

[श्री यशपाल सिंह]

का मन्दिर वहाँ ले जाया जाय। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं श्री प्रकाशधीर शास्त्री से बड़ी विनम्रता के साथ यह प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि वह इस अपने प्रस्ताव को वापिस ले लें।

16.03 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

USE OF GAS BY UNITED STATES IN VIETNAM AND GOVERNMENT OF INDIA'S REACTION THERETO

Shri P. R. Chakraverti (Dhanbad): I call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:

The use of gas by U. S. in Vietnam and Government of India's reaction thereto.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Sir, on a point of order. We welcome the statement to be made by the Minister of External Affairs, but only yesterday, the Calling Attention Notice tabled by some other hon. Members was rejected. At what stage you came to accept it, we need to know. It is a kind of mysterious process. Yesterday we had very serious arguments about its being rejected and we pleaded with the Speaker that the Prime Minister may be requested to make a statement. The statement was to be made at the instance of the Speaker, at the request of ours. And today, we are told that it is admitted. What is the kind of rules that are followed in admitting or rejecting these notices? Yesterday, it was ruled out of order. Today it is admitted. I think this is very objectionable. We welcome the statement by the Minister, but we must know the process through which Parliament works; it cannot be mysterious.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Are you objecting to this statement?

Shri Nath Pai: Not at all. We welcome it. I am objecting to the procedure. (*Interruption*)

Shri Warior (Trichur): Yesterday, the Calling Attention Notice of Shrimati Renu Chakravarty was rejected by the Speaker.

Shri Bade (Khargone): Further, the procedure is that only those who are signatories to the Calling Attention Notice would be called upon to put questions and others are not allowed. But now, it seems to happen otherwise.

Shri Nath Pai: The Prime Minister was to make a statement, and at our request the Prime Minister yesterday agreed to make it. Today, an announcement was made that the Minister of External Affairs is going to make a statement. We welcome this, but it is a matter of procedure which we cannot ignore.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): May I add, Sir, that it was the Prime Minister who yesterday agreed to make a statement. But today, the Minister of External Affairs has been called upon to make the statement. I do not know why this change has been made. It is most arbitrary.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not think the Prime Minister has said so. Anyway, I shall convey the wishes of the House to the Speaker.

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): We have learnt with distress and a sense of shock of the disclosure about the use of gas in South Vietnam affecting the Vietcong and the civilian population.

Ever since World War I, civilised opinion throughout the world has condemned gas, chemical and bacteriological warfare. The revulsion of

the peoples of the world was crystallised in the Geneva Convention of 1925 against use of gas in war. According to United States' spokesmen the gas used is not lethal. Even so, regard must be paid to world opinion and the danger of the situation escalating into a larger conflict. We consider that the use of gas is against the conscience of humanity and sincerely hope that no further use of it will be made in South Vietnam. We have already given expression to our deep concern at the situation in Vietnam. Arising from our initiative, discussions were held recently in Belgrade and many non-aligned countries will be making a joint appeal with the object of getting negotiations started as soon as possible, so that a political solution to the problem of Vietnam may be found.

Shri P. R. Chakraverti: Commensurate with the past practice of India to take the initiative on all crucial occasions whenever humanity has been aggressed upon, may I know whether the Government has banded together all the non-aligned nations and the other nations also to mould world opinion on this matter?

Shri Swaran Singh: I have already mentioned in my statement that arising from India's initiative a discussion took place in Belgrade and it is hoped that many non-aligned countries will be making an appeal to the parties concerned in Vietnam for the restoration of peace and for starting talks and discussions.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): While I congratulate the hon. Minister on the very fine statement that he has made, for which I think the whole world will congratulate him, I would ask just one question. May I know if the feelings of the Government of India with regard to the use of gas, which has been described as a kind of tear gas and which has also been described as a kind of gas which makes people only sick at the stomach,—the feelings of revulsion, the term which is not mine but which

is used in the statement against the use of this gas of whatever kind—have been conveyed to the USA and, if so, have they received any reaction from them and if they have not done so far, may I know whether these feelings will be conveyed to the US Government soon and the reaction communicated to the House very early?

Shri Swaran Singh: We have not separately conveyed our feelings in this respect, but the statement that I make now will now be public property and this will be taken note of by the United States Government and by the rest of the world.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): In view of the fact that the British Foreign Secretary, whose Government is linked very closely with the Government of the United States, has thought fit to publicly express himself on this point and therefore to communicate their idea to the United States Government, may I know why it is that the Indian Government is appearing to fight shy of making a direct communication to the US Government which is directly concerned in the use of the lethal gas which has caused us shock and revulsion in our minds, very rightly, and may I know why we are playing a hesitant role about it?

Shri Swaran Singh: We are not fighting shy and we are not at all playing a hesitant role. As a big country with a certain responsible approach to such matters, we have expressed our opinion very clearly. If the hon. member is pleased to call even this as hesitating or fighting shy, I can only say I am sorry for his way of thinking.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Why not tell them straight?

श्री किशन पटनायक (सम्बलपुर) : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि गैस-युद्ध के बारे में सरकार की तरफ से जो बयान दिया गया है

[श्री किशन पटनायक]

यह विशुद्ध नैतिक स्तर पर दिया जा रहा है या दक्षिण-पूर्व एशिया में हमारे जो राजनैतिक दांव हैं, उनको खयाल में रख कर दिया जा रहा है; अगर यह राजनैतिक दृष्टि से दिया जा रहा है, तो क्या इस गैस के चरित्र और प्रभाव के बारे में सीधी जानकारी प्राप्त करने के लिए भी कोशिश हुई थी।

Shri Swaran Singh: I have not quite followed the import of his Hindi, which was a little difficult and I did not switch on the English translation. Will he repeat it in simpler language?

श्री किशन पटनायक : मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि गैस युद्ध—गैस वारफ़ेयर—के बारे में सरकार ने जो बयान दिया है, यह विशुद्ध नैतिक स्तर पर—मारल प्लेन पर—दिया है या दक्षिण-पूर्व एशिया में हिन्दुस्तान के जो पोलिटिकल स्ट्रेक्स हैं, उनको ध्याल में रखते हुए दिया गया है; अगर राजनैतिक दृष्टि से दिया गया है, तो क्या यह गैस कितनी पाय-जनस है, इसकी सीधी जानकारी के लिए भी कोशिश हुई थी।

Shri Swaran Singh: I do not know what the hon. member means by political considerations. Here is the use of gas which we say is against the conscience of humanity. The other substantive question is whether we have got any direct information about the quantum of danger in this gas. You can well imagine the place where the gas is being used. We cannot have any more direct information. But this is now world news and even the composition of some of the gases that have been used has been publicised. It is also mentioned that one of the gases at any rate causes nausea and vomiting and therefore temporarily disables the people. Therefore, the use of this is something which is against the spirit and conscience of humanity.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंबेर) : वियत-नाम की लड़ाई में चार सरकारों का सीधा सम्बन्ध आता है—एक, उत्तर वियत-नाम की सरकार, दूसरी, दक्षिण वियत-नाम की सरकार तीसरी पीकिंग की सरकार और चौथी, वार्शिंगटन की सरकार। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि जिस जैनेवा सन्धि का उल्लेख बंदेशिक-कार्य मन्त्री ने किया, क्या इन चारों देशों ने, या इनमें से किसी देश ने, जैनेवा की सन्धि पर हस्ताक्षर किया है। अगर उनमें से किसी ने हस्ताक्षर नहीं किया है, तो यह जो गैस के इस्तेमाल की घटना घटी है, क्या उसकी रोशनी में सरकार इन चारों देशों की सरकारों से यह अनुरोध करेगी कि जिन्होंने हस्ताक्षर नहीं किया है, पहले वे हस्ताक्षर करें, जिससे ऐसी घटनायें भविष्य में न हों ?

Shri Swaran Singh: I do not know how this arises out of this question. In the Geneva Agreement there is no mention of any prohibition of the use of gas. It was not necessary because no one contemplated that gas would be used in any circumstance. So this question does not arise from the present problem with which we are concerned. For historical interest, I am sure the hon. Member, who is sufficiently vigilant, knows the names of the countries who participated in the Geneva Agreement. The United States, although not an original signatory, later on made a statement that they are bound by the decisions and they had unilaterally decided and made a declaration that they will abide by the terms of the Geneva Agreement.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं पीकिंग सरकार, उत्तर वियत-नाम की सरकार और दक्षिण वियत-नाम की सरकार के बारे में पूछ रहा था, लेकिन मंत्री महोदय कोई जानकारी नहीं दे रहे हैं। अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपका संरक्षण चाहता हूँ। आखिर मैं ने कोई मजाक में सवाल नहीं पूछा है। पहले तो मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या गैस की लड़ाई

पर रोक लगाने के सम्बन्ध में कोई सन्धि है, और अगर कोई ऐसी सन्धि है, तो यह जानना बहुत जरूरी है कि किन किन देशों ने उस पर हस्ताक्षर किया है और यह भी जानना जरूरी है कि क्या इस को मनवाने के लिए भारत सरकार इस वक्त इन देशों से अनुरोध करेगी कि वे हस्ताक्षर करें, ताकि अगर आईन्दा ऐसी घटना हांगी, तो उस के बारे में फैसला हो सके। मैं जानता हूँ कि क्या मंत्री महोदय यह सफाई इसलिए नहीं देना चाहते हैं कि पीकिंग की सरकार ने उस को नहीं माना है? पीकिंग की सरकार किसी भी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय कानून को नहीं मान रही है।

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): Sir, I rise to a point of order. Under the rules he can ask only one question.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. We will go to the resolution that is before the House.

Some hon. Members rose—

Shri Nath Pai: Mr. Deputy-Speaker,....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You are not a signatory.

Shri Nath Pai: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I want to bring to your notice the precedent in this matter. On a previous occasion when my Calling Attention Notice was rejected and, nonetheless, the Government spokesman was asked to make a statement, the Speaker insisted that on that statement questions could be asked. I am pleading with you, because this is a matter of the highest importance as far as the rights of the House are concerned, to allow us to put questions on this. Yesterday it was repeatedly said that it cannot be taken up. Today I insist that this has to be treated as a statement made by the Minister of External Affairs and therefore the right of putting

questions cannot be limited only to those who are supposed to have signed it. I, therefore, plead with you to allow us to put questions. This is a very serious matter (Interruptions).

Shri Swaran Singh: If instead of spending time on these arguments the hon. Members put their questions, I am prepared to answer them.

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): Yesterday it was not admitted and today we are precluded because we are not signatories. This is a highly invidious procedure.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Speaker later on has admitted them and therefore only the signatories can be allowed to put questions. (Interruptions). Order, order. I find that half-a-dozen hon. Members are standing and speaking at the same time. All right, I will allow two or three questions more—Shri Nath Pai.

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरा एक पायंट ग्राफ आर्डर है—व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : इस वक्त क्या व्यवस्था का प्रश्न हो सकता है ?

श्री मधु लिमये : जब मैं अपना व्यवस्था का प्रश्न पेश करूंगा, तभी आप उस के बारे में फैसला करेंगे। आप ने श्री नाथ पाई को प्रश्न पूछने के लिए बलाया है। आप उन के बाद मुझे इजाजत दीजिए। कोई जल्द-बाजी नहीं है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य बतायें कि उन का व्यवस्था का प्रश्न क्या है ?

श्री मधु लिमये : कल हम लोगों की मांग पर प्रधान मंत्री जी ने यहां कहा कि इस विषय के सम्बन्ध में सारी जानकारी इकट्ठा कर के सदन के सामने हम बयान दे देंगे।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : बयान दे दिया है।

श्री मधु लिमये : बयान नहीं दिया है। इस विषय से सम्बन्धित बातों की जानकारी वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री को नहीं है। क्या अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय कानून है, क्या सन्धि है, गैस की लड़ाई से किस का ताल्लुक रहता है, वह कुछ जानते नहीं हैं और फिर भी वह अपने पद पर रहते हैं। वह मेरे प्रश्न का उत्तर देने का बिल्कुल प्रयास नहीं करते हैं। इस तरह सदन का काम नहीं चल सकता है। वह जानकारी हासिल कर के सदन के सामने आयें।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no point of order. Whatever information he had he has given.

श्री मधु लिमये : वह समय मांग लें।

Shri Nath Pai: Mr. Deputy-Speaker Sir, I was on my legs when the point of order was raised. You asked me to ask a question of the Minister of External Affairs. Sir, the statement of the Minister of External Affairs tends to be equivocal. He has assured without saying why the Government is reluctant to convey directly, at the highest level, the concern and anxiety felt at the reported use of non-lethal gas. We are extremely cautious in the use of our terminology and phrases which we are using. He says that this will be taken note of. Is he aware that when the late Prime Minister was asked whether he had conveyed the anxiety felt in India regarding the liberation of Goa when he met President Kennedy, he had told me in these words "that was the first statement that I made to the President".

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is the question?

Shri Nath Pai: This matter has not become that clear. It is not a question of "yes" or "no". He says that this will be taken note of. Are we serious of conveying our feelings or are we trying to please and placate everybody? In some cases risk has to be taken. We do not want China

to become expansionist or help it in its objective. All the same, there are certain important matters on which we must convey our views. I want to know what is restraining our Government from conveying our feelings at the highest level, at the Prime Minister's level, rather than leaving it to those concerned to pick it up from the proceedings of the Lok Sabha. Will he kindly explain this?

Shri Swaran Singh: This is a suggestion for action. We will give careful consideration to this. I have already said that there is no hesitation. There is no question of fighting shy. There is nothing by way of information that he is asking for. He is suggesting that it can be taken up at the highest level. I said that we would consider this.

Shri Nath Pai: Why does the Prime Minister not rise and say something?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You have got the answer.

Shri Nath Pai: The reply has not come. The question was why at the Prime Minister's level it was not taken up to convey what we feel about it. I am repeatedly saying that I do not want the Prime Minister today to condemn it; but we want him to convey that we are feeling disturbed at the events and the reported use of non-lethal gas. What is wrong in doing that?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Why should he be tongue-tied?

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): My colleague has just now stated that we have no objection to conveying our views and feelings in this matter to the Government of the United States. He has already said it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: My colleague, Shri Nath Pai, said that the Prime Minister should write directly

to President Johnson of America. That is what he said, not the External Affairs Ministry. Why should he do so?

Shri Kapur Singh: The hon. Minister of External Affairs has just now made a revelation to us, and I am quoting:

“ . . . the use of gas is against the conscience of humanity.”

I would request him to make a precise answer to my question. Does he include all riot-controlling or incapacitating agents in them if they happen to be gaseous and not solid? Does he include in them tear gas also which makes people not only most uncomfortable but also lachrymous.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Kapur Singh: Let him answer this question.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are concerned only with the use of gas in Viet Nam.

Shri Kapur Singh: I am not talking of Viet Nam. He has said that the use of gas is against the conscience of mankind. I want him to tell me what he means . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He can table a resolution on this, if he likes.

Shri Kapur Singh: Why should he not give an answer to my question? Why should you come in the way? What does he mean by gas? Does he include all gaseous agents? He can answer this simple question without your protection.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I disallow it.

श्री बड़े : तीन चार रोज़ से अखबारों में समाचार आ रहे हैं कि वियतनाम में गैस का उपयोग किया गया है। इंग्लैंड की पार्लियामेंट में इस की चर्चा भी हुई है।

इसलिये गवर्नमेंट ने अभी तक इस के बारे में कोई स्टेटमेंट क्यों नहीं दिया है, हम ने जब इस चीज को प्रैस किया तब ही स्टेटमेंट क्यों दिया है ? मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि पहले आप ने प्रैस को या बाहर देशों को स्टेटमेंट क्यों नहीं दिया है और देरी का कारण क्या है ? हमारे मुखर्जी साहब ने कहा कि आप हैजिटेंट थे, क्या यह देर इसी वास्ते लगाई गई है ? पहले क्यों नहीं आप ने स्टेटमेंट दिया ?

Shri Swaran Singh: Sir, we could have made a statement even yesterday in the afternoon but we thought we could make it today. It was raised for the first time yesterday and, in any case, we would have made a statement. Once it was raised here, we could not make a statement even outside unless we made that statement first on the floor of the House.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): May I know whether the hon. Minister is aware that in the middle or early 50s the French used napalm bomb in Indo-China and whether since then our military specialists or Military Attaches have made any study about the intensity and quality of these bombs?

Shri Swaran Singh: If the Defence Ministry is addressed, they might give the information. This is too technical for me.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): What specific efforts did our Government make to ascertain the kind of gas and its likely effects in Vietnam and why has the Government not conveyed its feelings, if it had the information, to the Government of the United States of America.

Shri Swaran Singh: This use of the gas came to our notice only very recently and, as I have already said, the Prime Minister also has made that statement.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Khadilkar.

श्री मधु लिमये : जेनेवा संधि पर . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry. Order, order.

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): In the past, when there were issues of vital moral significance we never hesitated or observed any diplomatic silence while expressing our protest. But on this occasion, unfortunately, when for the first time—not even in the last world war . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is your question?

Shri Khadilkar: I am coming to that. In the last world war, gas was not used on either side . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are not concerned with the last world war.

Shri Khadilkar: It concerns Asia. On the Asian people, gas is being used for the first time in this warfare. Therefore, was it not proper for him to come out in a forthright manner condemning the action and conveying the resentment of the people of India, this Parliament, to the Government of USA?

Shri Swaran Singh: I am sorry that this type of thing should be said that there is any hesitation for diplomatic reasons or the like. It is an unfortunate temper into which some people are in the habit of working themselves up. I have made a clear statement and I have amplified it. The Prime Minister has said that it is our intention to take it up with the Government. I know how sensitive, and quite rightly, the House is. It was raised on the floor of the House yesterday. I had a temptation to issue a statement even yesterday at about 1 O'Clock but I could not do it unless I had made a statement on the floor of the House. I take strong objection to such a thing. It really

waters down our stand and unnecessarily exposes us to criticism which is absolutely unjustified.

Shri Raghunath Singh: In view of the fact that even in the last war Hitler did not use gas, may I know what was the immediate cause of using this gas in Vietnam?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: How can our External Affairs Minister say this?

Shri Raghunath Singh: May I know whether the Government of India has got any information why the gas was used there? (*Interruption*).

Shri Swaran Singh: Somehow or other, Mr. Madhu Limaye does attract notice and it is really unfortunate that, whether it is his question or anybody's question, he has always an opinion and has a very high opinion of his own knowledge on both international and national affairs. I do not want to join issue with him. But let us observe some decorum when I am answering something. (*Interruptions*). Well, if I am the Minister for External Affairs it is no favour of Mr. Madhu Limaye. I am there in spite of him and I propose to remain there . . .

श्री मधु लिमये : सवाल का उत्तर तो दिया जाए .

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : यह बड़ा अशोभनीय व्यवहार है ।

श्री मधु लिमये : अशोभनीय व्यवहार मंत्री जी का है, मेरा नहीं है । प्रश्न का उत्तर नहीं देते हैं, विदेश कार्य मंत्री बने हैं ।

श्री किशन पटनायक : उत्तर की तो हम आशा करते हैं न ?

Shri Swaran Singh: I have already said that this was used on the South Vietnamese people and against the Vietcong. As to what were the precise circumstances that necessitated

the use of it we have no further information.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is all. **Shri Bade** to continue his speech on the previous Resolution.

Shri Warrior: Sir, I want to ask one question.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No. I have given enough opportunities to all the parties.

Shri Warrior: The International Control Commission is there. Government can get the information. I want to ask a question on that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No. **Shri Bade.**

16.30 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: SESSION OF AT BANGALORE OR HYDERABAD PARLIAMENT—contd.

श्री बड़े (खारगोन) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री का जो प्रस्ताव है उस का मैं समर्थन करता हूँ। समर्थन मैं इसलिये करता हूँ कि मैं ने पहले भी देखा है कि जब मध्य भारत में ग्वालियर और होलकर स्टेट एक हो गई तो दोनों के इंटेग्रेशन के लिये ग्वालियर में भी विधान सभा होती थी और इन्दौर में भी विधान सभा होती थी। वैसे ही हाई कोर्ट के सम्बन्ध में भी है। एक हाई कोर्ट जबलपुर में है, दूसरा हाई कोर्ट इन्दौर में है, और तीसरे हाई कोर्ट की बँच ग्वालियर में है। यही प्रिंसिपल उत्तर प्रदेश में भी फालो किया गया है। इस लिये प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री ने अपने प्रस्ताव के समर्थन में जो मद्दे दिये हैं, जो आर्गुमेंट्स दिये हैं, वे बहुत ठोस हैं।

वस्तुतः बंगलौर में जो विधान सौध नाम का विधान सभा भवन है वह इस झाउस के बराबर है, और देखने में इस से भी अच्छा है। वहाँ जो एम० एल० ए० क्वार्टर्स हैं उन में 500 मेम्बर्स आसानी से रह सकते हैं। यह कहना गलत होगा कि चूँकि वहाँ पर जगह नहीं है इस वास्ते दक्षिण भारत में बंगलौर में या हैदराबाद में लोक सभा का अधिवेशन नहीं हो सकता।

वास्तविकता यह है कि दिल्ली में मद्रासी लोगों के आ जाने से हमारा और मद्रासियों का एक जगह पर खाना पीना होता है। उन की इडली दोसा हम खाते हैं और हमारी रोटी दाल वे खाते हैं और दोनों बड़े मेल से रहते हैं। भोजन को लेकर एक जगह लिखा हुआ है: "अन्नं ब्रह्मा"। इस तरह से इडली दोसा और रोटी दाल दोनों का सम्मिलन हो जाता है।

मैं जब मद्रास गया और मद्रास स्टेशन के लोगों ने देखा कि मैं हिन्दुस्तानी हूँ तो उनका व्यवहार मेरे साथ बड़े प्रेम का हुआ। इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि यदि हैदराबाद अथवा बंगलौर में पार्लियामेंट की एक बैठक हो तो इस से बड़ा लाभ होगा। मैं नहीं कहता कि वहाँ पर बजट अधिवेशन हो। क्योंकि इस में बहुत सी बातें ऐसी हैं जिन के लिये सेन्ट्रेरियट से माहिती या इन्फार्मेशन आने की जरूरत होती है। अगर बजट अधिवेशन के बजाय कोई दूसरा अधिवेशन किया जाये तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा और खर्च भी ज्यादा नहीं होगा।

एक दूसरा पहलु भी है कि वहाँ खर्च ज्यादा लगेगा। श्री शास्त्री ने कहा था कि मद्रास के लोगों को यहाँ आने में जो खर्च पड़ता है, उतना ही खर्च बम्बई के लोगों को यहाँ आने में पड़ता है। लेकिन बम्बई के आदमियों के लिये बंगलौर नजदीक पड़ेगा। हमारे वास्ते बंगलौर ज्यादा लम्बा नहीं रहेगा। कलकत्ता के लोगों के लिये जैसे बंगलौर पड़ेगा वैसे ही दिल्ली। इस लिये मैं समझता हूँ कि खर्च की दृष्टि से जो आपत्ति की जा रही है उस में कोई दम नहीं है। यह देश हमारा है लेकिन इस में अजीब अजीब तरह की कल्पनायें हैं। सदन इंडिया बाले कहते हैं कि प्लाट इज इंडिया आर भारत। भारत, बंट इज, उत्तर प्रदेश। वह उत्तर प्रदेश का इम्पीरियलिज्म अपने ऊपर सभते हैं। लेकिन वह गलत समझते हैं। इंडिया, बंट इज भारत, बंट इज उत्तर प्रदेश यह कहना