

[Shri Mahavir Tyagi] It is only just to have good relations between the Opposition and the Treasury Benches that something may be said.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : In my view the best epilogue to the chapter would be a thorough discussion on the land question in this House.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI) : Sir, I am happy that the House is showing such concern for the dignity and decorum of the House. I should like to draw your attention to certain incidents which took place the week before and a week before that. I did not see any agitation in the minds of the hon. Members opposite when one Member came and sat in the chair of the Secretary. Was that not against the rules of the House or against the dignity and decorum of the House? We have not heard any concern from Members of the Opposition when words which are considered as truly unparliamentary have been used. In fact when there has been comment from our side, the Opposition have tried to shout it down and alleged that our Members were shouting for no reason. You know, Sir, that I have never used a harsh word either in this House or outside about any Member of the House and or for that matter, anybody. Therefore, that they should now say that I am offending the dignity and decorum of the House or that I have hurt the feelings of Members, I feel, Sir, is most unkind.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Calling attention, Dr. Mahavir.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : We have discussed that problem of a Member sitting in the chair. We have discussed other problems too. Let not the Prime Minister be unfair to us.

#### **CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE**

##### **REQUEST OF THE TAMIL NADU GOVERNMENT FOR A SEPARATE STATE FLAG**

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR (Delhi) : Sir, I rise to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the request of the Tamil Nadu Government for a separate State flag.

urgent public importance

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA) : Mr. Chairman, in June this year a proposal was received from the Tamil Nadu Government in which they suggested the design of a standard to be flown by the Chief Minister and other Ministers of the State on their cars and residences. The National Flag and the emblem of the Tamil Nadu Government were both represented on the proposed design of the standard. The State Government were of the view that this standard, while keeping the status of the National Flag, would create a sense of distinction and identity especially when flown on the cars of the Chief Minister and other Ministers and would help to identify the State concerned and give it greater respect in a Federal set up. This matter has wide implications and has to be considered in all its aspects. Government will take a decision on the State Government's proposal after such consideration and consultation with Chief Ministers.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : The statement that has been read out by the hon. Minister is, if I may say so, thoroughly disappointing. We have not been told when the proposal came from the Tamil Nadu Government, what exactly was the wording of the proposal, whether the Government is prepared to place that letter on the Table of the House, and when the reply was sent, if any reply has been sent; and if so, what is the reply that the Central Government has sent to them. There are rumours, Sir, that apart from the letter—because it is being said that no reply has yet been sent by the Central Government to a communication which was received by it here as long back as in June; if a representation came from there in June, now it is now nearly August end and the Central Government has not thought it proper to send a reply to them. It means that the proposal is something which the Central Government considers worth consideration and it is not able to reject it outright or reject straightway. It is an attempt to place something at par with the National Flag which cannot in any circumstances be considered proper or desirable.

Sir, the difference that is being sought to be made between a 'standard' and a 'flag' is something like an after-

thought. It appears that the Tamil Nadu Government has got a cue from the Central Government to make this fine distinction without a difference in order to confuse the issue and in order to be able to pursue the request that it is made with the confidence that it would be able to make the gullible people accept it here. Sir, I would like to know what are the reasons for this demand because it is only being said that it will give a sense of identity or a distinction. Is there anything special in Tamil Nadu that it should have a separate sense of identity and a separate sense of distinction because all States have got an equal right and would have an equal claim? Is our Government proceeding in the direction in which separate States will be given encouragement or an opportunity to emphasise their separateness from the nation as a whole instead of their identifying themselves with the nation and not carving out a separate place for them with separate flags and separate emblems?

Sir, we have known that Kashmir today has a separate flag and for all honest nationalist people, even that was considered to be a temporary provision and we have been asking that it should be done away with. We should have one symbol and one emblem and one thing which should guarantee honour to everyone irrespective of State boundaries or other distinctions. Here, Sir, we are being told that the State Government has made a request for which absolutely no justification has been made but here and the Central Government's inability to say a clear and straight "no" to such a proposal is something which will disappoint all people who are unhappy about the fissiparous tendencies and centrifugal forces that are raising their heads in the country. The Central Government should put its foot down on some proposal which is calculated to weaken our sense of unity instead of strengthening it. I would like to have this assurance from the Prime Minister, Sir, that the Central Government will not waver, will not totter on its knees, simply for the sake of some votes which are given to it to remain in power on a national issue like this.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please be relevant.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : It is a very straight question because the people feel that the softness that is being shown is because the Prime Minister's party cannot remain in power without the D.M.K. votes.

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN (Tamil Nadu) : I protest, Sir. It is absolutely wrong.

MR. CHAIRMAN : It is not relevant.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Why is it not relevant? I am asking the Prime Minister for a straight assurance that the Central Government will take a decision on this question on the merits of the case and will not be influenced by any ulterior consideration of a few votes here or a supporting party there. Sir, this question has arisen because it is not a question of Tamil Nadu alone or the symbol or flag alone, it is the question concerning all the States, the whole country and the whole nation.

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN : Sir, according to Rules a question should not be loaded with insinuations.

MR. CHAIRMAN : That I have told him.

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN : Sir, on a point of order....

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Any inconvenient question is termed as insinuation.

SHRI G. A. APPAN (Tamil Nadu) : Sir, you have to allow him his point of order. It is a vital question.

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN : Sir, I should be allowed to explain my point of order. Then you can give your ruling. Sir, this is time for Calling Attention only of a particular Minister about a particular matter. The Rules say that he can call the attention of the Minister and then he can raise questions of clarification. ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very well. I have understood your point.

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN : Sir, he is not entitled to cast aspersion on any State Government or any State Minister. He cannot put irrelevant questions.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : What is it that is being said as casting aspersions on any State or any State Minister ?

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN : Saying that it is being done for getting the D.M.K. votes. This is casting aspersion on a particular party.

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF PLANNING (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI) : Sir, if I may digress for a minute from the main question, as far as I remember, we have agreed on a previous occasion that statements would not be made in this House which are derogatory to any party as a party. To say that any party will give votes just because a particular issue is decided in their favour, is, if I may submit, derogatory to that party.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Is the Prime Minister going to be equally particular about the honour of other parties also, or is it only for her supporters ?

MR. CHAIRMAN ; Dr. Mahavir, please sit down.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Sir, this is a completely irrelevant observation that she has been allowed to make.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Well, the hon. Member also makes irrelevant observations and he has made some on this occasion also. (Interruption) I have replied to his irrelevant observation. If he is allowed to make an irrelevant observation, I can certainly be allowed to reply to it.

Now, as has been very clearly pointed out, the question is not of the National Flag. Whether it is the D.M.K. Government or any other Government of any State or any party in this country, there is no question that the National Flag is supreme and remains the only National Flag for the entire country, from Kashmir to Kanyakumari, from the eastern-most area to the western-most area. There is no doubt cast on this either by the D.M.K. Chief Minister, who has written to me, or by anybody else. Now, the question was whether they should have a separate standard. The House knows...

urgent Public importance

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI S. N. MISHRA) : What is the distinction between the two ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : There is a distinction. Each State in our country has a separate emblem. (Interruptions) This may be right or not. I am not saying that Tamil Nadu have made a right demand. I am saying that they did not ask for a flag and there is no point in repeating that they did. We do have many different, separate standards. The Princes have their flags, the regiments have theirs, and Governors have theirs. We have this situation.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR ; The Arya Samaj has another.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : When the letter was received, as the hon. Members know, usually we first try to get all information and, therefore, the Home Ministry tried to get information about the practice in other countries. It was found that in some Federal States, for instance, the U.S.A.—it is only one example, but there are many others—the different States do have separate flags which in no way takes away from the importance of the National Flag which is above all State flags. I have sent a reply to the Chief Minister and the reply is that this matter has wider implications than merely those in Tamil Nadu, and that knowing the national feelings on this matter, I would like to discuss it with the Chief Ministers. Since there are different parties and different Governments in our country, we have made it a practice that whenever there is controversial matter or demand—not necessarily about a standard or a flag, but even about anything else—we do not normally say "No" straightway. We always try to talk to the person so that they themselves realise what the situation is and may agree not to pursue the matter. There have been disagreements and differences of points of view with other State Governments on some matters. Therefore, it is always better to talk about a matter, rather than do it in a manner which may create a tense Centre-State situation.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Sir, I asked for one or two specific pieces of information : when the letter first came from

the Tamil Nadu Chief Minister, when the reply was sent, and whether there were telephonic or other conversations in between. I would also like to know whether we are going to be considered a federal Government like the United States and we are to follow their example in this respect.

SHRIMATI NDIRA GANDHI :

No, I did not say that we should follow their example, I just gave the information as an instance, that there were such flags not only in the United States but also in other countries of the world. This does not mean that we have to follow any other pattern. We have made our own pattern and wherever a new question arises, we have to find an answer according to our wishes and what we consider to be best for our country. That was by the way. The date of the Chief Minister's letter was, I think, given in the statement. The letter came sometime in June. I replied just a day or so before the Calling Attention in the other House, i.e., in August of this year.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Sir, my point of order is that there has been a reference in the reply of the hon. Prime Minister to a certain correspondence that has passed between the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu and the Prime Minister of India. . . (Interruptions) This is a point of order. Now, in order to enable us to judge this fully and properly, since there is a reference to some correspondence or documents, they should be placed on the Table of the House, % 37^ ^

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra) : Sir, if it was only a matter of style of dealing with a simple request from the State Government, one could have understood. But, Sir, particularly in the Tamil Nadu State their approach towards various national issues is inherently separatist. For example, their demand

श्री समापति : मैं देखूंगा और पढ़ूंगा कि क्ल में जाता है या नहीं। . . . (Interruptions) . . . and then about that I can give them a direction.

for 1 separate song, was one which has hurt the feelings of the rest of the country. So, Sir, we, all of us, should denote that. 5—49 R. S./70

urgent public importance

SHRI KALYAN ROY (West Bengal) : You denounce the Shiv Sena...

(Interruptions)

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : We will come to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Kulkarni, you should address the Chair.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: I am addressing the Chair Sir, but because my honourable friend, Shri Kalyan Roy, wanted some information, I turned to him. Sir, my point is that, looking to the political philosophy of the D.M.K. Party and particularly their desire to have a loose federation of States in this country, the demand made now has got certain political implications. If it be only a style of approach, we can understand that. My point is that the DMK Party is thinking and canvassing for a loose federation.

Sir, only very recently the Industries Minister, Mr. Madhavan, has asked for a separate licensing authority to the State. (Interruptions) Sir, I want to say that this type of fissiparous tendencies on the part of the DMK Party has created all this misunderstanding and the Government of India must deal with it very squarely.

Further, Sir, I want to know whether it is also not a fact that the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu had appointed a commission under Justice Rajamannar to study Centre-State relations. What was the necessity of appointing a separate commission at the State level when the Centre itself is there to deal with such matters? Apart from the Central Government, have they got that authority to evolve new policy on Centre-State relations? They think that they have got that authority.

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN : Why ?

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : Tamil Nadu is supporting a loose federation or the demand for a loose federation in this country. That idea is being supported. What I wanted to know is whether the present move of the DMK Government and the Chief Minister is to please the DMK party, particularly because of their election reverses in their State very recently and because

[Shri A. G. Kulkarni] they want to boost their own morale. The Government should come right down on such demand and make a statement on the standard or the flag because, Sir, a standard is a flag. It has no difference. I have also brought a dictionary. I can read out the meaning of the words 'standard' and 'flag'... (Interruptions) But there is no time. My point is that the inherent strength of the country lies in remaining united. Fissiparous tendencies should not be encouraged.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I do not discern any question in what the Hon'ble Member has said. But I would certainly like to assure the House, what the House already knows, that I am myself against any separatist tendency, whether it is on the grounds of language, State, religion or caste. Any move which weakens the country should be resisted. But we must not also exaggerate certain things. As I said, we have to take a decision taking into consideration the views not only of the Chief Ministers but also others, and as such, the views of the honourable Members, I am sure, may also have some effect on Tamil Nadu.-

SHRI K. L. N. PRASAD (Andhra Pradesh) : Sir, it appears that there is a greater implication in the request of the Tamil Nadu Government. Our flag symbolises a synthesis of the various facets of our national life. It is a symbol of our freedom ; it is a symbol under the banner of which we have won freedom after great sacrifices. Any violation or deviation by giving freedom to the States will disintegrate our country.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

It is unfortunate that a State Government, which is a part of India, should have asked for a separate flag, however similar it is likely to look like the national flag. In this connection the United States is being quoted where they have different flags for different States. But America has only one language has a genius forging the people from different regions into the people of one nationality. . .

(Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER : Is it a speech or a question?

urgent public importance

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh) : The honourable Member may please come before the mike and speak a little louder.

SHRI K. L. N. PRASAD : The United States of America came into being by uniting what were independent States earlier. There the States had separate flags, or standards before they became members of the United States. In India the different States have already different emblems. Why should they now have different standards too? If this process is allowed, where will it end? We have certain regulations about the size and colours of our national flag. If there is anything superimposing the national flag, even by a State Government, will it not be going against those regulations?

(Interruptions)

SHRI A. D. MANI : It is a maiden speech.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Prasad, please come to your question.

SHRI K. L. N. PRASAD : Therefore, I feel that the Central Government should not allow this type of separatist tendencies to develop. Much has been said about the need to create a feeling of oneness among the people of India, no matter who belongs to which State. The people of India feel that they are one. They should all be one. They should all remain united under one flag. The future of this country, I am afraid, will be too dark and will be beyond our imagination if this type of a tendency is allowed to grow. The Prime Minister has, of course, clarified the Government of India's stand to a certain extent. Yet I would like the honourable Prime Minister to give a definite assurance in this House that such requests either from the Tamil Nadu Government or from any other Government will not be acceded to by the Central Government because it is not in the interests of our country.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, should I give a reply?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : If there are any points in what the honourable Member has said, you may reply.

SHRI I/GDISH PRASAD MATHUR (Rajasthan) : The honourable Member has sought an assurance from the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister can answer that.

SHRIMA' I INDIRA GANDHI : I think the honourable Member has made the same point to which I have replied to some extent, that this standard or pennant, whatever it is, may have the same place or may replace our national flag. As I said earlier, this is not their intention so far as we have been able to gather. I have also already assured the House that nothing will be done or can be accepted which in any way will affect the unity of the country. At the same time, I must say that we should give the people of India greater credit than we sometimes do. There is a very strong basic unity amongst all the people of India and we have seen that at all times of crisis, regardless of other differences, this unity has come to the fore and has strengthened our nation.

SHRI N. R. MUNISWAMY (Tamil Nadu) : The impression that I gather from the replies given by the hon. Prime Minister is that there is no constitutional embargo so far as this demand for a standard from the D. M. K. is concerned. The Mayors have their own flags, the Governors have their own flags and the President has his own flag. Either you must ban all these flags altogether or you must have standards according to the demands without going into the merits. I would only request the hon. Prime Minister to refer this question to the National Integration Council or to any other committee so that they may go into the ramifications of this question of giving a flag or standard and evolve a principle by which we can grant this, instead of throwing it to the motley crowd of Chief Ministers of different political complexion. They will all demand this. Kerala may ask for it. West Bengal may ask for something else. In view of this, instead of leaving the responsibility to these Chief Ministers, I would request the hon. Prime Minister to be either firm and say no to grant it to all. But if she throws it to the motley crowd of Chief Ministers, she may invite more troubles, because I am sure the hon. Prime Minister will have to resist similar demands from other States. I would therefore, request her to refer it to the National Integration Council where

urgent public importance

there are intellectuals who will examine the whole issue with all its ramifications and see whether it is to be granted or not. If it is to be granted, then it must be evolved for all the States. That is the first question.

My second question is this. We all know that even the principalities in Germany have got their own flags. The United States have their own flags. But they have got their own sovereignty. We do not have sovereignty. The D. M. K. does not want to by-pass the national flag because they have the national flag on one side and the Gopuram on the other side. It means that they are bringing both the things together instead of separating them. Every State has its own emblem. Instead of having this emblem, it is better to have a flag. That is evidently the basis on which the D. M. K. asks for it. You may reject it or grant it. But let not the Chief Ministers decide it. I would request the hon. Prime Minister to refer it to the National Integration Council.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI :

The hon. Member has made a good suggestion. It is our view also that we should discuss this matter not only with the Chief Ministers, but with different parties in any forum where these people can be present. It is our view and I have expressed it in the other House that while we discuss this, we should consider other questions like separate flags for Governors and so on.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Shri Thillai Villalan.

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY (Tamil Nadu) : My name is there in the list.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You will get your chance afterwards.

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN : I would like to have clarifications on the following points from the hon. Prime Minister. I will put specific questions and I want specific answer for each question. Are the President, the Governors and the Army officials having separate standards or not? Is every Corporation . . . (Interruptions). Please allow me to put my questions one by one. I want specific answers because this relates to our State and our Chief Minister. Is every Corporation in our country having

[Shri Thillai Villalan]

a separate standard or not? Is every State in all democratic and Communist countries of the world having a separate standard or not? Even in the State, is every town having a separate standard or not? Is not our hon. Chief Minister Shri Karunanidhi demanding only a separate State standard and not a separate national flag? In what way it is against integration or in what way it is due to any fissiparous tendencies, as Shri Kulkarni has stated in his long lecture on the approach of D. M. K. to political problems? Has not the Government of Tamil Nadu sent a model of the flag that they want? In that model, in one corner is there a national flag and in another corner is there any temple which has been accepted by the Government as a State emblem? From the deliberations in the Press, in the other House and in this House, is it not visible that certain parties, certain interested parties, are attempting to make a mountain out of a mole hill? Is it not that they are doing it wantonly . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : How many questions?

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN : Sir, I may be given more time. Is it not that they are doing it wantonly even though they know fully well that the demand of the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, Shri Karunanidhi, is only for a separate State standard, not any separate Tamilian or Dravidian National Flag against the existing Indian National Flag? These are the specific question. I would like to have specific answers from the Prime Minister to these questions.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I think most of these question have been replied to. But since the hon. Member has raised them again, I will answer. It is true that the President and the Governors have separate standards.

As far as the Corporations are concerned, I cannot say whether all of them have separate flags or not.

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN : The Madras Corporation is having.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : The Madras Corporation may have one. But, whether the other Corporations in India also have them, I do not know.

This is also true, as I said, about other countries. I do not have the list of countries now. I have mentioned the USA, Switzerland, etc.

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN : Czechoslovakia.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I think, in the U.S.S.R. also. But, I am not absolutely sure.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : Yes, separate standards.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Now, about every town, I am afraid I do not have the information here. But, as far as the motives of other parties are concerned, I will leave it to the House to judge. It is not for me to pass judgment and it is not only on this occasion, but on many occasions such things happen. But it is true, as the hon. Member has said, that the intention is not to replace the National Flag, but something that can be used on those occasions when the National Flag is not used. For instance, the normal rules are that the National Flag should not fly over the residences of Ministers or anybody except on Independence Day and the Republic Day and other such national holidays. Now, the Tamil Nadu Government suggests that on those days, they will have the National Flag; but on the days when the National Flag is not allowed to fly on private residences, their standards should fly but on offices and government buildings, the National Flag will remain as elsewhere.

The other places where they want to use this standard are the motor cars of State Ministers. There is no law about this but it is understood that Ministers should try not to use flags, except when on tour. Hence the Chief Minister, Tamil Nadu suggested that their Ministers could use their emblem.

About the other point, whether there is a separate standard, whether of a regiment or of a state in other countries, they do have the National Flag, I think, on the top right hand corner— but I am not absolutely sure—and they have their emblem on the other side.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY : Sir, I am one of those who have given the Calling Attention Notice.

urgent public importance

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have to call recording to the list.

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY: That is not the case. Only six persons are there. It is not party-wise.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, I am following the procedure that we have been following so far. I have called a DMK Member and I am now calling one Member from the Communist Party. . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I think it is unnecessary fuss over it. As far as we can gather from the reports, nobody is asking for the replacement of our National Flag by any other flag or even the use of a parallel National Flag. As to the standards, I think, it is very common in countries with a federal system. The suggestion can be considered on merits. But, I am surprised that our Jana Sangh friends have taken exception to it. For example, if they come to power, they might like to have a cow as the party emblem, the bovine preference may be there. Now, why are they not including this bovine preference, the cow as the national emblem? Therefore, I say, do not preclude him from the right to have a cow symbol. Now, in Kerala, they have the elephant as the emblem. Different States have different emblems. This can be discussed. Why there should be an attitude of this kind, I do not understand.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: I only want to know if the request is for an emblem. If that is the case, then there was no occasion for calling Attention Motion because we have understood this as a request for a separate flag. You are giving the argument on a completely different basis.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I gave you that as an analogy. For instance, we have our national emblem, the emblem of the Union of India—the Ashoka Pillar. Does it mean that we cannot have another emblem? Yes, we cannot, of a particular State, giving its own distinct character. Similarly, in many countries they have this kind of standard. They are by no means above, and certainly they are not equal, to the national emblem and the national flag of the country and that prevails in most other countries. Even in Wales, which

has a unitary system of Government, there is some other flag than the Union Jack. My friends should ask the Maharani of Gwalior to haul down her standard. All these Rajas and Rajas are flaunting their so-called standards which are their symbols of the treachery. I do not see why my friends are raising their voices against this standard and why they are very angry about this. Here I do not understand why my Maharashtrian objects. He should not have the Chatrapati mentality in everything. Therefore it is nothing wrong. My complaint is, he criticised the Tamil Nadu Government when others spoke.

The Tamil Nadu Congressmen should not criticise because the DMK Government is outdoing the Congress in arresting people. They have put 13,000 people under arrest. Criticise them on that score. I can understand it. They are following the Congress footsteps in arresting people and putting them under detention and then they trumpet before the country: 'We have arrested so many people'. (Interruptions) There is a point for criticism of the Tamil Nadu Government. My fear comes, as far as the DMK Government in Tamil Nadu is concerned, comes not from their suggestion which you may consider on merits and come to a decision to the satisfaction of all consistent with national integrity and dignity but my fear comes because it has begun already to emulate the Congress in arresting people and threatening people and it is even emulating the so-called Kamaraj plan. They are having a Kamaraj plan. So I say criticise the Tamil Nadu Government on that score because they are taking a very wrong course and trying to out Herod Herod in so far as this is concerned.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is there anything to reply?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I do not think so. The Member has expressed his views which I have listened carefully.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): I was just looking through the Constitution but I do not find there is any provision preventing the States from having any flag. I do not use the word 'national' but there is nothing in the Constitution preventing the States from having any flag. If



[Shri A. P. Chatterjee]

we have to proceed constitutionally, how does the question arise that if a particular State wants to have a flag, it will be against the Constitution or that it is unconstitutional and anti-national? Secondly, is there anything in the Constitution saying that a constituent State can or cannot have any different emblem or flag of its own apart from the national flag which the Indian Union may like to have?

After all, whether it is a Federation or not, let us not enter into that controversy, but the very first sentence of the Constitution begins by saying that "India shall be a Union of States." If it is a Union of States, then the States are its constituent parts, and certainly the Constitution means that India, if it is not a Federation, at least is a quasi-federation. If that is so, from that point of view also . . .

SHRI A. D. MANI : It is a full Federation.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : Well, I should have said that it is a Federation, but if anybody says that it is not a full Federation, I am not going into a controversy in regard to that matter, but certainly the States have the status of being units of the Federation. If that is so, why can't a State in the Indian Union, have a national flag like a State, for example, in the USSR or a State in the USA? I am not going into the question of Standards; I am raising the question of the flag itself, and the States certainly have every right to have a flag constitutionally and also otherwise.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Sir, we accepted the National Flag in the Constituent Assembly. I don't think that the Constitution as such mentions this subject so far as I know. But the question is that we have all to live together. We are all parts of this country. Therefore, we must try and work in such a way as to make this living together easier and more peaceful. I personally feel that it was good of the Government of Tamil Nadu to write to us when they thought of such a statement. If there is a feeling in the country that this is not a good thing, then I think we should all express our views about it, and I think the Tamil Nadu Government may themselves change their mind about it.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Delhi) : Sir, I think that the demand made by the Tamil Nadu Chief Minister is highly unfortunate, but the statements made by the Prime Minister in this House as well as in the other House are even more ominous. I am sorry to state that an analogy should have been drawn between the United States and this Federation of ours. There is no analogy whatsoever; there can be no more ill-conceived an analogy than this between the United States and India. After all, those U.S. States were sovereign States, which federated together and framed the Federation, and India was a Unitary State before it became a Federation of States. (Interruptions) I can understand comrade Chatterjee's plea that every State may have a separate flag, because he believes that every State is a different nation. But so far as the Prime Minister is concerned, I am of the view that the situation needs to be clarified. There can be no comparison between the Federation of the United States or of Germany or of Australia, and India, where the constituent States at no time were separate sovereign States; they are units forming part of one single nation. I would like her to clarify this point. Number two; she has also referred to the fact that the President and the Governors, and perhaps the Chiefs of Staff, have their separate Standards and said that this matter was under review. It is welcome that it is under review. It is welcome because it is situations like these which, in a way, encourage fissi-parous tendencies and provide some sort of rationale for them. But I would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister specifically this : Even while these Standards continue, is it not possible that at least on the Republic Day and on the Independence Day our National Flag flies atop Rashtrapati Bhavan, which is not the case even now. It is rather surprising that this should be so. So, even while this question of separate Standards of the President or of the Governors or of the Chiefs of Staff is under review, would the Government take an executive decision in this regard and ensure that from January 26 next year onwards the National Flag always flies atop Rashtrapati Bhavan? This is my second question.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I did not make any analogy between the two Governments. In the other House,

either I was asked a specific question about this matter, or a statement was made that even in the U.S.A. there were no separate flags. It was in this context that I made this statement.

So far as Rashtrapati Bhavan is concerned, I have my own personal opinion. I agree with the hon. Member that the National Flag should fly there. That is why I said that we were taking this matter up with the President and with the Governors and other people, and we hope that a decision will be taken very soon.

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY :

While I would convey my appreciation to the first part of the statement by the Prime Minister in upholding the supreme position that the National Flag occupies throughout the length and breadth of this country, may I ask here whether the flag of a country denotes its sovereignty or not and whether this demand for a separate flag—they may call it by the name of Flag or Standard—by the Tamil Nadu Chief Minister, by relegating to the corner the National Flag, the demand for a separate flag and a bigger emblem of a Gopuram that has been predicted in the designs, whether this is tantamount to demanding sovereign status for Tamil Nadu and whether this move is an ingenious move, which will ultimately end as the forerunner for separation from the Indian Union, and whether the order issued by the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu is not an assault on the sovereignty of India? I would like to get a categorical reply from the Prime Minister.

If the Government of India is convinced at any future date, after discussions with the Chief Ministers or the National Integration Council, that there is any element of doubt, may be even one percent, that this move by the Chief Minister of Madras is in order to bring about separation at a future date as is clearly envisaged in the whole of Tamil Nadu by the commotion that has been created there, will the Prime Minister do everything to see that this move is nip in the bud? I would like to have a categorical assurance from her on this point.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I have no hesitation in giving a categorical answer to the last part of the

hon. Member's question. I personally do not think that there is any such motive. In the Constitution and in Parliament we have made it very clear that no part of India can secede from the country. So that question really does not arise.

Now the hon. Member made a remark about the national flag being in a corner. That is the accepted practice in all such standards that you have the national flag in the right hand corner and the other emblem or whatever it is occupies the Central Place or the other side.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI (Uttar Pradesh) : That means you do not sanction the...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : No, no, Mr. Dharia.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I do not know whether in the letter written by the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu the word used is 'flag' or 'standard'.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Standard.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : That has already been made clear.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Mr. Deputy Chairman, let this House be very clear that we cannot compare ourselves either with the United States of America as was rightly pointed out by the hon. Member there or even with the Soviet Russia because the States there are having their right even to secede from the Republic of USSR.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : Why not have that right here also ?

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : I am here to oppose that view of the Communists.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order. Let him put the question.

SHRI N. G. GORAY (Maharashtra) : That right is only on paper ; 'nothing more than that.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, it is true that the States

[Shri M. M. Dharia.]

are demanding more and more powers and it could certainly be looked at from a different angle but our national flag and our national anthem are the symbols of our unity and integrity and in these circumstances to have such a move of having more flags in the name of standards will be absolutely wrong. Will the hon. Prime Minister assure this House ? I do appreciate her approach that in this country ultimately it is the people who are to be convinced and they should be taken with us. Will the hon. Prime Minister assure this House that she will try her level best to convince every body that there shall be only one flag right from Rashtra-pati onwards and in the name of standard, whether Rashtrapati, Governors or the States, we should not allow that. This is very important. If several flags are allowed it will certainly bring down or lower the value of the national flag itself. That is my feeling and in that background I would like to appeal to this House also to look at this problem from a different angle. I do not want to condemn this person or that person ; it would not be the proper approach. At the same time we do feel that at the moment when seeds are being sown for the disintegration of the country, this demand coming from the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu is certainly agitating many people in the country and note has to be taken of that feeling. Of course the hon. Prime Minister has assured that it is not the intention or the desire of the Chief Minister. Even so, let us be very clear about it that we will not allow anybody to sow the seeds of disintegration in this country. It is in this background I would like to appeal to the hon. Prime Minister to use her good offices so that the National Anthem and the National Flag remain the same in the whole country and that no effort to undermine them in the name of standard will be allowed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have made a suggestion.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I fully appreciate the hon. Member's deep as the National Flag and the Anthem concern and I can assure him that so far are concerned, nothing can be permitted which will in any way bring down their

importance, because they are supreme but I do not think that question really comes in.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mani.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: That will create difficulties . . .

SHRI A. D. MANI: I have been called.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: With your permission, I am suggesting this. Sir, I can understand the little technical difficulty which has been created by symbol, flag and other things. Flag is nothing but a sentiment, a patriotic sentiment, and that is the only symbol of patriotism. If by that name another little flag is permitted, which is of a different type, then there will be thousands of (flags in this country and ultimately the loyalty from the National Flag will go to the other flag. Psychologically it would be wrong and the Prime Minister herself will regret it if she allows any symbol or anything else to replace the National Flag or even along with it fly another flag. If there are two flags, then they may respect only one. They will choose one of them and in the matter of the flag it is only one which is to be respected and that is the National Flag, in England it is the Union Jack. If there is any other flag and if there is loyalty to that flag, the National Flag will remain isolated. I, therefore, suggest that for the purpose of maintaining the unity, let us strongly stand by the National Flag, not only logically but also sentimentally, and there should be nothing parallel to it.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Since you called me to put question . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Do not put forward suggestions, but just put questions.

SHRI A. D. MANI : I do not put forward suggestions. I always put questions. The Prime Minister, in reply to clarifications, stated that the National Flag alone will fly on public buildings in Tamil Nadu. I want to ask her: Has the Tamil Nadu Chief Minister made it clear that the State Flag will not be

allowed to fly along with the National Flag? This is very important because this is the pillar of the matter. We do not want the State Flag to fly on public buildings in Tamil Nadu. The second point is, she has agreed that the National Flag should fly over Rashtrapati Bhavan. The President would be very glad to do so. May I request that all the Governors should give up all symbols of personal authority, give up the personal flags flying on their cars. The Prime Minister does not fly her own flag. The third point, which is also very important, is in respect of the National Anthem. We do not want separate National Anthems to be sung at State functions. It should be the National Anthem which should be sung in Tamil Nadu and other State functions and she should insist on the Tamil Nadu Chief Minister honouring the National Anthem by having it sung at State functions.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I think that the demand is only to fly the standard on the cars of Ministers and at their residences. Not another flag, but their standard. The National Flag remains on all official buildings and whenever it is allowed to be flown on residences, at the same time also, it will be the National Flag. This is the position.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: What is their logic behind it? Why should they separate something for the Ministers?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Tyagiji, you want the whole argument over again. I am sure that the views of this House and the other House will have some effect on the Tamil Nadu Government. You asked me whether my other Flag would fly along with the National Flag. I am replying to it.

SHRI A. C. MANI: What about the flag over the Rashtrapati Bhavan?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I have also replied to that. All these questions have been replied to.

1 P.M.

SHRI G. A. APPAN: Mr. Deputy Minister, I entirely disagree with the views of Mr. Parthasarathy and the other friends—some of them, not all of them, a few of them—who are trying to say that the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu is trying to encourage separatist tendencies. On the other hand the Tamil Nadu Minister and our

Government have always been trying to solidly support all good issues. We have also been telling the whole World that we will try to support all good issues. It is not for separatist tendencies that we are trying, but it is to strengthen the national solidarity and to see that we are one among the nation; that we are trying to do. Mr. Deputy Chairman, the good intentions of our Chief Minister are not being realised. It is a pity that some of our good friends could not have the good intention to see nice things but they have been only trying to see some bad things in their own bad ways and nature.

(Some hon. Members stood up.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have had enough discussion on this.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Sir, I want to say...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Why do you want to continue the discussion? I am suggesting to you that we had enough discussion on this question. Why do you want to continue this discussion now?

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: One from our group may be called.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right. From the PSP group only.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS (Uttar Pradesh): I shall ask after that.

SHRI N. G. GORAY: I would like to point out that the whole confusion has arisen because we do not know the exact demand that was made by the

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : On a point of order आपने लिस्ट में एक पार्टी के दो दो सदस्यों को भी बुलाया है, लिस्ट में एक मेरा ही नाम बचा है, एक नाम ही यह बचा है...

श्री उपसभापति : आपकी पार्टी के भी दो हो गये। पी० एस० पी० का नहीं हुआ है इसलिये उनको बुलाया है।

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : लेकिन एक नाम जो बचा है लिस्ट में वह मेरा है, मुझे बुलायें।

श्री उपसभापति : आप बैठिये। श्री को मैंने बुलाया है।

[Shri N. G. Goray]

rami! Nadu Chief Minister. Everybody is trying to put his own interpretation on the letter the contents of which nobody knows. Therefore, I would request the Prime Minister to lay it on the Table so that we would know exactly whether they want an emblem or a standard or a flag. The motive is being doubted because certain things have happened in Tamil Nadu. You might recall the NCC was discontinued because there were Hindi orders, and they said that they would have nothing to do with it. These things have gone on multiplying. Therefore, this new demand— which we do not know, and we do not know in what exact words it has been couched—has raised a certain controversy. Therefore, Sir, I would say that the Prime Minister would be serving the cause of integration if she were to tell us exactly what the Tamil Nadu Chief Minister has demanded.

Sir, there were analogies from the U. S. A., the U. S. S. R. etc. But here, Sir, I would like to point out that once this process starts it may end into anything which may bring about disintegration of the country also. But if the demand is only for an emblem, I do not think we should make so much fuss about it. If they want a separate emblem with Gopuram and all that, I suppose there should be no objection to allowing Tamil Nadu to use that emblem.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : As flag.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : Not as flag but as emblem. That is what I am saying.

(No reply)

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY : The Prime Minister has not replied to the question.

MR. DEPUPTY CHAIRMAN :  
These are all suggestions made.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI :  
As you know, Sir, we do not normally put correspondence between the Chief Minister and the Prime Minister on the Table of the House because, in that case, it would make the frank expression of views difficult. I have made it clear that Tamil Nadu has asked for a

separate standard, not an emblem because they already have an emblem. They want a separate standard. There will be the National Flag in the right hand corner and a Gopuram which is their emblem on the left hand.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: 'Standard' actually means flag.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI:  
An emblem cannot take the place of the National Flag. It would be used on places or occasions where the National Flag would not normally fly.

SHRI J. P. YADAV (Bihar): The hon'ble Member here says that it will be used as a parallel flag.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI :  
No. It will be flown on the private residences and cars of the Ministers on those occasions when they are not allowed to fly the National Flag. On occasions such as Independence Day or the Republic Day only the National Flag will fly.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS: I would like to know from the hon'ble Prime Minister whether this demand of the Tamil Nadu Chief Minister she has seen in the background of certain unhappy incidents that occurred in that area some time ago, for instance, the burning of the National Flag and tearing off of the Constitution. Has she looked into this demand in that background? That is number one.

Number two, I would like to know from the hon'ble Prime Minister whether this demand is not likely to prove as a thin end of the wedge in the long run.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: He is apprehending too much.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : That she knows.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I have already stated that this matter will be considered in all its aspects and in its wider implications. This is what I have written to the Chief Minister also. Here I want to correct myself. I believe I said that the "standard" is put on the right hand corner. But I am told that it is on the upper left hand corner.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Sir, on a point of order. Sir, two concepts have been used by the hon'ble Prime Minister which seem to be utterly misleading. In the first place, a difference is sought to be made between a 'standard' and a 'flag' without any distinction. And this is a very misleading thing. We are unable to understand this.

Secondly, the hon'ble Prime Minister seems to imply that this lies within the executive competence of the Government to grant a flag or not to grant a flag. I would rather assert that this granting of a flag does not lie within the authority and competence of the Government. Therefore, my submission would be that coming as it does from a high authority like the Prime Minister, it is utterly misleading and it is doing grave injustice to the House.

Lastly, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would like to request your indulgence—I may not have time later—now that we have got the text of the statements made by the hon'ble Prime Minister earlier on the points that we had raised about her offensive remarks. And it does seem to me that . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : I will have to raise it. I have got the text with me.

(Inter-ruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Why don't you allow me to read it out?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mishra, we are discussing now the Calling Attention Motion. Let us finish the Calling Attention Motion and after that, we will see.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Then you should ask the hon'ble Prime Minister to stay here and reply to us. Otherwise, I will have to read out what offensive remarks have been made.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: After the Calling Attention Motion is over.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Sir, let him raise it after the Calling Attention matter is over. He is the Leader

urgent public importance

der of the Opposition and if he wants to bring something to your notice, he can do so.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: After the Calling Attention Motion is over.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But I have a constitutional point to raise arising out of the Prime Minister's reply to the Calling Attention Motion.

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA (Bihar): Sir, the Leader of the Opposition was permitted to raise this question and after the Prime Minister has replied to it. I think the question is over and it should not be allowed to be raised again.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : At that time, I did not have the exact words. Now I have got the exact words she used.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, the Prime Minister made a reply in the course of the Calling Attention motion, 'My personal opinion is this, that the National Flag should be flown on the Rashtrapati Bhavan'. Now under our Constitution, the President acts on the advice of the Prime Minister. I, therefore, request you, Sir, to transmit that part of the transcript of the proceedings to the President, treating it as advice to the President, so that from tomorrow we will see the National Flag flying on the Rashtrapati Bhavan. The President acts on the advice of the Prime Minister, under our Constitution; now that advice has been given here on the floor of the House; under our Constitution, the President is part of Parliament, since Parliament has been seized of it, the advice has been voiced on the floor of the House. It is imperative that the Prime Minister must write to the President that 'My advice is this, that from tomorrow, the National Flag, rather than the flag which always flies there, should fly there'. Now, if that is not done, then it will be seen that in matters of public policy, and in replying to questions, the Prime Minister has a personal approach and also a Prime Minister's approach vis-a-vis the President. Our Constitution does not provide for a double-pronged approach—a personal advice voiced on the floor of Parliament, and also an official

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

advice. She was answering the question not as Shrimati Indira Gandhi, a citizen of India, but as the Prime Minister of the country, head of the Council of Ministers which is responsible to the other House, to Parliament. Since she has expressed this opinion, it should be treated as an advice given to the President and should be given effect to immediately. I would request you, in consonance with the spirit and letter of the Constitution, to take immediate steps and I hope the Prime Minister will also take immediate steps. We fully endorse her opinion. I do not think anybody in the House opposes, for once, this opinion which has been given. This advice should be firmly tendered. Now that this advice has been given through the floor of this House to the President, I am sure that Shri Giri, who is now in Hyderabad, will send telephonic instructions to his Rashtrapati Bha-van people to fly the National Flag from tomorrow.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : Sir, this a very grave matter. Does it mean that we give an ultimatum to the President that within 24 hours he should haul down the present flag?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : He has only made a suggestion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have not given any ultimatum.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you took permission to mention something . . .

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Sir, I also raised the other point . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : No, no. First let Mr. Bhupesh Gupta finish.

**REFERENCE TO THE REPORTED  
PURCHASE OF POOR INDIAN GIRLS  
FROM KERALA AS NUNS BY  
CONVENTS IN SOME FOREIGN  
COUNTRIES**

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, yesterday in all the newspapers you have

seen a report on the purchase of poor Indian girls from Kerala by the convents of Italy, France, West Germany, England and other countries in order to recruit them as nuns. This has been broadcast by the BBC all over the country . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Just one minute, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. I think you and Mr. Goray approached the Chairman in this regard and it is under consideration for being taken up as a Calling-Attention Motion

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Then it should be done at the earliest.

**REFERENCE TO THE REPORTED  
POSTING OF TWO THOUSAND  
POLICEMEN TO PROTECT PRIME  
MINISTER'S FARM NEAR MEH-  
RAULI**

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही (उत्तर प्रदेश) :  
उपसभापति जी, मैं आपकी आज्ञा से इस  
सदन का ध्यान एक गम्भीर घटना की ओर  
दिलाना चाहूँगा। परसों 23 तारीख को  
माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी के फार्म पर लगभग  
दो हजार पुलिस वालों ने जो जुल्म किया  
उसकी ओर मैं इस सदन का ध्यान दिलाना  
चाहता हूँ।

(Interruption)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : He has been given permission by the Chairman. Please do not interrupt him.

श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी (मध्य प्रदेश) :  
पुलिस वालों ने जुल्म किया या वहाँ आकर  
लोगों ने अनधिकार चेष्टा की, ला एंड  
आर्डर तोड़ने की चेष्टा की।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : श्रीमन्, इस  
देश में विद्वद्विद्यालय में पुस्तकालय फूँके जाते  
हैं और वहाँ पुलिस नजर नहीं आती  
(Interruption) लेकिन प्रधान मंत्री के  
40 एकड़ के फार्म की रक्षा के लिए दो हजार  
पुलिस लगाई गई . . .

(Interruption)