

*Saklatvala Participation in Parliamentary Debate, 17/06/1927:  
– THE SIMON COMMISSION*

**§Mr. SAKLATVALA**

I wish to place before the Committee the point of view of the British Government in India not so much from the political or Parliamentary side as from the national possibilities which are inevitable when such relationship is created between two peoples. I listened, not only with interest, but with a great amount of respect and gratitude to the speech of the hon. Member for Bow and Bromley (Mr. Lansbury) and yet on certain fundamental points I stand as much apart from his views as from those of Lord Birkenhead. This is not a question of reform, or gradual or quick reform; it is a question of the possible relationship between two nations on the basis of one nation deciding what is good for the other. The hon. Member who has just sat down used a very fine phrase when he said that the majority of the people of India held moderate opinions. I do not know what moderate opinions are when one talks of India. I suppose that moderate opinion is that which agrees with the views of the hon. Member for Kidderminster (Mr. Wardlaw-Milne), and even the hon. Member is not quite sure that all the people of moderate opinion hold the same views. I have frequently put it to this Committee and I do it once again that in the year 1927—never mind what happened in 1827—it is absolutely impossible for one country to hold another in subjection and pretend to offer them measures of reform giving them a partnership in the commonwealth. That is all humbug. I see that a new Commission is going to be appointed, and I would like to ask what is going to be the scope of that Commission and its terms of reference. Everybody knows, whether it is put in black and white or not, that the first thing that will be put in the terms of reference is how this country can keep a stranglehold over India. That is a primary condition.

Another condition will be that you must give to the Viceroy full power, and place a whip in his hand by which the interest, the prestige, and the political power of Britain shall never be allowed to suffer a scratch. Whether that is put down in print or not, it is the

fact. Perhaps hon. Members will pardon me for putting things very bluntly, but I think that is the only way in which I can explain my views. Between slavery and freedom there is no middle course, and a transition from slavery to freedom can never be attained by gradual measures. As long as you continue slavery, it must continue with the full strength in the bond; the bond must be strong to hold down the people. When you make up your minds that there shall be no slavery, then the bond must break, and it must break completely. There is no human possibility of gradual reform and gradual freedom. The hon. Member for Kidderminster perverted an historical truth when he said that the last reforms of 1919 were not given to India by the Government under coercion. The Government of Great Britain played one of the most deceitful games in their history by pretending to give reforms to India, because the then Government of Great Britain was working under the greatest force and pressure and coercion of American and European nations. After the War, after the destruction of the power of the Kaiser, Great Britain stood, to the shame of the world, as worse than ten thousand Kaisers in her rule in India; and, in order to save the face of Great Britain, to show that Great Britain was no longer the only Imperialist Power in the world, but that British Imperialism after the War was modifying itself into a group of Commonwealths under tremendous coercion, perfidious Albion played the perfidious game by giving what you call the reforms.

In the reforms granted to India there is no measure of freedom, and I take the view quite candidly that there can be no measure of freedom. There is no such thing as gradual freedom. You must approach the point when the people enjoying the gradual freedom must overthrow the people who try to curb their freedom, even gradually. Why does Great Britain presume that, of all the savage peoples in the world who cannot manage their affairs, she must be the controller of the people of India only? Why do you not take into your charge the people of Persia, the people of China, the people of Egypt, the people of Turkey, and everywhere else, in the same manner and fashion as you take charge of the people of India? Did you not believe that the German people had no instinct of democracy? Why did you not take charge of them? You say the Italian people have not the same instincts of democracy that the

British people have; why do you not go and assume parentage over them?

It is all nonsense to say that for the benefit of the Indians the British nation has got to be there, and is performing some benevolent action. For goodness sake be honest, and say you are a nation of enterprise, and, in seeking for enterprise to seek your own good, opportunity placed you in a strong position to throttle the country and the people of India—that you are there, and you are determined to remain there as long as you can get any good out of it. That is the only confession of this House or this Parliament or this nation which can convince an honest world. It is no use pretending as though a deputation had come to you from the Indians, as though a section of the moderate opinion of India came to Great Britain and said, "Come and protect us; come and give us military protection; come and teach us civil administration," and so on. The hon. Member for Kidderminster said, but there has been tremendous progress in India since I do not know when—the last 20 or 30 years—

### **§Mr. WARDLAW-MILNE**

I am quite willing to make it 100 years.

### **§Mr. SAKLATVALA**

Make it as much as you like. I am prepared to grant you a still further term of 150 years, and I say that a nation which, after 150 years of hypocritical pretence, has kept the literacy of the people down to 6 per cent., ought to be pilloried in public in the eyes of the nations of the world. When a nation that says, "I control and give progress to the people of India," fails miserably—or rather, does not fail, but artfully and deceitfully in its own interest prevents 100 per cent. of education, and limits it like a tyrant and oppressor of an unspeakable character to 6 per cent.—how can any member of that nation come and say, "I am proud of my progress"?

Take the death rate in India, the crushing infantile death rate in that city of Bombay; take the progress of the hon. Member's own firm there. It has been a progress in infantile mortality from 150 or 200

up to 600 and 800 per thousand. There is tremendous progress in the murder of children all over India, and all over the industrial towns and cities there. The hon. Member spoke of wages—from 14 rupees they came up to 28 rupees; but there was another half-truth in it. He quoted the authority of the Labour Office. The Labour Office was under a fairly competent person, our friend Mr. Findlay Shirras; but, as soon as he began to expose some inconvenient truths about the mill-owners of Bombay, Mr. Findlay Shirras was fired from his place, and his office was abolished and absorbed in other departments, because the hon. Member and others engaged in enterprise and progress would not like so many facts to come out from time to time.

### **§Mr. WARDLAW-MILNE**

I am sorry to interrupt the hon. Member. I do not in the least mind his making statements about what happened to someone in Bombay, but I know nothing about it. It may or may not be true, but I object to his associating me with it; I know nothing about it.

### **§Mr. SAKLATVALA**

I am associating the hon. Member with it as a type and a class in saying that what happened was for the convenience of all those enterprising merchants who have given to India a tremendous progress within the last 20 years. But what was the same Labour Department's discovery? It was that the poorest labourer's home cannot be maintained in the City of Bombay under 53 rupees a month, and the hon. Member wants the world to believe that under a terroristic Government which makes it possible for the master class to give, not to everyone, but an average of 28 rupees a month in a city where the lowest type of living costs 53 rupees a month, there is no semi-starvation, that there is a position of prosperity and progress. The hon. Member gives us the consolation that there are not so many deaths from famine. No; some diseases first come in as epidemics, then they become endemic; and famine is no longer a periodical condition in India—it is the constant lot of the people. To die from semi-starvation is a permanent condition in the country; the condition is not one of periodical famine.

## **§Mr. WARDLAW-MILNE**

Have you any statistics?

## **§Mr. SAKLATVALA**

The statistics are the heavy death-rate. A Government that can tolerate a death-rate such as exists to-day in India is the most unfit Government on the face of the world, and, if nothing else, the murder of 4½ millions of Indians who are dying because of the British rule, over and above the normal death-rate which should exist in a tropical country like India, is alone a sufficient reason to tell the British to go out bag and baggage, in spite of all the chimneys that they are capable of erecting when they are there. The fact of the misery, the poverty, the starvation and the degradation of the people you cannot deny, but I am coming to the relationship as it stands, and to where even our friends of the Labour party are making a mistake.

Anybody who would try to speak of Great Britain as one homogeneous nation is wrong; anybody who is trying to speak of India as a homogeneous nation is wrong. Both the British nation and the Indian nation are sharply divided into two classes. The interest in Great Britain as well as in India between the two classes must be antagonistic, has been antagonistic, and will remain antagonistic, and I want the Noble Lord to attend to my remarks in this respect free from any political prejudice. In this country, taking class for class, the interest of the British working class and the Indian working class and the Indian peasant is identical and closely united. If there can be any advantage in the international relationship it will always spring in the heart of the workers and the peasants in these two countries, and where mistakes are arising they arise from ignoring this great factor of class interest.

For a time Great Britain pursued, or tried to pursue, the cultivation of a class rule for the capitalist and Imperialist class of this country. As long as the capitalist class rule exists in this country you are quite welcome to your choice, to build up and to back up the capitalist, Imperialist class in India, but that is where you are making your mistake. Between the two separate nations the

interest of the higher classes in the two countries is a conflicting, competitive and rival interest and is not identical. The mill owners of India and the mill owners of Lancashire would rather wish to see each other weakened and destroyed. The mill workers in India and the mill workers in Lancashire will both gain an advantage by standing together, fighting together, working for a common standard of life, demanding the same standard of wages and demanding the same form of political franchise, liberty and freedom, and if you take the peasantry of India, though there is not a correspondingly large class of agriculturists in Great Britain, you will find that their fortunes are essentially linked up together with the higher earning power of the wage earners and the agriculturists themselves in India. If you take the landlords' interests, they are not identical, and where this country continually comes into conflict is on this question, that whenever you talk of reforms, whenever you talk of progress, whenever you talk of any measure of liberty you in your hearts believe that by granting a few concessions to your own class brethren in India you are building a bridge of some kind. You are doing nothing of the kind. You are strengthening a class which in its economic interests is your rival and your competitor, and would like to see her manufacturing and commercial activity agree with the depression of yours, whereas if you look at the unity of interest of the agricultural worker and the industrial worker and the British worker and British agriculture, of course you will find there a genuine desire to co-operate and to advance together and to fight together against the external control and domination of any party over their own class.

I again appeal to the Committee to look to that position rather than any other. The hon. Member for Bow and Bromley appealed to the Committee that it is in relation to India that Great Britain can give real proof of the desire of this nation, as a conquering nation, to give freedom to the conquered. How can this Committee, how can even the hon. Member expect Great Britain to give proof of an equality that has never existed? Sometimes we are misled by looking at the Dominions. Australia, Canada and New Zealand are annexes of this country, but the example of South Africa is very often misleading. There was the Dutch exploiter of the African races and the British slave driver of the African races. A competition

clearly arises between the Dutch and the British as to who shall exploit the negro and his country and who shall fill his pocket best. A war takes place, after a lot of intrigue and forgery and plotting, and for the time being the position of the British exploiter and slave driver goes very low, and after some anxious times it again just comes about level, and then the Dutch and the British exploiter make common cause and say, "We will now be one corporate company of exploiters and robbers and we will carry on." There is no such thing as Dominion home rule for Africa. I suggest to the hon. Member for Bow and Bromley that he should never talk of Dominion rule and Home Rule in Africa as long as the poor Africans themselves are the slaves of foreign rulers and settlers. There is no Home Rule in South Africa, there is no Home Rule in the Orange Free State or any of those States won over from the Dutch Republic.

**§The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Earl Winterton)**

On a point of Order. May I make it quite clear than it is not within my competence, or that of any Minister, to reply to the speech the hon. Member is making, which solely concerns the position of the Union of South Africa.

**§Mr. SAKLATVALA**

I am not making a speech on the Union of South Africa. I am pointing out the fallacy of the argument that was used this morning, that it appears to us as if South Africa is one of the Colonies which has been granted a sort of Home Rule similar to what may be granted to India. No Home Rule has been granted to the people of South Africa and the granting of a similar Home Rule to a few British merchants in India without rights granted to the people of India would be no Home Rule at all.

With regard to these reform schemes and the gradually granting of Home Rule of some sort, I entirely agree with the difficulty which Members put forward from time to time. But when you realise those difficulties, why humbug the people of India and the people of the world as though there is a possibility of such gradual reforms and gradual freedom being granted? I quite see the position to-day.

What is civil liberty? What is the right of civil administration? Divorced from economic rights, divorced from commercial possibilities, civil liberty and civil administration have no meaning and no significance. The class that desires civil liberty and civil administration always desires them for economic and commercial advantages.

I fully agree that a powerful civil administration in the hands of Indians would simply be a mockery, if it were not accompanied by full powers to regularise their economic, commercial and fiscal policy. What else is the cause of war in this world except economic, fiscal and commercial jealousies and rivalries? You have to-day an example between Japan and India, and between Japan and Great Britain. With fiscal liberties, with economic power, looking at it purely from the standpoint of the good of the Indian shareholders, of the Indian investors and financiers, there ought to be a break in India's commercial relations with Japan. Now look at the position of Great Britain, and her shakiness in China. Great Britain has, once again, to, flatter Japan, and I realise now, Great Britain must control the Indian question and the welfare of the Indian and the power of the Indian, so that her interests in China and Japan are not to be allowed to suffer for the benefit of the fiscal and commercial interests of the Indian. I realise the absolute impossibility of dividing the civil and the military power. There is no freedom for a nation by telling that nation, "You are free to use your foreign policy, but your military power shall be in the hands of a foreigner, who will control you militarily, and who will regularise your inter-relationship with the outside countries."

Coming to what was described as the [Commonwealth of India Bill](#)—again I do not desire to be misunderstood—I see in the structure of that Bill the same objections and the same impossibilities. I do not believe that the representatives elected by the various groups of Indian political schools have ever, for a moment, supported that Bill as being welcome. I agree that there are several points in it which look like an advance in reform. But, taking the [Commonwealth of India Bill](#) as a whole, there, again, lies the inherent difficulty of one nation trying to grant to another nation a semblance of freedom without real freedom. If you analyse the [Commonwealth of India](#)



Bill in the final control of the machinery of the Government of India, you find only about 10 per cent. of the people having the franchise right to settle it. If you go further into this Bill, you find the power of revenues so tied up in the hands of the Viceroy, representing the interests and power of this country, that for education, water supply, irrigation, public roads, widows' pension, old age pensions, and all the amenities, for which you would require, in a large country like India, at least £250,000,000 to £300,000,000, the Bill empowers the Viceroy to give to the Indian nation not more than £15,000,000 a year on the present basis of the Government of India's revenue.

We perpetually find that in one country attempting to control another country the question never arises in a bona fide way of a gradual relief to the controlled country in such a way that gradually the controlled country might become the controller. At each stage, at each conflict of interests, the question will always arise, "Has the controller had his control really shaken? If it is so, it must be altered." I suggest therefore to this Committee, that we have only to consider two things. Shall we be in India? If so, then your policy should be to be as efficient as possible; otherwise you will be shaken. If you say, "No, we do not desire to be there. We have spoiled your powers in the past. We have deprived the people of their educational, franchise and political rights, and their freedom. But we will make good to those people all their educational, franchise and political rights. We will support them and back them up, and then allow them to manage their own affairs." Then you will immediately come to nothing short of international labour solidarity between this country and the other European countries and the people of India.

Coming to the small point of the Bengal detenus, I again put it to the Committee that there is the same hypocritical attempt to cover up the necessity of one country governing another. I do not believe that the Labour Government had the slightest justification for sanctioning that Measure. I do not believe that the Labour Government's policy, even in other respects in India, was other than that of a tyrant, an oppressor and a foreign monster, and every class of Indian politicians to-day will hold the same view. I do not

blame the Labour movement. I do not blame the Labour party in the country. I do not blame the large class of trade union workers of the country. I blame the last Labour Cabinet of the country. I do not for a moment say that the great intelligent working class movement, the Labour movement, is to shirk the blame, or is going to continue that policy or permit its own leaders in the future to put forward such an unfortunate policy with regard to outside nations.

But what is this system of governing a country by imprisonment without trial, and so on? If you say that you are powerful rulers, and that you have definite proof of the indisputable guilt of certain persons, surely you ought to be concerned with the proof, even if not with the persons who give you the proof. If you tell us that the whole police force, the whole Army, the whole Navy of the British Empire will be helpless in regard to 200 or 300 or 3,000 persons who will kill the witnesses in a law court, then it is time that you ceased to govern both India and Great Britain, and gave way to more competent persons. To suggest that the witness is afraid! Why, in regard to every common burglary committed in Great Britain every witness who might come against the burglar or against a murderer, would be punished if the burglar, or the culprit or his friends found a chance to do so. Will you wind up all your law courts and say, "We have not got the power to protect our own witnesses"?

You carry on the administration of justice in this country, and other administrators carry on the administration of justice in their countries, on the primary power and ability of the State to give protection to witnesses, and your pretence that the Government in India is not strong enough to give complete protection to the witnesses, is something that no community in this world will believe. Suppose our own rulers and administrators want to extort bribes, or want to extort some social advantages, from certain persons, and they say: "We believe that you are guilty, but we are afraid to bring witnesses." Apart from that, now that the Government have been beaten to a frazzle by the fine character of Mr. Bose and others, and the Government have had to surrender, how many murders have been committed and how many revolutions have taken place. What has happened with Mr. Bose

free, that did not happen when Mr. Bose was captured and imprisoned? The Government have adopted a savage way of governing the country. It is the tyrant way. No King in any country of his own would have dared to practise such an instrument of torture and terrorism over his subjects.

If Great Britain wants to rule India, she must take up the position that her own Monarch, her own Parliament, her own Cabinet, her own administrative machinery cannot afford to remain constitutional for five minutes and govern the country and affairs of another people. It is no use preaching common-sense and constitutionalism in respect of the people of India, when not only are you not constitutional, but you dare not be constitutional and you cannot afford to be constitutional. Just as this country would not allow Chinamen or Germans to write a constitution for this country, it is equally absurd for this country to appoint a Committee to write a constitution for the people of India, on whatever basis. The only point of discussion in this Chamber should be whether this country is still to be a tyrant over India, or whether it will be courageous enough to say "no" and cease to be a tyrant. There is no gradual process about this. I am prepared, and I am sure the Government must be prepared, to look at the international world in as much as it affects the peoples of these two countries, just as we are prepared to look at things which affect the peoples of other countries. If we analyse those interests, it will be found that, in the long run, the mass interests, the working class interests, the agricultural worker interests of India are closely identical with the case of the workers of Great Britain, Europe and America, and that there is a common economic interest between these working classes. From that point of view, the policy of the Government in India is extremely unfortunate, both for the people of this country and the people of India. The methods of repressing Labour literature, of repressing Communistic literature, of preventing the people of India from studying working class and mass interests, and studying Labour and Communistic literature, is a very short-sighted policy. If you are merely seeking your own permanent economic interests by the friendly tie of equality in India, it is to your own interests and the interests of the Indians to allow the people of India to study Labour

literature and Socialistic literature and the great international economic problem of life, rather than prevent them from doing so.

My further appeal is this, that whenever you do take steps you must, at least, ask your conscience the question whether you are British by instinct and by conviction, or whether you wear your British label only as you wear your clothes. Can you be British here and anti-British somewhere else? Can you be British this moment and anti-British the next moment? If you are British by conviction, if you are British in your conscience, if you say that you believe that there should be no taxation without representation, if you say that as British people you believe that education, franchise rights, sanitation, medical assistance and so on are now the absolutely necessary rights of a modern nation, how can you go forward and say: "Although we are British, although we believe these things, yet for the sake of filling our pockets we are prepared to act in an anti-British manner. We do not believe in practising these doctrines, because if we tried to practise them, our pockets will be hurt, and our commercial prosperity will be injured. Therefore, we will still hold the people of India in bondage by dictators, and they shall have no rights"?

When you are developing that policy, the inevitable result will be on the lines of those which we have seen in the [Trade Unions Bill](#). I appeal to the Committee to realise that two processes are inevitably going on—the cultivation of a capitalist class in India, not on Indian lines but a Britished capitalist class in India, with all the practices of the British ruling class, and with all the methods and facilities for the protection of the British financial class, and just as that Britishing of India goes on, there is a desire in this country to Indianise the working classes here. Once you realise that a large class of workers in India can be made to work, can be subject to overwork and underpay, and can be deprived of trade union and political rights, you try the experiment here. Therefore, the process of ruling India is taking the lines of the Britishing of the capitalist class in India, with its dire effects upon the working classes there, and the process of ruling the working class in this country is linked up with a desire to Indianise the British workers and deprive them

of their rights of freedom, of trade unionism, of education, of sufficient wages, and of short hours.

If this country is prepared to take the consequences, let it go on ruling India. The hon. Member for Bow and Bromley said that some Communists believe that a violent break must come. Call it a violent break or a gentle break, we do believe that there must be a break. I do not see the slightest reason why it should be violent, but I do not for a moment believe that a man can go out as the British Viceroy and say: "I am a man from Great Britain, and I have come to India for the specific purpose of obeying the people of India." There can be no intention to obey the people of India, unless under the subterfuge of obeying the people of India whilst looking after the interests of the capitalistic exploiters from Britain, who are in India. I therefore say that the break must come, but the break need not be violent at all. You need not pretend to charitable feelings as to what will happen to the people of India if the break does come and you retire. They will know how to conduct their own business. It is not a question of a violent break or a gentle break; it is merely a question of breaking your bondage. There is no middle way. As to inter-relations, the only natural bridge between the two countries, the only common bridge that can exist is the labour bridge, the working class, the Socialist, the International Communist bridge, and, if you are wise people, you will not stop the Indian population from reading Communist and Labour literature and interfere with the education of the masses in India. Do not prevent that literature and education from entering into and spreading in India.

### **§Mr. PILCHER**

At the opening of his speech the hon. Member for North Battersea (Mr. Saklatvala) made some very cruel and unjustifiable charges against the European population of Bombay. He quoted some figures relating to infantile mortality in Bombay, and he then charged the European community in that city with being largely responsible for the state of public health, and pointed to the hon. Member for Kidderminster (Mr. Ward-law-Milne) as being a sample of that class. Now the population of Bombay is over 1,000,000, and at the outside there are not more than 12,000 white people among

them. The hon. Member, in effect, asserted that the responsibility for the heavy infantile mortality rested upon that small minority.

**§Mr. SAKLATVALA**

The hon. Member must have misunderstood me, or else he is pretending to misunderstand me for the purposes of the newspapers. I never charged the white population with anything in connection with public health. I never said the white population was responsible for the infant mortality in Bombay. British industrialism and so-called progress are responsible for the increase in the infantile mortality among the factory working population of Bombay.

**§Mr. PILCHER**

The white population of that great city, whose total population exceeds 1,000,000, is some 12,000 at the outside. The dominant manufacturing class in Bombay, the people who own most of the mills, who give the industrial tone to the place, and who are responsible for its industrial development, are Parsees, of the race and religion of the hon. Member himself, and it is just as well and it is high time that the Committee should know who the hon. Member for North Battersea is and what is his relationship with that great industrial community in Bombay.

**§Mr. SAKLATVALA**

I want to make it quite clear to the Committee that I am not here to blackguard the white population in Bombay and defend the Parsees. Indians who have been influenced by the British capitalist system are just as much a curse to the working-class population of Bombay as the British capitalist himself. The Parsee capitalist class is just as abominable and as much to be avoided as the class to which the hon. Member and his friends belong in this country.

**HON. MEMBERS**

'Oh!'

**§Mr. PILCHER**

The hon. Member talks about the Britonised character of industry in India. That is evidently his point. Now up to 18 months ago this hon. Member was closely identified with the industry in Bombay which his grandfather created, and he drew emoluments from it. I pay my tribute to the hon. Member's grandfather for his great efforts in developing industry in that city. The white population of Bombay is, as I have pointed out, a tiny, infinitesimal minority. They have done everything they possibly could to improve the shocking slum conditions that exist in the city, conditions which are the creation of the Indian social system. It is the Indian practice to have marriage at an extremely early age, 13 or 14, and the conviction that a child must be born of such a marriage as soon as possible and that as many children as possible must be born is the root cause of the conditions of misery not only in India but in China. The British Government and the white population in India have endeavoured to remedy these social evils by promoting education, doing their utmost to improve the conditions of industry and agriculture and those engaged in them, and yet the hon. Member lectures the hon. Member for Kidderminster, who as a merchant in Bombay took so great an interest in the moral and material progress of that city. That is absurd on the face of it. I know how the hon. Member for Kidderminster worked in that city. The hon. Member for North Battersea is the very heir of the industrial system which he attacks. Some three or four years ago, one of the mills belonging to his own firm paid a dividend of 100 per cent.—[An HON.MEMBER: "400 per cent." ]—and up till eighteen months ago my hon. Friend the Member for North Battersea did not think it inconsistent with his political views to accept a salary from that industrial concern while living in London.

1.0 p.m.

I want to make a reference to one or two things which fell from the hon. Member for Bow and Bromley (Mr. Lansbury) with regard to Mr. Bose and his treatment. It is less of the individual that I want to speak than of the origins of the trouble which made it necessary for Mr. Bose to be put into confinement. The Secretary of State for India has several times given this House some particulars in an official form of the beginning of that conspiracy which led to his

confinement, and I do not want to go over that ground again. The hon. Member for Bow and Bromley, quite unintentionally I am sure, very much misleads the House by leading us to imagine that the sufferer is Mr. Bose. Mr. Bose has been in confinement for over two years, and when the Committee hears that he was in confinement for that period without any trial regarding the offences with which he was charged, it sounds awful; but I want the Committee to realise why it is that Mr. Bose and his fellow conspirators had to suffer in this way. I want to make it clear, and I do not think it has ever been mentioned in this House before, that Mr. Bose was the centre of the whole ganglion which formed this conspiracy. One of the objects of that conspiracy was actually to assassinate the Governor of Bengal himself, a man who went to Bengal with the very kindest intentions and good will towards India.

**§Mr. SAKLATVALA**

Is the hon. Member at liberty to utter absolutely unfounded untruths like that, when his own Government dare not bring the men before a public trial and are unable to establish anything of this nature; is he at liberty to make these accusations of the foulest character?

**§Mr. PILCHER**

That has been said in public in India many times and never contradicted. It has been said by responsible officials in the Bengal Council.

**§Mr. SAKLATVALA**

They are all liars.