CHAPTER V
After the split, V. Krishnaswami Aiyer, suggested holding a convention. This was accepted by Rashbehari Ghosh who suggested a draft be prepared. This draft became the basis of the Liberal Moderate Congress creed. Their goal was now broadened to include self government similar to the one enjoyed by the Dominions. In this way they applied the Liberal principles of gradualism in their approach. They adopted the constitutional approach. They were to ask for further Indianization of legislature and amelioration of the condition of the masses.

A move was afoot to bring about a unity between the two Congresses. Pherozeshah Mehta however was uncompromising. He refused to budge from his stand. Pherozeshah Mehta and his supporters thought they were on a sure wicket.

The nationalists were able to arouse the people but unfortunately they did not know how to harness the released energies of the people. They were not able to organise an effective alternative party. Their ideology was confined to the urban middle classes. They could not sustain the movement. Consequently they were repressed by the government. They were accused of inciting revolutionary activities through their press. The Moderates need not have
given up the 'radical' measures adopted at the Calcutta session. They spurned all overtures of unity and by doing so, they lost the support of politically minded Indians and the younger generations. Thus The Government imprisoned the Extremists and the path was clear for the Liberals moderates to follow their policies of moderation and liberalism within the framework provided by the Government of India Act and waited for the much needed reforms. This long wait exasperated the Moderates.

Morley assured the Indians of an increase of Indians in the Viceroy's and Provincial Council, introduction of the elective principle but, the nomination system would still continue. Morley assured Indians that he would try and secure a repeal on the restrictions on discussion on financial items.

The Moderates initially approved of the plan; but the Muslims were not happy and demanded separate electorates. The British bureaucracy jumped at the opportunity that arose before them. They utilised their time tested policy of divide and rule and applied it on the Muslim - Congress relations and the Moderate - Extremist differences. They encouraged the Muslims and other groups who were pro British to start an anti Congress movement. The British felt that the Moderate led Congress could be easily crushed.
because it was weak and had no popular support. But when
the militant nationalists among the Congress group became
strong, the British bureaucrats rallied the Moderates. Their
objective was to isolate the Extremist. With this in view
they accepted the Muslim demand for separate electorates.
Surendranath Banerjee, Madan Mohan Malaviya, Motilal Nehru
denounced the plan. But, the Moderates were willing to work
out the constitution for what it was worth. This was in
keeping with their Liberal tradition.

By the Act of 1909, a further increase in numbers
in the Indian Legislatures was granted and indirect election
was accepted. Certain recognised bodies could recommend
candidates and separate electorates were instituted. The
legislatures could discuss the budget and propose resolutions
on it which were however not binding on the executive.

The Liberals were satisfied only so far as the
appointment of Indians to the Executive Council of the Governor
General and the Governors and the proposal to create similar
councils in other large provinces were concerned. The first
Indian to sit in the Viceroy's council was the Liberal
S.P. Sinha. But whilst working out the Act of 1909, the
Moderates felt disillusioned because whatever they did or
said, it had no effect. During 1910-17, 168 resolutions
were moved. Of these the Government accepted only 24.
The rest were either withdrawn or rejected.
Among the prominent Moderates who served under this Act were Gokhale, V.J. Patel, Madan Mohan Malaviya, V.S. Srinivasasastri, Surendranath Banerjea, R.N. Mudholkar, Vijayaraghavachariar, S.P. Sinha, M.B. Dadabhoy. The Imperial Capital was now shifted to Delhi in 1912 and council meetings took place here since 1903. The Bills introduced were the continuing Act of 1910, Criminal Law Emergency Powers Bill, Elementary Education Bill 1912, Special Marriage Amendment Bill 1912, Promotion of industries Bill 1915, Financial Assistance in respect of the Military forces and 1918 Financial Budget.

The Continuing Act of 1910 was an extension of the Seditious meetings Act of 1907. The Moderates in the Imperial Legislature opposed the Bill. Among them were Gokhale, R.N. Mudholkar, Sachidananda Sinha, B.N. Basu, Vithaldas Thackeray, Madan Mohan Malaviya. The Muslims had supported the measure. The Bill was passed despite strong protest from the Moderates.

Gokhale took part in the discussion on the Income Tax. During the discussion, a resolution was moved by Mr. M.B. Dadabhoy. This resolution recommended to the Governor General-in-Council, that, in view of the rising prices of commodities, the minimum of income accessible to the income tax be raised to Rs.1,500/- a year. Gokhale felt that Dadabhoy had
not selected an opportune moment for discussion of this question. They were on the eve of the extinction of opium revenue as the Government agreed to stop its export to China. Besides, time drew nearer for the next financial statement to be introduced.

Gokhale pointed out that a definite proposal for remission of taxation could be justified if the condition of the finance of the country was prosperous and that there was unquestionable hardship caused by a particular input. With regard to the condition of finances, he thought it's prosperity was a matter of serious doubt and predicted a trying period for Indian economy if the opium revenue was extinguished. Apart from that, there was expenditure required in various other directions. There was the question of education. There was also the necessity for providing money for sanitation. He felt that one of the great needs of the country was that there should be larger grants-in-aid regularly made to local bodies to enable them to perform their work properly. He felt therefore that even if it was found that a surplus of revenues as has already discussed earlier, existed over the expenditure of the country during the next financial year, there were many directions in which that surplus could be usefully spent and remission of taxation was not the only term in which it could be employed to the advantage of the people.
In March 1912, he urged that the amount of the loan to be raised during the following year be increased by one crore of rupees so that the expenditure proposed to be incurred for building New Delhi in 1912-13 could be met entirely out of loan funds, and not partly out of the following years' estimated surplus. The resolution involved the use of surpluses and the reduction of debt. Of the 3 alternatives opened to the Government to meet the charges of New Delhi, the Finance Member preferred putting the Delhi works on the same footing as railways and irrigation, treating them as capital expenditure and financing them partly from loans and partly from spare revenues. It meant that surpluses which represent excess of revenue over the amount needed for ordinary expenditure, were going to be devoted indirectly to the reduction of unproductive debt, and not to measures calculated to promote the welfare of the people.

Gokhale said "This however, has been one of the principle grievances which non-official members have urged in this council year after year. I have pointed out that while this may be sound finance in the West, it is not sound finance in this country, where the unproductive debt is really a very small amount. Gokhale contrasted the conditions in other countries with the peculiar situation
in India and said "that in this country a surplus is always a temptation to the Government either to pay off its debt faster than is necessary, or else, increase expenditure in directions which entirely depend upon its own will and which sometimes do not commend themselves to the people.

He moved another resolution in March 1912, recommending the creation of special provincial reserves by means of grants, from Imperial surpluses. He drove home the same arguments and crystallised it into two definite points namely taking the smallness at the Indian unproductive debt into consideration, he felt, there was no need to liquidate it out of Indian ordinary surpluses. The provision that already existed for redemption of capital under railway for reduction or avoidance of debt under famine insurance, was amply sufficient for the purpose. Further, money was required for non recurring expenditure in many directions, especially education, sanitation and medical relief. He wanted to fix a certain amount of surplus namely two-thirds, for being handed over to the Local Governments. This would be an obligation thrown upon the Government of India, as local governments would be obliged to spend the sums received on programmes of non-recurring expenditure mentioned above. Not much came out of his suggestions.
Gokhale moved another resolution on 27th February 1912. This was with regard to steps being taken to bring district administration into closer touch with the people. For this purpose, district councils composed of not more than nine members, partly elected, partly nominated should be created. They were to be advisory bodies with whom the Collector should keep in touch for consultation purposes on important matters. This resolution was subjected to tough debates. Gokhale was supported by Malaviya, Raja of Dighapatia, Mr. S. Sinha, R. N. Mud'okar. However the resolution failed with 14 ayes to 32 noes.

The Liberals took part in the debates over the Elementary Education Bill 1912. As shown above, Gokhale played a very important role. Gokhale was interested in giving widespread education to the masses. He sought solution of India's future through education in the countryside. His views were opposed by G. R. Chitnavis, M. B. Dadabhoy and the Muslim League. He was supported by the Raja of Kurupan and Malaviya. His Bill had failed. Only 13 voted for it, 38 were against it.
Among other Liberals of renown was V.S. Srinivasa Sastri about whom detailed study has been undertaken in the later chapters. He too played an important role in the Imperial Legislature. He moved a resolution regarding recruitment for the technical and scientific services being made in India. The Resolution advocated that the steps should be taken to discontinue recruitment in Europe for these services within a period of ten years and pending the development of educational facilities in India, promising candidates should be sent to Europe and America for study at the expense of the State and appointed to the higher posts if duly qualified. To attract a proper type of candidate to the technical institution of India, an undertaking be given by the Government that not less than one half of the recruits should be chosen from their alumnis. He was supported by Surendranath Banerjea, B.N. Sarma, Dinshaw Wacha. But his motion had failed as the Government was not forthcoming with its financial advance and support.

Surendranath Banerjee also took part in the Legislature. He criticised the financial statement for the year 1918-1919. Speaking on the financial statement, he said that he considered the budget as a war budget. He felt that the entire budget did not really reflect the situation in India. He felt that the financial statement spoke about surpluses
when actually none existed at all. Rather the Budget had imposed taxes on account of the war that took place.

Further he stated that the expenditure on education had not made appreciable advance since 1914-15. This had also been the case with sanitation. The monetary advance given to Education was paltry.

He pointed out further, that Provincial Governments had no power for contracting loans. He urged the encouragement of industries in order to make India self contained and self reliant.

He urged that the railways be expanded. He said "Let us have wagons, steel rails and things of that kind in India". He remarked further about the pay concessions being made to British soldiers but no such commissions had been made to Indian soldiers.

V.S.Srinivasa Sastri felt that the Criminal Law Bill of 1919 brought out the worst in British administration as it went against the principles of justice and liberty. V.S.Srinivasa Sastri remarked that such a Bill would make the Government suspect innocent people. The Act was put to vote. The Council was divided - 22 were for the amendment, 35 were against it. The Moderates failed to make a dent.
Another Liberal Rao Bahadur B.N. Sarma also played a role in the Imperial Legislature. He introduced a resolution regarding introduction of free and compulsory education after the war. His aim was to improve the quantity of the students. The only way he suggested was to make education free. He was supported by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Srinivasa Sastri. But no substantial progress was made.

The Government had introduced a Bill for financial assistance in respect of the Military forces by means of men, money and material in 1918. V.S. Srinivasa Sastri opposed the Bill as it imposed large share of financial assistance from India. Madan Mohan Malaviya wanted the financial issue to be discussed in the Council. He felt that the Council should be consulted before any charges could be levied but their suggestions fell on deaf ears.

Hence, from the above discussion it would be seen that the Moderates had little opportunities to develop their skill in the legislatures as legislators. They were opposed by the Government. They faced rigid opposition from the Muslim League and the Extremist outside. They followed a very cautious policy and did not move with the spirit of the times.
Pherozeshah Mehta and G.V. Joshi shared a similar sense of frustration in the Bombay legislature. Pherozeshah Mehta's projects like the tax reforms, improvement of public health received little official sympathy.

The Annual Budget was under consideration and the discussion turned on the question of powers of taxation of the Provincial Councils. The Finance Member, Sir John Muir Mackenzie had strongly urged that the Council might be invested with the power to impose the taxation necessary to meet it's requirements and that the dependence on the Imperial Government might be done away with altogether. This suggestion had been given in 1910. He was supported by Fazulbhoy Currimbhoy on 25th July, 1911. Pherozeshah Mehta however, did not agree. In his opinion, until the Council was so constituted as to represent the direct voice of the people, it would be disastrous to invest it with any powers of taxation. He was not enamoured of 'non official' members. They were more official than the officials. Pherozeshah Mehta protested against such an exercise of discretion vested in the Governor under the rules. This irked Lord Sydenham. When Lord Sydenham interposed and gave him a two minutes time limit, he remarked that to give two minutes to
a member for a general debate involving the heads of the Budget was simply to prevent detailed discussion.

Pherozeshah Mehta opposed the Town Survey Bill introduced in the Bombay Council in December 1914. To all intents, it appeared to be a good measure. But, it contained a clause authorising the maintenance of a Register of possession showing the titles of individual holdings. Pherozeshah's keen understanding saw in this provision a dangerous power of inquisition into titles of private properties. He opposed it in the Corporation and in the Legislative Council. He considered the Registrar of Possession as an instrument of oppression and reminded the Council how in 1904, a similar clause was smuggled into a measure proferred to be based on the English Motors Act, and which had to be abandoned on his convincing Lord Lamington of it's real character. Although initially, many thought he was imagining things, ultimately, he had the satisfaction of carrying the public with him against the Bill. But nothing much was done by the Government to appease this fear.

Another liberal G.V. Joshi played an important role too. G.V. Joshi, whilst discussing the Budget for 1910-1911, pointed out that the expenditure had increased and suggested that the Government go slow on it's expenses.
In the session of the Bombay Legislative Council held on 26th February 1911, the Report of the Select Committee was submitted. This considered the new rules framed for the Conduct of Business and a motion was brought forward proposing the adoption of the new rules. G.V. Joshi objected to the rule regarding notices which were not printed. The rule said that speeches which were not printed and copies of which had not been supplied should be considered as read and were to form a part of the proceedings of the Council at the discretion of the President. G.V. Joshi pointed out that this rule was opposed to all reasons. His amendment was put to vote and adopted.

Chimanlal Setalvad also played a role in the Bombay Legislative Council. He spoke on the question of appointments made to the Legislative Council. Whilst the Muslims pleaded for increased Muslim representation in higher posts, Chimanlal Setalvad felt that efficiency should be made the hallmark for appointments. Herein he projected an image of being a Liberal because Liberalism knows no barrier between creeds. He opposed the Government's intention of raising fees in Government institution and was ably supported by Pherozeshah Mehta but without much result.
The Act of 1909 fell far short of the aspirations of the educated people. Yet the Liberal Moderates were willing to work out the Act for what it was worth.

Some Moderates took part in the proceedings of the Council. Amongst the Moderates who played an important role was V.S.Srinivasa Sastri. His forte was in the field of education and insisted on the introduction of private bodies which would impart education. Nothing came of the suggestion he had made in the Legislature.

The Madras legislature took up a discussion on the Bill to Amend The Madras Courts. Mr.A.S.Krishna Rao took a leading role in the discussion. He was glad that the Government had appreciated the difficulties of the old Regulation V of 1816 and Regulation XI of 1816 and village Courts Act of 1889. The Bill suggested the establishment of Panchayat Courts or Judicial Panchayats which he welcomed.

During the discussion P.Siva Rao stated that he had his own misgivings whether the Bill was a serious improvement upon the existing conditions. The subject of the Bill was not merely to entrust great responsibility to do justice
to the villager but also to entrust great responsibility to the villagers, to train them in the art of governance and the art of managing their own affairs. He urged that the Bill should invest the exclusive powers to the village Panchayats.

The Bill was passed. A select committee was established. Amongst them were Liberal minded Congress members like R.Ramachandra Rao, M.Ramachandra Rao, Sadashiva Bhatt, and A.S.Krishna Rao.

On 21st November 1917 a resolution regarding provision of process service and copyist establishment to each civil court in the Moffussil was introduced. This was introduced by K.Rama Ayyanagar. He said the Council recommended to the Governor in Council that process service and copyist establishment be provided for each of the mofussil civil courts and that the central Nazarat and Central copyist establishment, be avoided as far as possible.

The central Nazarut had not much work as it was performed by the mofussil Nazarats. He was seconded by T.Rangachariar. Mr.Gillman refused to accept the resolution and it had to be withdrawn as it was primarily to be sent for consideration of the High Court.
On November 1917 a discussion on the appointment of the Local Self Government Board took place. This resolution was introduced by A.S. Krishna Rao. It was introduced to loosen undue official control.

Local Self Government was to be established to advise, guide, and control local bodies and in their doings. It practically suggested a transfer of power of control then vested in the Secretariat under instructions from the Government to a Board with a member of the Executive Council as President, and consisting of the representatives of the people. This resolution suggested that in matters affecting local Self Government, the popular voice must be heard concerning matters of local interest and affairs. That was the first principle which the resolution wished to lay down.

A Central board should be created to coordinate the work of local bodies and regulate the procedure and guide them in all their work. The local Board must consist of a member of the Executive Council as President and eight representative of the people. His scheme aroused animated discussion between P. Rajagopalachariyar, M. Ramachandra Rao, K. Ramayyangar, V. K. Ramanujachariar, P. Siva Rao. Nothing came to the discussion as the resolution had to be withdrawn because the official sections opposed it.
So, in Madras too, the early liberal, minded Indians, were fully imbued with the spirit of the pioneers who laboured to lay the foundations of lasting freedom. In that spirit they worked for long years in unassuming devotion to the public interest. Gifted with rare powers of eloquence they were exponents of liberalism. Liberalism was a philosophy which could never be outmoded so long as men cared for liberties. They had their detractors and admirers. They made mistakes but who does not?

Here too, there was great popular dissatisfaction over the lack of any development in local self government. The Hindu of 1908 pointed out "Efficiency should by no means be the only aim of local bodies. Their main object if we understand it aright, should be to serve as training groups for popular political education. Judged from this point, the part which the local bodies have played in the fulfilling of this object is deplorably nothing".

So once again, the Indian Liberals of Madras continued to direct public opinion towards political reform. Some of the grievances were a result of the irksome policies of the British. These included monopoly of higher appointments by Europeans, salt tax,
meagre Indianization of the army and military expenditure. Here also, the expectations of the Liberals that the reform scheme would legitimise their leadership was shattered. The powers of the Legislatures were limited. The army and the Indian States were excluded from discussions. No resolution or voting was permitted on the whole budget. The Liberals were benefit of important powers. The majority of Congress men lost faith in their approach.

Besides, the Liberals, now entered an era where they had to face communal politics. Concessions to the Muslims led to militant Hindus demanding concessions. It was with this background that the Congress session of 1910 was held. Stress had been laid on the conciliation between Hindus and Muhammadans, Moderates and the Extremists.

The Congress found it was too late to inject new vigour into themselves. Attendance of the annual sessions dropped. Provincial Conferences now stopped in the wake of absence of Extremists who were in jail. With what little that was left, annual sessions criticised the limited franchise of 1909 reforms.

R.N.Mudholkar pointed to the anomalies, the inequalities and defects of the council regulation. He also urged an increase in the number of Indians in the legislatures and immediate introduction of direct election.
In the meanwhile Tilak's period of incarceration had ended in 1914. His tactical bid at rapprochment with the Moderates and his attempt at establishing a Home Rule League and the advent of Annie Besant tended to shake the Moderates still further. Many Moderates joined the Home Rule League so that their grip on the affairs of the country was not lost. Among the Moderates who joined the League were C.Y. Chintamani, Motilal Nehru, C.P. Ramaswami Aiyar, Dadabhai Naoroji and Srinivasa Sastri.

The older Moderates opposed Annie Besant's aggressive aims of the Home Rule League. They were lead by S.P. Sinha.

In the meanwhile the Government approached Gokhale to submit a scheme of reforms. He outlined a scheme of political autonomy. According to this scheme, the Governor should be appointed from England. There was to be a Cabinet of 6 members of whom 3 were to be Indians holding Home, Justice, Finance, Agriculture, Education, Local Self Government, Industry and Commerce portfolios. The Indians and the English should be eligible for seats in the executive council which should consist of 75-100 members who were to be elected. The relations between the Executive Government and the Legislative Council should be similar to the Reichstag of
Germany. Gokhale also envisaged that the Provincial Government develop a separate system of finance. Similar changes should be introduced in the centre. He wanted more portfolios and to be created /Indianization of the army. Gokhale's ideas provided to a certain extent the basis for the demands for further reforms.

By this time however the Moderates realised that the road for them was no longer smooth, especially, in the wake of the deaths of Gokhale and Pherozeshah Mehta in 1915. The Moderates were liberal in thought and had followed this approach as illustrated above. However all Moderates did not possess the same calibre as Gokhale and Pherozeshah Mehta who were no longer on the scene. D.E. Wacha and S.N. Banerjee were not that powerful. They could not hold their own against the Extremists. So they decided to adopt a conciliatory policy. At the annual session of the Congress in 1915 which met at Bombay, Annie Besant mediated and compromise was effected. The Moderate method of constitutional agitation was accepted. The Moderates in return, had to accept Swaraj as part of their programme. The breach of 1907 was therefore cemented.
The Moderates were dissatisfied with the Government of India Act of 1909. This Act had only trained them to be Government critics. However, they wanted to be trained in the art of government.

Therefore efforts were taken by the Moderates to infuse vitality amongst themselves. They took a slightly stronger stand than before. Prominent leaders of this time like Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, V.S. Srinivasa Sastri and 17 others from the Viceroy's Legislative Council formulated the Memorandum of Nineteen. Their suggestions became the basis of the Congress League Scheme. The Memorandum of Nineteen was influenced by Gokhale's Will and Testament mentioned earlier. The Memorandum demanded that the Indian participation in the Government be real, enlarged councils should be granted, a process of Indianization of provincial and Imperial Legislative Council be increased. They suggested abolition of India Council. They wanted it to be replaced by two under Secretaries of which one was to be an Indian. They wanted direct appointment of the Governors by the Parliament in England. They further demanded local Self Government as enjoyed by the Dominions for the Provinces to be granted immediately. They wanted the army to be Indianised.
THE CONGRESS LEAGUE PACT

In the meanwhile a compromise was struck between Tej Bahadur Sapru, Motilal Nehru, M.A. Jinnah and Wazir Husan. This was in continuation of the Liberal ideas. In 1916 the Congress League Pact was signed. This was based on Gokhale's Testament but it included separate electorates. The Government was now forced to announce the August 1917 Declaration (Montague Declaration), which stated that their political goal was to increase the association of Indians to every branch of Government in order to gradually develop responsible Self Government. However, the British were to be the judges of time and progress of each stage of advance.

Montague's Declaration however could not be accepted by the conservatives in England. To the Indians as a whole responsible government became a byword. The Moderate reaction was lukewarm. The Extremists considered this declaration a farce.

In 1918 the Montford Report was introduced supposedly infusing the ideas of the Declaration. It envisaged a federation with British India Provinces and the Indian States. It also envisaged ideas of self Government in the provinces where dual government would be introduced through Reserved
and Transferred subjects. However the British were to be
the final arbiters of India's destiny.

The Report of 1918 created a furore amongst the
Extremist circles in the Congress. The Congress met on
September 1, 1918 at Bombay to determine the line of action.
The Moderate Liberals did not approve of the Bill too, but
were willing to work it out. They were apprehensive that
because they were in a minority they would be forced to com­
pletely reject the Montfort Report. The Moderates action was
criticised as a result. One of the points made against them
was that they had gone back on their former support of the
Congress League scheme. To this attack Surendranath Banerjee
replied in his Presidential speech that the Congress League
scheme was framed before the announcement of 20th August, 1917.
It did not and could not deal with the new situation created
by the August Declaration. The August Declaration message of
dealt with the gradual development/responsible government
whereas the Congress League scheme of 1916 created an
administrative directorate with an Executive subordinate
to the Legislature but not removable at it's pleasure as
the Governor General and Governors still retained their
over all powers of control.

In the wake of the differences of opinion between
the Moderates and the Extremists, the Moderates did not
attend the special Congress session of August 29th, 1918
as their influence had reduced a great deal. The Moderates held a separate session on their own. So the first session of the Indian Liberal Party began on November 1st and 2nd 1918. It was styled as the 'All India Conference of the Moderate Party'. This became the nucleus of the National Liberal Federation. Details of the National Liberal Federation would be discussed in a later chapter, but suffice it to say, Surendranath Banerjee was the President during the 1st session. During its second session at Calcutta in 1919, it gave itself a name 'National Liberal Federation'. The important liberals were S.N.Banerjea, V.S.Srinivasa Sastri, D.E.Wacha, P.S. Sivaswami Aiyar, Tej Bahadur Sapru, C.P.Ramaswami Aiyar, N.M.Samarth, C.Y.Chintamani, M.R. Jayikar and others.

These Liberals demanded provincial autonomy, central autonomy except in defence, foreign affairs, Indian states, Religion affairs. They wanted the Government to be responsive to the public feelings of the Indians and stood for gradual realization of their hopes. They feared if the agitation for reforms was intensified the Government may drop all ideas of introducing them. They took a practical step in maintaining a continuity of what had been the original principles of the Congress.
They now slightly changed their originally stance. They now emphasised on the principle of cooperation whenever possible. They possessed a very weak organisation. There were no party elections. This was the reason why a liberal would find himself alone in the Legislature without other liberals backing him up. This lack of organisation was not because they were ignorant of the needs of having a strong organisation. In fact they evinced an interest in creating an organisation. Within this organisation thus merged the Indian Association, Bengal National Liberal League, the Deccan Sabha, the Madras Liberal League, the United Provinces Liberal Association, Liberal League of Central Provinces and Berar.

The Conference decided to continue to work between sessions through the office bearers. Each province was to be represented by fifteen members. The Vice Chairman and two Secretaries were to conduct work.

All provincial organisation were to deal with local policies which was to be constructive. It laid emphasis on economic development, administrative reforms, social upliftment, spread of education and public health.
SOUTHBOROUGH COMMITTEES AND THE LIBERALS

The 1918 Report popularly called the Montague Chelmsford Report had suggested the appointment of two committees namely, the Franchise Committee and Functional Committee which were to be presided by Lord Southborough. The Franchise Committee was to consider questions of electorate and franchise. The functions committee dealt with questions pertaining to Transferred subjects and Reserved subject in the working of dyarchy in the Province. The Liberals were also included in these committees. So the Liberals were now geared to give practical form to the 1918 Report. Tej Bahadur Sapru, Sir Baksh, Chimmanlal Setalwad H.E.Coachman belonged to the Functional Committee. Sir Richard Feetham was the Chairman of the Functional Committee. Suren-dranath Banerjea, Srinivasa Sastri, Sahibzada Aftab Ahmad Khan, Frank Sly belonged to the Franchise Committee. The Franchise Committee discussed on subjects relating to the number of seats to be given Hindus and Muslims. The percentage of Hindu and Muslim members had been decided on the lines suggested by the Lucknow Pact of 1916. The problem now was one of residence. Should the franchise be confined to residence in the constituency or should it be extended to the residents of the entire province whose names were included on the electoral rolls? The bureaucracy insisted on a residential qualification as an unrestricted residential qualification would let in political adventurers.
who had not much interest in the provincial affairs. The Local Governments were also in favour of residential qualification. Surendranath Banerjee felt that by restricting the qualification to actual residents would mean narrowing the fields of choice, which might in some cases operate to exclude the best men from the Legislative Council. He pointed out that the constituencies were fickle and sometimes a good candidate would be thrown out through the caprice of a not too stable electorate. Surendranath Banerjee was opposed by Lord Ronaldshay and the members of the Bengal Executive Council over this question. Lord Southborough and the Indian members held a different opinion which in the end prevailed. In Bengal the electoral rules did not provide for residential qualification, although it was confined to some of the other provinces.

The committee was opposed by Madras and the Punjab Governments. The Madras Government was unwilling to have a general electorate. The non-Brahmins of Madras felt that their rights would be ignored. They were impurified by the inclusion of Sastri. They wanted T.M. Nair and Sir P. Thangaraya Chetty to be included. The Punjab Government wanted only a small number of members for the Legislative Council and would not have the broad franchise recommended in the Montague Chelmsford Report. Sastri, realising that the ugly head of communalism was rearing its head suggested that 50% of the seats and above in the Madras Council be allotted for the non-Brahmins in a common electoral roll. His idea was accepted.
The Functions Committee's was unanimous in its Report. Setalvad and Sapru took part in its discussions. They felt that land revenue and irrigation should be made a transferred subject in Bombay because of its exceptional conditions. Soon after, the National Liberal Federation sent Surendranath Banerjea and V.S. Srinivasa Sastri to England to plead for the reform. The other members were Samarth, Chintamani, Kamat, P.C. Roy, Ramchunder Rao, K.C. Roy and Tej Bahadur Sapru. Although the Liberals were included with the committees, they played only a secondary role. A Bill embodying recommendations of the Montford Report and the reports of the two committees were introduced in the Parliament. A Joint Committee was established. The Liberals pleaded before this committee.

Lord Selbourne, the Governor of South Africa, was the Chairman of this Committee. The Indian Liberals appeared before this committee to plead for the Indian cause. Lord Meston was the official witness. Lord Selbourne suggested the creation of a Joint Parliamentary Committee which was condemned by the Indian Liberals. Tej Bahadur Sapru was able to secure the recognition of University education among Transferred subjects. The Liberals demanded introduction of responsibility into the centre. The Indian witnesses were emphatic and insistent on the introduction
of responsibility into the Central Government.

It was suggested that there should be a separate purse for the transferred department. This point was urged by Lord Weston in his evidence. The Indian witnesses were opposed to it as they felt that it would stereotype a distinction that was only transitional and delay the transformation of the reserved into transferred department. The Montford Report had recommended that a Parliamentary Commission should come out to India five years after the scheme had been in operation with a view to reporting upon its working and recommending its revision, if necessary. The period was extended by Parliamentary statute for 10 years. From the Indian point of view this was a long period and the restoration of the original period was urged. This was not accepted by the Joint Committee despite the protests of the Indian witnesses. Responsible government was to be the 'end' and 'aim' of British rule in India and in terms of the message it was to be attained by progressive stages. The Moderate Liberals supported this aspect because they felt that without their support the boon that had been promised would be lost and the prospects of responsible government indefinitely postponed. Surendranath Banerjea urged the formation of Local Government Board in each province of India. The other subject discussed
The Liberals recorded their objections to the reduction of the number of electors in the general constituencies, the retention of existing qualifications for membership of legislative councils, abolition of University qualification of electors to property alone, proposal to transfer only primary education, retention of control over higher education, development of industries, retransfer of subjects in case of tussle between a Governor and his Ministers, creation of separate purses for the Transferred and Reserved Department arising out of the income of the subjects under each half of the government and the grant of authority to each half to treat each financial matters independently. This would make the scheme unworkable. Surendranath Banerjea and Sastri tried to arouse public opinion through the newspapers. The Liberal Deputation waited on Montague requesting him to appoint a committee to prepare a Memorandum. This committee consisted of Chintamani, Samarth, P.C. Ray, Sastri and B.S. Kamat. Surendranath Banerjea submitted a memorandum criticising the Government on its Reforms and reiterated his demands of full responsibility of the Central Government, immediate introduction of responsible government in the Provinces, a common purse, and joint deliberation of both the parts of Governments, budget resolutions should be binding on the
Executive, subject to the power of certification provided for in the Joint Reports. Further, the Executive Councils should consist of two members, one of whom should be Indian and that the Minister should occupy the same position as the other members of executive council vis-a-vis his salary. He demanded that there should be a standing committee with regard to the Transfers and Reserved Departments and Under Secretaries. Finally, no proposal for taxation should be brought forward before the Legislature without the approval of the Minister. The Governor should occupy only a constitutional position. Some of the modifications urged by the Liberal delegates were taken into consideration. Hence the Act of 1919 was passed after some modification.

By this time Mahatma Gandhi arrived on the scene. He utilised the Congress platform to gain Swaraj. He employed civil disobedience, Satyagraha and fasts as means to gain this end. From now on the Moderates played a secondary role, but yet they carried on the struggle and made their presence, however slight, felt. They provided another opposition party to the Congress who followed Gandhian tactics. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri and Sapru could not acquiesce in it. They were opposed to Gandhi's Civil Disobedience Movement.
In the meanwhile, Rowlatt Act, and the Jallianwalla Bagh incident invited criticism from the Liberals. They felt martial Law should be used as a last resort. They demanded a public enquiry as a result of which political prisoners were given royal pardon. The Hunter Committee was created to investigate about the Jallianwala Bagh tragedy. This committee produced a Majority Report signed by 5 English men. The Minority Report was signed by the Indians. This Minority Report was essentially the work of the Liberals like Setalwad. He was assisted by Pandit Jagat Narain and another Liberal, Sultan Ahmad Khan. They condemned the action of General Dyer and implementation of martial Law.

It was in this situation that the Act of 1919 was passed. The main feature of this Act was that it introduced Dyarchy in the provinces. At the centre, power was vested in the Governor General-in-Council.

The Provincial and Central Legislative Councils were enlarged and free only to a certain extent. The Provincial Governors and the Viceroy's had reserved powers to certify legislation should a deadlock occur between the legislative and executive branches of Government.
Government had control over military, foreign affairs, tax, currency, communication and criminal law. Other areas of Government remained provincial subjects such as local self government, public health, education, land revenue administration, and law and order. No radical change was brought about in the Central Government. In the Provinces, Dyarchy was introduced. Some topics were placed under Indian Ministers who were responsible to the legislature and through it, to the electorate. Reserved subjects were under the Governor and his Executive Council. Agriculture, Public works, Education, Local Self Government came under Transferred subjects. Reserved areas included Irrigation, Land Revenues Administration, Police, Administration of Justice, Prisons and Control of Newspapers, Books and Presses. The Provinces were freed from Central control by the distribution of topics and allocation of certain sources of finances to the provinces like land revenue.

Franchise was enlarged. It was linked to the amount of tax of different kinds/people paid. All ex-soldiers were enfranchised. One tenth of the adult male population received vote. Women were originally not given the right to vote, but the provincial legislature were empowered to remove this disqualification. The number of women enfranchised was small. Communal electorates linked to reserved
seats were allocated to the Muslims, Punjab Sikhs, Indian Christians, Anglo Indians and Europeans. Some seats were reserved for non-Brahmins, certain socio economic interests like the landowners, businessmen and University graduates had seats allocated for them. So, from the above, it would be noticed that communal electorates was extended. Symbols were used to help the illiterates to identify their candidates.

Although the Moderates initially welcomed the reforms, they were alienated from the Government. They were discontented and asked for full autonomy in the Provinces and popular control over the Central Government in all subjects except defence, foreign affairs, relations with Indian States and ecclesiastical affairs. C.P.Ramaswami Aiyar criticised the Reform Act of 1919. He said "The first feeling which is evoked by a perusal of the Report evolved by the Viceroy and the Secretary of State, and which persists and is strengthened on careful scrutiny, is that whilst they have appreciated the magnitude and the intricacy of the problems confronting them, and whilst they have, through the exercise of political responsibility, and that in the language of the Report, mere discussion without opportunities for action will result in serious mischief, the Report has, in the main, been based on a lack of faith in the possibility of the natural and
inevitable adjustment of men to new environs. Through out the Report there runs the postulate that responsibility cannot be handed over.

However the Liberals welcomed the proposal to place the Secretary of State's salary on the British Estimates. The appointment of a Parliamentary Committee was welcomed. But the chief raison d'être for the creation of such a committee would be the vesting in it of revisional or appellate powers in case of differences between the Provincial Councils and Provincial Executives, Imperial Councils and Imperial Executives. This did not secure the subordination of the Executive to the legislature with proper safeguards and the granting of adequate financial control to the Legislative Assemblies.

Elections took place in November 1920. The Congress did not participate. The Liberals had participated in the Legislature along with other groups. The followers of the Congress and Extremists condemned their stance and branded them as traitors. The 'Hindu' said that they were Moderate only in patriotism. They stood as staunch supporters of the Government. The man chosen by them as a target for their criticism was V.S. Srinivasa Sastrī whom they called as "the official appologist". The Liberals who took part in the Legislature were as follows:
1. U.P. Hridayanath Kunzru, Gokaran Nath Misra, Anandaswarup
eriayanth Kunzru, Gokaran Nath Misra, Anandaswarup
Jagat Narain, C.Y. Chintamani were Ministers under the
Transferred subject. Jagat Narain was in charge of Local
Self Government. C.Y. Chintamani was the minister for
education. The others were elected to the Legislative
Council.
Bengal -
2. Surendranath Banerjea was a Minister of Local Self
Government. P.C. Mitter was in charge of Education.
Bombay -
3. R.P. Paranjiye was the Education Minister.
3. R.P. Paranjiye was the Education Minister.
. C.V. Mehta was in charge of prohibition.
Madras -
4. Venkata Reddy was the Minister of Industries.
5. S.P. -
S.P. Chitranavis held a similar position.

All these men were given portfolios such as agriculture,
local self government, sanitation and education. The Indian
Ministers not only came from the Liberal groups but also from
various other political and communal parties. This was one
of the reasons why there was no collective responsibility.
Madras alone had the Non-Brahmin Justice Party. They were
anti-Brahmin. The Muslims were few. It was easy, therefore,
for Lord Willington to form a kind of a cabinet ministry
here. As far as the moderate Indian's Ministers sitting
in the Executive Council were concerned Bombay had the
services of Chimanlal Setalvad and Cowasji Jehangir. Chimanlal
Setalvad and Cowasji Jehangir were as a member of the Bombay
Council. Chimanlal Setalvad was also the Vice-Chancellor of
the University of Bombay between the years 1917 to 1929. He
contributed much by opening new departments in the University
of Bombay. Cowasji Jehangir brought about an innovation by
which appeals could be disposed.
WORKING OF THE DYARCHY:

BOMBAY

The new constitution was brought into operation on 3rd January 1921, when new Governors, Executive Councillors and Ministers took their oath of office.

On 23rd February, the Duke of Connaught inaugurated the Bombay Council.

This new council survived the attempts of the Non-cooperation Movement to wreck it. It had to work in the atmosphere which destroyed the chance which it possessed for proving to be a real stage in the evolution of responsible Government. It was a still born child.

Hemmed between the public and an unsympathetic Government, the Liberals had to wade through to execute the task entrusted to them namely to sow the seeds of responsible Government.

Chimanlal Setalwad participated in the debate on the "Revision of the Electoral Rolls in view of the extension of franchise to women. He demanded a sum of Rs.20,000 for stationary and printing purposes for the same. He emphasised on the electoral rolls being revised every year,
similar to how it was in the case of municipal electoral rolls. Jehangir B. Petit felt that it would mean a recurring expenditure of Rs.20,000 every year which he thought was unnecessary. Setalvad was supported by Harilal D. Desai.

R.P. Paranjpye felt that the Council must make up its mind to pay as it is one of the necessary adjuncts of the reform.

Setalvad informed the Legislature that these electoral rolls required revision since rules requiring yearly revision was promulgated after the previous budget meeting. The power of making rules with regard to electoral rolls was vested in the local Government under the Act of 1919. Besides, he pointed out that the Government was alive to the inefficiency of the previous, published elective rolls. Setalvad therefore felt that it was important to have the electoral rolls revised and published. His motion won. Another Liberal R.P. Paranjpye participated in a discussion on new curriculum of a girl's schools.
In reply to a question instituted by Rao Sahib D.P. Desai (Kaira Dt.) on whether Government had consulted the Deputy Educational Inspectors, Presidents of the Districts, Local Boards and Municipalities and other educationists before finally setting clear the new curriculum of primary girls schools and training colleges for women, R.P. Paranjpye replied in the affirmative. He said that the original curriculum was drafted as a result of enquiries and correspondence between the educational department and Heads of girls schools, and with some modification. It was under trial in a government school, and in 2 aided schools, during which time local educational Inspectors had opportunities of seeing it's working. The curriculum was agreed upon in it's final form at a conference attended by certain Inspectors, Inspectresses and Lady Superintendents of Training Colleges for women and girls schools. However, Presidents of Districts, Local Boards, and Municipalities were not consulted. However, he assured that if they wanted to make suggestions, it would be considered.

Cowasji Jehangir served on the committee established by the Legislative Council which dealt with Bombay Retrenchment. This committee dealt with questions of public services and allowances and other Government departments. This committee consisted on of G.K. Sate, Sardar Naharsinghri, Ishwarsenghji Thakur of Amod, Cowasji Jehangir, G.K. Chitale and others.
This committee wanted to effect savings in the administration. They suggested a reduction in the pay of Executive Councillors and Ministers from Rs.5,333.5.4. to Rs.3000 per mensum. This meant a saving of Rs.1,40,000. They suggested an abolition of the posts of Secretaries, Revenue and General Departments which would bring in a saving of Rs.7,500/-. Similar reduction could be effected in the posts of five assistant Secretaries, Agricultural Department and Civil Veterinary Departments, Educational and Cooperative Department, Revenue Department Public Work Department, Police 64 were abolished. The Bombay Legislative Council actually reduced the annual salary from Rs.64,000 to Rs.48,000. of the Ministers.

R.P. Paranjpye introduced a Bill in the Bombay Council to provide for compulsory Elementary Education and to make better arrangements. In the United Provinces, Jagat Narain, was in charge of Primary Education. He advocated it's expansion and spread amongst the depressed classes. His work was continued by C.Y. Chintamani, Gokaran Nath Misra and Pandit Hrudayanath Kunzru.

C.Y. Chintamani tried to reorganise and reconstitute the Allahabad University on the recommendations of the Sadler Commission. He wanted an institute of technology to be established at Kanpur.
Local Self Government made vast strides in Bengal. In this Surendranath Banerjee contributed a great deal. He introduced an amendment of Bengal Municipal Bill in 1923. He completely revised the Bengal Municipal Bill in 1923 investing it with great power. One third of the commissioners were to be appointed by the Government. According to the Executive orders, one third of the members of every district board were to be appointed by the commissions of the Division with the sanction of the local authorities. Surendranath Banerjee made Local Government more real and over rode the decision of the local authorities to give practical effect to his Bill. It was after his Bills were passed that the Corporation passed into the hands of representatives of rate payers.

The impact of this effort could be felt in the rest of India. Pandit Jagat Narain introduced the Elective District Board Bill. In the U.P. women for the first time were allowed to vote in the local elections. The Liberals were able to win this political right for women. This is really a significant achievement. For the first time, Depressed Classes were given representation.
CENTRAL LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLIES

As the Congress had boycotted the elections, the Liberals had the field to themselves at the centre too. Among the Liberals who sat in the Central Legislature were Surendranath Banerjea, Srinivasa Sastri, K.C. Roy, Sapr, P.S. Sivaswami Iyer, N.K. Samarth, Munshi Ishwa Caran and others. P.S. Sivaswami Iyer stood from the non Muhammad rural constituency of Tanjore-Trichy constituency, Sastri stood from the Madras non Muhammadan constituency during the election. They played an important part too. At times they played into the hands of the British. Even a person like Surendranath Banerjea played into their hands. They discussed topics such as status of Indians in the colonies, Dacca University Bill, Indianization of civil service, Press Laws.

The Liberals played an important part in the Central legislature too. Surendranath Banerji moved a resolution "That a committee be appointed to examine the scheme of colonisation which the deputation from British Guiana desired to put forward and also to meet the deputation from Fiji which had arrived in India and to any proposals which they had to put forward, and to report thereon and make recommendations to the Government of India". This proposal gave rise to a considerable discussion on the position of Indians abroad.
The motion should have been made by Sir G. Barnes, but Government thought it expedient to have it moved by a non-official. There was strong objection from the Indians. Malaviyia and Khaparde raised a chorus of indignation. Mr. Sinha moved an amendment that the committee proposed should examine the report generally on the status and position of Indian subjects in all the British colonies. The official and European members opposed the amendment and supported the original motion of Surendranath Banerji. Surendranath Banerji's resolution was passed.

In 1920 Mr. Shafi moved the Dacca University Bill. In the course of his speech he said he was greatly struck with the possibilities of Dacca as a University Centre. The present buildings there would be suitable for University purposes. Surendranath Banerjee, while offering a cordial welcome objected to the question of communal representation which found a place in the Bill and he thought that the control was largely official and he would add to the Faculty of Arts, Economy and Law and also those of Medicine, Engineering and Agriculture.

Nawab Ali Chaudhri approved of the University Bill but said it did not go far enough to satisfy the aspirations of the Mohammadans of Eastern Bengal. V.S. Srinivasa Sastri said that all sections of the people welcomed the University.
But he deprecated generally the extension of communal representation in educational areas. But if it was absolutely essential in case of the Dacca University it must be temporary. He strongly advocated the appointment of expert Professors from all parts of the world and condemned the proposed recruitment rules laid down for Professors. Sir Dinshaw Wacha thought his Mahomedan friends were narrow minded and agreed with V.S. Srinivasa Sastri and B.N. Sarma. His idea of a University was that it should be a temple of free thought. He could not support the idea of a University of this nature. Pandit Malaviya while welcoming the University Bill thought that Arts, Science and Law should be added to the faculties and the University be modernised. The restraints imposed upon the University authorities were too severe. With regard to communal representation, he admitted that Mahomadans had not all the representation that they deserve, but they all wanted Dacca to be a model University. Mr. Shafi defended communal representation. Another question was the non-affiliation of mofussil colleges with the Dacca University. The Government accepted this principle. A motion to submit the Bill to a Select Committee was then passed.
There was the inevitable clamour for Indianization of Civil service and the commissioned ranks of the Army. The first Central Assembly strove to reflect this national aspiration. It scored an early victory. A commission on the public services was appointed in 1922. It was under the Chairmanship of Lord Lee of Parnham. G.A. Natesan, Gopalaswami Ayyanagar played an important role during the discussion.

The Lee Commission's report appeared after the Labour Party assumed office in Britain. It was denigrated by the Indian Press and in the Legislature as "Lee loot" as it gave generous concessions to the service in so far as home leave, free passages, family pension were concerned. But the recommendation did mark a break with the past as it proposed virtual Indianization of services except the two connected with security, the Indian armed services, and the Indian Police. Wide range of careers were now opened for the Indian youth. It was proposed to hold competitive examinations in India and Britain and to add a fifth complement by way of promotions from the provinces.

The Lee Report invited a lot of debate in the Legislative Assembly held at Simla in 1924. The galleries were packed in the Assembly. Question time produced a
preliminary skirmish of the Nationalist with the Government over Mr. Ramachandra Rao's question regarding the publication of evidence tendered before the Lee Commission. The Government declared that the Secretary of State had decided not to comply with the Assembly's request to publish evidence. During the debate, Sir Sivaswami Aiyar said that he was not for the wholesale rejection of the Report nor did he desire the disappearance of the British and was prepared to grasp such relief as the circumstances justified. He thought the members of the commission were as competent as any member in the Assembly and conceded that they approached their work in fairness and with a desire to solve it. He, however, felt that there was an intimate connection between the question of the organisation of the services and constitutional reforms. He was glad to hear from the Government that they considered that the Report would in no way prejudice the consideration of the constitutional issues. As for the organisation of the services, he believed that the forest and the irrigation service could be safely transferred and that there was no insuperable difficulty in transferring those subjects. He was emphatic that the Indian Police service should continue as All India services. He believed that every Indian desired the maintenance of a
proper standard of administration, but at the same time they must devise a measure to use the talents of the people of the country and develop it. He conceded that at present they should aim at making it half European and half Indian.

He claimed to be a practical politician when he urged that the British recruitment be stopped because it would take ten to twelve years even with the existing element to attain equality in the cadre. As for Medical Services, he, from past experience of the war office would say the less control of the war office the better for India.

The motion was carried through with the amendment introduced by Pandit Motilal Nehru.

Tej Bahadur Sapru was in office from 1920 to 1922 as Law Member, Executive Council of the Viceroy. He was offered this office when Gandhi was arrested. He accepted the office despite severe criticism from the Extremist Press.

The Government tried to bring hartals under the jurisdiction of Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1908. Sapru opposed it. He was crowned with success. He repealed the Indian Press Act 1910, newspaper incitement act, Bengal
State Offences Regulation were abolished by the Special Repealing Act of 1922. Racial Discrimination was removed in trying British and Indian subjects. He spoke against the Government when they arrested Gandhi as he had signed a manifesto protesting the Ali Brothers' arrest. He was able to secure a postponement of Gandhi's prosecution.

In 1921 he was appointed Chairman of the Repressive Laws Committee. Sapru was depressed when Montagu resigned in 1922. He too resigned.

The Liberal Party wanted to form an opposition against the Government whom they had joined. The party demand full autonomy at the Provincial level.

The country was seething with discontent. Gandhi became an all India figure. Dyarchy was also not working well. The division into two halves was unnatural and unscientific. The division was haphazard and was assigned to give minimum powers to Indians and maximum power to Governor General and Council. Emboldened by Lloyd George's speech on the "the steel frame" the bureaucracy shed its attitude of responsive cooperation and began to show their fangs. The occasion was the Central Budget of 1922-23.
which provided for doubling of salt. The Central Assembly threw out the budget clause relating to tax on salt. The Viceroy certified it as essential. His action proved that India really did not enjoy fiscal autonomy.

In the U.P. Cabinet, Liberal Ministers clashed with the Governors often. The Governor had given an instruction to a British official to file a suit against a liberal politician without consulting the ministers. Some of the Congressmen dramatised this event and wanted to destroy the legislature from within.

The Congress itself was now divided into prochangers led by C. R. Das, Motilal Nehru, Ajmal Khan, Vithalabhai Patel. They wanted to destroy the Legislature from within. The other half of the Congress was called the No changers led by C. Rajagopalachari and Rajendra Prasad. C. R. Das resigned from the Congress Presidentship when he was defeated at Gaya and formed the Swaraj party. He was able to win seats in the legislature because of the disillusionment of the Moderates in working of the Reforms.

The genuine Liberal feeling was accurately reflected by V. S. Srinivasa Sastri in a communication to the 'Servant of India'. He stated that liberals were not merely content
to mouth pious platitudes about the imperfections of Dyarchy. They realised Dyarchy must end soon. Though they preferred trying conciliatory methods with the Government, they were not opposed to use obstruction if the occasion justified or rendered it desirable.

The Swarajists had scored a characteristic triumph in the Central Province. Fazlul Haq and C.R. Das had the proposals for ministers salaries rejected.

Thus although Dyarchy proved to be a failure, it gave the Indian Liberals a chance to gain experience in the art of Government, which was what the Liberals aimed at. A beginning was made in associating them in every branch of administration. Lord Sinha was made the Governor of Bihar and Orissa. They took up questions in the interest of people and public. In this way they contributed to the National development. In this lay their message to Gandhi and the Congress who in turn did not totally ignore the moderate principles in pursuing their goal of securing freedom for India.
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