

Indian Politics Series—I.

**NON-CO-OPERATION
IN THE
SPECIAL CONGRESS**

COMPILED AND EDITED BY
JITENDRA NATH KUSARY, B.A.

**SEN GUPTA & CO.
5, COLLEGE SQUARE, CALCUTTA.**

Price six annas only.

To be had of :—

SEN GUPTA & Co.,

5, College Square, Calcutta.

CHAKRAVARTY CHATTERJEE & Co., LTD

15, College Square Calcutta.

SARASWATI LIBRARY,

62-5, Harrison Road, Calcutta.

Imp 119482
13-01-11

Printed by J. C. Ghosh at the COTTON
PRESS, 5, Harrison Rd., Calcutta.

Published by the Editor, 1, Huzuri
Mull Lane, Calcutta.

PUBLISHER'S PREFACE.

Non-co-operation is undoubtedly the most momentous question of the day. It has been exercising the mind of the nation to such an extent as was never before seen. I have accordingly collected in this booklet all the speeches delivered by the great nationalist leaders at the special session of the Indian National Congress held in the early part of September last. If this venture proves successful I intend to bring out a second part giving the views on Non-co-operation of the leaders of the different parties and the leading papers in the country.

CALCUTTA.
1st. October,
1920.

PUBLISHER.

NON-CO-OPERATION

IN THE

SPECIAL CONGRESS.

The Special Session of the Indian National Congress met in Calcutta on 4th September, 1920. The most momentous question discussed was non-co-operation. The discussion took place on 8th September and votes were taken on the following day. The following are the summaries of the most important speeches delivered on the occasion :—

Mr. B. Chakraborty.

Mr. B. Chakraborty, President of the Reception Committee, in course of his speech made the following remarks on non-co-operation :—

Fellow delegates, the Punjab and Khilafat combined have led on to the question of non-co-operation—whether we shall adopt it in principle and if so, how far we may put it in practice. These questions—both of them—bristle with difficulties and I should not be willing—even if I were able—to anticipate your probable decision upon them. Perhaps it will be freely acknowledged that on the principle of non-co-operation we are all united, and it will be acknowledged equally freely that upon details we differ. Yet, if non-co-operation is to be used as a political weapon (—and for me the movement has no meaning or significance unless it is used as a political weapon)—if it is to be used as a weapon for checking and paralysing the activities of the Bureaucracy, it is these details of policy which will really count. Speaking for myself, I must humbly confess that I am not clear in my

mind about these details—as to how far and how gradually they may be put in practice. So far as Bengal is concerned this doctrine of non-co-operation is no new thing. We had preached it and tried it in Bengal during the anti-partition agitation, though under a different name. We had also suggested the adoption of some of the same methods as have since been laid down by Mahatma Gandhi and the Central Khilafat Committee. The surrender of honorary offices, the settlement of disputes by private arbitration, the boycott of Government schools, the boycott of the Legislative Councils, non-participation in Government functions and a vigorous prosecution of the Swadeshi were some of the methods we pursued. It is true that it was at that time a merely provincial matter. It is also true that our Mahomedan brethren were not only not with us at the time but against us. That was, however, before the Jalianwalla Bag. The Khilafat question is also with us now for the first time. Our experiences in Bengal in the past, I regret to say, do not justify us in taking a very hopeful view of the success of the non-co-operation programme now adumbrated. But it may be we have been unfortunate in our experience in Bengal. The progress of events both in and out of India and the onward march of time may have brought about a change. Whether it is so or not will be a matter for your consideration. Meanwhile, and pending your final decision, here is one aspect of the question as it presents itself to me. The British people have no moral right to expect or demand any co-operation from us. I have never had much faith in the moral platitude about the British advent being in the nature of a Divine dispensation; and now, with the example of the Punjab Bureaucracy vivid before my eye, I have less faith than ever in this sort of sentimental cant. The British came here, as I have said, originally for exploitation by trade; trade

led to acquisition of territory ; and acquisition of territory ended in the establishment of a wide and far-flung empire. And all the time the empire has been growing and—the English have been exploiting us for all that we are worth—exploiting our man-power, exploiting our money-power and exploiting our enormous material resources. Thus the history of British occupation can be easily written. The English came for purposes of spoliation ; they have stayed here for purposes of exploitation and the relation between us has been always that of free, unchecked and unfiltered exploitation on one side and tame submission on the other. Grave as the situation was even before the war, it has become infinitely graver to-day owing to the general disturbance caused by the war in the economic condition of the whole world. The independent nations are devising various measures to re-establish normal conditions which trained intelligence may be able to devise. These sentiments may sound harsh and unpalatable to people who deal in rose-water sentimentalities and talk about changes in the angle of vision. But they are a plain statement of brutal fact, and rose-water sentimentalities are an insufficient substitute for fact. In these circumstances, and when we find that the humane and civilized British Government is ready to trample upon all considerations of justice, humanity and liberty whenever it may suit its purpose to do so, what are we to do ? How can we protect and preserve our self-respect ?

To protect ourselves and to protect our self-respect we must bring about a change in the mentality, the attitude, the aims and the methods of the Government. This is obvious, but how is it to be done ? We are powerless even, if we had the inclination to effect it by a resort to physical force, that is, by an armed revolution. What is then the alternative ? We cannot associate ourselves with the bure-

autocracy and mark our condemnation of it by an emphatic action against its mentality, attitude, aims, and methods. Many suggestions have been made by various thinkers but it appears to me that the application of the remedy suggested is fraught with difficulties and is a matter which will require deeper and graver deliberation. One thing, however, is obvious to me that whatever remedy may be accepted must be a remedy of a permanent character and not merely of a tentative nature dictated by our indignation caused by the Punjab atrocities and the Khilafat policy. One such remedy surely is an effective endeavour to destroy our economic serfdom and the bondage of foreign exploitation. India is looking round to discover what other means there may be short of a bloody revolution to enable a subject nation to attain its goal. I pray to God that He in His eternal wisdom may enlighten this Assembly and so inspire the collective and combined wisdom of the nation as to find the necessary solution.

In passing I may allude to a recent event which may also solve the problem and save the situation. This I say in the interest of the Empire itself. Why not grant India the same kind of independence to deal with her own affairs as you have done in Egypt? Have a commercial treaty with India in the same way as you are having with Egypt to safeguard all your vested commercial interests and leave us to ourselves to find out our own salvation. One matter is certain; things cannot go on any longer in the same way as they have done.

Lala Lajpat Rai.

In course of his opening speech the President of the Special Congress made the following remarks on non-co-operation:—

At the meeting of the All-India Congress Committee, which sanctioned the convening of this special session, it

was proposed by Mr. Gandhi that, as a protest against the Turkish Peace Treaty and the decision of the Government in regard to the Punjab affairs, that Committee should recommend a programme of Non-co-operation to the country—Mr. Gandhi's programme of Non-co-operation including the boycott of the Reformed Councils. The All-India Congress Committee considered that it was not within its competence to accept this proposition as it was opposed to the Resolution of the Amritsar Congress relating to the Reform Scheme. It did not, at the same time, think it right to dispose of the matter without giving the country, as a whole, an opportunity of pronouncing on it. So it has offered the whole matter to this Special Session.

The question has since then been widely discussed in the country, on the platform and in the press. The Central Khilafat Committee under the leadership of Mr. Gandhi have already started their campaign of Non-co-operation. Some Provincial Congress Committees have, by a majority of votes, accepted the principle of Non-co-operation, but have recommended no action, pending the decision of this assembly. The question is very much agitating the public mind and has divided the country into two opposing camps. On both sides are ranged revered and respected leaders. Much feeling has been imported into the discussion. Under the circumstances, I have decided that, as President of this assembly, the proper course for me at this stage is to refrain from expressing any opinion on this subject.

This, however, does not prevent me from making some general observations on the subject. Before we consider Non-co-operation, let us start with Co-operation. Co-operation of the people with the Government is based on one of the two assumptions, either that the Government represents them, or that the Government is there to protect their interests.

Now in India the first of these two assumptions cannot hold good. The second is unhappily in the course of being shattered to pieces, if not already gone. Co-operation with Government, again, is of two kinds : one enforceable by law and therefore compulsory, for example, the payment of taxes, or serving the army under conscription ; the other is voluntary, for example, accepting Government service or joining the Councils or so on. In the case of the former every refusal is punishable. As for the latter, there you have to distinguish between co-operation which is obviously for country's benefit and that which is not so. Co-operation determined solely or mainly by economic considerations can only be refused, if we can find economic alternatives. Co-operation inspired by considerations of honour and dignity can be easily refused if the mentality of the people regarding honour and dignity can be changed. Last, but not the least, in the same class you may consider co-operation, which gives you opportunities of serving your country by attacking the citadels of power and privilege from the inside.

Co-operation or refusal of it, then must be judged by (a) its obligatory or voluntary nature (b) by its economic consequences (c) by its inherent morality and (d) by its utility as a weapon of attack or defence.

Co-operation which is immoral or which makes you a tool of a foreign bureaucracy or which leaves you no option but to give effect to their orders, stands on an entirely different footing from one which is obviously for the benefit of the country. Similarly co-operation which is inspired by economic necessity stands on a different footing from the one which is solely or mainly based on considerations of honour and dignity. Then again you must consider if your refusal of co-operation proceeds from the desire to make an immediate effective impression on the Government or from the motive

of habituating the people to take their destiny in their own hands.

These, then, are the issues involved in the great question of Non-co-operation.

Mahatma M. K. Gandhi.

On the fifth day of the session of the special Congress Mahatma M. K. Gandhi moved the following memorable resolution on non-co-operation :—

‘In view of the fact that on the Khilafat question both the Indian and Imperial Governments have signally failed in their duty towards the Mussalmans of India, and the Prime Minister has deliberately broken his pledged word given to them and that it is the duty of every non-moslem Indian in every legitimate manner to assist his Mussalman brother in his attempt to remove the religious calamity that has overtaken him.

And in view of the fact that in the matter of the events of the April of 1919 both the said Governments have grossly neglected or failed to protect the innocent people of the Punjab and punish officers guilty of unsoldierly and barbarous behaviour towards them and have exonerated Sir Michael O'Dwyer who proved himself directly or indirectly responsible for most of the official crimes and callous to the sufferings of the people placed under his administration and that the Debate in the House of Commons and specially in the House of Lords betrayed a woeful lack of sympathy with the people of India and showed virtual support of the systematic terrorism and frightfulness adopted in the Punjab and that the latest Viceregal pronouncement is proof of entire absence of repentance in the matters of the Khilafat and the Punjab.

This Congress is of opinion that there can be no contentment in India without redress of the two afore-mentioned

wrongs and that the only effectual means to vindicate national honour and to prevent a repetition of similar wrongs in future is the establishment of *Swarajya*. This Congress is further of opinion that there is no course left open for the people of India but to approve of and adopt the policy of progressive non-violent Non-co-operation inaugurated by Mr. Gandhi until the said wrongs are righted and *Swarajya* is established.

And in as much as a beginning should be made by the classes who have hitherto moulded and represented public opinion and in as much as Government consolidates its power through titles and honours bestowed on the people, through schools controlled by it, its law-courts and its Legislative Councils, and in as much as it is desirable in the prosecution of the movement to take the minimum risk and to call for the least sacrifice compatible with the attainment of the desired object, this Congress earnestly advises—

(a) surrender of titles and honorary offices and resignation from nominated seats in local bodies ;

(b) refusal to attend Government Levees, Durbars, and other official and semi-official functions held by Government officials or in their honour ;

(c) gradual withdrawal of children from schools and colleges owned, aided or controlled by Government and in place of such schools and colleges establishment of National Schools and Colleges in the various Provinces ;

(d) gradual boycott of British courts by lawyers and litigants and establishment of private arbitration courts by their aid for the settlement of private disputes ;

(e) refusal on the part of the military, clerical and labouring classes to offer themselves as recruits for service in Mesopotamia ;

(f) withdrawal by candidates of their candidature for election to the Reformed Councils and refusal on the part

of the voters to vote for any candidate who may, despite the Congress advice, offer himself for election ;

(g) boycott of foreign goods ;

And in as much as Non-co-operation has been conceived as a measure of discipline and self-sacrifice without which no nation can make real progress, and in as much as an opportunity should be given in the very first stage of Non-co-operation to every man, woman and child, for such discipline and self-sacrifice, this Congress advises adoption of Swadeshi in piece goods on a vast scale, and in as much as the existing mills of India with indigenous Capital and control do not manufacture sufficient yarn and sufficient cloth for the requirements of the nation, and are not likely to do so for a long time to come, this Congress advises immediate stimulation of further manufacture on a large scale by means of reviving hand-spinning in every home and hand-weaving on the part of the millions of weavers who have abandoned their ancient and honourable calling for want of encouragement."

He said he was more than aware of the grave responsibility that rested on his shoulders in being privileged to move this resolution and that his difficulties as also theirs increased if they were able to adopt this resolution. He was also aware that the adoption of the resolution would mark a definite change in the policy that the country had hitherto adopted for the vindication of the rights that belonged to it and its honour.

After referring to the difference on this issue between a large number of respected leaders and after remarking that he stood before them neither as a saint nor as a candidate, for dictatorship, he said that non-co-operation was not new thing before the country. Non-co-operation had been accepted at hundreds of meetings attended by thousands

of men and had been placed in working order since the 1st August by their Mussalman brethren and many of the items in the resolution were now being enforced in a more or less intense degree. If they passed the resolution it meant that every one of them individually, to the extent that the items applied to him, had to enforce it. Non-co-operation was a measure of discipline and self-sacrifice. Unless they were able to fulfil these qualities of discipline and self-sacrifice, non-co-operation was an impossibility. He had been told that he was doing nothing but wreck the Congress and that by bringing forward his resolution he would be breaking up the Congress and breaking up the political life of the country (cries of no no). This Congress was not a party organisation, but a platform for all groups, for all parties and a minority need not leave this platform, need not leave this organisation, but that minority might look forward to translating itself into a majority if its opinion commanded itself to the country. If he found himself in a minority he would not go away from the Congress, but he would plead before them to convert his minority into a majority. There were no two opinions as to the wrong done to the Khilafat. The Mussalmans of India could not remain as honourable men, could not follow the faith of their prophet, if they did not vindicate their honour at any cost. The Punjab had been cruelly, brutally treated, and it was the wrongs inflicted on the Punjab which they and he—if they claimed to be worthy sons and daughters of India—must be pledged to remove. It was in order to remove these two wrongs that the country had been agitating itself. How was the Congress to vindicate itself, to justify its existence and its honour, if it could not force justice from unwilling hands, if it could not enforce clear, distinct repentance before receiving a single gift however rich it might be, from those bloodstained

hands? Therefore he had placed before the country a scheme of non-co-operation and he would ask them to reject any other scheme of non-co-operation except as detailed by him.

"I venture to claim," continued Mr. Gandhi "for this scheme of non-co-operation that if there is sufficient response in the country, I make bold to reiterate the statement I have made that you can gain your 'Swaraj' in one year (applause). But note one condition. Not the passing of this resolution by this vast assembly but the enforcement of this resolution by the great audience from day to day in a progressive manner, and progressive stages have been fixed due regard being had to the condition of the country. There was another way before the country save non-co-operation and that was the drawing the sword. But India does not possess the sword and if it had possessed the sword, I knew India would not have listened to this gospel of non-co-operation (hear, hear and applause). I want to suggest to you that even if you want to wrest justice from unwilling hands by methods of violence, the two things stated in the programme, discipline and self-sacrifice, will still be necessary. I have not yet known of a war gained by the rabble, but I have known of wars gained, as you have known, by a disciplined army capable of dying every one of them at their post. If we want to give battle by army to the British Government, the English nation of the combined powers of Europe, we must train ourselves in discipline and self-sacrifice and it is to that stage to which I am desirous to bring my country. I confess to you I have become impatient. I see that in intelligence we deserve "Swaraj" to-day, but we have not got the spirit of national sacrifice and the national discipline."

Mr. Gandhi then went on to say that he had come there and was travelling from one end of India to the other in order

to test whether the country had really evolved the national spirit, whether at the altar of the nation the country was ready to dedicate its riches, its children, its all. If the country was ready to dedicate its all without reservation, he promised that 'Swaraj' would come (applause). Was the country then ready, willing, able to make the sacrifice? Were title-holders ready to surrender their titles and all honorary offices? Were parents ready to sacrifice their children—the literary education of their children—for the sake of fighting the country's cause? If these sacrifices were not made then 'Swaraj' was an impossibility (applause). No nation being under another nation could possibly accept its gifts and then kick against the burden and the responsibility that the conquering nation placed upon it. Immediately the conquered nation realised intuitively that any gift which might come to it from its conqueror came not for the benefit of the conquered but possibly for the benefit of the conqueror, it should refuse to give every form of voluntary assistance to the conqueror. These were the fundamental and elementary conditions of success in their struggle for national independence whether within the Empire or without (applause). He was for real, substantial unity between Hindus and Mussulmans (applause) and the British connection, but if he had to choose between that unity and the British connection, he would have the unity and sacrifice the connection. If he had to choose between the honour of the Punjab, and therefore of India, and the British connection, he would have the honour of the Punjab and all that it meant, anarchy even, without the slightest hesitation.

In conclusion Mr. Gandhi referred to the boycotting of Council which was the burning topic of the day and regarding which opinion was sharply divided. Lastly the boycott of foreign goods had been included in his resolution, but he

did not wish to enter into the history of how it came to find a place in a programme of discipline and self-sacrifice (loud and prolonged applause).

Mr. Gandhi said in Hindi to forget whatever he had done and he would ask them to forget also Moulana Saukat Ali's services. He would ask them to do something to have the Punjab grievances redressed. Either they must draw the sword or by sacrifices force the Government to repent. He wanted them to follow the policy of boycott and non-co-operation as that might redress the grievances. By taking to non-co-operation the people could remedy the Punjab atrocities. He would pray not to fear himself and Moulana Shaukat Ali, but give the matter their deep thought and do what they thought right.

Dr. Kitchlew.

Dr. Kitchlew in Hindi seconded the resolution. He said that the resolution which the audience had received so well wanted their deep consideration. A time had come when such gatherings would be necessary almost daily to consider their duties. If they wanted to keep their self-respect they must work out the programme of non-co-operation. The mandate given by the Congress must be carried out by the people. But their enemies had all along tried to set the brother against the brother (Loud cheers). They had been made to forget their sacred duties and neglect their mother-land. The European nations had all gained their ends and the Indians cannot rest satisfied bound in chains of serfdom. Why were the Moslems present there in such large numbers? It was because they felt for the country and the Hindus and Mussalmans wanted to work together. Mahatmaji had said that he would prefer unity of Hindus and Mahomedans to Swaraj even. Mahatmaji had said

the right thing Mahatmaji had said that there was no sword to redress the grievances. It was proved in Cawnpur and in the "*Epiphany*" case that the Hindus and Moslems were ready to stand by each other. They must sacrifice everything before the valuable unity of Hindus and Mussalmans. The non-co-operation resolution had been accepted in the All-India Moslem League. It had been also settled that any one rejecting the resolution must be boycotted socially. The greatest Moulanas in a meeting had also accepted non-co-operation as the only weapon of redress. They must work with sympathy and fellow-feeling and they should not be prepared to hear their brothers disgraced in Fiji or anywhere else and this could be done by accepting non-co-operation.

Pandit Gokaran Nath Misser.

Pandit Gokaran Nath Misser in Hindi said that they were going to pass the resolution in the Indian National Congress. Every member of the Congress had to sign a creed (reads out). If any one said that he did not like the creed that was one thing. But the creed was there and they must "participate." (A voice—by non-co-operation.)

President.—Order, please, order

Pandit Misser.—How could they participate without co-operation. (No, no and cries of opposition).

President.—Order, please. The more you oppose and interrupt the more delay there would be.

Pandit.—He would place before them the proposal that so long as the creed was there they could not pass the non-co-operation resolution. (Loud and continued cries of opposition and hisses and the Pandit's voice is drowned for some time). They must be prepared for the non-co-operation as every

one was not a Gandhi. They cannot gain Swaraj without making themselves ready for self-sacrifice.

(A voice.—They are ready).

He would ask them not to accept the resolution so long as the creed was there (Loud cries of No, no).

Munshi Iswar Saran.

Munshi Iswar Saran seconded Pandit Misser, but none was in favour of the Pandit's motion and it was declared lost.

Mr. Shamlal Nehru.

Then Mr. Shamlal Nehru was called upon to speak on his amendment. He said if they read his resolution they would find that Mahatma Gandhi's resolution was not perfect without his amendment. He wanted all the words about "gradual" work deleted. He wanted the boycott of British goods instead of foreign goods. He would also ask them to stop paying taxes. (Yes, yes. A voice.—that should be first plank and first step.) He was not a lawyer, but he did not see why lawyers should alone suffer. They must suffer with the lawyers. If Mahatma's resolution was passed only the lawyers would suffer. They must suffer also. (If you mean it.) He meant it for years together.

A delegate.—I want to raise a point of order.

President.—What is it?

Delegate.—How can Mr. Nehru move the amendment when he approved the resolution of Mahatma Gandhi.

Mr. Nehru.—Mahatmaji asked them to give up titles but the joo-huzoors could not be made to give up titles. (Yes.) I fear not. The vast majority will never give up their titles. Mahatma said that Swaraj would come within a year but that was impossible. If his amendment was carried Swaraj would be got in six months (laughter).

A voice.—There might be cases in Court.

Mr. Nehru.—I had no cases in court. If the people acted up to his amended resolution they could get Swaraj in three months. Mahatma's resolution would only trouble the lawyers. Should they not suffer with the lawyers?

Mr. Chiman Lal.

Mr. Chiman Lal said that he was for non-co-operation. They were all for non-co-operation. The only difficulty was about "immediate" and "gradual" non-co-operation; the moderates were against non-co-operation.

President.—Do not refer to parties.

Mr. Chiman Lal.—I am asked not to name parties. I will not do that again.

Mr. Chiman Lal then quoted Messrs. Gokhale, Winston Churchill and others.

The Moslem League had passed the resolution by deleting the word "gradual." He would appeal to the youngmen to carry non-co-operation into practice at once. They must do away with the practice of bloody administration.

Mr. Shamlal's Amendment.

The president then put Mr. Shamlal Nehru's amendment to vote. As he spoke from his chair few could understand him. Even the ladies voted solid against the amendment and it was declared lost.

Babu Bepin Chandra Pal's Amendment.

Babu Bepin Chandra Pal then moved his amendment. He read out the amendment which ran thus:—

"Whereas in the matter of the events of April 1919 both the Indian and the Imperial Governments have grossly neglected or failed to protect the innocent people of the

Punjab and punish officers guilty of unsoldierly and barbarous behaviour towards them and have exonerated Sir Michael O'Dwyer who proved himself directly or indirectly responsible for most of the official crimes and callous to the sufferings of the people placed under his administration and the debate in the House of Commons and specially in the House of Lords betrayed a woeful lack of sympathy with the people of India and showed virtual support of the terrorism and frightfulness adopted in the Punjab,

And whereas the bulk of the European community in India, officials and non-officials, have expressed their sympathy with the said policy of terrorism and frightfulness and are actively raising funds and taking other steps to honour those who have been proved to be guilty of acts of frightfulness and terrorism,

And whereas on the Khilafat question both the Indian and the Imperial Governments have signally failed in their duty towards the Mussalmans of India, and the Prime Minister has deliberately broken his pledged word given to them,

And whereas the disintegration of the Turkish Empire and its division into vassal states as proposed in the Peace Treaty is a source of prospective danger to India,

And whereas the only effective remedy against these wrongs and the only guarantee against their recurrence is the immediate recognition of India's rights to full autonomy,

Be it resolved,

(a) That the Prime Minister be asked to receive a mission composed of representative Indians to be selected by the All-India Congress Committee to lay before him the statement of India's grievances coupled with a demand for immediate autonomy.

(b) That in the case of his refusal to receive this mission

or in the event of his refusal to replace the Reforms Act of 1919 by a measure granting full autonomy to India, a policy of such active Non-co-operation be adopted as would leave no doubt in the minds of the British people that India can no longer be governed as a dependency,

(c) That in the meantime this Congress recommends to the country for favourable consideration and eventual adoption of Mahatma Gandhi's programme of Non-co-operation with such modifications, alterations and additions, either for the whole of India or for particular Provinces to suit special conditions as may be recommended by a Joint Committee consisting of :—

(1) Twenty representatives of the Indian National Congress,

(2) Five representatives of the All-India Moslem League,

(3) Five representatives of the Central Khilafat Committee,

(4) Five representatives of each of such Home-Rule Leagues as accept the principle of Non-co-operation with Mahatma Gandhi as the President of the Joint Committee,

(d) That in the meantime this Congress recommends the immediate adoption of the following measures as preparatory to the actual putting into practice of Mahatma Gandhi's Programme :—

(1) The education of the electorates in the principles of Non-co-operation,

(2) The establishment of National schools,

(3) The establishment of Courts of arbitration,

(4) Renunciation of titles and such honorary offices as are not conferred by the suffrage of the people,

(5) Refusal to attend Government levees, Durbars and such other functions,

(6) The organisation of labour into trade-unions,

(7) The gradual withdrawal of Indian capital from European Banks and such other industrial and commercial concerns in India as are controlled by Europeans and also of Indian Labour from such concerns,

(8) Refusal on the part of the military, clerical and labouring classes to offer themselves as recruits for service outside India except in the event of foreign invasion,

(9) Adoption of Swadeshi especially in piece-goods on a vast scale and revival of hand-spinning and hand-weaving."

Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal while reading out the amendment went on commenting and explaining. Coming to the Khilafat problem he said amidst cheers that even if the Mussulmans had not objected, he, as a nationalist, would have objected to the treatment meted out to the Mussulmans.

They could only try to undo all the wrongs done to them by having in their hands the military control and control of all other departments. There could be no responsible Government protected by the Tommies, the Dyers and the British aeroplanes. They could not have autonomy without full control of everything. What could they do then? They could reduce them to utter helplessness. Fifteen years they dreamt of these things in Bengal. A Magistrate without a case, the University called Golamkhana without a student etc. were their ideas. But those ideas evaporated thanks to the repression of the bureaucrats. Mahatma Gandhi had placed before them progressive non-co-operation only. When it progressed well they would get Swaraj. He was for the adoption of the full programme including non-payment of taxes. He wanted full, complete and effective non-co-operation. He had been asked to proceed step by step. But he would ask them to give the British Government a chance. He therefore asked for a mission to go to the Prime Minister. (No, no, tumultuous cries of

opposition.) He himself was of that opinion. But they must prove to the world that the British Government was in the wrong as Srikrishna wanted to prove that the Kouravas were in the wrong before beginning the fight. If the Prime Minister refused to receive the deputation they would carry out the full programme of non-co-operation. (No mission. It won't help us, the Khilafat mission of Md. Ali had failed). Md Ali had gone with a special mission. He proposed the appointment of a Committee. (Committees are useless). He did not mind whether they appointed Committee or not. He would put his case before them.

Mahatma Gandhi asked you to gradually withdraw students from schools. Mr. Pal asked them to start National Schools and send their children to the National Schools. He was not preaching violent non-co-operation. Was he? (No.) They should force the lawyers to give up practice. He would fall at the feet of the litigants and ask them to withdraw cases from courts and the lawyers would then be forced to give up practice.

The boycott of new councils is in the resolution of Mahatma Gandhi. Mr. Pal was opposed to it. He had asked the people not to co-operate with the Government to make the reforms a success and he had been abused by friends and foes for that. He wanted to make the administration impossible, not the Government. He was not going to stand as a candidate. They should go to the Council, but must not pass any budget or law and let the Governor pass the budget. If this could be done for three years even the moderates would be won over. The people of Eastern Bengal had made the administration well nigh impossible. He would also make the administration impossible. When the Anglo-Indians pull the strings Lord Chelmsford signs as Mr. Lloyd George according to the strings pulled by

the people of England. The Anglo Indian exploiters were the real administrators, and they did what they liked.

Mr. Joyakar.

Mr. Joyakar supported the amendment of Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal. He said that before they carried on warfare they should give the British nation a chance. They ought to tell the British Government that if full autonomy was not granted they would carry on an agitation from one end of the country to the other (cheers.) Missions in the past had been unsuccessful. He would not speak of threat or ultimatum but ought to tell the British nation that it was their ultimatum and that they would go on with non-co-operation if full autonomy was not granted.

Mr. Joseph Baptista.

Mr. Joseph Baptista in seconding the amendment of Mr. Pal said that he was still the same friend of the Khilafat and the Moslem, as he was when he was offered the presidency of the first Khilafat Conference. He was a follower of the great man who was dead—the late Lokemanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak who a few days before his death came to him to form a social democratic party. The great Guru combined the brain of the Bengalee with the practical sense of the Marhatta.

The late Guru wanted to work out the reforms. (A voice.—He is not here). No, I see him here. His spirit is here (cheers). He is a mad man to say that the great Guru is not there. The Government would not touch a hair of the head of Mahatma Gandhi as he was equal to ten thousand policemen. Mahatma Gandhi had made the lion of war, Moulana Shaukat Ali, the lion of peace. He had seen them

woo and woo like the groom and the bride (laughter) and he had said to Moulana Shoukat Ali if he had caught a Tartar.

Mr. Yakub Hossain.

Mr. Yakub Hossain spoke in English and asked the audience to allow him to speak in a language in which he could make them understand well. The British Government in the beginning of the war said that they were going to fight the Germans to have the wrongs of small nations redressed. The Indians therefore had helped the British Government to carry on the war. But instead of helping the small nations the allied nations had destroyed small nationalities. The Punjab atrocities came as the result of the changed feelings of the British nation. They were imperfect men and instead of having perfect schemes they might accept Mahatma Gandhi's scheme as he was the fittest man to cope with the matter.

Mrs. Annie Besant.

Contrary to expectation as soon as Mrs. Annie Besant got up cheers were heard on all sides and as she came to the rostrum there were tremendous cheers of welcome and the venerable lady smiled and acknowledged the welcome.

'She said that the proposals of Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Pal were not universal Non-co-operation. They did not propose to cut off all connections with the Britons. It was nowhere said that they would cut off all connections with the Britons. Could they do without the motor cars and taxis which were all around? They would not do that. How could they then boycott all foreign goods? Why then that hypocrisy? She was against the boycott of the Councils because those councils were sanctified by Sir Pherozeshah Mehta, Mr. Gokale and others for thirty-five years. Should

they give up those Councils? Should they leave the agriculturists where they were? Should they leave the mill labourers in the condition they were? Think of the housing schemes in Bombay. The mill-hands were going to be housed nicely. Should they stop this by not going to the Council? As regards boycotting the schools, Mr. Gandhi might leave the boys without education but would that benefit the country? They could not boycott the Central Hindu College which did not take any Government aid. They could not boycott the Hindu University of which Pandit Malaviya was the heart and soul and who had got several lakhs of Rupees for the University from Bombay.

Pandit Motilal Nehru.

Pandit Motilal Nehru rose amidst cheers but as he wanted to speak in English there was great opposition. He had to speak in Hindi. The condition of the land made him think that the country was then like a badly wounded beast. He gave a history of the Reforms movement and what the Congress had done in the matter. He said that money had been wasted lavishly in sending missions. He could not support Mr. Pal's proposal to send a mission again to England. The British public had not done the least justice to them and it would be unwise to send a mission to England again. He quoted from Tolstoy and said that a people who had not the power of redress should not certainly go to the Councils. He would say to the workers who left them that they could not be of any service to the people by going to the Council. (The speaker after speaking Hindi for some time drifted into English again). The Government had enough notice from them and it was useless to go to England to approach the Prime Minister.

He had been for years in the Council. They were worse

than useless. ✓ They were not justified in going to Council. What were steady steps in 1909? Much water had flown by the Ganges these 12 years. As regards boycotting Government schools if the resolution was passed a committee would be formed to establish schools all over India and when the regular Congress meets in December in Nagpur they would be satisfied with the work the committee had done. (Loud cheers).

Mr. Satyamurti.

After lunch Mr. Satyamurti said that it went against his grains to stand there to support an amendment which was less extreme and less democratic and which was against the proposal of Mahatma Gandhi. The time of parleying with the bureaucracy was gone and they should not go to the Council. But in the beginning they need not boycott the Council (No, No.) But he would hear a different tale in the Nagpur Congress. The electorate would not boycott the Council and would run to the polling booth. His personal experience showed that Till the Nagpur session he should go to the Council and if the Nagpur Congress passed a resolution boycotting the Council they would boycott the Council effectively. In Ireland the Sinn Finners had boycotted Parliament after election and in Egypt the Egyptians did not form a ministry making administration impossible. He wanted Swaraj as much as anybody but he would not like the Congress pass a resolution which was impracticable and to stultify itself. As the Congress had refused to accept the amendment of Mr. Sham-lal Nehru he took it that the Congress was not for wholesale non-co-operation. Why not wait for a few months and decide the matter in the Nagpur session. They were in earnest to begin non-co-operation, but not at once. The late Loke-

manya Balgangadhar Tilak was against the boycotting of Councils. (No. no.) In the Essex Hall Meeting Mr. Tilak got the Boycott resolution defeated. Mr. Kelkar says that Mr Tilak was against the boycott of Council to the last. He would give another authority. Mr. Motilal Ghose, the great nationalist leader of Bengal, the editor of the "Amrita Bazar Patrika," the finest and the best national organ of India (loud cheers), was of opinion that the Councils should not be boycotted (He is wrong). Mr. Ghose might be wrong, but was he not justified in referring to those two great men as his authority. He was not a candidate for membership of any Council. He had suspended his practice as a pleader and he had no children to be sent to school.

Dr. Ansari.

Dr. Ansari said that it had been said that there was no resolution on the Ratona slaughter house or the South African Indians. Perhaps they were not considered in the Subjects Committee. However it was not too late and resolutions might be passed on those subjects. He was there to support the resolution of Mahatma Gandhi (cheers). It was impossible after reading the despatch of the India Government to work with the Bureaucracy. The people could on no account act in co-operation with men who had condoned the Punjab atrocities. In the Reformed Councils the Viceroy and the Governors could pass any resolution they liked without caring for the public. If they went to the council to obstruct, the obstruction would be quite useless. Going to the Council could not be supported or justified by any means. He had the greatest confidence in the people (cheers) and he believed he would get their wholehearted support whenever he went to them.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.

The Honourable Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya who was received with a great ovation said :—

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I need not take up your time by drawing attention to the grave importance of the question which is now before you. Never since the advent of British rule in India had Indians to face a question of the importance of the one which is now engaging your consideration, and I therefore implore you all to bring your calmest judgement to bear upon this question. In the history of British rule never did a situation arise such as we have seen during the last twelve months.

So far as the Khilafat is concerned we used to hear that England regarded Turkey as a great friend. English statesmen used often to acknowledge the friendly services of Turkey in the past and they were anxious to protect Turkey so long as there was a danger of invasion from Russia. Times changed, and policies changed, and came in the Balkan War, and after it came the great European War. By stress of circumstances into which it is unnecessary for me to enter, Turkey joined the War against the Allies. The Allies triumphed and the Allies have now to lay down the terms of the Turkish Treaty. If the Allies had only remembered the promise that they had made during the progress of the War, if the Allies had only acted up to the pledges which they had given to our Musulman fellow-subjects in India who went to fight against Turkey on behalf of England, this question of the Khilafat would not have arisen to-day. But the question has been the creation of England. It is not of our creation. We, Hindus, feel, apart from any considerations of diplomacy, we feel that the great fight which was fought for righteousness has ended in an unrighteous attitude on the part of Eng-

land. We feel that instead of the Victory proving the harbinger of a new era of freedom for small and great nations, it has served to be a new instrument for enslaving other peoples on earth. That is the reason of the sympathy which I believe, the Hindus generally, the Parsees generally, the Indian Christians generally feel with our Mahomedan fellow-countrymen. It is the unrighteousness of the attitude adopted by England. We feel also that a great nation like the Mussulman nation which has had a glorious past, ought not to be subjected to the position, reduced to the position to which they propose to reduce Turkey. For all these reasons and knowing that millions of our Mahomedan countrymen and country-women are sore at heart and feel deeply on this Turkish question. We are face to face with this situation that the feelings of the Indian Mussulmans have been outraged and they are undergoing mental pain and that pain shall not end until some remedy has been found for it. That is the one situation that has arisen.

The second is the Punjab. Last year when I spoke in the Viceroy's Council I expressed the hope that when the acts would be known about the tragedy in the Punjab there would not be an Englishman or an Englishwoman in the British Empire who would not feel aggrieved at what had happened. I regret to confess that my hopes have been shattered to pieces (Shame, Shame). First, the attitude adopted by the Government of India, next the attitude adopted by His Majesty's Cabinet, (Shame), then the attitude adopted by the House of Commons, the great defender of the liberties of nations, after that the attitude adopted by the House of Lords (Shame), have shattered our hopes to pieces. Judicial pronouncements of the Privy Council of England have shattered our hopes to pieces. We are now face to face with this situation that we have proved to the

uttermoſt—we have proved beyond cavil or diſpute—that groſs outrages, brutal outrages had been practiſed upon an armleſs, helpleſs, unoffending people in Amritſar and various other diſtricts of the Punjab and the Government recognised, or rather were forced into accepting our view ſo far as to appoint a committee, and having received that report and the evidence of the public they have in a calm moment practically connived at the wrongs which had been perpetrated (Shame) by excuſing thoſe who have been guilty of them. Siſters and brothers, I am willing to forget the terrible events of Jallianwalla Bagh, grievous as they were, but the thought of the attitude taken up by the Government of Lord Chelmsford and His Maſteſty's Government, the thought of the attitude taken up by the Houſe of Commons and the Houſe of Lords, has been to me a deeper ſorrow than even the maſſacre of Jallianwalla Bagh. I have been exerciſed in my mind as moſt of you have been, as to what remedy, as to whether there was any remedy, to 320 millions of people to undo the wrong which they had not cared to redreſs. I have been as much exerciſed, allow me to ſay ſo, even, I believe, as my eſteemed brother Mahatma Gandhi has been exerciſed. I have diſcuſſed it often with him, I have thought over it and I have been anxious to find a ſolution which would enable us to find ſome ſolace for the people whoſe ſenſe of honour, whoſe ſenſe of ſelf-reſpect has been outraged beyond deſcription. If I felt that a policy of non-co-operation, ſuch as my brother has propoſed, would carry the object, would ſecure the object in view, I would unheſitatingly commend it to your acceptance. But while I recognise that a policy of non-co-operation is in the circumſtances—both in view of the Khilafat and the Punjab tragedy, both on theſe queſtions—a policy of non-co-operation is a perfectly legitimate and conſtitutional policy (hear, hear), while I would have no

hesitation in recommending to my countrymen the adoption of such a policy, I have to remember that it is, after all, a policy, a means to an end. What is the end that we have in view? Helping our Mussalman brethren to rectify the wrong which has been done to Turkey, and undoing the wrong, so far as it is possible, by bringing some punishment on the offenders who perpetrated the wrong in the Punjab.

So far as the last is concerned, some of the officers who were guilty of those atrocities have left the country. Others are leaving. Remember, in the Congress Report, the recommendation made by Mr. Gandhi's Committee was the recall of Lord Chelmsford, not the punishment or dismissal from service of Sir Michael O'Dwyer and certain number of other persons. My brother with that feeling of forgiveness which distinguishes him above many of us did not entertain that desire that these men should be removed from the service. I did not agree with him. I am sorry to say, it is right that I should say so. I told him that he was asking for less than what was due, but I bowed to his judgment, and that little which he had asked for has not been given. But that is what you aim at. Lord Chelmsford will leave this country. He will not stay in this country beyond the 3rd of April next year unless an extension is granted to him which is not likely. He should have left the country long ago in justice to the country, (Hear, hear), in justice to himself, and in justice to the high office which he holds. It is a matter which will ever stand against him that in the situation in which he found himself, or rather he had put himself in spite of the protests from the highest to the humblest among Indians, he continued to enjoy the hospitality of India when India did not want him. (Shame). But he will go. My point is, he will go on the 3rd April. Part of your Punjab grievances will then be remedied. The Punjab officials, some of them,

have gone and others will go. A part of the grievance will have gone. (A voice, Not yet gone). You will not be able to persuade the Government to prosecute them after they have retired from service when you have not been able to persuade them to prosecute them when they are in service.

Now, we are left with the Khilafat question. The Khilafat question is a big question. God knows how I wish that the terms of the Treaty would be revised, and would be made reasonable and just. I consider the terms of the Turkish Treaty harsh and oppressive and unjust, but it will be a long time and will require a long-continued agitation on the part of our Mahomedan fellow-countrymen supported by us and supported by Mahomedans elsewhere before those terms are revised to the satisfaction of our Mussalman brethren.

In, therefore, framing your programme you must as practical men see what is the length of the period for which you are going to adopt a certain policy. How long you are going to non-co-operate with Government and to what extent? What is the goal which you fix to yourself? That goal, some of you may say has been indicated. I say it is very vague and I draw your attention to the length of the period that it must occupy. Having given the matter my earnest consideration, when I was at Bombay I came to the conclusion that the only effectual remedy for the wrongs of the Punjab and for enabling us to undo the wrongs done to the Khilafat is the attainment of full responsible Government in this country. I feel that if we have full responsible government, by which I mean government which will have control over its army and the navy and the air force also, if we have that government, we can to-morrow prevent a single soldier, Indian soldier from going into Mesopotamia, and cutting down our Arab brethren who are fighting for their freedom

and for their religion. (Hear, hear). It is a source of infinite, inexpressible sadness to me, of pain to me that Indian soldiers are at this moment being employed by His Majesty's Government against Arabs and other people in Central Asia while the Government is aware of the sentiment which exists in India. You have not the power to stop it. You, therefore, want the power to stop it. That is one. So also in the matter of the wrongs done in the Punjab. While you remove five or six officials from the Punjab who have actually been connected with those atrocities, you cannot forget that a vast number of officials and non-official Europeans in India have expressed their sympathy with General Dyer and Sir Michael O'Dwyer, (shame). You may cry shame to any extent. That is at present the only power we possess. I ask you now to seek that power which will enable you to require that every European who shall continue in the service of India shall sign a declaration that he regards the Indians as equal fellow-subjects and that he holds Indian life and honour as high and sacred as the life and honour of any European (hear, hear), and tell every fellow, whoever he may be from the Viceroy downwards, that if he regards the life of an European as equal to the lives of a thousand or a hundred or even two Indians he has no place in this country and must leave. That power you want. If you agree with me so far, then you have to approach this question of non-co-operation from the point of view how far this will be a means to obtain the end. I have told you that I regard it as a perfectly constitutional and legitimate weapon. But it has to be used with effect and one essential condition of its being used with effect is that it must be a mass movement, there must be tremendous numbers of people who will take it up. That requires educating. My brother, Mahatma Gandhi, has been educating, Mr. Shaikat Ali and many other

brethern have been educating some of our people in some parts of the country. All honour to them for that. But you will have to educate a very many more people. You have not touched the fringe of the population. You have not penetrated except a very few places. Then, secondly, you have to remember that ideas do not change suddenly. You have to create a conviction that the wrongs to which India is subjected to-day cannot be righted, Indian honour, and life and interest cannot be protected unless we obtain Self-Government in the full sense of the term. (Hear, hear). It will take time. You will have to tell your people, how you are being excluded from the highest ranks of the army. You will have to tell your people how you are not allowed to touch the artillery. You will have to tell your people how the British Army is an Army of occupation to keep us in a condition of serfdom. You will have to tell the people how the fiscal policy of the Government is being pursued in disregard of the protests of the Indian merchants and for the benefit of the British Merchants and traders. You will have to tell other things to your people in order to create a conviction in their minds that the present system of Government shall make room for the system that we want, namely, full responsible Government such as the Dominions of Canada, and Australia and others enjoy.

Now, let us see what is the point to be considered. If that is our aim, there are two courses as previous speakers have pointed out. Either force or policy. Force we are not able to use and we are not prepared to use. Policy has to be pursued. Do you imagine that the British Government, with all the interests which they have established in this country, with all the mighty power, which with the help of our own resources they have built up in this country, are going to vacate their office merely because a few people do

not co-operate with them? Do you believe that the keeping away of children from schools will really paralyse them? Do the civilians care for the education of your people? Will many of them not rejoice if the schools are all closed, or if the education of the people is stopped (Hear, hear). Do you believe that if you do not go to the Courts they will suffer? They have got numerous enough sources of revenue, and the loss of stamp and court-fee revenue will not paralyse the administration. There are cases pending, there are parties to cases. It will take time to settle. You must establish arbitration courts which will inspire confidence among the people. You must organise your resources before you can ask the people to cease to go to law courts (hear, hear). You know, though I did belong to the profession of law, I do not give very much time to it, but I know this much that the profession of law is not such an ugly thing altogether, a bad thing, as some people described. There are good points as well as bad points, and Mr. Manomohan Ghose was the saviour of many a man in Bengal and Mr. C. R. Das and Mr. B. Chakrabarty have stood up to defend many a person who were unjustly accused. Therefore you must proceed step by step. You must organise your strength and your force.

Lastly, I come to the question of the Reformed Councils. I suppose you will acquit me of any ever-burning desire to go to the Legislative Council. I have been there for nearly twelve years, and you will take my word for it,—I am not given to swearing,—that if the Councils were not reformed I would not spend one day more in these Councils, so far as I am concerned, that is to say, if I consulted my own feelings. Just imagine my feeling which I cannot describe to you, which I have felt sitting there, having all the arguments, or the right, or justice on my side, and votes on the side of

the Government. But the Councils are going to be reformed, and even such as the Councils are—you will pardon my referring to an incident with which I was personally connected, but the cause is great and that is my only justification for bringing it in,—you remember I had resigned my seat in the Viceroy's Council. Pandit Motilal Nehru and many other friends pressed me, persuaded me to go back to the Council, and I can tell you, my friends, sisters, and brothers, I can tell you that I thank God that I did listen to their advice and went back to the Council. (Hear, hear). Let me assure you;—and the Punjab friends know it and Mr. Gandhi knows it,—that the raising of the question in the Viceroy's Council, the debate on the Indemnity Bill and the questions which were put and not answered but which were published in the public press rendered a service to the cause of the Punjab which has some value. (Hear, hear). When you start a campaign of full responsible government remember the Britisher is a very tenacious fellow, very dogged in his pertinacity, he will fight to the last, he will use his diplomacy to the last, and he possesses that in a large measure—do you forget that he has used his diplomacy even after the war to put the United States on one side and France on the other side and has received the greatest benefit out of the War? Now, this diplomatic nation, this disciplined nation is not going to yield to you without using every means in its power to keep you out of it? That will be a prolonged period of agitation, of conflict, a peaceful conflict, if you please, but it will be a period of conflict. Do you think that no magistrate, no Superintendent of Police and all the underlings of the executive,—that they will not harass and oppress our people who will join the movement? I wish I could think so. I do not think so. There will be occasion, when you will want your men in the Legislative Council to be there to expose

the wrongs that are being done and there to exercise a restraining influence on the wrong-doers, to bring punishment where it can be possible and it will be possible because you will have an elected majority in the new Councils. My dear brother, Lokamanya Tilak, whose loss the whole country has mourned and whom we needed at this moment more than at any other moment in the country's life, was not an unwise man. But with all his desire to secure complete *Swaraj* at the earliest possible opportunity, if he thought of using the councils he did so because he recognized their practical value. Let me tell you that it was my privilege to see my dear friend on the last day of his life at Poona. I went and saw him and asked him to take up the Presidency of this session. He said, "No, Madan, not I. I would not take it up." I said, "We shall force it on you. We shall overrule your wishes." "No, Madan, I will not. I have made up my mind, and I will not." Do you know what he then talked to me about next? "I have been telling you for three years to organize a permanent deputation to England and the United States and other countries. You have not done so. Pray, take up that question and let us have a permanent organisation which will have to work for some years before we secure full responsible Government." That was his thought on the last day when I met him in Poona. I mention this to show you—certainly you will not accuse Mr. Tilak of any tenderness towards the Government, you will not accuse him of being under any delusion or illusion in the matter of the conflict which has to be fought,—but he clearly recognised that, as you are not going to have a fight with physical force, moral force, pressure of public opinion, that is, moral force, that is the only force you will have to use, and he wanted to enlist the services of as many Labour Members in England as he

could on the side of Indian freedom. He wanted to enlist the moral support of the United States for the cause of freedom in India and that is what I ask you to consider.

You decide you ought to make a declaration. It is not fair to this Congress that you should pass a resolution asking even for full responsible Government in this assembly. I put my view before you. You may decide as you like, but I ought to state to you and to the country that for thirty-five years we have gone on certain lines. We are perfectly entitled to make a departure. As I have said, the time has come in my own belief that we should ask for immediate full responsible Government, but you must tell the country that this is the change that you want the country to adopt. You must give sufficient notice to the country, and at your next session change the creed of the Congress and declare that hereafter one object of the Indian National Congress will be to secure the establishment of full responsible Government at the earliest possible opportunity. Having done that, remember that you have not force, the modern destructive weapons of warfare on your side. You have not even half or even one fourth of the officers in the Indian Army Indians and therefore you must send a deputation to England to tell the English Cabinet, not to beg, not to petition, not to appeal merely for mercy, but tell them face to face, man to man as equal fellow-subjects, as equal fellow-men that this is the conclusion to which we have been driven by the failure of your administration to subserve our Indian ends and interests, and that we have come to the decision that we shall not be happy, we shall not cease to agitate, we shall give ourselves no peace, give you no peace, until the establishment of full Swaraj. Don't, I beg you, underestimate the forces that are arrayed against you in the conflict you are going to take up. Remember the case of Ireland. Is there an Indian who

has not the deepest, the fullest sympathy with Ireland in her long-continued suffering and long-continued fight for freedom, and yet think of the case of Ireland. The people are armed, they have weapons, they used them too, and they have used their seats in Parliament for such a long period, and still it is sad to think that they have not yet attained the full self-government they want, they have not attained the autonomy which they want. God knows how much longer they have to fight. Do you not note that the presence of a section of the people among the labourites in England who are friendly to the cause of Ireland has been of great value to the Irish? Do you not think that if the Labourites had not sympathised with Ireland the militarists in England would have massacred thousands of Irish people by the time? And if the United States did not stand at the back of Ireland would not the English militarists and imperialists have felt greater freedom in cutting down the Irish people? These facts have been of value to Ireland, and you should not throw them away as despicable. I know that Mr. Gandhi has tremendous heart-power, but with all that he expects and hopes, I do feel it my duty to ask you and him not to underestimate the difficulties that lie in our path and not to be oversanguine as to the results of non-co-operation. (Hear, hear.)

Now, I will not detain you long. My whole point I will try to briefly put before you. I have come to the conclusion that life in this country is not worth living if we do not, man and woman, brother and sister, endeavour to the best extent of our power to establish full responsible government at the earliest possible opportunity. I feel that this is such a great, such a glorious task, such a sacred task, that we should not throw away any of our forces nor increase the difficulties in our path. I feel that we have to unite our people much more than has been done. I value Hindu-Mussulman unity.

It is that which enables me to speak as I am speaking to-day, **and I pray to God that it may grow and endure and that our Mahomedan brethren and we should think as one people and should act as one people in all that concerns our country.** I feel, that being so, we should discipline and organise and the discipline and the organisation will require a tremendous agitation, a tremendous propaganda. You will have to go all over the country, into every home. The conviction will have to be created that for the interests, for the honour, for the good name of India, for the happiness and prosperity of the millions of India it is essential that Indians shall rule in India as Englishmen rule in England. (Hear, Hear). That will require time, and therefore I say let us take time. Let us proceed as even a general or generals would proceed in a military fight. This is a constitutional warfare upon which you are launched. Don't underestimate, don't neglect, don't ignore the great difficulties that lie ahead. Let us have this determination. My Mahomedan brethren may say, probably some of them will say, that shelves the question. My friend, my countrymen, my brethren, let me assure you as a simple humble man, as a simple fellow-man, that I have no desire absolutely to shelve this question for one moment. I have placed before you my reasons for the course which I ask you to consider. I believe that by this course we shall serve Turkey and our friends better than by any impetuous, impulsive action whatever self-sacrifice it may involve.

I feel that, though you may, some of you may feel angry with me, as some of you did feel angry when I expressed these sentiments (No. No.)—I thank you for that—I feel that you will in your calm moments consider these few ideas that I have placed before you. I repeat that I do think that it is the duty of every Hindh, and Pārsi and Indian Christian in India to stand by his Mussulman fellow-

countrymen in their fight for a reasonable and just revision of the Turkish Treaty (Hear, hear). But I feel that I shall not be doing my duty to you, that I shall be deceiving you, if I do not tell you what I feel of the situation. My conviction is that though by this path the day of retribution, the day of justice being done may be delayed, the day will come as sure as the sun will rise again to-morrow. That is my conviction. It is not a small fight, It is a big fight, it is a fight for the freedom not merely of Turkey, but of Asia as against Europe. (Hear, hear). It is a fight for the freedom of the people who have inherited the noble civilisation which you, my Mussulman brethren, have been privileged to inherit and which we, Hindus, have been privileged to inherit. Let not the inheritors of these ancient civilisations, by a little impulsiveness, by a little want of patience, by a little want of foresight, by neglecting the tactics which are recognised as honourable and reasonable in all warfare, whether military or civil, let us not neglect the opportunity that lies before us. The Hindu-Mussulman unity I hope and pray God, may live and endure. I hope that the delay in taking action in these directions will not put a severe strain upon their feeling of brotherliness which has been created in their minds. I beg you to approach the question in this manner. Let me say this. I am not fond of being a member of any deputation. I do not wish to approach the Viceroy or the Prime Minister of England as a supplicant. I consider it hurts my national sense of self-respect that I should have to propose the adoption even of the course which I have suggested, but let us face facts. Our hands have gone down under a heavy stone which is brimful of points. It is not good to take it off by a scratch, it will only hurt us and not enable us to take it off. • Time is a factor. Let us not allow any time to pass without a determination to work, to work

from now, as many of you, Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Shaukat Ali are working. Let us all take a solemn resolve to do all that lies in our power in reasonable discussion to facilitate the grant of full responsible government. Continue your agitation for the Khilafat alongside it. You have not found, I hope, any Hindu of any note standing in the background in this matter. We are with you. Continue also to ask for redress of the Punjab grievances. Personally I have put that aside from my mind. I feel that there will be no remedy until we get full responsible government. That, therefore, is my earnest humble recommendation to you. I am sorry by reason of the views which I have tried to put forth before you, I have to differ from my esteemed brother, Mr. Gandhi. I do not accept his proposition because he wants to withdraw children from schools. I wish every child should be sent to the school. I wish to multiply the number of schools and colleges. Our children are the soldiers of the next few years. If the Germans, the English and the French had their army classes of 1917, 1918 and 1919, we must also have our soldiers of the future at school receiving instruction. We are 320 millions. Without withdrawing children from the schools we can make an impression upon the Government. So also with regard to the law-courts. I do not like the law-courts. I hope the time will come and it will soon come when we should establish arbitration courts in every *mohulla* so that criminal and civil cases should be decided there, and those who want to go to courts to complete their cases or obligations or to settle them, let them go. Even after we have established arbitration courts, if some will go, let them go. I have told you about the Councils.

The whole object of these proposals is to make Government feel that the people are angry and that they will not co-operate with the Government. Have we not made it

clear by what we are saying? Let us make it clear in every possible way, but let us not adopt methods by which much suffering and self-sacrifice will be inflicted upon our people without a corresponding gain.

Lastly I am sorry to say that I am not even in full agreement with Mr. Pal's amendment though I like it much better in many respects than Mr. Gandhi's resolution. The thing I want to say is this and I have done. If you adopt a policy of full responsible government as a means to remedy the wrong done to the Khilafat, as a means to remedy the wrong done to the Punjab, and above all, as a means for the future growth and independence and prosperity of the great Indian nation, then I say, if you decide to send a deputation to England, do not let it be accompanied with a threat. Threat is not a good thing to hold out, until the time has come when we can execute it. I am not afraid of holding out a threat, but the threat should go when the time has come for it. If you send a deputation it will be merely bad tactics, it will not be good tactics, to let it be accompanied with a threat. My second reason is regarding your proposition about the withdrawal of capital from European Banks and labour from European concerns. Let there be as much Indian Labour employed under Indian Managers as possible. Let the Indians organise and take up as many more industries as they can, but don't by beating the drum, raise your opponent and don't warn him to take action against your own men without taking action yourselves to help your people. For these reasons I am sorry I am not in agreement with Mr. Pal's amendment. But as I have said his amendment is in better form, more in keeping with the spirit of what I have tried to submit to you and I recommend this to your consideration. I thank you for the patient hearing you have given me. (Loud and continued cheers).

Moulana Abdul Kalam Azad.

Moulana Abdul Kalam Azad said that the only true and sure remedy for their grievances was non-co-operation and if that be so, was it beneficial and good to them to delay using that remedy? There was no other remedy and why should they lose time in making arrangements and preparations?

Mr. Jamunadas Dwarkadas.

Mr. Jamunadas Dwarkadas said that he opposed both the resolution and the amendment. (Most tremendous shouts of opposition for minutes together). After Mrs. Annie Besant had spoken on the subject he need not say much. Boycott of British goods was impossible. (Most tumultuous uproar in spite of the presidential admonitions and the speaker's voice was drowned). He was endorsing what Mr. Gandhi said. Unless the British Banks gave a guarantee, no German or Swiss goods could be imported. He asked for a patient hearing as the president had invited him to speak, saying that a patient hearing would be given to him.

President.—I must ask you to hear him patiently. He will stand there so long as you do not hear him. I will not even ask the interference of Mahatma. He has been invited to speak and you must give him a patient hearing. You may vote against him but you must hear him.

(There was some silence then.)

As soon as the speaker quoted some words from Mr. Gandhi's speech on Civil disobedience and spoke of the danger of Civil disobedience the whole audience opposed by cries and cheers and the speaker was not allowed to speak practically.

He said that the Khilafat Conference had passed a resolution* saying that if the non-co-operation movement failed they would do what they liked. What did that mean? The Satyagraha movement had to be suspended last year and the non-co-operation movement would have to be suspended if violence came in. (The speaker was simply drowned in opposition cheers and cries)

Mr. J. L. Bannerjee.

Mr. J. L. Bannerjee in supporting the resolution of Mr. Gandhi said :—

Mr. President, brother delegates, ladies and gentlemen, I cannot say like my friend Mr. Jamunadas Dwarkadas that I shall oppose both the resolution and the amendment, rather I stand here very much to support Mahatma Gandhi's resolution (hear, hear) and very much to oppose the amendment of Babu Bepin Chandra Pal. I want to make this position perfectly clear lest it should be fancied that Bengal opinion is wholly against Mahatma Gandhi. Gentlemen, permit me at the very outset to refer to a point which was raised by the Hon'ble Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and which was greatly applauded by many among the audience. Speaking in defence of his proposal to enter the Council, Pandit Malaviya has said that much useful information could sometimes be elicited by questions and he referred very modestly to his magnificent efforts in this connection. I shall take him up with this very point and shall show that he is not acting to his own emotion (hear hear). Gentlemen, no doubt, the Hon'ble Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya got much information for us—he bore up a gallant fight in the council. We praise him for all that, but in his fight in our cause how often was he not taunted, rebuffed, snubbed and humiliated by civilian officers unworthy to touch the very

latchet of his shoes. Besides, were his questions answered? And even when the questions were answered, were the wrongs of the Punjab rectified and did the information awaken the conscience of the English? Nothing of the sort. All these were labours misspent—a strenuous energy for the good of the country misused. Had he used all this energy for the purpose of organising the country, solidifying its resources, mobilising the strength how much more beneficial would this have been. That was my point. Not that his labours were unpatriotic, but that his labours were fruitless from the necessity of things. So long as this degrading system of rule continues, so long all our labours in the council are doomed to be fruitless.

Gentlemen, here in the course of this debate the honoured name of Lokamanya Balgangadhar Tilak has been taken, I shall not say taken in vain, but taken to justify a course of which his life, his whole career was one long contradiction. Many people have given you their reminiscences of Lokamanya Tilak. I also, in my humble way shall be able to give a reminiscence not borrowed from others like Mr. Satyamurti, but a reminiscence of myself. I have had the honour of seeing Lokamanya Tilak at Benares. I met him in the house of our revered leader, Babu Motilal Ghosh. He was against the boycott of councils.

A voice—Then?

Mr. Bannerjee—Wait. There is a significant sentence that followed.

Mr. Bannerjee continuing, said that he (Mr. Tilak) was against the boycott of councils. But he said "If our Mahomedan brethren adopt it we shall have to stand by them." Do not, therefore, misjudge Lokamanya Tilak—do not misinterpret his words. Had he been living to-day—had he been watching the current of affairs, who knows what

course he would have adopted? For my part, I am perfectly sure that as a means of bringing the gulf between the Hindus and Mahommedans closer he would never have hesitated but would have cast in his lot with the Non-co-operation movement heart and souls (hear, hear).

Gentlemen, in supporting the resolution of Mahatma Gandhi and in opposing the amendment of Mr. Pal, I confess that I rise to do so with a sense of some pain and anguish. This time—the first time in five years—that I have occasion to differ from Mr. C. R. Das and Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal. But there are occasions in the life of human individuals and nations when personal consideration must sink into nothing—when we must stand up only for the truth—when we must stand up only for the light—when we must stand up only for justice—when we must stand up only for our country—let all else sink into oblivion (hear, hear).

Gentlemen, please turn to Mr. Pal's amendment and I shall show you how futile it is. Mr. Pal accepts the principle of non-co-operation, not simply that, he adopts the programme of Mr. Gandhi. He recommends it for immediate consideration and, to use his circumlocutory language, for eventual adoption. Immediate consideration and eventual adoption! He accepts the principle—he accepts the programme. What then is the difficulty? What must be the steps then? He says, wait, let us send a mission to England—another expedition of mendicancy. People say that resources for this mission have been exhausted. But according to Mr. Pal the resources of mendicancy are inexhaustible. Names may be different. Pandit Madan Mohan Malavia in accordance with his peaceful nature called it a deputation. Mr. Pal calls it a political mission. Mr. Jinnah yesterday called it in military style—an ultimatum. But, mission, deputation and ultimatum, whatever you may please to call it, it comes to the same and

another violent effort of mendicancy. Your kicks of the past, your rebuffs of the past may not have been enough. But you want to send another deputation for what and to whom? He says,—send a deputation to the Prime Minister. Apart from the absolute futility of the whole thing, mark also the indecent and hopeless character of the whole business. What has the Prime Minister to do in this matter? How can he help you in this? Have you not had enough of the British Parliament—have not you had enough of the House of Lords and the House of Commons both? Why should you discount recent experience? Why do you build your hopes upon a foundation which is absolutely insecure and which is absolutely unreliable? Gentlemen, this question of sending a mission is not the only point of difference. There is another point of difference—that is the vital point, viz. the boycott of the election to the councils. Two months ago—three months ago—one had thought that Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal was not very keen about these elections. But now he thinks that the fate of the country stands or falls with these elections. If the fate of the country was such a fragile affair one should really despair of it. He says, we must get elected, why? for the purpose of paralyzing the government. 'I beg his pardon. He made a metaphysical distinction between government and administration—he said that he was not going to paralyse the government but he was going to paralyse the administration. In other words, he would not paralyse the body but only the function of the body. The difference of such a metaphysical distinction may be appreciated by Mr. Pal, but an humble mortal like myself fails to perceive it. In any case, how is this wonderful paralysis of the administration to be effected? He says, 'We shall go and refuse to vote the budget,' but gentlemen, the budget is not for you to give your vote to or withhold

from. It is possible only so far as supplies are concerned. A curious fallacy lies at the bottom. So far as the revenues of the Government are concerned it wholly lies with the Government. Your paralysis will not deprive them of one solitary penny- it will not deprive them of one solitary nickel coin of their income. All that you can do even as regards expenditure—the bulk of it—at least the four-fifths of it—is beyond your control, placed within the clutches of the Reserved Department. You can only make some alterations in the allotments of the Transferred Department. And even there your power is for temporary delay—for some temporary embarrassment. And in order to obtain this shadow of power should you like to undergo this waste of time—this waste of energy that may be necessary for this kind of thing? Some of our critics have said—what do you gain by boycotting the councils? By boycotting the councils, we gain nothing, most probably excepting that we have energy at our disposal. We have time at our disposal and money at our disposal for organising the country solid for non-co-operation, but beyond that there is another point which you must take into consideration and that is the great problem—what you must do with your Mahomedan brethren. They had adopted this course—they have adopted this programme. Are you going to stand by them or are you going to take your stand behind such reformed council of yours? Gentlemen, Islam stands at your gate—expectant and hopeful, I may almost say, stands with the right hand of fellowship outstretched towards you. The question is what you will do. Will you grasp this right hand of fellowship and side by side, hand in hand and shoulder to shoulder march on along the path which leads to the shining mansions that are the abode of freedom? Will you do that? Or, will you, upon narrow technical grounds of mean temporary ex-

pediency, reject the proffered friendship of Islam and stultify yourself and stultify your country? That is the great problem before you. And so far as that is concerned, I beseech you, think well, think wisely—think not for this moment but for the years and centuries to come before you decide—before you set seal upon your destiny. (Loud cheers)

Mr. C. R. Das.

President, ladies and gentlemen, I rise to support Mr. Pal's amendment. I do not desire to take up much of your time in discussing the question as I feel that almost everything has been placed before you for your consideration. I desire to say one or two words which struck me as of importance and which I feel most, before you come to a decision on this most important question.

Mr. Gandhi has told you that although—
A voice—Please call Mahatma Gandhi. Mr. Das.—Yes, Mahatma Gandhi. But I want to tell you that I yield to none of you in my reverence for Mahatma Gandhi. Please do not interrupt me in that way.

Mr. Das continuing said, Mahatma Gandhi had told you that the only test which you are applying for coming to decision is not the test of his personality but the test of reason. I therefore feel entitled to appeal to your reason. If the question had been between myself and Mahatma Gandhi as personalities I would not have thought fit to trouble even one single man because, however, much we may differ, this may be admitted and gratefully admitted that he is the greatest personality to-day in Indian public life (hear, hear). The question is not of his personality here at all as he has told you. The question is what are the reasons upon which you may be asked to adopt Mr. Pal's amendment. The question has

been discussed threadbare. It is admitted by all—all of us are agreed—when I say all, I say practically all are agreed that the only goal at the present moment is complete responsible government. There is no dispute as regards that. It is not new that we have come to this conclusion. When the Congress was held in Bombay, I mean the [special session of the Congress, I thought then that the only things to ask for was complete responsible government. I did not then do it because at that time there was a split and we all expected that if we lowered our demand our friends who had kept away from the Congress would come in. At Delhi after that, I was of opinion to put forward our demand for complete responsible government. We did not do it for the same consideration.

Gentlemen, after that there was the Punjab occurrence and you have got before you the Khilafat question. I will not discuss them. I will say this that if I was of opinion before these occurrences that the only thing to ask for is complete responsible government, my opinion is hundred times stronger to-day that the only thing worth living for, worth fighting for, is complete responsible government (hear, hear). We are, therefore, all of us agreed on that question.

The next question is—"what is the means." Please do not, I pray you, attach importance to such insignificant things as the sending of a mission or deputation to England. I know that it means nothing. I take it out of the amendment. It does not lose its strength in my opinion. I am not asking you to go as a beggar. We have ceased to do that from the year 1907 and I am not weaker to-day than I was in 1907. Call it a deputation, call it a mission, call it a mockery, have it or reject it, that does not touch the question which you have got to decide. Do not be carried away by side issues.

The only question before you to-day is Non-co-operation, and the applicability or the practical methods of non-co-operation. There is no other issue before you. There is no question whether Non-co-operation is or is not the only possible ideal. Some say it is the only possible ideal. There is no other ideal. The question is not of ideal. We are practically agreed upon that. But the question is what are the effective steps that we are to adopt at the present moment. That is the only question. Now, gentlemen, I ask you to consider this. Do Mahatma Gandhi's practical steps, I mean his proposal before you, constitute the ideal or does not constitute the realisation of that ideal at the present day at the present moment? That is a question we have now got to answer. If my revered friend speaks after me probably he will answer that question. I have not yet heard his answer. "Surrender of all titles and honorary offices and resignation of nominated seats in the local bodies,"--is it to be done at the present moment--the present day, or is it to be done in the course of five years or is it to be done in course of ten years? Do we start now? If not to start now, then are there any practical steps to be adopted at the present moment? Let us not delude ourselves--let us not take shelter in the verbiage of words and phrases.

Then gradual withdrawal of children from schools and colleges.--What does it mean? Is it an ideal? If it is an ideal, is it practical? If it is a step to be taken now do not say gradual. I want to know--I have got to exercise my vote, I am entitled to know--what is it that you mean. Do you mean that the children are to be taken away from schools and colleges at once? Do you mean that (no, no)? No, then gentlemen, it is an ideal, it is not a practical step. It is an ideal not to be realised.

A voice--Mahatma Gandhi will answer.

Mr. Das—Yes, Mahatma Gandhi will reply. I will not run away and if I find reasons against me I will accept them.

Mr Das continuing said, "Only I am drawing this distinction between the ideal and the application of it at the present day. That is not in its power. It does not appear to me as a realisation of that ideal at the present moment. All that I want to impress on you is this : Let our policy of Non-cooperation be not a mockery of words. If you mean it, if it is to be the injunction of the highest National Assembly in this country, let it be in terms which can be understood by everybody who has got the intention, the desire to follow that injunction (hear, hear). I am a humble servant of the Indian National Congress. I want an injunction in the clearest possible terms. I want to know—am I to take my children from our schools and Maktabas? (no, no). I am told no. Therefore do not put it forward as a practical step at the present moment. Even great proposals must be admitted to logical treatment. I heard a voice say—no, not now. Is it to be after the establishment of national educational institutions? (yes, yes). Ah, I know that. That is what the amendment provides—not to take away our children at the present moment from the schools (clap and laughter) before we establish national educational institutions where we may take those children. Do not try to raise the second story before you put up the ground floor (hear, hear). But that injunction upon us and you will find no more devoted servant than I am to carry it out. Put a tax on the people of India, on the servants of the Indian National Congress, put an injunction on us to give a certain percentage of our income to that fund and with that fund start national schools. And after you have provided schools for our children the man who will keep away his children in government schools and

colleges will be a traitor to his country. If you want me to withdraw my children from schools before that do you expect that other children in India should come out of their schools schoolless possibly to foster anarchy and other crimes? Do you want to do that? (No, no). Then kindly wait till you establish your national schools. If you cannot establish national schools it is no use talking tall and big, it is no use sending missions and petitions. You are such a mighty nation, I want to test your capacity.

I am an idealist, but at the same time a practical man. I want to test your courage. Is it a stage courage or is it a real courage? I want to hear you. Do not deceive yourself and do not deceive others. I do believe in the inherent capacity of my race. I will not say one word against the possibility of the great Indian nation that is in the making. I say nothing against that. On the contrary, if I do not believe in my race I would cease to live. It is that which comforts me under this government, it is that ideal of the Indian nationality that keeps me up and gives me courage, fortitude and patience in all circumstances under which we are placed. I am not doubting the possibility—it is the inherent possibility — and pray to God that that possibility may realise itself. We shall do everything in our power to bring that about and the only way to bring that about is not idle talk. Build up your schools, build up your colleges, then pass an injunction against all Indians to send their children to those schools.

Then I find the gradual boycott of British courts by lawyers. What is the meaning of that again? "Do you want the lawyers to give up practice today? (no, no). Ah, I know that; do not think that I am against it. If you pass this resolution to-day, to-morrow I cease to go to court. I want to know what is the command of the Indian National

Congress. I ask Mahatma Gandhi to reply, because I have got no reply to make after him. I will take it that he has got no reply. I am not a great man. I am what I am—an humble servant of the Indian National Congress, ever ready to carry out its command; and with what very little service I have done in the course of the last few years in the cause of the Indian National Congress I ask you, am I entitled to know what is your command? Or am I not entitled to know it? Am I to follow the Indian National Congress or am I to follow Mahatma Gandhi's every now and then? •Tell me what I ought to do.

Pandit Motilal Nehru.—I rise to a point of order. Is it open to a member of the Congress to stand up and question?

Mr. Das.—I am entitled to know I say and my own reason is this. If you feel that you are strong enough at the present moment—and whatever this non-violent non-co-operation might be—if you feel it in your heart of hearts, not in words, put your hand on your breast and answer that question. If you feel it necessary, then why these series of 'graduals.' (hear, hear.)

Mr. Das continued :—

I now come to the most important question which is a source of difference between myself and Mahatma Gandhi and that is the boycott of the councils. My answer is very short. It is not as if I am asking you to go to the council as the only practical step towards the realisation of the ideal of Non-co-operation. I am willing to accept everything that Mahatma Gandhi has laid down. Only I want to have it made clear as to whether it is gradual or whether it is immediate. I am willing to accept every part of it and all that I say is this—do not leave it for the application of the same principle of Non-co-operation. I was told this morning by Mahatma Gandhi that the only question is whether you

should attain Swarajya through the council or without the council. I submit that do not dispose of the question which is raised, it is not through the council that I seek to attain Swarajya. (hear, hear). I want to make the council my instrument to the attainment of Swarajya. As I have said before, I repeat that this measure of reform-do not attach the slightest importance to it. These measures of reform are not fit to be touched. But because you have got something in your hand which can be used for the purpose with which it is secured will you not exercise it for securing something else? Do not think, gentleman, that the Reform Act is a gift of the British Government. I deny that entirely. (hear hear). It is not a gift, it is something which is wrung out of the British Government. You have got that. You have earned that. It is an instrument which is in the hollow of your hands. Will you use it or will you give it up on sentimental grounds? (voices of no, no). I say sentimental for this reason because the only argument I have heard up to now is this that it is not practicable that you will get a majority of nationalist members. I pause to ask this question to you. Do you think it more practicable that the lawyers should cease to practise? If you go on waging this battle of Non-co-operation day after day and year after year I may tell you that though it may not be practicable this year, by the next election you will get a vast majority in your favour and at that precise moment you will be able to use that weapon to secure what not? —a little modicum of great legislation from this legislature. I beg of you, gentlemen, not to give up this weapon, but use that weapon as a means to wring full complete Swarajya for India (hear, hear). Use all other methods that you may, but use this also. I cannot understand the wisdom of giving up that which you have already secured, which you have acquired, which you have

earned by the labours of your last thirty-five years. Will you give that up? I am not asking you to give up any other method of Non-co-operation, but do not give this up. Gentlemen, with these observations I ask you to accept the amendment which has been put forth before you. (Loud Cheers.)

Pandit Rambhuj Datta Choudhury.

Pandit Rambhuj Datta Choudhury supported Mahatma Gandhi's resolution and said that Mahatma Gandhi spoke of gradual taking away of boys and girls from Government schools. It could not be done all at once. Formation of national schools and withdrawal of boys and girls from Government schools must go hand in hand. Mahatma Gandhi said that they should serve the public and at the same time carry on non-co-operation. Should they give up the seven crores of Mussalmans, should Mahatma Gandhi ask the Mussalmans to give up the councils because the Khilafat Conference had resolved on a boycott and ask the Hindus to go to the council because the Congress had said so? They must all be ready to sacrifice everything for their motherland if they wished for its improvement and salvation. Mahatma Gandhi said that the council was a trap and not a fort or an arsenal. If they acted up to the advice of Mahatma Gandhi they would get Swaraj in one year.

Mr. Jinnah.

Mr. Jinnah who was received with cheers said that he had already spoken in the Moselem League. It was a great national problem that they were considering that day. One wrong after another wrong had been heaped upon them. The Khilafat was the last straw loaded on the camel's back. The question they had to consider was what should they

do now. The difference between Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Bepin Ch. Pal was when to begin non-co-operation. The audience was there surcharged with excitement. Would they tell him when he should give up practice. (To-day,—to-morrow). A voice says "to-day", another says "to-morrow" (cheers.) (President rings the bell as warning not to argue with the members of the Congress).

Mr. Banerjee spoke in a jocular view of deputation, mission etc. Did not Mahatma Gandhi send his ultimatum to the Viceroy?

A Voice.—It is done.

Mr. Jinnah.—Not from the Indian National Congress (cheers.)

Mr Jinnah —Why did not Mahatma Gandhi put into practice the whole programme at once. It was a policy of non-co-operation and there was no principle in it. The policy of non-co-operation was excellent and effective, but there was a great "if." It was said that they should not fail to stand by the Musalmans. He was a Moslem himself and he had worked for unity long. They must not be misled. Mr Winston Churchill had three "ifs" when speaking of the Indians.

Mahatma Gandhi.

Mahatma Gandhi, in replying to the criticism against his resolution, said :-

Mr. President and friends, I know that it is most cruel to keep this vast audience for any length of time, but I know that I have got to perform a duty by you and I shall answer some of the many objections that have been raised against the points in the proposition that has been put before you.

You have now listened to all the speakers but one with respectful attention. I am exceedingly sorry that you refused

to hear Mr. Jamunadas Dwarkadas. But you have heard Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya. You have heard Mr. Jinnah and you have heard Mr. C. R. Das—a host in themselves. You have heard also the arguments advanced by Mrs. Besant and several other speakers. They have all a splendid record of services behind them and they have hitherto led the Congress and for a number of years they have given you their best services and I know that you will give all the arguments that have been advanced against my proposition the best consideration that their experience entitles them to. But at the same time I am here to tell you that with all my anxiety to be convinced of any error of judgment or otherwise that I might have committed, I stand unconvinced.

It has been suggested just now by Mr. Jinnah, as also by Mr. C. R. Das, that this programme is impracticable and I suppose that it is also suggested that it is unpractical. Now, if it is impracticable it is not capable of being practised—that is the meaning of the word. But I venture to suggest to you that it is capable of being practised by every one to-day who is affected by the several items. There is the introduction of the word “gradual” and Mr. C. R. Das has very properly laid emphasis upon the word ‘gradual’ in order to show that it is a recognition of the impracticable nature of at least two items—the schools and the lawyers. I respectfully differ from him. In my opinion the introduction of the adjective is a concession to our weakness and a recognition of our unreadiness. And I admit that with the introduction of the adjective the two items may be absolutely whittled down. It will depend largely upon the sense of indignation that has really fired the nation and it will still more largely depend upon the work that may be put into the programme by the real workers and you may depend upon it that so long as the Non-co-operation Committee started

by the Central Khilafat Committee, is in existence, so long will you find these items and many more continuously placed before you for acceptance and every argument and every inducement will be held out to you, not pecuniary but every inducement in the interest of the nation, every appeal will be made to your patriotic spirit in order that you may be stimulated to action. I have not the slightest doubt even with the experience of a month and a half behind me in saying that we shall have a fairly good response from the country. I contend that the programme is not unpractical but it is practical in the sense that anybody who wishes to enforce these items can do so to-day. It is not a physical impossibility with him, as practically it is, if he wanted really to enforce a complete boycott of foreign goods. In my humble opinion that is a practical impossibility as these items are undoubtedly not. I have given you my reasons for accepting this item in my programme, only because I believe as that in theory it is a sound thing, but I was most anxious to place before the nation only those things which the nation if it was willing and ready, could put into practice to-day. Let me not conceal one great fact from you. I do suggest to you that if you want to carry out the programme of non-co-operation as it has been sketched by me it is expected of you and you will find in the course of our peregrinations that which we shall be continuously dinning into your ears—it is expected of you that if it is at all possible for you you will withdraw your children from schools to-morrow and that lawyers will suspend their practice from to-morrow. But as I have said, if you have not the ability, if you have not the immediate readiness the introduction of the adjective gives you thinking time. I decline to accept the interpretations that some of the audience laid upon these two items when questioned by Mr. C. R. Das, that they are to withdraw

their children when the schools are ready. That, in my opinion, is building before the foundation. I cannot put a handsome pile of buildings or even erect a cottage without having children to educate. And when a nation is at war --violent or non-violent,-it is an indispensable condition that it stops the schools and colleges and its law courts. Two wars I have gone through myself, and in all these two wars I noticed that the schools remained in suspended animation and so were the law-courts closed. The result was-or rather because the litigants had no time to think of their private quarrels and the parents came to the conclusion that the best education that the children could receive at a time, critical in their history was that they should understand that it was better for them to have their education suspended for a time than that they should remain in a state of slavery (hear, hear). These two items, therefore, are undoubtedly the test of our feeling in the matter and if the nation feels, will the nation act up to these two things ?

Much has been made of want of notice and if the facts were as they are supposed to be, I think that it would be sound argument, but perhaps it has escaped even Babu Bepin Chandra Pal's notice and I feel it has escaped even Mr. Jinnah's notice that really this question of notice arises only because of the introduction of a new element in the programme, viz. the demand for Swarajya ; and you are making a new demand for Swarajya ; perhaps the argument would be final that we as an honourable nation ought to give a clear and emphatic notice to the British people. But in my programme it is not put even in that fashion. I have said that without Swarajya it will be impossible to prevent a repetition of the wrongs such as have been inflicted in connection with the Punjab and therefore in this programme Swarajya is not an independent demand but it is a demand

made because in the opinion of the Congress it is necessary in order to guard against future contingencies to have Swarajya. In my humble opinion, there is absolutely nothing wrong in it. But I go further. Both Mr. Jinnah and Mr. Malaviya have accepted Babu Bepin Chandra Pal's programme. You will find therein that some of the items are to be enforced from to-morrow and what the amendment states is that the other items will be reduced to practice later on. Pending, you will see the expression there meanwhile, that is to say, while the Mission is conducting its affairs some portion of the non-co-operation programme is to be enforced from to-morrow and why not? It is a mistake to suppose that there was a notice given to the Viceroy by an individual. It was a notice given by one of the most important bodies that is in existence at the present moment in India, that is the Central Khilafat Committee. I think it is the duty of the Congress, at least it will be graceful for the Congress to recognise the status of a body which represents seven crores or nearly one-fourth of the whole population of India, and I think that the Congress may hold that notice sufficient for its purpose without in any way damaging its prestige or the prestige of the whole nation which are convertible terms.

I now come to the final point, the pivot, namely, the boycott of Councils. I must confess that I have not yet heard a single argument in favour of going to the Councils. All the argument that has up till now been advanced is that, seeing that we have done something even through these Councils during the thirty-five years, seeing that the reformed council is really in response to our agitation, which I admit and seeing that there is greater scope for obstruction if we can command a majority by influencing the voters which too I admit, we may be able by going to the councils to paralyse

the government or the administration as the case may be. In my humble opinion, as a somewhat superficial, but nevertheless as a student of history—and in English history I have found it practically the maxim adopted in English public life—that every institution thrives on obstruction and when we seek election to the council I assure you that the Government will be pleased. They will not be pleased to see the nationalists outside the Council. I am aware that the Government are eager to-day to have the Nationalists in the council in order to impair their power. You will take my evidence for what it is worth. It may be bad evidence but it is there. But this is my firm opinion that the services that public men, who want to work for all their worth, can render outside the council, are infinitely greater than the services, that we can do being inside the council. What is the secret of the great power of the late and only Lokamanya in the country? Do you suppose that if he had gone to the council he would have exercised that unrivalled influence that he exercised over the millions of Indians? (cries of, no, no). You have had the evidence given before you in connection with his opinion. I am exceedingly sorry that you had not anything brought before you as to what he considered in connection with the programme of non-co-operation, but as the matter has been brought before you it has become my painful duty to give you the evidence that is in my possession. I happened at his wish to wait upon him nearly a fortnight before his demise in company with Maulana Shaukat Ali and he said these words, "I personally believe that it will be better to go to the councils and obstruct where it was necessary and co-operate where also it was necessary." But when Maulana Shaukat Ali told him what about his promise to the Mussalmans in Delhi at which also I was present, he immediately added "O, yes, if the Mussalmans

do the thing " and he laid emphasis on it, not merely spoke " but if the Mussalmans really do the thing, if they boycott the councils, I say, I give you my word for it, my party will stand by you in everything that you do." But I do not want you to exaggerate the value of this evidence as I know that his name is a name to conjure with us and as his opinion must carry great weight to those of us who believe in him--also believe in his great service and who believed that he was unrivalled in his continued persecution for the attainment of Swarajya, naturally any opinion that might be said in having come from him must carry weight. What do these councils mean? The simple test, I venture to present to you and my elders is this. The two wrongs that we have really to consider are the Khilafat and the Punjab. Do you believe that by going to the Council, by engaging in the debates you can produce a direct impression upon the British Ministers and secure a revision of the terms and a repentance for the Punjab? Our revered brother and leader Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya has said to us that very soon all that the Congress Sub-Committee has asked for will be granted, because some of the officers or most of the officers have gone or will be presently going. In the month of April even the Viceroy will be going.

• Pandit Malaviya—I said, it would come to pass.

Mahatma Ghandhi—I respectfully submit that it is not what I at least, when I put my pen to that report, intended. I said too emphatically even at our discussion that the dismissals of these officers should be unconditional and should be based upon their incapacity and the atrocity that they were guilty of and not by efflux of time, and the Viceroy should be compulsorily retired if he does not tender his resignation before his time. It does not serve my purpose when the Viceroy goes by efflux of time and so do the officials, and if the officers are retired compulsorily but not retired

on this specific ground it does not serve my purpose either. I want a repentant heart. I want a clean heart, I want a change of heart. And I miss any repentance.—I miss a change of heart—I miss that hand of fellowship which I had thought was extended at the time of the Amritsar Congress, and that is my reason for having then suggested co-operation with the Government, but having found out afterwards—because some one asked why it was I had changed—the reason is surely obvious. I had full faith then that the Khilafat wrongs at that time had not even been inflicted—that the Punjab wrongs would certainly be righted, but to my surprise, a painful revelation has dawned upon me that these British ministers or the Government of India never meant well by the people of India. What do I find? Instead of repentance, an insolent challenge is given to India, that if you want to be ruled by Britain, excuse me the expression, I use that expression advisedly—the price is terrorism. I therefore, want to make this party of terrorists a present of these law courts—a present of the education of my children. If I cannot bring into being National Schools and colleges I certainly decline to wait for the establishment of these schools. Necessity is the mother of invention and when there are children without schools, I promise that our revered leader himself will be going from place to place and collecting subscriptions for opening national schools (hear, hear). I do not want to starve the Indian mind. I want every Indian to be educated but educated along proper lines—educated to understand the dignity of his nation and not to receive any education that befits a slave. That is my contention with reference to the schools.

I have told you the main points about the councils. There are many other things; but two things I would like to reiterate. Do not begot the public mind. The public

will not understand our fine distinction if we mean by non-co-operation that non-co-operation must commence at the top, viz., in the body miscalled the representative body, viz., the reformed Council and if the best minds of the country refuse to associate with that government even as obstructionist, I promise that the Government's eyes will be opened. The condition is that those who refrain will not go to sleep, but move from one end of the country to the other and bring every grievance to the notice not of the Government but of the public, and that is, if my programme is carried out, the Congress will be doing from year to year—not ignore any grievance but give public expression to those grievances, so that the volume of wrong ever increasing as it rolls, inflames this great nation and enables the nation to harbour, to conserve all its anger, all this heat and transmute it into an irresistible energy.

Please recognise one fundamental settled fact that the Moslem League has passed a resolution that they are going to boycott the councils entirely. Do you believe that one, fourth of our body may pull one way and three-fourths another way (no, no). If both were running along parallel lines and in the same direction I can understand it, but here we will be pulling the opposite way. Is it right that it should so happen and can the Hindus gain anything even by a policy of obstruction, if every believer in Islam boycott the councils as he would boycott sin? That is the religious position of Islam. They consider that it is sinful for them to go to the council—to take their oath of allegiance. Let not practical India—let not practical politicians who gather here from year to year forget the settled fact, if they believe that they will be able even to change the Muslim mind, if they believe that all the resolutions of the Mussalmans are pious wishes, then certainly the arguments that I have now

advanced fall to pieces ; but if you believe that the Mussalmans are earnest, that they feel the wrongs and as time rolls on, the wrongs instead of dying out, instead of being forgotten will gather force day after day, then you will understand that as time goes forward the energy of the Mussalmans will increase whether the Hindus help them or not. That is the choice that lies before the whole of this National Assembly. I therefore respectfully submit to you that I am not embarking upon this thing without careful thought—it is not a matter of pleasure, it is not a matter of joy to me to pit myself—an humble individual always liable to error—to pit myself against the best leaders of the country. But where it is a matter of duty, where I see as clearly before me as I see these lights that if we want to cement the relation between the Hindus and the Mahomedans and if we want them to stand, to endure for ever there is no escape for us but complete association with them so long as they remain, so far as the means are concerned, on the right path, so long as they adopt honourable means, so long as they do not overreach themselves in framing their demands and so long as I believe they do not resort to violence.

There are many other things which have been said and to which I must have given a reply. But I know that I have already tired your patience unduly (cries of no, no). My business is finished when I have placed every argument that comes to me in a dispassionate manner not as an advocate, but if it is at all possible for me, as a judge. But I assure you I have endeavoured to place the whole argument purely and simply as a judge. I owe a great deal to Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya. The relation perhaps that subsists between him and me, the country does not know. And I would give my life to placate him, to please him and to follow him at a respectful distance (hear, hear) ; but when it becomes

a matter of sacred duty and conviction I hold that I am absolved and I know that he absolves me from any such obligation of following him. And if I who venerate him adopt a course different from his, you will understand that I am absolutely serious and sincere when I ask every one of you in this pandal to use your own independent judgment and not to be carried away in the slightest degree by my personality. Finally, if you pass this resolution—you will do so with your eyes open. If you think that every one of you individually has the capacity—has the willingness to offer this small measure of sacrifice in the name of the nation, for the sake of the nation—for the sake of securing lasting friendship with the Mussalmans, you will not hesitate to adopt this resolution. But if you cannot satisfy these conditions you will not hesitate to reject this proposition. (Loud cheers).

President's concluding Address.

The President who on rising received a great ovation said:—

By provinces Mahatma Gandhi's proposition has been carried (shouts of 'Gandhiji' *ki jay*). That proposition has been carried by 151 votes to 18. The total number of delegates assembled in the meeting that were registered was 5814. The total of those who took part in the voting was 2773 out of which 1826 voted for Mahatma Gandhi's proposal, 884 for Mr. Pal's amendment and 63 were either neutral or hostile. Now I want to crave your indulgence for a few minutes for my concluding remarks. At the outset I thank you from the bottom of my heart for the co-operation, I received from you, to bring this great gathering to a successful close—the courtesy and kindness with which you treated me these six days has touched me very much (applause). All my life I have not seen another gathering either in this

country or anywhere else which is so much surcharged with electricity as the present one. Nevertheless, the incidents which I may regret, have been so few and that was all due to your kindness, courtesy and indulgence, and I thank you all for that. Before I refer to one or more regrettable incidents which have taken place, refer to them I must, I want to thank the Reception Committee, its Chairman, its Secretaries, the Captains and the Vice-Captains of the volunteers for the splendid hospitality they gave us all. I never expected anything less from Bengal. Bengal has never failed to rise, to the occasion and inspite of the scanty notice and short time they had, they have been able to make such splendid arrangements and give such splendid hospitality that it has given us immense proof of Bengal's patriotism. One word more about Bengal. I want to assure my Bengalee countrymen that I have always regarded Bengal to be forward and the intellectual leader of India (Hear, hear). But Bengal has to a certain extent ceased to give the lead. I am saying this from the bottom of my heart. (A voice—you are quite right). Bengal has given the purest ideal of nationalism. Bengal has shown us the way how to make sacrifice for the cause of Motherland (Hear, hear). There is not one province—not one community in India which has electrified the country by its noble sacrifices in the cause of the motherland as Bengal has done (Hear, hear).

I wish every province had the same record to follow the example of Bengal. If therefore in any one particular instance Bengal does not give the lead, I am sure I am very much hurt at heart. I want Bengal to continue to lead because I believe in its sincerity and in the depth of your patriotism. My love for them, my admiration for them have not decreased in the least if I have spoken a single word in anger about Bengal.

After having paid my homage to Bengal I crave your indulgence to make a few more remarks upon the proceedings. Firstly, I want to refer to one or two regrettable incidents for which as the President of the Assembly I want to make a kind of apology. First of all about that unfortunate and unintentional and unconscious reference made by a Bengali speaker about the nationality of Mr. Montague. I have received a telegram in which a point of objection was raised to that remark. I want to tell the assembly that I have the highest respect for the Jewish Community. I went abroad and since I have been in America I have the greatest respect for them as I say that some of the Jews are the greatest thinkers, writers and soldiers of the world. And so Jews are not entitled to be talked of contemptibly by any of us. Secondly we must not forget that the Jews are Asiatics (Hear, hear) and therefore they are with us as one of us. You may criticise Mr. Montague as a British Cabinet Minister and as a British public man. So in your name and on your behalf I wish to express regret for that absolutely unconscious and unintentional incident.

" Next I want to thank you, first of all, for the difference in your treatment to Mrs. Besant from the first day as compared with yesterday. You behaved splendidly yesterday when she addressed the meeting and I want to thank you for this. But I must express my regret at the treatment which you meted to Mr. Jumnadas Dwarkadas. Some of the moderate leaders are not attending the Congress. I, however, admire those who come for their love of country and their patriotism. (Hear, hear). If you refuse this platform to be used by moderates, the moderates are certainly justified in not coming here to be treated thus (No, No). If this is the state of mind of the audience, those of the nationalist leaders who do not agree with Mr. Gandhi will find the same treat-

ment in the future sittings of the congress. If you conduct the business of the congress in this way, you will reduce the national congress to a pure party organisation built up and founded by some of the greatest men in public life in the country. I appeal to you with all the emphasis I can command that you should not reduce the national character of the organisation. If you continue to hoot them down in the way which you did yesterday and which you are inclined to do, it would be impossible for this organisation to continue as a national body and that day will be a black day in the history of India. I therefore beg of you to change your temper of mind and exercise that discipline for which Mr Gandhi appealed to you—not to reduce the character of the national assembly to an assembly of a partizan character.

I have rejoiced all these six days to find that the country has found its way. I rejoice to see that the country and the national assembly have a clear political vision. They have a clear conception of the means by which you will get your success. I rejoice to find that this assembly has after all found that its salvation—the country's salvation—must come from the country itself. (Hear). I rejoice to find that the country has realised that paltry reforms will not satisfy you. Out of a total strength of seven or eight thousand voters there are only 63, really speaking, who are opposed to non-co-operation or are indifferent. In such a big house you have found 63, who for some reason or other have not voted for non-co-operation. I will say without fear of contradiction that the bulk of the country is in favour of non-co-operation. I am afraid I am to give expression to views which will not be acceptable to you all. As the President of this great assembly my position is like that of the Speaker of the House of Commons. But still I will be failing in my duty if I do not speak my mind on this programme of

non-co-operation. I may tell you at once that I am absolutely whole-hearted in support of the Non-co-operation Movement. I am not convinced that the programme which you have accepted is the best and the most effective one. I have my own doubts about several of the items. I am wholeheartedly opposed to the withdrawal of boys from schools and colleges. I do not accept that proposition at all. I do not yield to anybody in my desire for national education, for establishing national institutions and giving my life for national educational problems. I was a boy of eighteen years of age when I started my life. In April 1910 I gave the best part of my income to the building up of national educational institutions. Pardon me for this brief personal reference. After a great deal of study and experience I have come to the conclusion that you cannot construct a national system of education without a National Government. (Hear, hear). You must direct all your energy to have a national Government and unless you have national government, to talk of national education, is in my humble opinion, not fruitful. After 25 years of my experience I have eventually come to the conclusion that the conception of national education in the country is very defective. What is national education and how it should be carried out? Will it be Hindu system or Muhammadan? The question bristles with difficulties. They are not insuperable or insoluble, but they are very difficult. I do not know of any nation that has solved the problem of education by any other body except the Government of the country which takes the revenue. It will be absolutely suicidal to withdraw your boys and girls from schools and colleges (hear). Go on establishing what I call private schools. I do not call them national schools. Even in this country an attempt was made. It was the National Council of Education in Bengal.

It was found impossible to carry it out. You should have private schools, colleges and pathshalas and some such institutions, but you cannot solve the problem of national education unless you have a national Government. I want the whole attention of the country to be directed to and concentrated on this that you must have a national Government before you have national education. There is a great deal in the contention of Mahatma Gandhi that the education is a false education which you receive. You want to be Indians. But what you want to be is not a body of the ancient Indians but modern and up-to-date and progressive Indians. You should not go backward but must go forward. You must combine western and eastern culture together.

I am afraid that the resolution dealing with the withdrawal of lawyers from courts seems to me to be impracticable. I may tell you that I am in no love with lawyers, much less with courts. All that I have earned by law, I have given away. The other day I spoke in strong language about lawyers. I do not consider them to be absolutely necessary for the progress of the nations. They are more or less like parasites. I may also tell you that it is a paradox of Indian life. While the lawyers are the best leaders of the country, I would say with all respect to them, when moment of crisis comes it is the lawyers who would go back (Cheers). While I admire the great and noble leaders like Lal Hara Kissen Lal, Lala Dunchand and other lawyer leaders of the Punjab in time of crisis I know some of the lawyers of my Province who refused to defend them or otherwise cheated them. (Shame, shame). I, however, hold that the gradual withdrawal of lawyers from courts is an impracticable proposition. I am in favour of the ideas for establishing courts of arbitration. Establish them and take your cases to those courts, but so long as the British Government is in this country, it is im-

possible to avoid the courts altogether. In political cases I may tell you that those of us who are foremost in denouncing the British Courts, are the first to ask the assistance of lawyers. Gentlemen, my own idea is that the other two or three measures that have been stated are very fine but they are more like flies in the cart-wheel. I may say that you shall not be able to paralyse the Government unless you strike at the root of economic exploitation. Economic bondage is the root of political bondage. If you want non-co-operation to be carried into actual practice you must strike at the root of economic bondage. Now, you have added another clause that is the boycott of foreign goods. You have passed that resolution and I wish you complete success from the bottom of my heart absolutely. (Hear, hear) There is one word more which I speak before I wish you success. There is a great deal of heat introduced into the deliberations of the Congress over the question of the Council. I must confess that my sympathies are entirely with Mahatma Gandhi (Hear, hear). But my head sometimes reels and begins to go to the other side. (Laughter). That is my contention and you may take it what it is worth. There is a good deal of force in what Mahatma Gandhi says with regard to these councils. There is an insidious poison which may demoralise those men who are going to the Council. There is a great deal of truth in it. I know from actual experience that many of our friends whose patriotism I do not dispute, whose high motives are absolutely without question—their patriotism has been poisoned by going to the Council. In my life I do not expect a favour from the hands of those who are not well-wishers of your country. What you have been doing for the last 35 years? The leaders of the nation have been crying for co-operation. In the course of a year you cannot change 315 millions of population of this country from an

attitude of co-operation to an attitude of non-co-operation. If you do so you are liable to fall into pitfalls. You require time to face that I am afraid that the time is inadequate. I am entirely in favour of that programme provided it is considered by a joint committee consisting of the best men of the country to give details, but at the same time not to give away the programme of Mahatma Gandhi who is a national asset.

Referring to the deputation to England the President said that he had no faith in such a body. From experience as a member of the Congress Deputation in 1905 he could say that he had no faith in the British public. But he had great faith in publicity to the whole world. He wanted independent campaign of publicity in America, Japan and other countries.

In my humble judgment now that the resolution has been passed, you should act up to the programme of non-co-operation and I hope and trust that in course of the next three months before the next Congress sits at Nagpur you will show to the world that you mean what you say (cheers). If you cannot show any tangible result I will call you as traitors to the cause of your country. You have pledged yourselves to the programme. Carry it forward with all the means at your disposal, with all the self-sacrifice and discipline which you are capable of. I from the bottom of my heart wish you success. I am not going to the Council. The decision is final for me. I will, to the best of my ability co-operate with you in making your non-co-operation programme a success. But at the same time, I think it my duty to explain my views before you and I beg of you that in case your programme requires any revision or modification, you should not refuse it. Go on like brave men and women. We have still many men and women. Let us go on and pro-

ceed with enthusiasm and confidence. But let every one of you from early in the morning when you rise till late in the evening when you go to bed, examine yourself and see how much you have done for non-co-operation. Let us not be branded as a nation of bluffers, liars and boasters.

Addressing the Muhammadans the President said, that the honour of the Islamic world was in their keeping and if they could not keep that honour they should be held responsible before God and man. He considered that Mahammadan a false Mahammadan who having accepted that programme did not co-operate and put his whole heart, property and life into that programme. If anybody was not true to that programme the first thing would be to chuck him away.

I read an open letter in the '*Times of India*.' The writer hopes that I will not be the grave-digger of the Indian National Congress. I say, that inspite of all difference of opinions you will not allow a split in the Congress Camp. I beg of you to change your attitude towards the moderates and to invite them back. The present moment cannot afford to do without them.

The platform ought to be kept sacred for everybody to express his opinion. In conclusion, I thank you for having given me a patient hearing.

The President concluded his speech amidst loud cheers.

Moulana Soukat Ali.

Moulana Soukat Ali next addressed the meeting and in course of his speech said that Columbus, for the benefit of Europe, discovered America, Vasco De Gama for the benefit of England discovered the Cape of Good Hope and the President discovered Mandalay for the good of India.

Continuing the Moulana said that he had two aims in

view. First he would do nothing to help England and secondly he would never quarrel with his Hindu brothers.

He would never stop in his work until he wrested the last inch of Moslem holy land from the hand of the foreigners.

Referring to the remarks of Mr. Baptista Morina Soukat Ali humorously said that he did not know why Mr. Baptista called him a lamb and the Mahatma a lion. Strong as he was he could lift Mahatma Gandhi by his left hand and put him in his pocket.

Continuing the speaker said, that inspite of the fact that he was a fanatic Mussalman and the Mahatma Gandhi, a fanatic Hindu, he took the Mahatma as his guide. The reason was that Mr. Gandhi had fully understood that the fate of India depended upon the unity between Hindus and Mussalmans. The speaker continuing said that he was fully convinced that inspite of his fragile body Mahatma Gandhi was the bravest man. If they chose to be soldiers, Mr. Gandhi would be the most powerful general. He had all the qualities of a general. He never lost his temper and he had no enemy. But at the same time, Mahatma Gandhi was the shrewdest Bania in the whole country.

Continuing the speaker said that some said that they should follow Seinfenism and some advised them to appeal to the labour Unions of Europe. But the speaker said that he was ready to go east, west, north, south, up and down where he could find freedom for India. Some of them counselled them to send deputation to England. But the speaker opined that they would be able to derive infinitely more benefit if they could send a deputation to the Government servants, policemen and the soldiers, because they would be able to impress more easily their own countrymen than the British Ministers of the Cabinet.

There was a great deal of enthusiasm in the Congress pandal Thursday morning at the final success of the non-co-operation resolution although the attitude of the delegates on Wednesday evening left little room for doubt or the subject. Instances were not rare of people actively canvassing for their respective side. The result of the poll will be clear from the following table :—

PROVINCE.	Approximate No. of dele- gates regis- tered.	Supporters of Gandhi's resolution.	Supporters of Mr Pal's amend- ment.	Members of the All- India Con- gress Com- mittee.
Andhra ..	130	50	12	11
Madras ..	301	161	145	14
Central Provinces ..	163	30	33	12
Punjab ..	1,071	254	92	20
Bombay ..	682	217	93	20
Sindh	36	16	5
Bengal ..	2,100	551	395	25
United Provinces ..	358	259	28	25
Delhi ..	130	56	9	6
Behar ..	360	184	28	20
Burma ..	37	14	4	5
Benar ..	46	5	28	6
Total	1,826	884	..

The number of delegates registered is actually 5814. The figure in the above table represents figures of a few days ago. 2373 delegates voted in all. 63 remained either neutral or opposed both the resolutions. Taking by Provinces Mr. Gandhi won his resolution by 151 to 18—a crushing majority. Taking by numerical strength 1826 voted for Mr. Gandhi and 884 voted against him. The Indian National Congress thus adopted the Non-co-operation programme of Mahatma Gandhi after much anxious consideration.