

SHRI B. RATH: Instead of going through old history, may I know, after receiving this memorandum.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Rath, one at a time.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I contest what the hon. Minister has said just now and say that it is not a fact. I say with all the emphasis at my command that there was no enquiry held and the States Ministry proceeded with the matter *suo motu* and transferred the States to Bihar. Why should they not again proceed *suo motu* now and give these States back to Orissa?

(No answer.)

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Where is the answer? We want an answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All questions will be answered together by Dr. Katju.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Is it not a fact that an overwhelming section of the population in these two States consists of Adibasis and that they want to remain united with Bihar?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not want the controversy between Bihar and Orissa to be staged in Parliament by means of questions.

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH: Out of these 25 representatives, Members of Parliament, how many are from Orissa State?

PROF. G. RANGA: How many are from Orissa? That is the point.

DR. K. N. KATJU: I hold every Member of Parliament in equal affection. I am sorry I have not analysed that fact from that angle.

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH: Regarding this question, I want to know how many are from Orissa?

DR. K. N. KATJU: I confess that I have not analysed the number 25 in that light.

PROF. G. RANGA: Very good; you are exonerated.

DR. K. N. KATJU: Whoever he is and whichever part he comes from, once he is a Member of Parliament, I consider him to be a representative of the whole of India.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Would the hon. Minister be prepared to receive a representation on this point from 76 Members of Parliament from Bihar?

DR. K. N. KATJU: May I just say one word, Sir? At the time that this controversy was going on, I happened to be, in another capacity, in Cuttack itself, and I am very familiar with the whole history both in Cuttack and in Patna.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: I want to know if the Orissa Assembly has passed a resolution?

(No reply.)

FLYING OF UNION JACK ON THE OCCASION OF THE CORONATION OF QUEEN ELIZABETH II

*261. SHRIMATI SHOILA BALADAS: Will the Minister for HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state what principle was followed when the Union Jack was flown side by side with the Indian Tricolour Flag on the Central Secretariat Buildings in New Delhi on the occasion of the Coronation of Queen Elizabeth II of England?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI B. N. DATAR): The Union Jack was flown side by side with the Indian National Flag on the Secretariat Buildings in New Delhi on the Coronation of Queen Elizabeth II as a matter of courtesy towards a friendly country and also because the Queen is the head of the Commonwealth.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: What is the constitutional provision in our Constitution, to which all of us, Ministers and Members, have sworn allegiance, which says that the Queen of Great Britain, whoever she may be, is the head of the Commonwealth?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: There is no constitutional provision, but there are provisions which are equally sacred or important.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Sir, I should like to ask how, when we have sworn allegiance to the Constitution, we justify ourselves paying indirect allegiance to a foreign sovereign? Is it not a violation of the Constitution?

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: There is no violation of the Constitution.

DR. K. N. KATJU: This is not so. This is a matter of what we may call a convention and an agreement arrived at with which the hon. Members are quite familiar. It has nothing to do with the Constitution. (*Interruptions.*) It is extraordinary that you will not let me speak.

PROF. G. RANGA: You first of all amend what your colleague has said. It is only a matter of convention.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: Yes.

PROF. G. RANGA: It is only a convention; so, better amend what your colleague has said.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: What is the sacredness attached to it?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: The sacredness is.....

DR. K. N. KATJU: Every one of us, every Indian, owes allegiance to our Constitution and to nothing else; but then, apart from the Constitution, we may enter into agreements, and it may be, as a result of the agreement, that the Queen of England is the symbolic head of a Commonwealth of which we, the Republic of India, are a member. There is no question of sanctity.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: I should like to know, Sir, how the hon. Minister, clever lawyer as he is, tries to justify that there is no violation of the Constitution.. ..

69 C. S. D

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: There is no violation.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: No violation of the Constitution.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY:.....when it is said that the Queen of England, the queen of a foreign country, who has nothing to do with this country, is the head of a group of which we are supposed to be a member?

DR. K. N. KATJU: I do not think that there is any violation, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Imbichibava.

SHRIMATI SHARDA BHARGAVA: On a point of order, Sir. The questioner wanted to ask supplementaries.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have always given her the first chance but she never gets up.

SHRIMATI SHARDA BHARGAVA: She got up but there are young men and she is an old lady.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to ask any question?

SHRIMATI SHOILA BALA DAS: No, Sir.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: One question, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

GRANT OF INDIAN CITIZENSHIP TO MUSLIMS WHO RETURNED FROM PAKISTAN

*262. **SHRI E. K. IMBICHIBAVA:** Will the Minister for HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have received any applications for the grant of Indian Citizenship from Muslims who have returned to India from Pakistan; and

(b) if so, what action has been taken thereon?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI B. N. DATAR): (a) All