the unitary and federal types of government have their good points. In the past India has been ruled, and her present nationalistic spirit developed, under the stimulus of a centralised form of government. To replace this suddenly by a federal government is obviously a leap in the dark, the more so when one finds it connotes the close material co-operation of the Indian States. If we are to judge by the terms published in the Press on which these States would be willing to enter such a federation, their connection with British India would for some time be more in the nature of a sentimental than a practical association. At the same time, we readily appreciate the willingness and desire of the States to join the Federation and, on the assumption that such a Federation would soon materialise into a corporate body, it would be ridiculous for any one of us to refuse such an offer; and therefore, on behalf of the community I have the honour to represent, I raise my voice in favour of a federal form of government and welcome it as best for the future of India.

With your permission, Sir, I should like to go a little further and say a little more on this. In the creation of this federal Gov-

ernment, the consummation of which no one here can foretell, I am afraid that, judging from some of the speeches I have heard, we have in a measure, by seeking for a federal Government first before stabilising our provincial Governments, placed the cart before the horse. My conception of a practical measure would be to give India immediately complete provincial autonomy and, when the Provinces have stabilised themselves, allow them absolute freedom to federate with those States which are willing to enter into association with them, and so form a number of federated units which could eventually combine in an All-India Federation with a strong, responsible and representative Central Government.

I am aware there are some States which will refuse to enter into this pact, and perhaps some special provision will have to be made for their affiliation with a federated India on terms acceptable to them. But whatever the decision of this Conference may be, I am prepared to accept it, as a member of a minority community, for I am wedded to neither one form nor the other of government. All I ask is that ample provision be made for the development of self-governing institutions in India and that we be given ample power to deliver the goods that we are manufacturing at this Round Table Conference; and at the same time I ask for the adequate and statutory protection and safeguarding of minority interests.

By that I do not mean the sort of provision that already exists in the Instrument of Instructions in the 1919 Government of India Act, which no Governor has up to date put into operation; nor do I mean any authoritative directions from the Secretary of State. What I desire to express in clear and unmistakable terms is that all minority communities must be afforded full protection, be it by means of a Magna Charta or in any other way, and given a right of appeal to the Central Government or, if necessary, to some higher authority against any infringement by a Provincial Government of this statutory protection, the Central Government being armed with adequate powers for the purpose.

This protective clause should in the first place prohibit discriminatory legislation against minorities; secondly, it should guarantee their entry into the public services, and thirdly, secure their adequate representation in all legislatures. Such a provision is guaranteed in other Dominions, and particularly in the constitution controlling the New Zealand Government. The stability of a majority government depends on the protection it affords to the minorities. This was in a large measure overlooked when freedom was given to Ireland, with the result that an Ulster was created to the permanent prejudice of a United Ireland. The demand for self-government for India has often been compared to the similar demand made by Ireland. Let us hope that in its attainment no Ulsters will be created in India.

It is true that in numbers we are one of the smaller of the Indian minorities represented here to-day, but our stake in India, our interest in her future destiny, and the part played by us in her

defence, development and past fortunes, and to be played by us in the future, are in no way commensurate with the mere numbers of the Anglo-Indian community. In the first place, we represent in our very bodies that fusion of East and West, India and Britain, which in other Indians and other Britons can exist only as a fusion of interests in politics and economics. If India is our Motherland, Britain is our Fatherland, and whatever may be the case of other communities, our loyalties are to both these great lands; in the connection between them we find our truest welfare, and in the growth of affection and union between them we find our highest happiness and contentment. Indeed we are your joint responsibility and neither partly can disclaim its honourable obligation to protect us.

Moreover, small as our community is, it has played a mighty part in the making of British India. Its military services from the old John Company days to the Great War, when we gave 80 per cent. of our manhood at the call of King and Empire, is an unparalled record. To-day, Sir, we form 27,000 out of an auxiliary force of 34,000, and to-day, with India seething with civil disobedience and revolution, you will find at all important railway stations our men standing behind sandbags with rifle in hand, protecting British and Indian lives and property.

Modern India has been truly described as a creature of communications, and I claim that my community has played the leading part in making and working these communications, which are the framework of the nervous system of modern India. I go further and say that, without my community, these communications would not have been developed as early or as completely as they now are. I appeal confidently to the history of India to prove what I am saying. In all India there will not be found any community more steadfastly loyal, more industrious, more law-abiding, and, in a word, more fully possessed of the virtues of good citizenship than the Anglo-Indian community and in pleading the cause of my people, I beg most earnestly that my kinsmen, Indian and British, will try to appreciate the value to the future India of such a body of citizens as we represent. In the Memorandum to the Simon Commission this community asks for temporary economic protection for 25 to 30 years, after which it is prepared to sink or swim with the rest of India. During this short period it merely asks that the number of posts it occupies to-day in the various services be not reduced, that its educational grants be not lowered, and that it be very liberally assisted with generous scholarships to enable it to educate itself and enter the higher services in larger numbers. Surely these demands are not excessive when one considers the great economic, military and administrative services rendered by this community to India and the British Empire. If this protection is refused, we sink; if it is granted, we swim, and shall, without doubt, play as great a part in the future as we have already done in the past India. Indeed, Sir, I assure you that the decisions now being taken at this Conference are matters of life and death, literally life and death, for us.

Of late years our economic position has steadily deteriorated. Nevertheless, so far as it is in our power, we are endeavouring to make it possible for the more promising of our younger generation to receive the education and the training which will fit them to compete with the members of other Indian communities. But—this is a point which I would ask all present to consider dispassionately—the deterioration in our economic condition is due very largely to no fault of our own, but to a deliberate policy on the part of Government. The members of other communities are now in a position to undertake many of the duties which have fallen to us in the past, and particularly in that sphere of work which hitherto has provided my community with its main employment—I mean the Railways, Telegraphs and Customs. It was inevitable, of course, that the competition of other Indians for the posts, which we held in these and other services, should become more and more strenuous as education spread, but we are suffering under the dread conviction that, as a small and poor community, we are being sacrificed to the demands of other more powerful communities, and I repeat again, not communities whose attachment to India is any more real or deep than our own.

If our experience of the past few years is to continue, then indeed, I can see no hope for us. And there is another thing I want to say with all the seriousness and emphasis I can command, and it is this: the treatment accorded to the Anglo-Indian community, small as it is, but with a record of consistent and devoted loyalty to India and Britain, will be a touchstone by which the quality of Indian and British statesmanship and equity will be judged in the future. We can be disposed of all that we have and truly ruined, and dispersed as a community: that can be done quite easily. But if it is done, it will be done to the everlasting discredit of the two countries to which we belong. I do not want to make a begging appeal to retain as privileges the Government posts and other benefits which we have enjoyed in the past by virtue of service, tradition and fitness; rather I want to ask if it is not possible to give us something in the nature of a "Bill of Rights," to embody in the fundamental document of the new Indian constitution a declaration with all the authority of India and Great Britain behind it, to the effect that we shall not be expropriated from our employments and the other positions which we have created by our labour and our service merely because we are partly Indian and partly European. In short, I want to ensure that a reformed India will not result in a deformed Anglo-India.

We are not before you as beggars, but as suitors in a just cause; an Indian community devoted to our Motherland but, it must be admitted, under some suspicion because of our unflinching loyalty and devotion in the past to our Fatherland. Our bitter experience has forced us to the conviction that nothing less than that for which I am now asking will be of any use to us, namely, a solemn declaration in the fundamental document of the constitution that we shall be allowed full access to all the work for which we are fitted,

and that we, as a community, shall be given the opportunity of playing our part in the future development of India, military, political and cultural, as well as economic.

Sir, let me end on the note on which I began. My people and I are Indians, but Indians whose roots are deep not only in the soil and traditions of India, but in the soil and history of this country where we are meeting to-day.

We are a synthesis of India and Britain as no other people are or can be, and I would like to remind my Indian kinsmen that it was a man of my own community, the poet and statesman Louis Derozio, who, more than a hundred years ago, long before any of the developments of modern days could possibly have been foreseen, woke from its long sleep the lyre of the Indian Muse with the noble poem, which opens with the stirring and filial declamation:—

“Harp of my land, which mouldering long hath hung,”
and ends with a touching appeal for—

“My fallen country, one kind thought from thee,”
and this is what I ask for, Sir, of the British Delegations and Parliament, and this is what I ask of my Indian kinsmen of all castes and creeds, and of the Indian Princes, whom for over a century we have served loyally, nobly and well, a kind and generous gesture, not, thank God, from my fallen country, but from my country resurgent.

THE GENERAL DISCUSSION—(continued).

Plenary Session, 19th November, 1930.

H.H. The Maharaja of Patiala: Mr. Prime Minister, in rising from my place at this comparatively late stage of the general discussion, I feel I have somewhat of an advantage over the speakers who have preceded me. This is the third day of the general discussion which, I am sure we must all agree, has greatly clarified our ideas. It remains, therefore, only for me to deal with those points which I think might be clearly brought out, in order to summarise what I take to be the general view of the Indian States Delegation.

My brother Princes have already laid stress upon the intimacy of those personal ties with His Majesty's Person and Throne, of which I and every Prince are so proud—ties which bind the Princes of India to the Crown of Britain. These ties remain indissoluble, in the truest sense, links of Empire. But I would point out that they operate in two ways. They constitute on the one hand a link between the Indian States and Great Britain. On the other hand, they constitute a no less important link between the Indian States and British India, since they bind the two halves of India, politically distinct though they may be, into the higher unity which comes of common attachment to a common sovereign. It is my earnest hope, as I am sure it is the hope of all my brother Princes, that the dual operation of these bonds will play its own great part in the birth of that United India for the achievement of which we are all striving.

I make no secret of my own belief that the connection between my own country and the British Commonwealth is one that has been designed by Providence for the benefit of humanity at large. India herself comprises within her borders no less than one-fifth of the human race. If, as I hope and pray, she remains within the British Empire, as a partner equal in dignity with her sister Commonwealths, there will result such a free and voluntary co-operation between East and West as the world has never known. What may such an alliance not achieve for the peaceful progress of mankind at large? The culture of the East, like the culture of the West, has its own characteristic contribution to make. It is for us here to see that our strengths are jointly cast into the same scale—the scale of justice, of progress, of co-operation.

Like all my brother Princes, I have been greatly impressed by the eloquent appeal made to us by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, when he opened this general discussion, that we should recognise we are Indians first and Princes afterwards. May I with all earnestness say how readily we respond to that appeal? We yield to none in our devotion to India, our Motherland. But may I also point out that by remaining Princes we do not cease to be Indians. Our Order is supposed, in certain respects at least, to be conservative. I should myself prefer to say that we are conservators. We

feel indeed that we are the conservators of a great tradition, of an ancient civilisation and of a proud culture.

At a time when the dynamic, machine-made civilisation of the West threatened to overwhelm much of our ancient Indian culture, it was the Indian States which proved themselves the conservators of the traditional arts and crafts. It was within the Indian States that Indian talent, whether in the sphere of arts or politics, for long found their freest, and indeed perhaps for a time, their only scope. It was within the Indian States, to speak of the past alone, that men like Sir Salar Jung, Sir T. Madhav Rao, and Seashadri Iyer, discovered opportunities of self-realisation, of work for the Motherland, that were not available to them in British India. And to-day, is it not the case that the Indian Princes can count among their Ministers and advisers, statesmen of whom the whole of our country may well be proud? I feel strongly that the Indian States have it in their power to make a contribution no less valuable to the Great India of the future, than the contribution of British India herself. Nor is this contribution confined to a historic continuity of culture, a proud sense of citizenship, a solidity of political institutions transcending differences of caste and creed. The Indian States can contribute something else, which until the millennium arrives is no less important to the life of a country than the arts of peace—namely, the capacity for self-defence. It is in the Indian States that there still flourish most prominently such organised military life and tradition as still exist in India, and I suggest that in the future this may be found amongst the most practically valuable of the contributions that the Indian States can make to India, and through India to the Empire.

Mr. Prime Minister, I believe I am speaking for my brother Princes as much as for myself when I say that we all look forward to the birth of a greater India; whether that greater India will take the form of a United States of India, or of a Federal Dominion of India, we may know more clearly before this Conference comes to the conclusion of its work. Our readiness to work for this ideal, and to facilitate its achievement, has already been made manifest; and I am happy to think that both His Majesty's Government in England and my colleagues, the political leaders of British Indian thought, fully appreciate the anxiety of the Indian States that India shall rise to her full stature within the British Commonwealth of Nations. I believe, and I am happy to think that my belief is shared by many, that the readiest and the quickest method of achieving this enhanced status and dignity lies along the road of federation. For federation I am prepared to work, knowing that only through federation can the Indian States join with British India in the formation of the greater India which we all desire.

Here, I think, it is necessary to be clear in our ideas; for it is not only the future of our own States and our own peoples, but the future of India as a whole that is involved. I believe that at every step we should reflect upon the immense issues concerned. What do we Indian Princes mean when we say we are prepared to join

with British India in constituting an All-India Federation? Let me say first what we do not mean. We do not, we cannot, contemplate any severance in the ties which bind India to the Empire. The maintenance of the British connection is the fundamental assumption of our whole position. In the next place, we desire to make it plain that, outside the matters of common concern, we shall preserve our internal autonomy intact, without any interference on the part of British India, whatever the constitution of British India may be, just as the British Indian unit of the Federation will be entitled to manage those affairs, which are exclusively its own, without interference on our part. To put it otherwise, by federation we mean an arrangement entered into by us and by British India jointly under which, while British India manages those affairs that exclusively concern it, and while the Indian States manage those affairs that exclusively concern them, and while the Crown discharges such function in India as are reserved to it, the Crown, British India and the Indian States join together in a system which provides for the joint management and joint control of matters that jointly concern the two sides of India.

The task of devising such a system is not merely difficult and delicate, but involves certain assumptions that I desire to bring out. No Federation has, I am sure, ever come into existence without the right of the federating units being first precisely known. Now, so far as the Indian States are concerned, these rights are in some doubt. Our own view, the view of the Princes, is that our rights are founded upon our treaties and engagements, that our relationship with the Crown is an ascertainable relationship, the terms of which depend upon the element of consent. The Indian States Committee has challenged this view of ours. Are our own legal advisers right—some of the most eminent Counsel in London—or are the members of the Indian States Committee right? How can we federate until we know what rights and what duties we bring to the Federation? When, therefore, we express our willingness, and indeed, our desire to enter a federal arrangement are we not entitled to ask that there should be a prior ascertainment of our rights, not indeed by executive action, but by judicial decision; by the decision of the highest judicial tribunal to which His Majesty's Government and the Indian States may agree to prefer the question? We feel that such ascertainment of our rights runs in no way counter to our desire for the higher unity of India, but will indeed directly facilitate the formation of that federal arrangement through which we believe that unity can best be achieved. Again, it is impossible for federation to come about unless those who are parties to federation are prepared to pay the necessary price. Sacrifices will be necessary. Sacrifices by British India as well as by ourselves. Are we prepared to face the sacrifices? For my own part, I believe that we are. But let us be under no illusion that sacrifice will not be necessary. And while I do not think that there can be any question, for example, of our losing that internal autonomy which each State cherishes, I do

think that we shall find the actual process of working out a federation one which demands great unselfishness, great patience, great patriotism.

Are the Indian Princes afraid then of what the future holds? Speaking for myself, I can answer frankly, that we are not. We are proud of being Indians: we are proud of our Motherland: but we are also proud of the historic position of our States. We are fully conscious of the trend of thought in British India. Indeed, I think that this trend of thought has in many respects served to modify in some degree our own institutions within our States. At the same time, we believe it is not essential that lines of progress within the Indian States and in British India should follow exactly the same course. Each State, with its historic consciousness, should, I feel, seek its own particular form of self-expression consistently with contributing to the higher purposes of the Federation. And may I here say, in all earnestness, that I deprecate even casual references to the possibility that the Indian States may be obliterated by the rising tide of democracy? Mr. Prime Minister, the Indian States have survived many cataclysms; they may survive many more. In my view, it is just their strength and vitality, their sturdy vigour, which has carried them through so many trials, which gives them their greatest value as elements in the future polity of India, and as links in those chains of common loyalty, common affection and common interest, which, I pray, may ever bind together Britain and India in the great British Commonwealth of free nations.

Dr. Moonje: I should like to begin my speech by expressing my heart-felt gratefulness to Lord Peel for the noble and courageous lead that he gave yesterday by saying that we should speak frankly and sincerely. He may be legitimately proud of having brought a contribution of sincerity to the business before this Conference, and for having paid this Conference the compliment of frankness. I can assure him that in my speech he will not be disappointed; he will have the most frank, sincere and honest views of a man who has proved his loyalty to the British Empire, even running the risk of losing his life in doing so, when he was a young man and comparatively unknown, and when he showed his loyalty in the actual fire of the Boer War. It is such a man who now speaks frankly and sincerely and may even appear to be a rebel at the present time.

I should like first to dispose of certain points which Lord Peel made in dealing with the speech of Mr. Jayakar. Lord Peel complained that Mr. Jayakar in his speech did not appreciate the services of the many young British people who go to India and give their devoted service in the prime of their life for the uplift of that country. I do not know whether Mr. Jayakar appreciates those services or not; but in any case I fully appreciate the services which the British people give. I may give an illustration of how I appreciate their services. There is a farmer in a village who keeps a cow.

He gives his devoted attention and his devoted service to that cow, so that every morning he may have an ample supply of fresh milk for his tea. I may also make a comparison with the devoted service which a landlord or malguzar pays to his malguzari village. India is the malguzari village of England, and as such I appreciate that devoted attention is given so that India, the malguzari village, may supply all the needs of England.

Lord Peel also complained that Mr. Jayakar charged the British people with having monopolies in British India, and I was pleased to hear the definition of monopoly which Lord Peel gave. If that definition is correct and if practical effect is given to it, then I, coming from the great Hindu race, have nothing to fear. Efficiency, competence, intelligence and capacity for work, if that be the test for the loaves and fishes of life, if that be the test for a man's worth, I, coming from the great Hindu race, have nothing to fear.

Unfortunately, however, it is not that. Lord Peel says, "I submit that there is no monopoly, legal, constitutional or of any other kind, except that monopoly which is obtained by skill, energy and commercial success." I wish that were the fact. In the history of the British Empire in India I wish it were a fact; for, had that been the case, I would be the last man to complain, for I would have no reason to complain. Efficiency, capacity for work, intelligence, if that be the test, no man from the Hindu race would ever have reason to complain or would ever have complained.

As regards the monopoly, I might bring to the notice of my friend, Lord Peel, something which was written by one of his own people: a life of Sir Bartle Frere, Governor of Bombay, written by Mr. Martineau. He gives a history of how the Indian shipping industry was killed and the present British India Steam Navigation Company brought into being. A Mr. Mackinnon went to India, without means, as an adventurer, and was introduced to the Governor, who was told that he was a very capable young man who would be able to build up a great British shipping industry in India, if the Government would only help him by a subsidy. "That is the man I am looking out for," the Governor said; and a subsidy was given. Every help was given, and the British shipping industry was established, to the prejudice of the then existing shipping industry of the Indians.

I should now like to quote from the reports of the House of Commons. In 1839 a Committee was established by the House of Commons before which a Mr. Melville gave evidence. India passed entirely into the hands of the British after the war which ended in 1818, when the Mahrattas were finally defeated. Some twenty years later, in 1839, Mr. Melville said before that Committee "If British India were a foreign country, a ship built there and navigated wholly by natives might bring a cargo of produce to this country and take back a cargo of British produce; whilst, being a British possession, a ship so owned and navigated is denied

that power. The natives of India are excluded from advantages to which natives of all other countries are admitted; they are not only deprived of the advantages secured to British shipping and seamen, but even of the advantages possessed by some of the foreign nations."

Mr. Wilson, who is known as a great British historian, an honest man, and a sincere man, and one who follows Lord Peel's advice of speaking frankly and sincerely, describes how the Indian cotton industry was killed. He says "British goods were forced on India without paying any duty, and the foreign manufacturer employed the method of political injustice to keep down and ultimately strangle a competitor with whom he could not have competed on equal terms." He further says that "Had not this been the case and had there not been such prohibitive duties, the mills of Paisley and Manchester would have been stopped at the outset and could scarcely again have been set in motion even by the power of steam." That was the position of the cotton industry in India and that was how it was killed.

Now that it has been killed Lord Peel comes and says there is no monopoly, legal or constitutional, or of any other kind, except a monopoly of efficiency. I wish it were so. May I say a word about a monopoly in a sphere which is dear to my heart—the monopoly which is enjoyed by Britishers as regards commissions in the Army? Up to ten years ago not one Indian belonging to the fighting races, belonging to the races that established and subverted Empires, and are looking forward to the time when again they will establish Empires, was admitted to the commissions in the Indian Army. The sons of such races were absolutely excluded from Commissions in the Army. Is not that a monopoly? Was the Civil Service not a monopoly? Was the Indian Medical Service not a monopoly? Was it based entirely on efficiency and capacity for work? I wish Lord Peel would reconsider his statement and, as he has given us a lead in frankness and sincerity, would reconsider the position and give us a further lead in sincerity and frankness.

Lord Peel reminds us, and sincerely reminds us, and very gravely reminds us, that Lord Irwin, for whom we gave very lusty cheers when his name was mentioned here, has never promised immediate translation into fact of the full measure of Dominion Status. I know it. I do not require to be reminded of it. I have not yet known any British statesman say, "I shall take time by the forelock and be an exception this time to the rule of the British being always five minutes too late and doing a thing when all grace is out of it." I expected that the British people would rise to the occasion and say, when we come here to-day to give a frank expression of our opinion, "If you prove your capacity, if you prove worthy, immediate Dominion Status will be given you." In capacity, in efficiency it cannot be said that the representatives of the Hindus have been found wanting. (*A Delegate: Of India.*) Yes. Hindus of Hindustan, which is called

India in English. Hindus therefore means Indians to whatever religions they may belong—Hindus, Muslims, Christians, etc. I am glad the Delegate reminded me of that. I am not an Englishman and therefore I am accustomed to speak of Indians as Hindus of Hindustan.

Now what is the present situation in India? Lord Irwin may say that he is not going to give immediate Dominion Status, and the British people may say that they are not going to give immediate Dominion Status. We are not here to know whether the British Government is going to give us Dominion Status or not. We have come here as a mark of our consideration for the long-standing friendship, the long-standing association between India and England, to tell the British people frankly and sincerely—taking the lead of Lord Peel—what India thinks and what is the situation there at present, so that you may exercise your independent brain and your independent thought and make up your minds how to proceed in the present situation. The situation in India I shall briefly describe. There are Indians in the Civil Service, there are Indians in the Medical Service, there are Indians in the Military Service, and their wives and their sons and their brothers and their nearest relatives are taking part actively in the national movement of Civil Disobedience, and are going to gaol and are suffering all kinds of indignities and oppression. Young boys, young kids, young girls, young women, old women, old men—all are coming forward to express their heart-felt feeling that the time has come to assert India's position and dignity, and that India can never be satisfied with anything less than Dominion Status or full responsible government. I will come soon to what I mean by Dominion Status or responsible government. They are suffering all kinds of indignities and oppression. I was myself twice convicted and was one of the guests in His Majesty's gaol in the struggle for freedom, in my desire to make India as free as any Dominion in the Empire. If further sacrifice is needed this man will not be found wanting when the time comes, as he was not found wanting during the Boer War and during the last World War. If I could offer the sacrifice of my life for the Empire during times of real emergency, I should be a thousand times more ready to offer my life for sacrifice for the freedom of my country.

British people think, and perhaps British officers in India think, that they can put down the movement, that they can demoralise the people. They think that by a display of force they will cause all this trouble to disappear. The time has passed—I am speaking frankly and sincerely—and that time will never come again, when any show of physical force is going to cow down the Indian people. I have seen with my own eyes officers with police and military, faced by thousands of people, children, boys, women, men, who said: "All right, you do your worst; we are prepared to be shot down." While being shot down they may run away for the time being, but, when the shooting stops, they come again to do the

same thing over again. In the organ called "Young India," Miss Slade, one of the daughters of the British people, a daughter of Admiral Slade, who took part in the last war, writes as to the ways of British oppression; how the British people are aspiring to kill the movement and how they do not succeed. I shall only quote, without adding any remarks of my own: "Lathi blows on head, chest, stomach and joints . . . stripping of men naked before beating . . . dragging of wounded men into thorn hedges or into salt water; riding of horses over men as they lie or sit on the ground; thrusting of pins and thorns into men's bodies, sometimes even when they are unconscious; beating of men after they had become unconscious, and other vile things too many to relate, besides foul language and blasphemy, calculated to hurt as much as possible the most sacred feelings of the Satyagrahis. The whole affair is one of the most devilish, cold-blooded and unjustifiable in the history of nations." So says Miss Slade, the disciple of Mahatma Gandhi, the modern avatar, *i.e.*, incarnation, of love, non-violence and truth. That disciple, an English lady, says these things. She has seen these things with her own eyes, and frankly, taking the lead of Lord Peel, frankly and sincerely and honestly says what she has seen.

This is what is going on in India at the present moment, and this has been going on for more than six months and yet the movement has gone on. As I have said before, when shooting does take place people may run away for the time being but as soon as the shooting stops people again throng and do the same thing. (*A Delegate*: They should not run away). I should have thought they should not run away, but let us imagine the difficulties of the progeny of the races which fought wars, which waged wars, defeated enemies, having been disarmed and made helpless. For the last 80 years or so—three generations of disarmament! The Moguls came, conquered India, defeated us, established their Empire; but it did not enter their brains to maintain their Empire by disarming the whole nation. It is this thing that has gone right into the bottom of our hearts. I could quite understand it if anybody says, "If you have a rifle, and if your opponent has a rifle, and then you run away, then you can call him a coward." But cowards they are not, because these people, seeing that their own people are being shot down, return to the same place to do the same thing, simply because they have not rifles of their own. That is the crux of the situation. The pith of what I am saying is that, if the British officials in India think that this movement can be cowed down or submerged by any kind of repression, they are mistaken. It is impossible that that movement could be crushed. We have gone through it. My grandfather has passed through all these troubles before. We know in our history what a repression we have gone through before, much more serious than the present repression. We have gone through that, and we, Mah-rattas and Sikhs standing together have withstood the most unimaginable atrocities that human nature could think of; and yet

we went on and eventually succeeded in establishing Swaraj in India.

The sum and total of what I say is this. This is the parting of the ways for the British people and ourselves. We have been in association, according to my calculation, for a little more than a hundred years, according to somebody else's calculation about a hundred and fifty years. It is the consideration for this association that has prompted me to come to this Round Table Conference against the desires of all my people, in spite of the condemnation of friends with whom I have worked for the last twenty-five or thirty years, and ignoring the assertion by friends and co-workers in private and in public that he is a traitor who goes to the Round Table Conference. They say, "We believed that he was a sound soldier of his Motherland, but when the time for the real examination came, he was found out, and now we know he is a traitor who goes to the Round Table Conference."

I am risking all. I am risking everything that is dear to a man's heart in this life, and all for one thing; for the some little affection there is for the association that has been established for the last 125 years. It was that little affection that made me take risks in my youth, according to the promptings of youth in those days, when I joined General Buller's Command in the Boer War and offered my services for the last World War. According to the promptings of a more sober and a more advanced age I am taking the risk of losing everything that a man holds dear in his life. If I had looked at things from a personal point of view, what a simple thing it would have been for me to be hailed as a great patriot. I had only to say "Mahatma Gandhi Ki Jai: down with the Round Table Conference," and people would have said, "There is no greater patriot than Dr. Moonje at this time in India." But I have risked all that and I have come here, and I am so glad that Lord Peel has anticipated the promptings of my heart to speak here sincerely and honestly and frankly.

Now that I have said all these things, what is it that India wants, and what is it that you are asked to do? India wants Dominion Status. India has an ambition of her own. India had, according to her own ambitions, established her own Empires, and, of course, those alone who can establish Empires lose Empires. It is not a very extraordinary thing to lose an Empire, because only those can lose Empires who have got the capacity to establish them. The last straw is being put on the camel's back. Let us see if the British people have the wisdom to avoid putting the last straw on the camel's back before the camel's back breaks. What is it that India wants, and what is it that we are asking you to do? We want Dominion Status. I am not using the words from a constitutional point of view. When we meet in the sub-Committees, then we can talk about it scientifically and constitutionally and historically, but here I am speaking from a layman's point of view. What is it that India wants? India wants to be a Dominion

within the British Empire, so that India may also be in a position to own the Empire as its own. If I possess a house, I feel a kind of love for that house. I wish, and India desires, that, in consideration for our long-standing association, India should be allowed to feel that the Empire is also its own. It is in this sense that I am using the term Dominion Status. I know that we are different from you as regards race and religion and colour, though ultimately you and we are one; we belong to the Aryan race. At the present moment we are black people and you are white people, so perhaps you may think that you and we are quite different, and you may also think, being different people, "Is it wise to give Dominion Status to them, so that they might afterwards stand up against us and sit on our chest again to-morrow, and might do something which will not be very pleasing to us?" You might feel that. You have seen the past history of India. If that had been the intention of the Indian people, the history of our connection with the British nation would have been quite different.

There are people here who know that three days after the Great War was declared I volunteered my services; but, being over age, unfortunately I could not be accepted. Then I volunteered that from my little Province I would raise 50,000 soldiers for the war, provided that the racial bar to Indians for King's Commissions in the Army and the racial monopoly in the Army was removed. If the mind of India had been different you would not have received that offer; but we said, "This is a time of emergency and difficulty for the British people; and it is not our comprehension of our duty and of our conscience that we should create troubles for the British people at such a time; they are also human beings like us. After seeing them through their difficulties, the God in them will be roused enough to make them see that our people, though black in colour, are the same as their own."

I have not come here as a beggar. It will be a good thing if you, of your own accord, would say, "We offer you Dominion Status." If fear or suspicion may not lead you to make that friendly gesture, then I say we will not be satisfied with anything less than full responsible government, *i.e.*, Dominion Status. I want to be as free in my country as an Englishman in England, as a Canadian in Canada, as a New Zealander in New Zealand, and as an Australian in Australia. Nothing less than that is going to satisfy me. That is one thing.

The second thing which I shall never tolerate is the cant that Indian people cannot defend their own country, and, therefore, the British people must undertake the responsibility of defending India.

We shall be satisfied only with full responsible government. You must look at it from the psychological and physiological point of view. There are things which are known as foreign bodies. When a foreign body enters into the body politic, if the body politic reacts in a certain way, that foreign body becomes a part of the body politic.

body isolated and independent of it; but if the body politic does not react favourably, then the foreign body acts as a poison and poisons the whole body politic. Either absorb us into yourselves so that we can say that the Empire is our own along with you, or say, "You are a foreign people, but we shall allow you to isolate yourselves as an independent being." If something on those lines is not done it is not very difficult to prophesy that that foreign body will be a source of immense trouble, will poison the whole body politic, until either it is cast out or the body politic itself is destroyed.

It is to tell you this that I have come here and spoken freely, frankly and sincerely, and I am grateful to Lord Peel for having given me the lead. This is the frank expression of a man who has been known up to now as a patriot in his own country. Now he is called a traitor to his own country for having come here. I would commend to the British Delegations the amount of responsibility that lies on their head. It is a question whether India shall be complementary to England or opposite to England. In the latter case there may be constant warfare, constant trouble and constant repression so that there will be peace on neither side in India.

Sardar Ujjal Singh: Mr. Chairman, we are assembled here to find a solution of one of the most difficult and complex problems which any assembly was ever faced with. We were reminded yesterday by Lord Peel that we should proceed with caution. I fully agree with the noble Lord that we should take all factors into careful consideration, but we must face and surmount difficulties and not succumb to them. I need not repeat what many of my friends have already said about the grave situation in India. I will only say that rapid progress may lead to some trouble, but hesitation and half-hearted measures are bound to lead to great disaster. We cannot forget that India at this moment is impatient and restless to breathe the air of freedom. This impatience has led the leaders of the greatest and most powerful political party in the country to adopt means which we all, I believe, sadly deplore. But we Indians deplore no less the measures adopted by the Government resulting in breaking of heads and the sending to prison of India's gems, who, in a free country, would have commanded the respect of the proudest nations. Both these methods are a counsel of despair. This unfortunate, sad state of affairs in India calls for the rarest courage, wisdom and statesmanship of the highest order. In the success of this historic Conference lies the good, not only of India or of England, but of the whole world; for one-fifth of the human race in ferment cannot but produce uncertainty and restlessness in the whole.

Although the problem is difficult and its solution imperative, there is no ground for pessimism. On the other hand there is a clear indication of a determination on the part of every section of this historic assembly to find a ready solution for it. By inaugurating the opening ceremony of this Conference His Majesty the King-

Emperor has given practical proof of his anxiety to see the success of our deliberations. We should express our gratitude to His Majesty not by words but by the results which he expects us to achieve. The fact that you, Sir, with your multifarious duties and momentous responsibilities, have been able to find time to preside over our deliberations is another proof of the determination of the British people to find a solution to this problem. We Indian Delegates have already staked our reputation in the eyes of our fellow countrymen. We cannot—we dare not—go back to India without carrying with us the solution which will satisfy the aspirations of our people.

The Indian Princes in their magnificent speeches have made it abundantly clear that they are not only anxious to adjust their relations with British India, but that they are equally desirous to see India occupying her rightful position in the proud nations of the world. When the best brains of England and the versatile brains of India are bent upon the solution of the problem there is no difficulty which may not be overcome.

What is the nature of our problem? We have been asked here to give an expression of a limited character on the question of federal or unitary government. Before expressing my opinion on this specific proposition, on behalf of the Sikh community which I have the honour to represent here, I make bold to say that, from the point of view of British India, our immediate business is to obtain the substance of independence, a status of equality in the British Empire, and a full measure of responsible government in autonomous Provinces under a responsible Central Government. If that had not been the main issue perhaps this Conference would not have seen the light of day. The immediate realisation of this desire is no doubt full of difficulties, and if there were no difficulties, we would not have been here putting our heads together and coming to close grips with the problem. Lord Peel said yesterday that the Simon Commission Report, so far as the Provinces were concerned, was a revolutionary document in so far as in the Provinces Dyarchy was done away with and a unitary responsible Government established instead. I admit that the word "Dyarchy" has been taken away from the constitution, but Dyarchy in substance is replaced in the shape of an official member of the Cabinet. I do not desire to enter into any discussion at this stage of the various proposals, but, with all earnestness I submit that no amount of autonomy in the Provinces is going to satisfy Indian public opinion unless responsibility is established in the Central Government. Representing, as I do, the important Sikh minority, I cannot shut my eyes to what realisation of full responsible government would mean to a minority. If we were all to forget that we were members of different communities, and were prepared to sacrifice our communal interests at the altar of nationhood or nationalism, I for one would not have asked for any consideration for my community; but unfortunately communal interests are still dear to us and require adjustment in a spirit of give and take.

The Sikhs—who were, I need not remind you, the masters of the Punjab not many years ago, and who, since the British advent have maintained their military prestige in the various theatres of war in Asia, Africa and Europe, and who during the Great War supplied no less than 89,000 combatant recruits, besides 30,000 already in service, and who still constitute the most gallant element of the Indian Army—the Sikhs cannot remain indifferent to their interests. I beg of you not to ignore the just claims of a community which is to be the backbone of India as a Dominion. I need only remind you of the words of Edward Thomson, who has written a book on the reconstruction of India. He says that, if the Sikhs remain loyal to a federated India, the North-Western border is safe against Afghanistan, and if India remains a Dominion her shores are secured by the British Navy.

I am anxious, therefore, to be assured of a rightful position for my community. In fact, the test of a constitution is the measure of security it provides for the minorities. But I am not without hope that, along with other difficulties, we shall be able to solve this problem in a friendly spirit, with a common desire to see India occupying a proud position among the countries of the world.

The problems of defence and the maintenance of law and order were mentioned yesterday as the big problems which presented peculiar difficulties. I am of opinion that with the solution of the minorities problem and with the introduction of a system of responsible government, which might satisfy general public opinion in India, the question of law and order becomes very easy. Indians in general are more peace-loving than Westerners, and if their legitimate demands are acceded to, the chances of disorder and outbreaks are considerably reduced.

I admit that the defence problem is more difficult, but it is made more difficult partly from the peculiar nature of India's frontier, and partly by the exclusion, until recently, of Indians from higher ranks and positions of responsibility in the Indian Army. I hold the view that India cannot be a full-fledged Dominion until she is able to assume control of the Army, but that does not imply that she cannot have Dominion Status and responsibility in other spheres of governmental activity without delay. The question of defence—and along with it relations with foreign countries—can for a period of time be entrusted to the Viceroy, assisted by an advisory board of Indians; but to seek to remove the control of the Army from the Indian Legislature and to vest it in a foreign body for all time to come is to postpone the attainment of full Dominion Status by India until Doomsday.

What is immediately needed is to accelerate the peace of Indianisation in the higher ranks of the Army. It is inconceivable that the right material will not be available, or that any peculiar difficulties will present themselves in providing non-British commands. In spite of general disarmament and physical degeneration, for which the Arms Act in India is mostly responsi-