Sastri and the other Liberals felt the need of to
galvanising their efforts and inject more vigour in/their
agitation. They joined the more active nationalists in
had
demanding their freedom. Initially they/asked for Dominion
Status. But gradually and eventually they clamoured for
Purna Swaraj.

The political situation during the first nine months
of 1929 were on the surface relatively quiet. It was lull
before storm. The Government found itself opposed by the
extreme section of the Congress, the Hindu politicians and
Moderates who stood against the Simon Commission. The British
realised it was essential to initiate a course of action in
order to prevent dangerous situations. As already discussed,
the commission envisaged a plan of holding a conference in
which all political parties would be represented. The Govern-
ment undertook this plan of action to convince the more
moderate opinion "that there did not exist an irreconcilalde
gulf between India and England". The Viceroy announced the
calling of a conference with the "assurance" that the
Government's aim was to introduce Dominion Status. This
assurance was however already implicit in the preamble to the Government of India Act of 1919. This assurance satisfied the Liberals for what it was worth. Congress was dilly dallying with the idea of joining the Conference. But at the meeting of the leaders with the Viceroy on the 23rd of December 1929, Gandhi and Nehru made it clear that the Congress would participate in the London Round Table Conference on the understanding that the object of the Conference was to frame a scheme for immediate introduction of Dominion Status.

Sastri’s views about the forthcoming London Round Table Conference could be gauged from a letter he wrote to Sir P.S. Sivaswami Aiyar, a Liberal, on December 2nd 1929. In this letter he pointed out that things would not be easy for Congress with "hardliners" like Jayakar and Jinnah standing for communalism. It was this fear that made Sastri suggest, as already discussed, a preliminary conference to be held in India so as to arrive at a concord before they attended the London Conference. The object was to summon all the Muhammedans and the Hindus in the Viceroy’s list to attend this meeting in India and iron out their differences.
before attending the London Round Table Conference. But in actual fact, this did not happen, for in selecting the Muslim delegates, Irwin was guided by Fazli Hussain, member of the Executive Council. Fazli Hussain was keen on excluding any Muslim who was suspected of leanings towards the Congress, and who under the pressure of Wedgewood Benn, the Secretary of State, might be suspected to give support to joint electorates. Therefore, he used all his influence and powers of persuasion in the selection of a Muslim delegation consisting of members who would represent his point of view and do so effectively. Therefore Sastri was pessimistic about the results of the conference.

Gandhi, in the meanwhile, had launched his Dandi march on the 12th March 1930. Sastri and the other Liberals condemned this Satyagraha as it would prevent the British, from granting India Dominion Status. At the same time he urged the Government to adopt a more conciliatory policy towards the nationalists, but, the Viceroy did not listen to this advice. In the meanwhile Sastri had left for England to try and influence British public opinion. He sent information to India from England that the official view had agreed that India should be granted Dominion Status.
However, this could only be granted if Civil Disobedience was suspended. If things went awry in India, Britain would not help India in any way. No need was taken and Sastri naturally felt let down because both the nationalists and the Government did not heed his advice. Sastri was however, nominated to attend the First Round Table Conference.

Sastri feared that the Moderate trial was imminent in the coming conference. To him the Conference was going to try Liberal Indian statesmanship, patience and strength. He was pessimistic of the outcome of the conference, but his motto was to serve through failure. He rightly observed that the worst enemy is not only the British diehard but also the Indian sectarian. The Round Table Conference seemed designed more to advertise the diversities of India than to promote unity for it was represented by the Hindu Mahasabha, the Zamindars, the non-Brahmins and the scheduled castes and the Muslims. This conference therefore did not start under ideal conditions.

THE ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE:

The Conference was inaugurated by King George V on November 12, 1930 when 16 Muslims, 3 Mahasabhaigs, 2 Sikhs, 1 Christian, 4 Non-Brahmins, 2 Depressed Classes,
4 Land owners, 4 Europeans, 1 Anglo Indian businessman, 3 Burmese, 16 Indian States and 13 Liberals were invited.

Among the Liberals were Sastri, C.Y. Chintamani, Chimanlal Setalwad, Cowasji Jehangir, Tej Bahadur Sapru, Pheroze Sethna, C.P. Ramaswami Iyer, Ramachandra Rao, J.N. Basu, N.M. Joshi, P.C. Mitter, H.P. Modi and N.N. Law, Sastri C.P. Ramaswami Iyer, Jayakar Jinnah, Tej Bahadur Sapru, Muhammad Shafi, Sardar Sahib Ujjal Singh, Saiyid Sultan Ahmad were British India delegates.

The other members represented their own interests. Some were communal, some were of vested interests, some were Liberals. The Congress did not participate in the meetings.

It is interesting to point out that whilst there was a strong group of Liberals at the First Round Table Conference, the number was reduced in the second and was totally absent in the third, when no Liberal was invited by the Government except Sir Tej Bahadur. He had described himself as belonging to no party. N.M. Joshi represented Labour and Sir Cowasji represented his community.
Sastri read the felicitation address. He delivered his address after Sir Muhammad Akbar Hydari. He said "we all feel heartened to our taste by the gracious and inspiring words of His Majesty, they contain lessons which we must practice 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... Through all clouds of prejudice and misunderstanding that darken the problem two statements of policy shine ... One was made by His Majesty to the effect that the natural issue of India's constitution of progress as contemplated by August 1917 Declaration is
the attainment of Dominion Status. Another was large
degree of management of her own "affairs". In a diplomatic
manner, whilst he praised the British sense of justice, he
took a pro-India stand.

In the plenary session, a general discussion took
place on the question whether India should be a Federation
or a unitary state. Five days were allotted to discuss
the constitution. Committees were established such as the
Federal structure committee, Communal minority committee,
Provincial constitution, Burma, North West Frontiers,
Franchise Defence Service and Sind. The Indian Princes made
a declaration in which they agreed to accept the idea of a
Federation consisting of the British India Provinces and
Indian princely States provided it did not hurt their
interest. The Maharaja of Bikaner spoke on behalf of the
Princes assuring their contribution for the prosperity of
India. They accepted the Federal system so long as it was
an independent authority which was not under British control.
They wanted to know however, what powers they were to possess.
They were prepared to accept certain limitations and safe-
guards but only during the period of transition. Sir Akbar
Hydar emphasized this point.
The Muslims led by Jinnah and Muhammad Shafi welcomed the Federation. They demanded the status of equality with the Dominions and security for Minorities.

During the discussion on Federation, Sastri admitted to have become a recent convert to the idea of Federation. He cautioned the members of the Round Table Conference not to weaken relations or alter the character between the British India Provinces and the Indian States. He further stated that it was essential to examine at every stage whether the Federation that they were to establish could really bring conformity and uniformity. He further said "as point after point arises, it may be with reluctance, I for instance, acquiesce in the arrangement proposed, although I may not quite approve of it; I may think it is a weakening element. It is quite possible that at a certain stage, when these weakness have accumulated, it may appear to some of us that the point has been reached when Federation might not effectively take the place of those relations between British India and the Indian States that now subsist".

When discussing the component units in the Federation Sastri was of the opinion that he could not conceive of
Provinces of British India and the States being in exactly the same position.

Sastri felt that it was wise to group the Indian Princely States before they accede to the Federation. The Maharaja of Bikaner made it clear that some states may have to be grouped. Sastri felt that one cannot sacrifice the right of State to say whether it will join the Federation or not. This should be done voluntarily. Tej Bahadur Sapru strongly supported a federal form of Government as the Princely States would be a stabilising factor. There would also be a faster rate of Indianisation. He welcomed the idea of Federation.

Sastri referred to the grave problems India had been facing and in view of this how future plans could be executed. He reminded the British of the repercussions of the Rowlatt Act and the Simon Commission on India and said "I beg our British colleagues here to remember these two lessons and not upon this occasion to act as may seem best to them, but as appears best both to them and to us here on this side".
He wanted power to be transferred to the representatives of the people of India. He was anxious that power should not pass into the hands of those who will make political sport of the welfare and prosperity of India and bring things to crash either because they do not understand the gravity of things, or because it just pleases them to bring chaos. At the same time he pointed out, that Indians must really put power into the hand of the people and it is that impression which above all else the Indians must be anxious to produce. He said "we must take care not to produce the impression that when power passes from British hands it passes into hands which are considered safe for the British still, but not into hands which may be construed to be the hands of popular representatives. Only gradualism would help in producing a solid base for democratic ideals."

Elsewhere Sastri emphasized that they were creating a new Federation with a citizenship of its own for certain purposes. The moment a law is passed in a Federation every individual living within the jurisdiction of that Federation, comes under it. No immediate authority was required. He emphasized that this process must be followed when creating citizenship for India. He said "everyone of us has got to
be taught to believe that in respect of certain matters he is the citizen of a very large and all embracing entity. This has found a place in our constitution of 1950.

The above discussion was followed by a debate on the subjects to be included in the Central, Provincial and concurrent list. The members of the sub-committee who discussed this topic were Tej Bahadur Sapru, C.P.Ramaswami Aiyar, M.R.Jayakar, Jinnah, Edward Chamiers and Maurice Gwyver. Of these, Tej Bahadur Sapru, C.P.Ramaswami Iyer were Liberals. Sastri took part in the discussion too. He discussed questions relating to Central subjects which were proposed to be partly or wholly federalised. Sastri supported the classification of residue subjects into 3 categories. Some were exclusively Central, some exclusively provincial and some subjects in which both the centre and provinces were interested and which were to be subject to Central co-ordination. The discussion started about communications. Subjects that were dealt with under this caption were Railways, Aircraft, Inland waterways, Shipping and Navigation, Ports, Port Quarantine, Posts Telegraph, Trunk Telephones and Wireless installations.
Railways were to be made federal for policy and legislation. Administration was to be federal to the extent of powers exercised by the Railway Board. Srinivasa Sastri felt that the States were to be entitled to a return on the capital they had spent on the Railways. Further, the Railways should pay for itself. The surplus money could be ploughed for different purposes. Sastri felt that the same policy should be followed with regard to Inland waterways and Airways.

The sub-committee felt that Light houses beacons, light ships and buoys were to be Federal.

Port Quarantine was to be Federal so far as international requirements were concerned.

Posts Telegraphs, Telephones and Wireless installations were to be Federal subjects with such qualifications as was necessary for the purposes of adjustment with the States in matters of detail. Sir B.N.Mitra suggested that Posts and Telegraph system should also be introduced in the Indian States. There should be a coordinated control between the British India Provinces and the Princely Indian States to make the proposed Federation a reality.
Customs and Salt were to be Federal. Maritime customs was to be Federal subject to special adjustments with Maritime States having regard to their treaties, agreements and engagements. Customs on external frontiers of Federal India was to be a Federal subject and was to be considered on the same lines of maritime customs subject to the special case of Kashmir. Currency and Coinage was to be a Federal topic subject to adjustment with the States concerned of such rights as were not already conceded by them.

Public Dept of Federal India was to be a Federal subject whilst Savings Banks were to be Federal for policy and legislation regarding Post Office Savings Banks. Audit was to be a Federal subject. Commerce including banking and insurance were to be Federal for policy and legislation.

With regard to Development of Industries, the subcommittee felt that it should be a Federal subject in cases where such development of Federal authority is declared by order, or Federal Government made after negotiation with and consent of Federating units.
Control of cultivation and manufacture of opium and sale of opium for export was to be Federal policy and legislation. Stores and stationery both imported and indigenous required for Federal Department was to be a Federal subject.

Control of petroleuim and explosives was to be Federal for policy and legislation, whilst geological Survey of India and Botanical Survey of India were to be Federal subjects. Inventions and designs were to be Federal for policy and legislation.

Emigration from and Immigration to India, Federal Police organisation were to be Federal subjects. Traffic in arms and ammunitions came under the Federal subjects for policy and legislation. The same principle was applied to copy rights. As far as central agencies, institutions for research including observatories and professional training or promotion of special studies, Survey of India, Meteorology, All India statistics, Federal services, Immovable property acquired or maintained at the cost of Federal Government were concerned, they were to come under the purview of Federal subjects Public Services, Commission was to be Federal for the purposes of Federal legislation.
Under the caption 'Central subject, no portions of which was proposed to be Federalised' came the Civil Law. This was to include laws regarding status, property, civil rights and liabilities and procedure. This question had to be considered by a special Legal committee and they therefore refrained from dealing with it.

Control of production, supply distribution of any article in respect of which control by a central authority was declared by rule made by the Governor-General in Council or by or under legislation by the Indian Legislature was to be considered as essential for public interest save to the extent to which in such rule or legislation such control was directed to be exercised by a Local Governments.

The majority of the committee considers that the Central Government should not retain the power which this entry gave.

The control of mineral development should be a provincial subject but the regulation of mines should remain a central subject to the extent it was at that time.
Criminal Law was to be dealt with by a Legal Committee.

Ecclesiastical administration and European cemeteries were not to be legislated upon by the Provinces. It was however to be considered whether it should not be a Crown subject. The committee understood that this had to be dealt with under the amendment of the constitution.

Regulation of ceremonial titles, orders and precedence was a matter to be dealt by the Crown.

The joint committee considered that a new entry should be made making services in the centrally administered areas and expenditure incurred therein a central subject.

Under the caption, Provincial subjects, subject to legislation by the Indian legislatures came local self Government. Local Self Governments dealt with powers of local authorities to borrow otherwise than from the Provincial Government. It also dealt with the levying by such authorities of taxation not included in the schedule II of the scheduled Taxes Rules. The committee
thought that the words "subject to the previous sanction of the Governor General is now required" should be substituted for the words 'subject to legislation by the Indian Legislation'.

Public health sanitation and vital statistics was also discussed in detail. As regards infections and contagious the majority were in favour of coordination as against legislative control by the centre.

Education should be Provincial. Benares Hindu University, Aligarh Muslim University were to be central. So also Agriculture, Disforestation, Land acquisition were to be a provincial subjects but the right of the Central Government to acquire land for its own purposes should be safeguarded. Ancient monuments, disposal of colonial properties were to be Central subject.

Industries factories, settlements of Labour disputes, Electricity, Welfare Prisons were to be considered concurrent. This was an age when ideas of socialism and communism were rearing their heads. These ideas spread to India. The Liberals were influenced by this trend and started taking interest in the Welfare of Labour.
The next subject that was discussed was that of the Legislatures in the proposed federation. A debate arose whether the Legislature was to be unicameral or bicameral. Tej Bahadur Sapru and Sastri supported Bicameral legislatures. Sastri preferred a total number of 150 for the Senate and 300 for the Assembly.

B.N. Mitra commented that 300 be allowed for the Indian representation. Sastri did not agree with the British representative's Sir Samuel Hoare's view that the Federal Legislature should have limited function.

With regard to representation in the Legislature, Tej Bahadur Sapru wanted Indian States to be represented in both houses of the Legislature as that would simplify the working of the constitution. Sastri, however, did not agree to the principle of equality amongst the component units. If the Indian States and British India were to have parity of
representation, the States were not a unit. They were entering the Federation individually. He laid stress on representation on the basis of importance or by area and population. He preferred representation by population.

He wanted the Indian States to be included in the Upper House if the population standard gave a very unequal ratio. In the case of the Lower House, he was firm on the population ratio being limited proportional to the population of a given area. With regard to representations from other groups, Sastri felt that Labour, depressed classes, European Commerce, General Commerce, Indian Commerce, Indian Christians, the military class, landlords and Anglo Indians were and that to have representation they should be represented in the upper and in the Lower House. Sapru supported this view.

As far as responsibility was concerned, Tej Bahadur Sapru felt that the executive should be made responsible to both Houses instead of only the Lower House. In case the Executive lost the confidence of the legislature, a joint session of both the houses should be called to determine the life of the Executive by a joint vote.
He further said that whenever a vote of no confidence is moved whether with regard to British India and Indian States or with regard to Federal subjects, a joint session of the legislatures must be held. This indirectly gave a voice to the Indian States in the affairs of British India. He was not afraid of this because, to his mind the question of stability of the Executive was of great importance.

His farsightedness paved the way for the Indian States to be brought into the Indian Union.

With regard to legislative procedure, if the Indian States acceded to the Federation in connection with the introduction of a new subjects to be added to the list, Sastri felt that it was impossible to get individual consent of all Indian States or the 200 groups of States. This would mean blocking the process of the machinery they were devising. The matter should be left to the concern of the legislature. When it was pointed out that this would create a deadlock, Sastri answered that the constitution would be blocked. A provision would be made contrary to developing the constitution.
He said "The Constitution would be blocked. You said here that provision must be made for the constitution to develop, we shall now in effect be making a provision in the contrary direction."

Sastri was totally against the Defence Minister's voting rights. He insisted that if the Defence Minister was given this right he should also have a share in the collective responsibility of the ministry. Since he was responsible only to the Viceroy, he could not be asked to resign when a vote of censure is passed on the Cabinet as he had no share in shaping the policy. If a question concerning defence was discussed, the Cabinet members would find it difficult to vote either way. He felt that there was no alternative but to appoint the ministers and their secretaries each to one House, and give them the power of discussion only.

Sastri did not agree with Lord Reading's idea of referring the question of franchise to a special commission. He agreed with Lord Reading in favouring direct election to the Lower House.

He did not agree with Tej Bahadur Sapru on certain points which are given as follows. The idea that Ministers responsible to the Viceroy for the subjects of finance and
external affairs which they proposed to keep out of the scope of the Indian Legislature, should share responsibility to the Legislature with others, seemed to him far fetched and unnecessary. Responsibility had been defined as being liable to be dismissed. If a Legislature was displeased with its Executive, it had the power of dismissing the Executive. He pointed out that these Ministers for defence and external affairs would be constitutionally responsible to the Viceroy and the Imperial Parliament. Being so, they had constitutional dismissability. This according to Sastri, was one type of dismissability. He also said there was another type of dismissability which came from joint responsibility.

He abhorred the practice, in the Viceroy's Government of India, of sending private and personal telegrams from and to the Secretary of State, as it constituted a secret Government on matters of grave consequences were thus settled. This prevented free and unfettered discussion and judgement amongst the members of the Cabinet. He felt that the Viceroy might have the Prime Minister or the Domestic Minister to preside over the meetings of the Executive Council. But as a rule he must abstain from participating in the preliminary discussions. He also felt that the Viceroy
should possess emergency power to intervene and set the constitution in working order. In short, he asked for a nominal constitutional head of State who possessed de jure powers. He agreed with Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru that the Viceroy should not be given ordinance powers as they were contemplating an executive Government responsible to the Legislature.

He warned Lord Reading of the risks involved in insisting on safeguards, or restrictions on questions of finance. Finance should be transferred to the Government of India without restriction.

As far as Tej Bahadur Sapru was concerned, he felt one should not deprive the popular House of its share in matters of a fiscal nature.

With regard to the services, Sastri felt it should be Indianised and the Secretary of State should not recruit future Civil service members or regulate their conditions of tenure or stand guarantee for their good treatment or for their pensions. The Government of India must take the place of the Secretary of State in this matter for future recruitments.
With regard to ordinance powers, the Governor General should be allowed to employ them in case of misrule in a State. With regard to 'paramountcy', in accordance with the desire of the Princes, it should vest in the Crown as apart from either the Government of India or the Federal Government.

He further agreed with Tej Bahadur Sapru that the proposed power of interference of the Viceroy in the cases of budgetary irregularities and borrowing irregularities in states would help the Governors to maintain law and order.

According to Tej Bahadur Sapru, the Federal legislature should have two Houses. In case of a deadlock, both the houses could be called. The Lower House should not be deprived of the power over finance, but due to the peculiar conditions in India, the Executive should be responsible to both the Houses instead of only the Lower House. If the Executive lost the confidence of the Legislature, the matter would be decided in a joint session of both the Houses in order to determine the life of the Executive by a joint vote. He supported the idea of a federation because it would include the Princely State which would form a stabilising factor. Further more, the establishment of a Federation would begin the process of further Indianisation. Moreover, with a federal form of government opportunities would be provided for practical experience in defence matters. He was against dyarchy. C.Y. Chintamanii felt that while in theory the Executive could be removable by the Legislature, in practice the Executive would really be irremovable on all occasion. He wanted the Executive to be responsible to both the Houses of the Legislature.
Thus the sub-committee agreed on matters regarding the component element of the Federation, the type of Federal Legislature and the number of Chambers of which it should consist, and the powers of the Federal legislation. They recognised that any measure of federation involved for the Princely States, sacrifices in a sphere to which they had always attached the greatest importance for practical reasons as well as on grounds of existing treaties and sentiment. They recognised, on the other hand, the natural hesitation of the representation of British India to accept any form of constitutional changes which might be thought to endanger the unity of British India or those positive advantages which are derived from a uniform body of law and administrative practice. All parties of the sub-committee were unanimous in preferring the welfare of India as a whole to the individual claims of the interests they represented in the conviction that only in the larger unity can the diversity of interests and policies be completely harmonised. Links between some parts of the Federation and others were slender. Somehow the Liberals in the sub-committee were not worried on that score. A new state is not born fully grown. It must contain within itself the capacity for growth and the attainment of full maturity must depend on the efforts and devotion of Indian statesmen themselves.
The conclusions of the sub-committee were as follows:

(1) Component elements of Federation agreed upon.

a) The component elements of the Federation should be the federating provinces of British India on the one hand, and Indian States or groups of States on the other. Provision was to be made for the subsequent entry from time to time of such further states or groups of states as agree to enter the Federation.

The important question of the position of the Crown was to require further examination when the relation of the Federal Executive to the Crown was discussed. So far as British India was concerned, the federating organism would neither be the Government of British India as it existed, nor autonomous provinces released from the central tie. The process of Federation would involve the creation of a new State which would derive its powers as follows:

(a) In part from the powers which the state would agree to concede to the Crown, to be placed at the disposal of the new Federation.
(b) In part from the transfer to it of such of the powers of the Central Government and also it may be of the Provincial Governments as may be agreed to be necessary for the purposes of Federation.

It was concluded that the Federal Legislature should consist of two chambers, each consisting of representatives of British India and of the States and their relation would be a matter for subsequent consideration under heads not yet referred to the sub-committee.

The method whereby the representatives of British India were to be chosen was not referred to the sub-committee, but their Highnesses made it clear that in their opinion the method by which the States representatives should be chosen would be a matter for the States themselves. If, and so long as, there are any reserved subjects, it would be necessary for the Crown to be represented in both chambers.

Differences between the two chambers might be determined either at a joint session or by other means, by vote whether by a bare majority or otherwise being a question for discussion at a later stage.
A list of subjects provisionally recommended as federal subjects was appended. This list was framed on the assumption that the Federal Legislature would be clothed with power to legislate upon all the subjects included in it. The inclusion of certain subjects like defence, external affairs was not specifically considered, since these subjects, in particular, though not exclusively, raised the question of relations between the Executive in India and the Crown, a matter not within the sub-committee terms of reference. It is of the essence of a Federal Constitution that the enactments of the Federal Legislature acting within its legal scope should have full force and effect throughout all units comprised in the Federation.

Provision should be made by some constitutional procedure for additions from time to time to the list of Federal subjects.

In relation to Federal subjects, a distinction was to be drawn between policy and legislation on the one hand and administration on the other. In some Federal systems, there was a complete separation between Federal and State agency in the administrative as well as the legislative sphere, but in others the administration was entrusted, subject to certain federal rights of inspection, to the State
authorities. The choice was a matter of convenience rather than of principle, depending upon conditions existing at the time of federation and the practical advantage or disadvantage of disturbing the status quo.

The precise delimitation of the functions of the Federal and State Government respectively in these spheres would be a matter for settlement in respect of each subject by negotiation.

Since there was no consensus of opinion, the sub-committee were strongly of opinion that there should be only a single legislature to deal with Federal subjects proper and with any subjects which could not be either federalised or completely provincialised. Such a Legislature will no doubt contain representatives of units of Federation which would not be concerned with some of the subjects with which it dealt. But, the partial acceptance of this anomaly was preferable to the difficulties and complications involved in any expedient for completely avoiding it, such as creation of a separate British Indian Legislature with a separate executive. How to deal with this anomaly would be considered at a later stage.
With regard to Finance, the sub-committee regarded it as a fundamental condition of the success of the new constitution that no room should be left for doubts as to the ability of India to maintain her financial stability and credit, both at home and abroad. It would, therefore, be necessary to reserve to the Governor-General in regard to budgetary arrangement and borrowing, such essential powers as would enable him to intervene if methods were being pursued which would, in his opinion, seriously prejudice the credit of India in the money market of the world. The sub-committee recommended, with a view to ensuring confidence in the management of Indian credit and currency, that efforts should be made to require the Governor-General's previous sanction to the introduction of a Bill to amend the paper currency or coinage acts on the lines of section 67 of the Government of India Act. They agreed that the service of loans with adequate provisions for redemption by sinking funds or otherwise and the salaries and pensions of persons appointed on guarantees given by the Secretary of State should be secured with the supply required for the Reserved Department as consolidated fund charges.
With these limitations, the sub-committee did not contemplate any differentiation between the position of the Finance Minister and that of any other Minister responsible to the Legislature; and, in regard to taxation, fiscal policy and expenditure or objects other than those under the Governor-General's control, he would be responsible to the Legislature only.

The sub-committee recognised that it would be difficult in existing conditions to set up a Reserve Bank of sufficient strength and equipped with necessary gold and sterling reserves immediately, and that therefore, until this had been done, some special provisions would be found necessary to secure to the Governor-General the existing powers of reservation and disallowance would remain.

Thus in these ways the Liberals constructively gave advice and ideas with regard to setting up of the Federation. These ideas have been the basis on which our Constitution of 1950 had been framed.

PROVINCIAL CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE:

The sub-committee was appointed to consider the powers of the Provincial Legislation and the constitution character, powers's and responsibilities of the Provincial Executives. The people who belonged to this committee were
Mr. A. Henderson (Chairman), Lord Zetland, Sir Robert Hamilton, H.H. The Maharaja of Nawanagar, Sir Prabhasankar Pattani, Rao Bahadur Krishnamachari, holding a watching brief Sir Ghulam Hidayatullah, Mr. Jadhav, Sir Chimanlal Setalwad, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, Sir Shah Nawas Bhutto, Sir P.C. Mitter, Mr. Fazl-ul Haq; Raja of Parlakimedi, Ramachandra Rao, Sir A.P. Patro, Nawab Sir Ahmad Said Khan, Mr. Chintamani, Mr. Tambe, Zafrulla Khan, Nawab Narendranath Sardar Sampuran Singh, Maharaja of Darbhanga, Mr. Barooah, Sir Abdul Qaiyum, Mr. Wood, Mr. Paul, Mr. Joshi and Dr. Ambedkar. Of these, the Liberals were Sir Chimanlal Setalwad, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, Mr. Chintamani and Mr. Joshi.

The sub-committee agreed that in the Governors' Provinces the existing system of dyarchy should be abolished and that all provincial subjects, including the portfolio of law and order, should be administered in responsibility to the provincial legislatures.

The sub-committee recommended that there should be unitary executive and that the individual members composing the executive should be jointly responsible to the legislature.
The responsibility for appointing ministers would rest with the Governor. The sub-committee was of opinion that in the discharge of that function the Governor should ordinarily summon the member possessing the largest following in the legislature and invite him to select the ministers and submit their names for approval. The ministers should ordinarily be drawn from among the elected members of the provincial legislature. In the event of the appointment of a non-elected non-official, such person should be required by statute to secure election to the legislature and if the legislature be bicameral, to either chamber within a prescribed period not exceeding six months, but subject to this limit he may be nominated by the Governor to be a member of the legislature. The sub-committee was of opinion that there should be no discretion to permit the appointment of an official to the Cabinet.

The sub-committee considered it a matter of practical importance to the success of the new constitutions that important minority interests should be adequately recognised in the formation of provincial executives. An obligation to endeavour to secure such representation should be expressed in the Instrument of Instructions to the Governor. C.Y.Cinta-
man dissented from the last sentence as he disapproved of the communal representation to be given a legal backing.

The Governor should have power to dissolve the legislature, he could give his assent or withhold assent to legislation, or reserve it for the consideration of the Governor-General.

It should not be lawful without the previous sanction of the Governor to introduce any legislation.

(1) affecting the religion or religious rites of any class or community in the Province;

(2) regulating any subject declared under the constitution to be a federal or central subject;

(3) any measure repealing or affecting any Act of the federal or central legislature or ordinance made by the Governor-General.

The Governor should, with the knowledge of his Ministers, be placed in possession of such information as may be needed by him for the discharge of duties imposed upon him by the Constitution.
In the opinion of the sub-committee, the Chief Minister should preside over meeting of the Cabinet but on any special occasion the Governor may preside.

With regard to the question of relations of the Governor to his Ministers, the Ministers were to hold office during the pleasure of the Governor.

Sub-section 3 of section 52 of the Government of India Act, which confers a general power on the Governor to refuse to be guided by the advice of his Ministers when he sees sufficient cause to dissent from their opinion shall no longer operate. The Governor's power to direct that action should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the advice of the Ministers, was be restricted to the discharge of the specified duties imposed on him by the Constitution. These duties was to include the protection of minorities and the safeguarding of the safety and tranquility of the Province.

The Governor was to be vested with suitable powers in regard to legislation and finance necessary for the discharge of the specified duties imposed upon him by the constitution and suitable emergency powers to carry on the administration in the event of a breakdown of Government or the Constitution. The powers under subsection 3 of
section 52 of the Government of India Act already referred to above, was not to remain in operation for more than six months without the approval of Parliament expressed by a resolution of both Houses.

The sub-committee suggested a rider that, in their opinion, it was desirable that the rigid convention in provinces other than the Presidencies of appointing Governors drawn from the Indian Civil Service should be relaxed. Liberals like Chimanlal Setalwad, Sir Cowasji, Ramachandra Rao, Chintamani and Joshi along with Paul and Ambedkar belonging to the religious minorities dissented from the sub-committees' conclusion on the powers of the Governor as it was too wide and sweeping.

With regard to the composition of the Provincial Legislature, the sub-committee anticipated that to meet the conditions of the new constitutions and electorates, the provincial legislatures would require to be enlarged on the basis of ascertained needs, with attention being paid to the numbers and character of the constituencies. In the opinion of the sub-committee, the normal lifetime of the provincial legislatures should not exceed five years.
With the possible exception of a strictly limited proportion of non-officials who may in some province require to be nominated by the Governor to secure the representation of groups unable to return their own members through the polls, the new provincial legislatures should consist wholly of elected members and the official bloc should disappear.

The committee recognised the conditions in some province made it desirable that the provincial legislature should be bicameral, but the decision regarding any province other than Bengal and United Province and Bihar and Orissa, where opinion in favour of a second chamber had already been all expressed, should not be taken until opinion in the Provinces definitely favoured this course.

As a matter of fact, the "Provincial autonomy" discussed above was really loaded with wide powers which the Governor was vested with, and which he could wield independently of the Council of Ministers' advice. Besides, he had sweeping powers of supervision and control over the Province and also the British Parliament possessed over all powers. This frame work for Self-Government was built on a weak foundation. It had left great deal of
gaps, which were left for the Second Round Table Conference to consider.

The minorities' question was another problem that bogged the minds of the moderates. Before going to the Conference Liberals like Sapru, Sastri, Setalwad had met Muslim leaders like Jinnah and Aga Khan.

A sub-committee was set up to consider the claims of minorities other than those incidental to the subjects referred to other committees and was composed of the following members.

The Prime Minister (Chairman), Sir W.A. Jowitt, Lord Peel, Major Stanley, Lord Reading, Mr. Foot, H.H. The Aga Khan, Maulana Muhammad Ali, Dr. Ambedkar, Sir Shah Nawaz Bhutto, Sir Hubert Carr, Chintamani, Nawab of Chhatari, Mr. Fazl-Ul Huq, Mr. Ghaznavi, Lieutenant Col Gidnaji, K.B. Hafiz Midayat Husain, Mr. Joshi, P.C. Mitter, Dr. Moonje, Raja Narendranath, Rao Bahadur Pannir Selvam, Sir A.P. Patro, Mr. Paul, Mr. Ramachandra Rao, Mr. Shiva Rao, Sir Sultan Ahmad, Sir M. Shafi, Sardar Sampuran Singh, Mr. Sastri, Sir C. Setalwad, Sir Phiroze Sethna, Dr. Shafaat, Ahmad Khan, Begum Shah Nawaz, Rao Bahadur Srinivasan, Mr. Subbarayan, Sardar Ujjal Singh, Mr. Zaffrullal Khan and Captain Raja Sher Muhammad.
The sub-committee felt that the first task to which it should address itself was to have an authoritative statement of claims put in by the representatives of each community with proposals as to how their interests should be safeguarded. Opinion was unanimous that in order to secure the cooperation of all communities, which was essential to the successful working of responsible Government in India, it was necessary that the new constitution should contain provisions designed to assure communities that their interest would not be prejudiced, and that it was particularly desirable that some agreement should be made between the major communities in order to facilitate the consideration of the whole question. Although this was very nearly accomplished, it had not yet succeeded, but the negotiations were to be continued both in England and in India.

One of the chief proposals brought before the sub-committee was the inclusion in the constitution of a declaration of fundamental rights safeguarding the cultural and religious life of the various communities and securing the every individual without discrimination as to race, caste, creed or sex, the free exercise of economic, social and civil rights. Mr. Joshi objected to the omission of reference to the economic rights of various communities. Dr. Ambedkar
called attention to the necessity of including a right of redress when they were violated.

The possibility was expressed that under certain conditions the election of the Legislatures might be from a general register but no agreement was come to regarding these conditions.

Whilst it was generally admitted that a system of joint free electorates was in the abstract the most consistent with democratic principle as generally understood and would be acceptable to the depressed classes after a short transitional period provided the franchise was based on adult suffrage, the opinion was expressed that, in view of the distribution of the communities in India and of their unequal economic and political effectiveness, there was a real danger that under such a system the representation secured by minorities would be totally inadequate and that this system would therefore give no communal security.

Claims were therefore advanced by various communities that arrangements should be made for communal representation and for fixed proportion of seats. It was also urged that the number of seats reserved for a minority
community should in no case be less than its proportion in the population. The methods by which this could be secured were mainly three (1) nomination (2) joint electorate with reservation of seats and (3) separable electorates. Nomination was unanimously deprecated.

Joint electorates were proposed with the proviso that a proportion of seats should be reserved to the communities. Thus a more democratic form would be given to the elections whilst the purpose of the separate electorate system would be secured. Doubts were expressed that whilst such a system of election might secure the representation of minorities, it provided no guarantee that the representation would be genuine, but that it might in its working mean the nomination or, in any event, the election of minority representatives by majority communities. It was pointed out that this was in fact only a form of community representation and had in practice all the objections to the more direct form of community electorates.

The discussion made it evident that the proposal which was as the only one generally acceptable, was separate electorates. The general objection to this scheme has been subject to much previous discussion in India.
It involved a very difficult problem of solution viz. what should be the amount of communal representation in the various provinces and in the centre that. If the whole or practically the seats in a Legislature are to be assigned to communities, there would be no room for the growth of independent political opinion or of true political parties.

This problem was further complicated by the demand of the representative of the Depressed Classes that they should be separated from the Hindu population and be regarded, for electoral purposes, as a separate community.

It was suggested that, in order to meet the most obvious objection to the reservation of seats to communities, only a proportion should be so assigned - say 80% or 90% and that the rest should be filled by open election. This, however, was not regarded by some of the communities as giving them the guarantees they required. The scheme proposed by Maulana Muhammad Ali, a member of the sub-committee that as far as possible no communal candidate should be elected unless he secured at least 40% of the votes of his own community and at least 5 or 10% according to arrangement, of the votes of other community was also considered. It was, however, pointed out that such a scheme necessarily
involved the maintenance of communal registers, and so was open to objections similar to those urged against separate electorates. Reservation of seats in joint electorates was made on behalf of women who should continue to be eligible for election on the same footing as men. But, in order to familiarise the public mind with the idea of women taking an active part in political life and to secure their interim representation on the Legislature, it was urged, that 50% of the seats in the first three councils should be reserved for women. It was suggested that they should be filled by co-option by the elected members voting by proportional representation.

There was general agreement with the recommendation of sub-committee No.11 (Provincial Constitution) that the representation on the Provincial Executives of important minority communities was a matter of the greatest practical importance for the successful working of the new constitution.

It was also agreed that, on the same grounds, Muhammadans should be represented on the Federal Executives. On behalf of the smaller minorities, a claim was put forward for their representation either individually or collectively on the Provincial and Federal Executive.
that, if this should be found impossible, in each Cabinet there should be a Minister specially charged with the duty of protecting minority interests.

As regards the administration, it was agreed that recruitment to both provincial and central services should be entrusted to public service commissions, with instructions to reconcile the claims of various communities to fair and adequate representation in the Public Services, whilst providing for the maintenance of a proper standard of efficiency. It had been made clear that the British Government cannot, with any chance of agreement, impose upon the communities an electoral principle which in some feature or other would be met by their opposition. It was therefore plain that failing an agreement, separate electorates with all their drawbacks and difficulties would have to be retained as the basis of the electoral arrangements under the new constitution. From this the question of proportions would arise. Under these circumstance the claims of the depressed classes will have to be considered adequately.
The sub-committee recommended that the Conference should register an opinion that it was desirable that an agreement upon the claims made to it should be reached, and that negotiations should be continued between the representatives concerned, with a request that the result of their efforts should be reported to those engaged in the next stage of these negotiations. The minorities and the depressed classes were definite in their assertion that they would not consent to any self-governing constitution for India unless their demands were met in a reasonable manner.

Hence, the question of the Minorities proved to be a difficult problem. As said earlier, before going to the Conference, Sapru, Sastri, Setalwad, Jinnah and Agha Khan had met and tried to arrive at an understanding. They had agreed to the Muslim demands: NWFP and Sindh be made separate provinces, reasonable weightage in the provincial legislatures and one-third of the total number of seats to be given to them in the Central Legislature. But, during the discussions they had to face stiff opposition from Moonje and Jayakar.
In the meanwhile, diehard Muslims in London and India like Fazli Hussain, scenting what was going on, decided to bear upon the Muslim representatives in the Conference. Their leader Ahga Khan informed Sastri, Sapru and Setalwad that things had gone out of his hands. He could not bind the Muslim representatives to any arrangement. This malady spread even amongst the depressed classes. The Liberals found that they were not strong enough to force the adamant hardliners. They did not have that much of a capacity to bring about a compromise between the majority and minority communities and amongst the Hindu society itself.

The sub-committee on NWPP insisted on the need for reforms. One of the proposals was the separation of Sindh from Bombay Presidency. The sub-committee consisted of Mr. A. Henderson (Chairman), Lord Russell, Lord Reading, Lord Lothian, Lord Zetland, Sir Samuel Hoare, Maulana Muhammad Ali, Sri Nawaz Bhutto, Captain Raja Sher Muhammad Khan, Dr. Moonje, Sir B.N. Mitra, Raja Narendranath, Mr. M. F. Mody, Sir A. P. Patro, Nawab Sir Abdul Qaiyum Khan, Sir Muhammad Shafi, Sardar Sampuran Singh, Dr. Shafa'at Ahmad Khan, Mr. C. E. Wood and Zafrullah Khan. This was a group comprising of Muslims and British with a smattering of representative belonging
to the depressed classes, Hindu Mahasabha and Liberals. The Liberals did not oppose this demand and this resulted in the creation of two new provinces which had Muslim majority.

With regard to the sub-committee No. VI (Franchise), a report was presented at the meeting of the committee of the people of the whole Conference held on the 16th January, 1931. The delegates selected to serve on the sub-committee were Sir W.A. Jowitt (Chairman), Sir P.C. Mitter, Lord Zetland, Mr. Pannir Selvam, Major Stanley, Raja of Parlakimedi, Sir R. Hamilton, Mr. K.T. Paul, Mr. Foot, Mr. Ramachandra Rao, Dr. Ambedkar, Mr. Shiva Rao, Mr. Basu, Laldar Sampuran, Mr. Barooch, Sardar Ujjal Singh, Mr. Chintamani, Sir Chimanlal Setalvad, Mr. Fazl-ul Haq, Kunwar Bisheswar Dayal Seth, Lieutenant Colonel Gindney, Dr. Shafa'at Ahmad Khan, Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatullah, Mr. Hafiz Hidayat Hussain, Mr. Zafarullah Khan, Begum Shah Nawaz, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, Mr. S.B. Tambe, Mr. Joshi, Sir Hubert Carr and Sir Muhammad Shafi and Dr. Narendranath Law.

In their discussion of the Franchise principles they found that they were closely connected with questions which more properly concerned the composition of the legislature, the nature of the constituencies, and the qualifications for
candidates for election. These points had not been considered in the sub-committee as they fell outside its terms of reference. The Statutory Commission suggested that an increase in number of electors would bring that number up to 10% of the total number. They recommended that an expert Franchise Commission should be appointed with instruction to provide for the immediate increase of the electorate so as to enfranchise not less than 10% of the total population if that should be found practicable and desirable. Besides the commission should consider the introduction of a scheme by which all adults not entitled to a direct vote be grouped together in primary groups, of about 20 or in some other suitable manner for the election of one representative member from each group who would be entitled to vote in provincial elections, either in the same constituencies as directly qualified voters, or in separate constituencies to be formed by them.

While it was generally held that adult suffrage was the goal which should ultimately be attained, it was agreed that the basis of the franchise could be broadened and that a large increase was desirable.
Some differences of opinion existed as to the extent to which this was practicable and necessary material required to determine the precise limits of the advance. The statutory commission suggested such an increase in number of electors as would bring that number up to 10% of the total population. Some of the members thought that an increase to 25% of the total population was immediately practicable. Sastri and Joshi felt that the introduction of Adult Franchise was not premature.

Mr. Joshi, Mr. Shiva Rao, Dr. Ambedkar, Mr. Srinivasan Mr. K.T. Paul and Mr. Jadhav regarded these proposals as quite inadequate and considered that the basis of the franchise should be broadened, if at all by another system. Mr. Joshi and Mr. Shiva Rao were Liberals.

They recommended that in any given area the franchise qualifications should be the same for all communities which was in keeping with the Liberal tradition. They desired that the Franchise Commission, whilst making their proposals, should bear in mind that the ideal system would as nearly as possible give each community a voting strength proportional to its numbers, and that the commission should so contrive their franchise system as to secure this result in so far as it may be practicable.
The Franchise Committee considered that there should be a property qualification for the franchise and that in this connection the word "property" should be understood in its widest sense as including not only the ownership of landed property but also the occupation of landed or house property, or the receipt of income or wages whether in cash or kind.

The Franchise Commission should consider the extension of this qualification so as to include in the service auxiliary and territorial forces.

The committee also felt that under the existing franchise the number of women voters was infinitesimal as compared with that of men. The committee agreed that special qualification be prescribed separately for women, but at the same time they felt that there was not sufficient material to justify an attempt to formulate these special qualifications.

The committee further felt that the disparity in franchise qualification should be removed between urban and rural areas so that many more could vote.

With regard to the question on Defence, the delegates selected to serve on the sub-committee were Mr. J.H. Thomas, Lord Peel, Sir S. Hoare, Lord Reading, Lord Lothian, H.H. The Maharaja of Alwar, H.H. The Maharaja of Kashmir,
H.H. The Maharaja of Patiala, Sir Akbar Hydari, Sir Mirza Ismail Colonel Haksar, The Rt. Honorable Srinivasa Sastri, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao, Diwan Bahadur Ramaswami Mudaliar, Sir Phiroze Sethna, Mr. M.R. Jayakar, Dr. B.S. Moonje, Mr. Jadhav, Sir B.N. Mitra, Sardar Sahib Ujjal Singh, Lieutenant Colonel Gidney, Sir Hubert Carr, Sir Muhammad Shafi, Mr. M. Jinnah, Dr. Shafa'at Ahmad Khan, Nawab Sir Abdul Qaiyum and Raja Sher Muhammad Khan.

The discussion in the sub-committee mainly centred round the question of Indianization and every aspect of this question received thorough attention. It was unanimously agreed that in a matter of such importance as Defence, utmost care was necessary in expressing opinions and the sub-committee as a whole was very anxious not to create the impression that anyone in any way or to any degree wanted to say anything that could even remotely tend to imperil the safety of the country or to weaken the strength of the army. It was in view of this general feeling that all sections of the sub-committee emphasized the importance of maintaining the same standard of efficiency in training as prevailed in England. The sub-committee also recognised that in dealing with the question of Defence it was not possible to overlook that a factor that
must govern all considerations of the subject was the responsibility of the Crown through the committee of Imperial Defence, which body was ultimately responsible for examining all these problems. It was realised that the responsibility of the committee of Imperial Defence was not special to India, but was common to the Empire as a whole.

The majority of the sub-committee considered it impossible for practical reasons to lay down any definite rate of Indianization or anything of a precise character that might in any way embarrass those responsible for Defence and fetter the judgment or the discretion of the military authorities. Those that held this view felt that the principle of Indianization of officers of the Indian Army could not be looked upon as merely a question regarding the efficiency of a single officer or a group of officers, or even of a single unit or group of units. It was a principle that to the majority appeared to affect the army as a whole. One section of the sub-committee was in favour of complete Indianization within a specified period subject to the requirements of efficiency and further subject to the provision of suitable candidates for requirements of efficiency, and subject to the provision of suitable candidates for recruitment as officers in India. Those members who held this opinion held
the view that this was not a technical question at all, but involved only practical considerations. The difference in these two views being fundamental, the sub-committee decided to incorporate these in its report. The Chairman undertook that when in pursuance of the resolutions of the sub-committee/expert committee was appointed, it would as a matter of course take into consideration the proceedings of previous committees and in particular the proceedings of the Military Requirements Committee of 1921 and the committee on Indianization of the Indian Army of 1922.

Subject to the above, the sub-committee arrived at the following resolutions:

(1) The sub-committee consider that with the development of the new political structure in India, the Defence of India must to an increasing extent be the concern of the Indian people and not of the British Government alone.

(2) In order to give practical effect to this principle, they recommended that immediate steps be taken to increase substantially the rate of Indianisation in the Indian Army to make it commensurate with the main object in view, having regard to all relevant considerations, such as the maintainance
of the requisite standard of efficiency. At this moment, Mr. Jinnah dissented and desired a clear indication of the pace of Indianization.

The sub-committee further stated that in order to give effect to the above a training college in India be established at the earliest possible moment to train candidates for commissions in all arms of the Indian Defence services. This college would also train prospective officers of the Indian State Forces. Indian cadets should however continue to be eligible for admission as at present, to Sandhurst, Woolwich and Cranwell.

Further, in order to avoid delay, the Government of India should be instructed to set up a Committee of Experts, both British and Indian, including representatives of Indian States to work out the details of the establishment of such a college.

The sub-committee further recognised the great importance attached by Indian thought to the reduction of the number of British troops in India to the lowest possible recommended figure and that the question should form the subject of early investigation.
A view was expressed that an addition should be made to those resolutions to the effect that the sub-committee recognised that no action should be taken so as to prejudice in any way the power of the Crown to fulfill military obligations arising out of treaties with particular Indian States. It was ruled however out and accepted by the sub-committee that such a specific declaration was unnecessary.

The sub-committee had agreed to establishing a military council including representatives of the Indian States.

Sastri and Sapru welcomed the decisions of the sub-committee. But, they could not tolerate the provision for the Committee of Imperial Defence to examine all the problems relating to Defence. The Liberals did not endorse the suggestion that it was to have a determining voice in the question of political principles relating to Defence.

With regard to the sub-committee on Services, the following delegates were selected to serve on the sub-committee. The Chairman was Sir William Jowitt ... Lord Zetland, Major Stanley, Lord Reading, Sir Robert Hamilton, H.H. Maharaja of Alwar, H.H. The Maharaja of Nawanagar, Sir Prabhashankar Pattani, Rao Bahadur Krishnamachari, Sahibzada
Sultan Ahmad Khan, Mr. Chintamani, Sir P. C. Mitter, Dr. Narendranath Law, Mr. Basu, Mr. Tambe, Sir Chimanlal Setalwad, Mr. Shiva Rao, Mr. Mody, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, Sir A. P. Patro, Rai Bahadur Kunwar Bisheshwar Dayal Setti, Maharajadhiraja Kameshwar Singh of Darbhanga, Raja of Parlakimedi, Dr. Ambedkar, Lieutenant-Colonel H. A. J. Gidnay, Mr. Paul, Sardar Sampuran Singh, Sir Shah Nawaz Bhutto, Mr. Ghaznavi, Khan Bahadur Hafiz Hidayat Hussain, Mr. Zaffrullah Khan, Dr. Shafat Ahmad Khan, Mr. Fazl Ul Huq and Sir Edgar Wood. According to the discussions, the Secretary of State-in-Council should guarantee certain rights and safeguards to members of the services and due provisions be made in the new Constitution for the maintenance of those rights and safeguards for all persons who have been appointed before the new Constitution came. The sub-committee stated that when the new Constitution was drawn up suitable safeguard for the payment of pensions including family pensions be provided. Provident funds should be provided in it. It agreed that the right to retire on proportionate pension should be extended, but opinion was divided as to whether the extension should be for an unlimited term or for a definite period of years, not exceeding five years.
It further insisted that for the Indian Civil and Indian Police Services recruitment should continue to be carried out on an all India basis but the majority of the committee were of the opinion that recruitment for judicial offices should no longer be made in the Indian Civil Service. The Indian Forest Service and the Irrigation Branch of the Indian Service of Engineers should be provincialised. Mr. Shiva Rao wanted all services to be provincialised.

The majority of the sub-committee were of the opinion that in the case of Indian Civil Service and the Indian Police Service it was desirable that some recruitment of Europeans should continue. On the question of the ratio there was a difference of opinion, some holding that for the present recruitment should continue on the lines laid down by the Lee Commission while others preferred that the matter be left for decision by the future Government of India.

Whatever may have been the opinion, the majority of the sub-committee held that the recruiting and controlling authority in the future should be the Government of India.

It also said that steps should be taken for the appointment for public service commissions at the centre as well as in the Provinces.
In the sub-committee regarding Sindh, sat Liberals like Chintamani and Pheroze Sethna. They agreed that Sindh should be separated from Bombay.

Much of the above discussions were mainly the work of the Liberals. Their reports, were of highest value for use in the framing of a Constitution for India. They embody a substantial measure of the agreement on the main ground plan and many helpful indications of the points of detail which could be further pursued.

The Conference ended with a speech delivered by the Prime Minister Ramsay Macdonald.

He affirmed that the British "attitude" was nothing more than the Indians settling their own affairs. "Britain would step in when Indians could not manage their own affairs". He announced the decision of the new Constitution. He further "assured" that responsibility would be granted to the centre and provinces "with such provisions as may be necessary to guarantee, as may be necessary, during the period of transition, the observance of certain obligations and to meet other special circumstances and also with such guarantees as are required by the minorities to protect their political liberties and rights". 
He further said that the Government had taken note that the Central Government should be a Federation of India with the Indian States included in it. The Legislature was to be bicameral and Dyarchy was to be introduced at the centre and full responsibility was to be given in the Province.

The British Government was not really very keen on bringing in reforms. Noticing the differences of opinion during the discussion on the question of minorities, they decided to play on it. It was the minorities question that proved to be a thorn on the road towards Swaraj. The Liberals were at their wit's end over the communal question and hoped the communal problem would be solved.

Another trend could be noticed too. This was the difference of opinion between Sapru and Chintamani. Sapru throughout the Conference spoke in his personal capacity and publicly disavowed Liberal connexions. Though he did so, it was the Liberal spirit that he carried through during the struggle for Independence. Individual opinions need not have prevented a united stand of the Liberals. It was precisely for this reason that the Liberals were not able to force their way through to secure a united decision.
Sastri, Sapru and Jayakar returned to India in February, 1931. Pandit Motilal Nehru had died. The civil disobedience movement was running its course. Liberals hoped that the movement would peter out but their hopes were belied. Ordinances were issued, police charges took place, collective fines were imposed, the Congress was banned, Congress leaders were arrested, confiscation of presses, lands et al took place. Hindus and Muslims joined the movement of whom the most notable Muslims were Abdul Kalam Azad, Ansari, Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan. The masses also joined and so did the women. The arrest of Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan and Gandhi did not end the campaign. Economic distress also played a major role in adding fuel to the political fire and strikes took place in the factories. In Uttar Pradesh villages, a movement for non-payment of rents gathered momentum and in Gujarat, a no-tax campaign had been planned. The Government resorted to coercive measures to realise revenue.

This movement succeeded in galvanising the moral stature of the people and destroying the political prestige of the British Government.
GANDHI IRWIN PACT:

The British realised that they had to enunciate a conciliatory policy. They realised that Gandhi ought to be called for a Conference and Sapru appealed to the Prime Minister to show clemency to the prisoners.

The Viceroy too persuaded the Congress members to give up civil disobedience movement. Sastri and Sapru held discussions with Gandhi till February and it was on their advice that Gandhi agreed to meet Irwin. The meetings took place between February, 17 and March 5, 1931. Gandhi was in a conciliatory mood although he laid difficult conditions. Irwin also had been interested in a compromise as actually, the British realised they could not continue for long in this situation.

On March 5, an agreement was signed. According to it a Federation was to be established with necessary safeguards. The Congress would be invited to participate in the Second Round Table Conference and Civil disobedience would discontinue. Indian industries would be encouraged but boycott of western goods would be eschewed and picketing was to be suspended. Gandhi's suggestion that an enquiry should be taken up to look into the alleged atrocities of the police was considered undesirable.
Ordinances promulgated in connection with the Civil disobedience movement were to be withdrawn but Ordinance No.1 of 1931 relating to the terrorist movement did not come within the scope of the provision.

The Government assured that notification declaring associations unlawful under the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1908 would be withdrawn, provided that the notifications were made in connection with the civil disobedience movement.

However, notifications recently issued by the Burma Government did not come under the scope of this act. Further, pending prosecutions would be withdrawn if they had been filed in connection with the civil disobedience movement and related to offences which did not involve violence other than technical violence, or incitement to such violence.

Such were the assurances given in the pact. This pact required the approval of the Indian National Congress. It was decided that the Congress would meet at Karachi on March 29, 1931. They accepted the agreement. However, they were unhappy over the news of the executions of Vidyarthi, Bhagat Singh, Rajguru who were hanged for the murder of Saunders at Lahore in 1928. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru moved the following resolution:
"This Congress while dissociating itself from and disapproving of political violence in any shape or form, places on record its admiration of the bravery and sacrifice of Bhagat Singh, Sukdev, Rajaguru.

Jawaharlal Nehru as a leading Congressman ratified the agreement. The agreement reemphasised the Congress demand for Purna Swaraj and the right of either party to end the partnership at will. The resolution, however, committed the Congress to participate in the Round Table Conference and allowed its delegates freedom to accept such adjustments as might be necessary in the interest of India. One good result was that it committed the Congress to participate in the Second Round Table Conference.

Sastri had worked hard for this reconciliation and herein lay his contribution. So the Liberal leaders like Sastri, Sapru and Jayakar had contributed a great deal in narrowing the gulf between the two sides and hastened the conclusion of the pact. The news of the Congress attending the Round Table Conference had a mixed reaction. Jawaharlal Nehru was dissatisfied whilst Vallabhai Patel thought Gandhi would not lose anything by going to London.
The Pact was objected to by the sub-committee of the conservative members of Parliament on India. However, members of the Unionist Committee on India, who earlier had denounced the negotiation, now congratulated Irwin and Baldwin in trying to bring in pacification. Except for a few from the Conservative Party, the English politicians generally supported the Pact. The British Labour Government expressed in private their dislike of the acceptance of the unique and semi sovereign position of the Congress. The Pact had a mixed reaction in India. The Madras Legislative Council, for instance passed a resolution was moved by Kumararaja of Venkatagiri saying "This Council expresses its profound joy and gratitude at the successful termination of the conversations between the Viceroy and Mahatma Gandhi and expresses its heartfelt appreciation of the inexhaustible patience, industry and courtesy of the Viceroy to bring about the result ...." Mahatma Gandhi it must be remembered also played his role and one cannot only give credit to the Viceroy.

Although Sastri played his role as a mediator well, Gandhi and Irwin had that compromising disposition so essential to form a pact though each held his own views. Sastri's achievement was in bringing the two leaders together to the
negotiating table. Sastri worked hard for this reconciliation. The Liberal leaders were Sastri, Sapru and Jayakar contributed in narrowing the gulf between the two sides and hastened the conclusion of the Pact.

In the meanwhile, Irwin had retired in April, 1931. Willingdon was now the new Viceroy. Gandhi and he did not get along well with each other and repression was going on. Gandhi corresponded with Sastri saying that the Pact being trampled on and in these circumstances, it was not possible for him to attend the Second Round Table Conference. Sastri now decided to act and after an hour's calm talk with Wedgwood Benn, the Secretary of State, it was agreed that the Government of India ought not to publish their charges against the Congress workers. Since the Government was more powerful and a responsible party, it should show greater restraint and forbearance. Sastri undertook to speak for Gandhi in his discussion with the Government. The British agreed to Gandhi's proposal that a High Court Judge should be appointed to examine the breaches of the Pact.
Secondly, it was agreed to include members of the Bombay Chamber of Commerce as delegates of the Round Table Conference. Gandhi had wanted to include Birla or Jamal Mahomad who according to Sastri, would exert their influence on the decisions at the Round Table Conference along with Gandhi who had agreed to participate as representative of the Congress.

The Second Round Table Conference began on September 7, 1931. To this Conference came Sir Mohammad Iqbal, the Muslim League President, Dr. S.K. Datta, the Christian representative, G.D. Birla, the great financier and industrialist, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, the Sanatani, Hindu Reformer, Sarojini Naidu was nominated by the Government in her individual capacity. Ansari had been nominated but his name was dropped because Sir Fazl-1-Hussain opposed it and the Government depended on him to rally Muslim support. Fazl-1-Hussain was interested in preventing any Muslim representative favouring joint electorates and he threatened to resign if his wish was not taken into consideration. This was the first obstacle strewn in the path of the Congress.
THE SECOND ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE:

Gandhi arrived on 19th September, 1931 in London. By this time, the Conference had started and certain decisions had already been taken and things did not augur well. The British had stiffened their attitude. This attitude developed because the British could not accept the triumphant mood of the Congress in the wake of Churchill's vituperatives. They had lost face and were eager to humiliate the Congress in order to get back some of their lost prestige. They wanted to reverse the policy of equality and partnership and agreement between Britain and India whilst framing the new Constitution.

The Tories had defeated the Labourites and were now in power and they did all they could to prevent the Indians from coming together.

As said before, Gandhi went as the sole representative of the Congress. Sarojini Naidu, though a Congress member, was nominated by the Government as an additional delegate. So, when it came to the question of numbers, he could not get the required quorum to support his plans. He refused to consider the utility of numbers. Sarojini
Naidu had attended the meeting to present a joint memorandum with Begum Sahah Nawaz, representing the views of a number of women's organisation demanding education and social reform and equal political status by the grant of adult franchise.

During the session, the Liberals generally supported the movement for freedom. They did not keep aloof at all as it was made out. Among the Liberals were Cowasji Jehangir, N.M.Joshi, B.Shiva Rao, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, Rt. Hon. V.S.Srinivasa Sastri, Sir Chimanlal Setalwad, Sir Phiroze Sethna, Purushottamadas Thakurdas, Sir C.P.Ramaswami Aiyar, Mr.Chintamani. Chintamani however did not attend the second session.

The Conference did not begin with a meeting of all members as in the earlier session. During this session, the Federal structure sub-committee and the minorities committee continued to solve the problems entrusted to them separately. The Liberals like Sastri and Sapru played an important role during the discussions. They were the moving spirits of the Conference. They stood for complete transfer of power to the Provinces. They did not want special powers and reservations to be vested in the hands of the Governors. However, they felt their certain emergency power should be vested in the hands in case
of a breakdown of Government machinery. Provincial autonomy alone was not enough. Simultaneous transfer of power was necessarily to be introduced at the Centre with the exception of External Affairs and Defence. Sastri did not support Gandhi's demand for the introduction of a unicameral legislature which went against the Liberal demand of a bicameral legislature. The Muslims were sullen and militant and supported the Conservatives. They wanted India to have Provincial autonomy and no responsibility at the Centre as the Mohammadans feared Hindu Domination. The Princes wanted weightage for their representation which the Muslims opposed. Sapru had worked hard for unity but had failed as the Muslims were adamant. But since he was not able to secure it, he gave up striving for the cause. The Muslims were also at loggerhead with the Sikhs. Gandhi was by this time deciding to confess failure. Sensing this discomfiture of Gandhi, it was Sastri who implored him to explore every possible avenue of peace. Sastri worked behind scenes. Sapru was the moving spirit in the foreground.
PLANS FOR AN ADMINISTRATIVE SET-UP:

So the Liberals found themselves in the foreground in the major discussions. As said before, they wanted complete transfer of power for the Provinces without reservation powers for the Governors except during emergency and responsibility at the Centre. Sastri pleaded for the grant of equality with self-governing parts of the Commonwealth. He said the Indians were willing that there should be certain subjects marked off for the time being as Crown subjects in respect of which the Indian Legislature of the future, although Federal, would not be supreme, but the Imperial Parliament which has hitherto taken charge of the subject would continue. This must be subject of course to a period of time that must be made known and subject also to "certain large aspect of these questions which might be transferred with safety to our Legislature". He was not in favour of the safeguards under commercial discrimination and Defence. He felt they were "unnecessary and irritating deductions from Dominion Status". No Dominion constitution had such a clause. He felt that safeguards could be put in a chapter of the Constitution, but this should be open to revision and
modification by the Indian legislature without the necessity of coming to the Imperial Parliament for dealing with them. He further suggested that "an Instrument of Instructions" which the Viceroy received on appointment to the effect that the safeguarding of powers vested in him singly or apart from his Cabinet in India, must be exercised in the interest of India.

MINORITY PROBLEM:

With regard to the minorities, Sapru as stated before hoped for an amicable settlement. Chimanlal Setalwad submitted a memorandum for the Minorities committee in which he stated that the communal problem was being exaggerated and exploited in certain quarters in order to retard the full constitutional advance that India demanded. He revealed that a critical examination of the points of differences showed that there was considerably more agreement than disagreement. He said that there was no difference of opinion on the question that proper safeguards which should be provided for ensuring full religious liberty and protection of cultural and personal laws of the minorities, and that provisions should be made against legislation affecting their religion. It was also agreed that the minorities
must be secured a proper share in the services and as far as possible in the executive Government.

He further reiterated the point that certain special demands of the Muslims with regard to Sindh and the states and the constitution of the North West Frontier Provinces had met with agreement to the satisfaction of the Muslims. He stated that the Muslim claim for one-third representation in the Federal Legislature had also been agreed upon. He was hopeful of securing to the Muslims further seats to make up one-third of the total number of members.

There was no opposition to the Muslim claim to be allowed the existing weightage in the Provinces where they were in a minority. However, he pointed out the disagreement extended to the methods by which the Muslims would be represented. Whether their and other minorities representation was to be secured by separate electorates or by joint electorates, and the allocation of seats in the local legislatures of Punjab and Bengal were to be decided upon. Setalwad realised that the Muslims could not be forced against their wishes to come into joint electorates. He
felt that they should be allowed to have separate elections, but it should not be extended farther than where they exist, and other minorities should be secured their proper representation by reservation in joint electorates. He hoped that the Muslims and the Sikhs would realise the advantage of coming into joint electorates. Therefore provision should be made that, if any time, at least two-thirds of the Muslims' representatives decide in favour of joint electorates, they should be established. He felt it was unwise to create further separate electorates. Depressed classes should have reserved seats but this should depend on the number of people in the constituency.

The Liberals were more practical in their outlook. Their solutions appear more pragmatic, retrospectively speaking. India need not have undergone the trauma of had partitioning if their proposals had been accepted.

Gandhi appealed to the various parties to unite for a common cause. The Muslims were in the midst of conflict of ideas within themselves. The Scheduled Castes, non-Brahmins, Anglo-Indians, Indian Christians, spoke for their own interests. From the above, it would be noticed that the conference was called ostensibly for the purpose of
settling disputes amicably. But things were manocured in such a way by the British that only the communal problem loomed large and dominated the scene and they successfully used it to put an end to the Conference.

The failure of the Conference could be attributed to the composition of the Indian delegation which was such that it made the solution of the communal question impossible. There was only one Nationalist Muslim, namely Sir Ali Imam. He was allowed to be present on condition that he would not support the demand for joint electorates. For reasons known only to himself, he did not take much part in the discussion.

The nominated Muslims, depressed classes, Indian Christians, Anglo-Indians and the resident British community claimed separate electorates and warned that if anything less was given, progress towards self-Government would be prevented and that they would not deliberate in the discussions on the question of responsibility of the Centre.

Gandhi was clearly disappointed, Sastri and Sapru felt that the Muslims were asking far too much, whilst the British just jumped at the opportunity to rally the Muslims.
The Muslims now made an alliance with the British and the minorities pact was signed called the Benthall circular. This was mainly the work of Sir Edward Benthall. They assured the British of their support in return for which the British promised to improve their economic plight in Bengal by placement in European firms. This type of agreement would not have come about if Nationalist Muslims had also been nominated. The real motive of the British could be seen in this circular, bringing out their anti-nationalist stand. The failure to secure a general consensus of opinion led the Prime Minister Ramsay Macdonald to announce the Communal Award, and declared that he would introduce this measure to protect the minorities. He felt that it was easier to introduce provincial responsibility than central responsibility in the wake of differences of opinion. Sapru, Sastri and Jayakar bitterly opposed this mischievous suggestion. Sastri writes "Expressions like Anglo-Muslim Raj were heard even while we were in England, and they seem now to be louder here. It is probable that some important sections of British opinion will not shirk from such a development. But you will be a sad man when you discover that your life long labours for the welfare of India have ended in the setting up of
class against class and an application on a colossal scale of the principle of Divide and Rule".

Further, in the same letter he pointed out that the Princes were not in agreement either, their role covered the movement with confusion and Sapru felt that smaller States should have been given equal representation.

The Conference ended on the 1st December, 1931. It had failed on the Minorities question. It carried on the work of the Liberals on the Federation which Sapru and Sastri had taken part in the discussion. The question of introduction of Dominion status had dimmed. The introduction of an All India Federation was proving to be illusive. The Conference before adjourning formed a number of committees to proceed to India to conduct enquiries and make recommendations. They were (1) Franchise committee under Lothian, (2) Federal Finance committee under Eustace Percy, (3) The Indian States Enquiry committee presided over by Davidson. Besides, this there was the consultative committee consisting of the Governor-General and 19 members.

The Liberals came back with a heavy heart. The Civil Disobedience Movement continued with greater zeal than before and Gandhi, Sardar Patel, Jawaharlal Nehru were
imprisoned and pro-Congress press was gagged. Sastri was now called away to attend to the work of the Second Cape Town Conference in South Africa.

The Liberals had proved to be very objective in their outlook throughout the proceedings. Sastri, Sapru and Setalwad considered all the questions in the wake of an All India basis. History to-day proves them correct on major suggestions they made during the discussions and deliberations. They were able to make considerable progress on questions relating to the Federation and the idea of a federal judiciary was taking shape. These were their significant contributions.

THE THIRD ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE:

The British now called for the Third Round Table Conference which was to be followed by the Joint Parliamentary Committee and Parliamentary Legislation.

Samuel Hoare announced a new procedure to deal with constitutional questions. This was to send proposals in a Whitepaper for circulation among the Parliament Members and place before Parliament members comprehensive measure for consideration during the life of the existing House of Commons.
This new method reduced the status of the Round Table Conference. It was not going to be a body of representatives of the British Government and of Indian parties and interests, negotiating on a principle of equality, the Indian members were to be treated as advisers to the Government, whilst the Government remained free to accept or reject their advice.

As stated earlier several committees had been sent to India. The consultative committee under the Governor-General with nineteen members was to send information to London from India. This committee was unable to do its work fully as the Congress leaders were in jail. Sapru and Jayakar were among the 19 members associated with the Governor-General.

The Liberals protested vehemently against this new procedure of the Conference. They registered their protest on the 27th July, 1932 and demanded that the Conference method to be restored. The Government was beginning to consider the Liberals as a growing power as they were assuming a stronger posture than before. Joshi, Sapru and Jayakar resigned from the committees. Liberal organisations like the U.P. Liberal Association, the West Indian National
Liberal Association the South Indian Liberal Association opposed the Government's move. It was at this point that Sapru and Jayakar held meetings with the Viceroy when they discussed the matter at great length. They stood firm by the plan that was evolved at the Round Table Conference and said that they had no faith in the new plan announced by Sir Samuel Hoare. According to them it virtually amounted to the return to the Simon commission's ideas with the only difference that the Joint Select Committee under the new plan would sit before the Bill was introduced and discuss with Indians same concrete proposals.

The Liberals held a meeting on the 16th July, 1932, under the Presidentship of Chimansial Setalwad. It was largely attended and included Sapru, Sastri, Jayakar, Chintamani, Ramachandra Rao, Cowasji Jehangir, Pheroz Sethna, B.Shiva Rao, N.M.Joshi, B.V.Jadhav, S.B.Tambe and Ramaswami Iyengar. They denounced the Government scheme and wanted the Conference system to continue if the British required their cooperation. Sastri applauded Jayakar and Sapru's resignation from the consultative committee. It was however, the European Association which made the Home Government modify its stand. In September 1932 the Viceroy announced the calling of the Round Table Conference and the British Government in the
meanwhile announced the Communal Award. Gandhi saw in this a further advance in the policy of Divide and Rule. The depressed classes and others would now demand their rights. He therefore, appealed to Dr. B. R. Ambedkar to withdraw his demand for separate electorates and join the general electorates. He assured him that the Congress would give them a proper number of seats and simultaneously Gandhi undertook to go on fast if his demand was not met. Sastri too condemned the communal award and blamed the people for playing into the hand of the Government. He believed that the British introduced the Communal Award because the Indian community leaders refused to come to an understanding. He felt that the Communal Award should be accepted for the time being and that it could be altered later. This should be the attitude adopted by the Indians in the wake of big constitutional issues which were of greater importance. Sastri mistakenly considered communal politics as a minor issue. There were issues like these that led to many misunderstandings resulting in the holocaust of 1947.

The news of Gandhi's fast brought forth vehement criticism from Sastri as he considered it a totally unnecessary effort. Immediately a leaders' conference was summoned by Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya which met at Bombay.
and Poona in September. There was a prolonged discussion on joint electorates when Sapru suggested the adoption of a system of primary and secondary election for a limited number of seats. Sapru said that the system while maintaining the principle of joint electorates would enable the Depressed Classes to choose their own candidates. Dr. Ambedkar and his colleague Dr. Solanki welcomed the proposal but stated that they would demand a much larger number of total seats than the Prime Ministers award had given them. When the scheme was put before Gandhi on 21 September, he accepted the panel idea scheme but instead of confining it only to a limited number of seats, he extended the system to all the seats reserved for the Depressed classes. He correctly said Sapru's plan would have divided the untouchables into two groups consisting of a panel group in the Legislature and the other group which would come in by direct election. This would in turn result in the creation of a complex among the Depressed Classes. Dr. Ambedkar gave up his demand for separate electorates in response to the moral pressure. Gandhi and Ambedkar signed the Poona Pact on September 24, 1932. Pandit Madam Mohan Malaviya, Tej Bahadur Sapru, Jayakar, Rajendra Prasad and C. Rajagopalachari signed it on behalf of the Caste Hindus.
A settlement was arrived at on the basis of the above agreement. A common electorate was agreed upon subject to two conditions namely 148 seats were reserved for the Depressed Classes in place of 71 provided by the communal award in the Provinces. At the Centre, 18% of the seats were reserved for them. There would be primary election by the voters of the Depressed Classes for 4 candidates for each reserved seat and the election by general constituencies was restricted to these alone.

Somehow, Srinivas Sastri with his foresight said that India would begin to perceive that the gains of the Poona Pact were dubious. It was a "mad bargain". The tension over it he said was possible only in India. Setalwad said that Gandhi, who refused in London to agree to reservation of seats for the depressed classes had now agreed in not only to reservation of seats but also separate primary electorates.

The anti climax of all this political activities was the Third Round Table Conference of November 17, 1932. This meeting went on till December 24, 1932. 46 delegates took part. The British Labour Party did not attend. The Indian National Congress was excluded. The Liberals were
not included. Sapru was the only exception, but he attended in his individual capacity. Lord Willington, making use of Sastri's ill health, decided not to include him among the list of delegates for the Round Table Conference. Rather, he offered him the post of the President of the Council of State at New Delhi when Sir Henry Moncrieff Smith retired in November. It took three full days for Sastri to reply. He realised that this offer was just an eye wash. Sastri was appointed to the Royal Commission on Labour under the Chairmanship of Right Hon'ble Whitey to inquire into the Indian Labour condition.

The British did not want the presence of active Liberal elements. Here it proves the fact that the Liberals played a very important role in the Round Table Conference and this trend was noticed by the British. They therefore, decided to keep them out of the Third Conference. The British who wanted to cover up their ulterior motives, had wanted Sastri to help in persuading Gandhi to give up the Civil Disobedience Movement. Sapru, decided to do some constructive work during the third Round Table Conference and hoped that his proposals would be placed before the Parliamentary Committee. His hopes were belied by the political conditions in India and England, because of the hardliners in India and
England and his fears that nothing would come out of the Conference turned out to be well founded. The Third Round Table Conference was really a force. It was "a window dressing". It was not intended to be a Conference of equals. Jinnah was not invited, the Indian States sent their representatives, but the Princes did not attend. Sir John Simon and Lord Irwin attended as British delegates.

The main task of this third session of the Round Table Conference was to consider the recommendations of Lothian Percy and Davidson committees which were set up at the end of the Second Round Table Conference. Marquis of Lothian was the Chairman of the Franchise Committee. J.C.C. Davidson was the Chairman of States Enquiry Committee (Finance). Sir Percy was in charge of Federal Finance Committee. The working committee consisted of Raja of Sarila Rao Bahadur V.T.Krishnamachari, Nawab Liaqat Hayat Khan, Sir Manubhai Mehta, Nawab Sir Muhammad Akbar Hydari, Sir Mirza Muhammad Ismail, Mr. L.C.Benthal, Mr. A.H.Ghuzhavi, Mr. M.R.Jayakar, Mr. N.M.Joshi, Dr. B.S.Moonje, Sir A.P.Patro, Sir C.P.Ramaswami Aiyar, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, Dr. Shafaat Ahmad Khan and others.
The delegates spoke on the old subjects such as safeguards and eligibility of Indians to administer their own affairs. The Lothian Committee pointed out that it was impossible to launch a constitution on the basis of adult Franchise. First among the numerous administrative difficulties mentioned was the dearth of officials qualified to work it. There was a well grounded suspicion that the elections were falsified by unefficiency and corruption. The presiding officer must be competent to manage the police and of such standing as to be above suspicion. As regards non officials, few would be forthcoming except in urban district and moreover objections would be liable to be raised against them for political, religious, caste or other reasons. Another difficulty was the insufficiency of police to main law and order. Direct voting was to be retained and the existing franchise was to be maintained. Women would be substantially enfranchised and it assured that the election to the Federal Upper Chamber would be made by the Provincial Legislation. The committee was in favour of direct rather than indirect election for the lower house.
There was a detailed discussion on Residuary powers. The Hindus wanted these powers to be vested in the hands of the centre. The Muslims wanted it to be vested in the hands of the Provinces. With regard to the powers of the Legislature, it was decided that the British Parliament would deal with questions of sovereignty of the Crown, Defence, nationality. Discussions regarding the question of distribution of financial resources between centre and provinces.

The third session of the Round Table Conference opened on 17th November 1932 and continued till 24 December 1932. The British Indian delegates had been insisting on immediate implementation of the Federal scheme and not to wait till the Reserve Bank had been set up.

They urged that responsible Government be granted to the centre. They wanted the safeguards should be in the interest of India. Sapru, by profession was a lawyer and knew the implications of a Federation. He wanted the safeguards to be clearly defined so that the ministerial responsibility at the centre or in the Provinces would not be eroded. He wanted foreign police, finance and defence to be carefully divided, so that many of these may be transferred to popular control. He insisted that the establishment of a Federation should not wait for the creation of a
Reserve Bank. Purushottamdas Thakurdas suggested that provisions should be made to cover the interim period before the establishment of a Bank. He visualised the Federation becoming a reality in 1935. He argued that on constitutional and administrative grounds it would be impossible for responsible Government in the Provinces to work smoothly with an autocratic Central Government.

Debates took place over the questions of defence and the extent of financial independence to be granted. The Indians felt that the Viceroy should Indianize the army. During the transitional period the Viceroy should be in control of the armed forces. This period of transition should not cover an unnecessary long period of time. They further argued that the army member should be selected from among the member of legislatures both from British India Provinces and Princely Indian States. A committee should be appointed by statute or by Instrument of Instruction consisting of an army representative, Federal, Finance member, Prime Minister and another Minister of the Federal Government to discuss, consider and approve the army budgetary estimates. The Viceroy's decision was to be final a case of deadlock.
The Indian Legislation should be responsible for maintaining and expanding military education in India. Military academies were to be established for the same purpose.

Sapru defined the scope and functions of Central and Provincial Legislatures, the power of the Governors-General and Governor and the role of the Judiciary. He urged that the Government release Gandhi and other political prisoners so that it would create a proper atmosphere for the Government to discuss major problems with them.

These above demands were written in a long Memorandum on 27 December 1932.

These demands voiced out in the above Memoranda deals with the plea for an early implementation of a Federation with a responsible centre. This should include safeguards which would be in the interest of India. It urged the Government to prepare electoral rolls and registers, delimitation of Constituencies. It further urged Indianization of the Army Reserved departments must be transferred to the Indian Legislatures. Question relating to Fundamental rights, powers of the Governor-General and Judiciary were discussed.
The memorandum saw the necessity of having all political parties in India represented.

It hoped the Government would also fix the date on which the Indian States must, formally and authoritatively notify their willingness to come into the Federation. It was suggested that the Federation must be framed to function leaving it open to the Princes to come as and when they pleased.

With regard to Finance, the Government's intention to transfer Finance to popular control was welcome. With regard to safeguards the validity of the claim that the British investors should be impaired and the Governor-General may be vested with power to secure the maintenance of that security unimpaired was accepted. The objection was not to the powers vested in the Governor-General during the transitional period of effectively securing the discharge of the obligations in regard to Reserved Departments and Service, but to a general phrase the content of which seemed to be too elastic and indefinite. With regard to having a financial adviser, it was felt that he should be appointed by the Governor-General in consultation with his Ministers. His position should approximate to that of the Auditor-General.
He should be above party politics in England and India. He should not be a rival Finance Minister. The Financial Adviser should give advice on questions of international finance or any other technical question and his opinion should be brought to the notice of the legislature. The control of the army during the period of transition should be in the hands of the Governor-General. It was also agreed that as far as the army Budget was concerned, it should be independent of the vote of the Legislature. As far as supplies were concerned it should be left to a committee consisting of the Governor General, Army Member, Finance Minister, Prime Minister and other Ministers. The Army Member should be a man selected from the members of the Legislature who represented British India or Indian States. He would be a bridge between the Governor-General, the Army and the Legislature. Defence should be the increasing concern of India and not of great Britain. The Army should be Indianised within the shortest possible time. The Indian Legislature, should have the responsibility given to it of maintaining and expanding military education in India and the institutions established for that purpose. Sapru was convinced that there was considerable room for economy in the army expenditure and suggested that there should be a committee of Indian and British experts to investigate the
problems to explore further avenues for the reduction of army so that the expenditure may be brought, as soon as circumstances permitted, to near pre-war level. Further, the army should not be sent outside India without the Legislature's permission.

Distinctions in the matter of recruitment which had prevented certain classes from adopting the army as their career should be done away with. In this Sapru 93 supported Dr. B. R. Ambedkar.

With regard to the powers of the Governor-General and the Governor, it was recognised that the Governor-General must have a reserve of power in case of grave emergency or in case of a breakdown. It was questioned whether it would be wise to grant the same powers to the Governor.

Sapru corresponded with the Princes of Jodhpur, Udaipur, Bikaner, Rewa, Bhopal, Gwalior, Patiala and Kashmir regarding these proposals. They supported his 95 views on the Constitution, but put forward difficulties over the question of Paramountcy. If this was satisfied, they would join the Federation.
Tej Bahadur Sapru's contribution during the Third Round Table Conference was in envisaging Federation which included the British Indian States. The Conference however failed because of the intransigence of the British Members, the Indian Princes and the Muslims.

The Federal plan was not running well. Sapru had in fact, warned Lothian that it would be disappointing if the scheme was put off indefinitely. This course of action would prevent all chances of its working on well oiled wheels. The Princes gave only lip sympathy to the scheme and were really not sincere in their approval. Their main interest was to look into the question of Paramountcy as they were mortally afraid that the British would hand over power at the centre to the Indian politicians who had no respect for the Princes. They wanted a federal scheme which made them equal partners as it would ensure their independence. The Chamber of Princes supported this point of view.

As the discussions progressed however each Indian State tried to secure as many rights as possible with the result that by the time the blue print of the Government of India Bill was published, they had turned against it. Sapru was the only member of the Conference who still had
faith in the Princes. When the British pointed out the latter's attitude Sapru criticised them saying that the British were trying to drive a permanent wedge between the Indian States and the British Indian Provinces. Later, he had to acquiesce in the final decision of the Chamber of 98 Princes who rejected the Federation scheme.

The Muslims supported the demand for a Federation during the Conference, but back in India, they met at the All India Muslim Conference, where they passed resolutions supporting a weak Centre. This, according to them, would prevent the "Hindu" centre from interfering in the Muslim Provinces. It became obvious that they were not serious about the Federation.

The Liberals were the only group which had supported the Federal scheme with a responsible Centre. They were not in the majority at all in London, nor did they have much following in India, which was very essential to influence the British authority.

Soon, a White paper was produced based on the discussions of the Conference. It embodied
the Simon Commission recommendations of a Federal Government at the Centre.

Winston Churchill condemned the paper and in March 1933, the Secretary of State moved the House of Commons to appoint a Joint Committee of Peers to consider the scheme. In India, only the Muslims welcomed the paper, the Congress did not support it and the Liberals were against it.

To Srinivasa Sastri, it was progressive in small ways, yet, "in essence it was undemocratic and deliberately aimed at keeping India weak, disunited, unable to act and in Britain's leading strings". He pointed out that the Congress was not going to bother about improving the White Paper. He considered it an impossible dream in the wake of the Tories being in power in England and the "minorities in India clamouring for alms." He wrote "I won't go so far as to say that, in future, the White Paper cannot be amended and made to subserve our purposes. It will be, that is certain. But not by any principle of evolution within it. The reforming power must come from outside. If I could stop the scheme coming, I would. But not all that Gandhi, Nehru and Congress can do will stop it ... The Princes and Moslems are
out to gain communal advantages. But the principle thing is that the Conservatives, having got the power now, will settle the thing in their way and complicate the matters as much as possible.

Chimanlal Setalwad, President of 1933 session of the National Liberal Conference which met in Bombay, denounced the proposals and said that the British had not shown their keenness in establishing the Federation scheme. Sastri pointed out that the term Dominion Status was avoided. The White Paper had increased the scope of safeguards to include British interests. Sastri considered this as an improper change, as Lords Irwin and Ramsay had categorically said that the safeguards would be in Indian interest only.

On the 27th March, 1933, the Secretary of State moved in the House of Commons for the appointment of a Joint Committee of Peers to consider the White Paper. Lord Linlithgow was the Chairman. The Indian delegation consisted of 21 members from British India and 7 from the Princely States. A report was submitted to Parliament in October 1934 and a Bill based on it was introduced in the Parliament on December 19, 1934. Parliament supported the Bill, and it was passed on the 2nd August, 1935, notwithstanding Churchill's hostility to it.
The Secretary of State considered the Government of India Act of 1935 as his personal triumph for it introduced "valuable" measures of an "all comprehensive constitution". In actual fact, due to the cultivation of friendly discussion, which had been imbibed by the Liberals, good will was created between the British and Indians which went a long way towards creating a peaceful atmosphere while transferring actual power in 1947.

In India, the Joint Parliamentary Committee's report was received with displeasure. The Liberals were against the provisions which safeguarded British commercial interests. The idea of establishing a Federation by a Union of British India Province and Princely Indian States had been abandoned and the Liberal idea of a Federation became just a dream. The Joint Parliamentary Committee further reduced the assurances as given in the White Paper. The Bill was therefore rejected by the Liberals. Some Liberals felt that the Montford Reforms were better and wanted the British to establish a Constituent Assembly which would frame a new Constitution. Others felt it was not necessary to totally reject the idea. Sapru belonged to this group. Sastri and Chintamani also felt it was essential to work out a
Constitution rather than reject it. The Liberals had played a vital role in the Round Table Conferences. The ideas that they had conveyed may have received a temporary set back, but, it was largely their schemes and plans that were taken into consideration at a later stage. By now, the Liberals realised that they could not continue with their earlier stand on major issues, so they instilled and infused greater amount of vigour into their activities which helped them to join the mainstream of national activities.
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