

extended by two days. On 8th and 9th also, we are going to meet.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) : It upsets all our plans. I do not know why at the fag-end they decide it.

MR. SPEAKER : I thought, you had agreed to it.

SHRI SURESH KURUP (Kottayam) : Every time this is the practice.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat) : We were not consulted, but we were informed that the Government has decided to extend the House.

MR. SPEAKER : It is only with your consent. It is only you who decide it. I just announce it.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : It should not have been done at the last stage like this.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : We are not politically unemployed.

MR. SPEAKER : You are right.

— — — —

16.26 hrs.

**DISCUSSION RE : NEED TO PRESERVE
 SANCTITY AND DIGNITY OF
 NATIONAL SYMBOLS—Contd.**

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : We will now take up Item No. 20.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Order please. Another importaat subject is comming up. Let us give our attention to it. This is also a very important subject. We must give importance which is due to the subject that we are discussing. Yes, Mr. Kurup.

SHRI SURESH KURUP (Kottayam) : Sir, National Symbols symbolise the unity and integrity of our country. It is unfortunate that these symbols as also our

Constitution which are common assets of the people of this country are often publicly abused and challenged. I am not only talking about the incident of those students who refused to sing the National Anthem when it is sung in their school, as also about the verdict of the Supreme Court upholding their position. Sir, we can force them to sing the National Anthem by a new legislation, if there is any lacuna in the Statute, as was pointed by Shri Madhav Reddi the other day. But, is this a problem that can be treated so lightly ? Is this only a legal or, a technical matter, about which we can make a law so that it is enforced in the country ? I think it is not. I believe that our national symbols can be well honoured...

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order. Mr. Jaipal, the Hon. Member is being disturbed by your talk. This is a very serious subject. Please listen. I think that this subject is as important as the one we have been discussing till now. It is even more important because it might have far reaching...

SHRI SURESH KURUP : I think that our national symbols can be well honoured and protected only by preserving our national unity, There were ever so many incidents in this regard. Some group in Tamil Nadu burnt the Constitution. When there was the Akali agitation, they also burnt the Constitution. And now the students belonging to the Jehovah's Witness Sect refused to sing our National Anthem. These acts of disrespect to our national symbols should not be tolerated. There is no doubt about it.

Sir, in connection with this, I would like to say that one unfortunate thing is there. So many people in our country. unfortunately associate these National Symbols with the Government and rulers of the country. So, the misdeeds of the rulers of this country also are reflected in the action of certain sections of our people.

As regards our Constitution, our party has serious reservations about it. We have explained it again and again. We believe that it needs to be changed lock, stock and barrel.

(Interruptions)

SHRI VAKKOM PURUSHOTHAMAN
(Alleppey) : We have had more than
possibly...

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY
(Katwa) : That is a shameful thing.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SURESH KURUP : I said, I
have, our party has serious criticisms about
the Constitution. It should be changed lock,
stock and barrel. That is what I said.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY :
If and when we come to power, there would
be completely new Constitution. There is no
doubt about it.

(Interruptions)

PROF. P. J. KURIEN (Idukki) : They
have taken the oath under the Constitution.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY :
You have taken the oath under the Consti-
tution and do you want to villify it.

SHRI VAKKOM PURUSHOTHAMAN :
You cannot speak against the Constitution.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Kurien, there is
a law provided. There are rules provided for
the Amendment. We have already done it.
It is the House which can do it. If outside
somebody does it, it is illegal.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY :
That is all right. Nobody can do it outside.

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : He is only
referring to Article 368 of the Constitution:

(Interruptions)

SHRI SURESH KURUP : Our party's
position in this regard is very clear.

MR. SPEAKER : You can express your
opinion.

SHRI SURESH KURUP : Many of the
provisions of the Constitution do not suit
our country to proceed as a modern State.
That is what I said.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : He has all respect to
your Constitution.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY :
He has full respect.

SHRI SURESH KURUP : Otherwise, I
would not have taken oath. Many of the
instances are a threat to our national
symbols. Many of instances are a sign of un-
rest among the people of our country. I am
sorry to say in this connection, many, of the
actions of the Union Government, regarding
this, regarding some major sensitive issues
are like adding fuel to the fire. Tamil Nadu
is a case in point. Even though, our late
Prime Ministers and present Prime Minister
have reiterated that there is no question of
imposing any language on any sect of people,
but some are so particular about giving an
impression that they are going to impose
Hindi. That is why in Tamil Nadu a section
of people were mobilised and they burnt a
part of our Constitution.

SHRI VAKKOM PURUSHOTHAMAN :
Sir, Are you justifying that action ?

SHRI SURESH KURUP : I am not
justifying it.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY :
You give them a handle.

SHRI SURESH KURUP : I mean by
your action, you allowed them to do all
these things to denigrate the most important
national symbol by your actions, you are
allowing it, I am not against any language
or our party is not against any language, all
languages are to be respected, but unnecessarily
your Government is creating problems to the
integrity of this country. Who is protecting
the divisive forces and encouraging the forces
of disintegration and creating an atmosphere
of disrespect to our national symbols ? I

would request the ruling party to have a serious introspection regarding this. Sir, a Minister in Kerala urged the people of Kerala to start an agitation like the Punjab agitation....

MR. SPEAKER : No.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SURESH KURUP : And not only that...

(Interruptions)

SHRI VAKKOM PURUSHOTHAMAN : It is against the facts.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : You look here. I do not know whether I am right but I think the State Legislature can best take care of that, you cannot. The State Legislature is capable of doing that.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : He is speaking of the ruling of the Court.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN : It is *sub judice*.

MR. SPEAKER : On *sub judice* matters. I will not allow because the State Legislature is quite competent to do it.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : About the verdict of the court, he is talking.

SHRI SURESH KURUP : I am not at all talking about the State Legislature or anything. A Minister in Kerala publicly exhorted the people of Kerala to fight against the Union Government to start the Punjab model agitation.

SHRI VAKKOM PURUSHOTHAMAN : No. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SURESH KURUP : Now, that very same Minister who denigrated the Constitution of our country is taking shelter under your Ministry.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : Very bad... *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Not here.

SHRI SURESH KURUP : There is a Chief Minister belonging to your party....
(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Restrict your speech to national symbols. Don't bring in extraneous things. Relate your speech to the symbols. Mr. Kurup, I think you are a very intelligent young man; you must come up with some positive thinking pertaining to this subject.

SHRI SURESH KURUP : This is a very recent incident.

MR. SPEAKER : No... it might be so, but it does not concern this subject. I will not allow that.

SHRI SURESH KURUP : Let me say this, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : No....*(Interruptions)*

PROF. P. J. KURIEN : A ruling has been given. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Let us leave it to the State Assembly. Let them handle it. *(Interruptions)* Mr. Kurup, you now carry on.

Mr. Kurien, you leave it to me. I know what I am doing. Please be seated. Mr. Kurup, please refer only to the subject.

SHRI SURESH KURUP : What right does the ruling party have, when they are allowing this type of forces to come and take shelter under them? What right do they have to speak about national symbols? I cannot understand it. I do not know what sanctity you give to national symbols if you are openly supporting all anti-national forces in the country. You say GNLF is not anti-national. At the same time you speak about the sanctity of national symbols. *(Interruptions)* We are discussing about national symbols today.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE (Jadavpur) : We are not discussing West Bengal now. He is bringing in politics here.

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order. Mamata Ji, take your seat.

SHRI SURESH KURUP : I only said this. I am not making an irrelevant point. I only said that all over the country, all these anti-national forces are being protected by the ruling party, directly or indirectly.....
(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY :
Directly and indirectly. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM :
(Salem): It is a discussion regarding national symbols. Is it necessary to come down to this level? There should be some level to be maintained...

SHRI SURESH KURUP : When a person of the stature of the Prime Minister himself is saying that a disruptive organization is not anti-national. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : That is your point of view.

SHRI SURESH KURUP : It is in effect protecting anti-national forces, and I am saying that the ruling party has no right to speak about national symbols.

MR. SPEAKER : That is your point of view. The Prime Minister has his own point of view.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY :
That is right, Sir; but he has to say that.

SHRI SURESH KURUP : And the ruling party, in Tripura is aligning with the Tripura Juba Samiti, and again you are talking about the sanctity of the national symbol. What is the use? For all practical purposes, your party aligns with all these forces all over the country, and here in Parliament, you are talking about the sanctity of the symbols. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK (Panaji) :
He is referring to the ruling party in Tripura; that is right.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE :
Referring to the ruling party in West Bengal. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SURESH KURUP : I am not going to the continue to speak for long.

(Interruptions) Sir, I must get a translation of what Mamata Ji is saying. I am not going to talk much more. *(Interruptions)* I am again saying that the dignity and the sanctity of the symbols can be protected and honoured, only through the integration of this country, by protecting the national unity of our country.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY :
And by rousing patriotism.

SHRI SURESH KURUP : And for that, all patriotic forces should unite and work. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER : The Prime Minister.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY :
Is it a reply on the Punjab debate, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER : You are sitting right there to listen to, Sir.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : They are clapping without knowing what he is going to say.

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : Let them clap. You mind your own.

(Interruptions)

[English]

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI RAJIV GANDHI) : Hon. Members may be clapping without knowing but the Hon. Member there is talking without thinking, Sir.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I only talk without thinking but he acts without thinking.

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : As Prime Minister, it is his privilege to act without thinking!

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : Sir, although the subject may sound light-hearted the way the House was carrying on when I came in...

(Interruptions)

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM :
We were serious.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : I did not ask
for a running commentary. You are not at a
cricket match.

The subject, I believe, should not be
taken lightly because Nations are not auto-
matically built. Every effort must go into
building a Nation and when we set out to
build a nation almost 40 years ago, we gave
two symbols to the nation, the National
Anthem and the Flag. These symbols, in a
sense, embody the soul and the spirit of the
Nation. Our Tricolour and the Jana Gana
Mana are the symbols of our Nationhood.
They are—and they must be—sacred to us,
and they are an integral part of our freedom,
of our unity. They have come out of our
freedom struggle, our freedom movement.
They are a symbol of free India today. Our
Tricolour represents sacrifices, purity and
prosperity as was described at Independence.
It carries the imprint of the Eternal Wheel,
the Jana Gana Mana is the creation of
Gurudev Tagore and...

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI HARISH RAWAT (Almora) :
The Court's judgement has deeply hurt the
people's sentiments.

MR. SPEAKER : What is this happen-
ing ?

[English]

SHRI RAM SINGH YADAV (Alwar) :
This is an expression against ..

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Who gave you per-
mission ?

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : I understand
some of our Members are little upset about
what the court has said.

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM :
We are only demanding** Nothing more
than that. It is time that we showed the
nation...(Interruptions)

It is an insult to the whole nation.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : You have given
powers.

[Translation]

SHRI HARISH RAWAT : The Judge-
ment of the Court has hurt the sentiments of
the people of the whole country.

MR. SPEAKER : The function of the
Court is to pronounce judgements, ours is to
frame laws.

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE
(Bolpur) : Each and every epithet cannot be
hurled at the Courts just in this manner.

MR. SPEAKER : Who said it ?

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : Nothing goes on record
without permission. Please be seated.

[English]

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Demand
for** cannot be made in this manner. They
have to table a motion.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Sit down.

[Translation]

I cannot understand what you are doing.

SHRI HARISH RAWAT : The judge-
ment of the Court in regard to our National
Anthem is an insult to the whole nation.

**Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER : You have said it. Everyone got an opportunity to express his or her opinion. It is in this context that discussion has been allowed. The House is competent enough to make changes in the law if it so desires. The Court's duty is to give judgement on the laws and our work is to frame laws. It is the duty of the court to pronounce judgement and your duty is to enact laws. Let us see what happens.

SHRI HARISH RAWAT : We express our gratitude to you for it. We want to make a request.

MR. SPEAKER : You take your seat.

SHRI HARISH RAWAT : We just want to make a submission.

MR. SPEAKER : You have done your job, Shri Harish Rawat. You as well as all others got a chance to speak and participate in the discussion. The Prime Minister as well as the House know all about this case and now it is for the Prime Minister and this House to take action.

SHRI HARISH RAWAT : We are grateful to you and are expressing our gratitude to you.

MR. SPEAKER : You take your seat.

[*English*]

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I am on a point of order. You may please go through the text. Whatever was said by way of reflection on the Supreme Court Judges, cannot form part of the record. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : You are making a noise unnecessarily.

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Jaipal Reddy, you are unnecessarily all the time creating trouble for me. There is no point. Nothing will go on record which is against any person,

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : I can make out nothing when you 50 persons start speaking at a time. I simply do not understand anything. What does all this mean ?

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : It is all right. You keep speaking like this.

[*English*]

Nothing goes on record. Let them speak.

(*Interruptions*)**

MR. SPEAKER : It never comes to an end. I have told you repeatedly that nothing against the judges will go on record. So simple it is.

[*Translation*]

Did you say something ?

[*English*]

Have you said anything against the judges ?

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : If you have not said anything, then it is all right. (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER : You please listen to me. Have you said something against the judges ? If not, then it is all right.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : If you could listen to me for a minute, I shall be able to convince you. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER : Let me say something. Anything which is against the law and against all rules, that will be expunged and nothing else. If you have not said any such thing, it will not be out of the record. (*Interruptions*)

* * Not recorded,

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : What is the dispute then ?

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : If what you have said is under the rules, there is no dispute. If it is not, then, it will not go on record. It is very simple.

AN HON. MEMBER : We have said it under the rules.

MR. SPEAKER : If it is so, then what is the dispute. You are unnecessarily making a noise without giving a thought to it. All persons start speaking at the same time.

(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the *Jana Gana Mana* is the creation of Gurudev Tagore. It has come out...

(Interruptions)

This is the respect they show to the National Anthem.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : That is a different thing.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : You take your seats. Please take your seats.

(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : I did not say that the Hon. Member had said it.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Jaipal Reddy, please sit down. You should take your seat. It is between me and Saifuddin. I do not want any lawyer in between.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : The *Jana Gana Mana*, in its words, gives the message of

integration, of tolerance, of equality for our nation.

Sir, some think the national anthem is a mere set of words and the flag just another piece of cloth. But it is most important that we understand and share the faith and the efforts of nation building. Perhaps I can best quote Indiraji at this point. She said :

"Our Flag and our National Anthem are no ordinary things. They unite the country and bind it together, and that is why I want to say that the glory of the Flag must be protected even at the cost of life."

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Of course, of course.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : May I say that the same is true for the National Anthem.

Building a nation is a great and onerous task built brick by brick, stone by stone. It is built by Gandhiji, by Panditji, by Indiraji and many others that have sacrificed to bring our nation to the great position that it is in today. What is most important for a nation, a developing nation, a nation in the stage of building such as we are in today, is that we must be very careful that those symbols which stand for our Nation, which stand as insignia of our Nation are not chipped away and cut at the root slowly and gradually, bit by bit, over a period of time. This chipping is an insidious encroachment on our Nation. We must nourish our Nationhood at the roots beginning from our freedom struggle and build from there. We cannot do this by imparting imported ideologies and values into our value system. We cannot compare directly with what is happening in other countries in the world and bring it in and pretend that it will fit in here. It does not. We are building an India. We are not building an America or Japan or a Soviet Union or an England.

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : I am speaking very carefully and if you go back to the judgement you will know precisely what I am talking,

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : Let us remember that the Flag and the Anthem as symbols of India have grown out of our Indian struggle. They have come out of history and out of our heritage. Let us not borrow from other countries to pull them down and destroy them.

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : Let there be no doubt that we will not allow these symbols to be reduced in value or cut down. We do not accept the Supreme Court judgement in the manner in the Emmaneul case.

[*Translation*]

SHRI BALKAVI BAIRAGI (Mandsaur): Many many congratulations to you.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I shall do myself whatever you want to do....

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : The malaise grows with each dose of treatment, it does not recede.

SHRI RANA VIR SINGH (Kaiserganj) : But ultimately, this treatment proves effective.

[*English*]

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : We shall ensure that the true and correct position is not only stated but it is also enforced. We will use all the legal means that are available and if legal means do not work, we will use Constitutional means to see that they are enforced.

AN HON. MEMBER : Constitutional means are also legal means,

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : They are legal means. Both are legal means.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : What I have said is very clear if you want to understand what I have said.

Sir, Article 51A enshrines the respect for the Flag and the Anthem. This House represents the unshakable will of the sovereign people of India. I am fully confident that this House will support and endorse every measure that is necessary to give the due respect to the Flag and the Anthem. The Government is determined to ensure that faithful obedience to fundamental duty is there in India. Thank you.

SHRI C. MADHAV REDDI (Adilabad) : One clarification, Sir. It is my motion. I just wanted to know this. Instead of depending on your appeal before the Supreme Court, before the Full Bench, that is Five-Member Bench, why don't you immediately take the action and amend the Insult to National Honour Act? Section 3 is defective for that purpose.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : Sir, we believe there is no need for that. We believe the Judgement is not acceptable.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Sir, when the Prime Minister refers to the National Anthem, I hope he is referring to the present one and not any new Anthem which may be thought out by somebody.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : Sir, I do not know what the Hon. Member is talking about, I am talking about '*Jana Gana Mana*', as I have said here, as written by Tagore. Perhaps the Hon. Member has some other Anthem in view which I do not know about. To the best of my knowledge, Sir, this country has only one Anthem.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : And shall continue to have it.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : Sir, the doubts about the continuation of this Anthem are only in the mind of the Hon. Member.

[*Translation*]

SHRI HARISH RAWAT : We are very grateful for this. Action should also be taken against the Judges who delivered such a judgement.

MR. SPEAKER : This is their job.

[English]

Nothing can be done, Shri Balkavi Bairagi.

[English]

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Sir, it is my turn. (*Interruptions*). He took the time of more than three Members of the Ruling Party. The turn is mine.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Jaipal Reddy, sometimes you must have restraint. All the time you go on rising without any restraint. It is very bad on your part.

[Translation]

SHRI BALKAVI BAIIRAGI : Hon. Speaker, Sir, first of all I want to congratulate the Hon. Prime Minister on behalf of all the Members. I want to felicitate him for his determination to preserve the dignity of the national symbols with all his alacrity, enthusiasm, whole-heartedness and awareness. I am highly grateful to him for it. When a man of poetic sensibilities like me speaks under the chairmanship of a person like you, his responsibility increases. First of all, the Prime Minister clarified the whole situation, but I want to say one thing with utmost humility. I am a villager living in the fields. It is a separate issue whether you take some decision or not about these judges according to the Constitution while sitting under this giant tomb, but every wise farmer of this country and even the illiterate ones are criticising those judges. I want to say this much only.

[English]

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Sir, you must come to our rescue.

[Translation]

SHRI BALKAVI BAIIRAGI : You may expunge these words from the record if you want and I do not have any objection to it.

17.00 hrs.

(*Interruptions*)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : No reflection please. No reflection on the judges please.

[Translation]

Jaipalji, I have said it without your request.

(*Interruptions*)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : No reflection on the judges will go on record.

[Translation]

Now what is troubling you ?

SHRI BALKAVI BAIIRAGI : Mr. Speaker, Sir, Gurudev Tagore created this song "*Jana Gana Mana Adhinayak Jai He, Bharat Bhagya Vidhata*", He was not a poet restricted to some house, village or city. We have acknowledged him as a world renowned poet. When a poet of international stature writes a song, it will not be fair to cast aspersions on his integrity after his death. He himself had set at rest all these doubts. It is absolutely wrong to blame him that he wrote this song in praise of George V or George IV. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to add to the speech of the Hon. Prime Minister and say before this august House that Gurudev did not describe any geography in this song and did not mention any person. Had it been so, it could have been pointed out that it did not mention the names of Rajasthan, Assam, Brahmaputra, Godavari, Krishna, Karnataka or any other place but I, in all my senses, want to say that instead of describing some geography or a person, Gurudev has embraced in this song the culture of the whole country. Gurudev has described all the cultures like that of Punjab, Gujarat, Marathas and others which cover the whole of our country. Is Bangla not our culture ? Can you exclude the Indus culture ? Today many people ask us as to why do you praise Sindh even though it has become a part of Pakistan. But I want to say that Indus is a part of our culture and will continue to be so. We cannot do away with the Indus. He has used the expression "*Dravida Utkal Banga*" which represents the whole of our Southern, South-Eastern and

[Shri Balkavi Bairagi]

Eastern cultures of our country. So, Gurudev wrote this song after he had given a deep thought to it. I do not want to accuse anyone but so far as my knowledge about our cultural heritage goes, I would say that these people who say today through their children that they will not sing the National Anthem as it is not sanctioned by their religion, forget that day when in their neighbourhood, the Constituent Assembly in the presence of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, C. Rajagopalachari, Maulana Azad and other great leaders including the representatives from all directions, religions and groups had unanimously taken this decision, appended their signatures to it and then it was adopted. No one expressed opposition at that time. Today they are accusing us through small children. I want to ask them that were not the makers of our Constitution wise persons? Are not we their children? Are not we descendants of those wise persons of this country? If not, of whom are we the descendants? Today the time has come to prove it. Today, in the presence of the Hon. Prime Minister, I want to say very seriously that no attack on the integrity, unity, sovereignty and development of this country will be tolerated irrespective of the forces behind such activities. Today a conspiracy is being hatched in our country to gradually attack our national symbols so that the people might disown them and a feeling of hatred against such symbols could be generated among them to carry on the activities aimed at disintegration of the country. But we want to testify the determination of the Hon. Prime Minister with our blood. We cannot tolerate disrespect to this sacred symbol at any cost whatever sacrifices we may have to give. I want to present the factual position before you. What can we do if we start reciting the *Jana-Gana-Mana* and our Hon. Friends are unable to make out the meaning of it. No other song can be more sacred than this. It is not directed against any country and it does not smell anything bad. Gurudev created this song by incorporating the total heritage of the country. If someone raises doubts over this song, we shall have to give him a suitable answer whatever may be the status of that person. I am happy that the Prime Minister has prepared today the ground for that answer. I want to say that sometimes atmos-

phere is created to tear off the National Flag and to burn the Constitution. These are all conspiracies to weaken us. I am very happy that these weaknesses have been identified. In the end, I would request you personally to move necessary amendment to the Constitution. Whole of this country and this House is with you. But if this disrespect is not curbed, we shall be the biggest culprits in the eyes of the history. We are prepared lest we should become the culprits in history and for that we felicitate you and express our thanks to you.

The national flag is not a piece of cloth to compromise on, as our Prime Minister has said. We are being poisoned to accept their view point, but we do not accept it. I want to say that duty towards nation is the noblest of all. The duty towards nation is first and foremost. We follow this duty and abide by it. With these words I welcome you and once again express my thank to the Prime Minister. If some of my Hon. Friends are feeling relaxed after discussing this serious issue at this critical hour following the discussion on Punjab, then I am happy that you have taken the initiative at the right time. I want to tell all of my friends that wherever their hearts and minds may be, but they will have to abide by all such things as long as they are on the soil of India. If they do not agree, the coming generations will force them to do so. I conclude my speech by expressing my thanks once again to the custodians of those coming generations.

[English]

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Mahtubnagar): I wish the Prime Minister should stay back to hear.

Mr. Speaker, at the very outset I must say on this occasion I find myself in total agreement with the sentiments expressed by the mover of the resolution Mr. Madhav Reddi and the sentiments expressed by the Hon. Prime Minister.

They are not merely symbols. They are symbols of our integrity, of our dignity, they are symbols redolent with the aroma of sufferings and sacrifice of the freedom struggle.

Our past Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, while tabling the motion for the flag, said that the flag represents the concentrated history of the freedom struggle of India. Therefore, one cannot take a legalistic or doctrinaire view of the question of 'symbol'. But, then, we must know and recall how various symbols of our nation have been trampled with in this country for so many years.

There was a manufacturing company in Karnataka some time back which used the picture of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru on the thermos for their commercial use. It was a good thing that that firm was proceeded against and penalised for its offence

But, I would say that the Office of Prime Minister, though not exactly a symbol, is only a symbol of our nation irrespective of the fact who occupies it. At a recent AICC session, HMT watch—not one but all HMT watches—with the picture of the Prime Minister was distributed. I want the Government of India to reflect as to whether this is the best way of honouring the symbols of our Constitution, of our nation, of our democracy ..

(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : It was a symbol of HMT...

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Mr. Deputy Speaker, I seek your protection.

(Interruptions)

Sometime back, on the gate of Rashtrapathi Bhavan...

SHRI VAKKOM PURUSHOTHAMAN (Alleppey) : If your photo is there, nobody will purchase. But if the Prime Minister's photo is there, thousands of people will purchase.

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : They want the office of the Prime Minister to be on sale. What can we do ?

(Interruptions)

17.11 hrs.

[**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER** *in the Chair*]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Mr. Jaipal Reddy, please be serious. Don't waste the time. I have to give chance to others also.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : When you come to me, why do you think of time ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Not only for you. It is applicable to everybody.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : The point is, at the gate of Rashtrapathi Bhavan, the British Coat-of-Arms symbol was still painted. An objection to this was taken by our leader Prof. Madhu Dandavate and the Government promised to remove it. I would like the Home Minister to answer...

DR. V. VENKATESH (Kolar) : To listen to your point ?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I would like the Home Minister to answer whether this symbol of British Coat-of-Arms has been removed from the Rashtrapathi Bhavan gate.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Make a note.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : The former Chief Minister of Maharashtra had used the name of one of our Prime Minister for building up a Trust...

SHRI RAM SINGH YADAV (Alwar) : Sir, I am on a Point of Order. The matter is pending before the Supreme Court...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : It is no longer pending.

(Interruptions)

The name of the former Prime Minister has been removed from that Trust. That Trust has since been dissolved. It is no longer *sub judice*. It is Indira Prathiba Prathistan.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Come to the point, You cannot get sufficient time. That is the problem.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I am coming to the point. The thing is they want me to start with introduction ..

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : In the name of introduction, you cannot take 15 minutes...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Our Prime Minister spoke highly about the sublime and supreme importance of the National Flag. As, I have mentioned earlier. I am in total agreement with it But, I beg him to reflect as to whether the flag of any single party should be identical to that of the National Flag. I beg him to reflect whether such continuation of this anomaly is not tantamount to dishonouring the National Flag.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY (Katwa) : Let the Minister reply what is the difference between the National Flag and the Congress Flag.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Definitely he will reply.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : They can use National Flag in their party meeting...

(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI BASAVARAJESWARI (Bellary) : Sir, he is talking very lightly. This is a very serious subject...

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM) : I don't think the Hon. Member should make an irresponsible allegation that we are using the National Flag in the party meetings; and we are throwing away and trampling upon the Flag. He should not make that irresponsible statement. He should withdraw his allegation He cannot do that. He is making a very irresponsible allegation.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, what I said was not the same as the Minister understood...

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : He is a newcomer to politics. That is why he does not know...

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : That is why my mind is clear and your mind is not clear.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Your experience is very limited...

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : My mind is quite clear.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Otherwise, your experience is unlimited because you are a Minister...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : At least the Minister was not reacting to my statement. I did not refer to the use of flag ..

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : He will reply when his turn comes to reply.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : The Minister did not understand the difference between a clear mind and a blank mind. We know how blank it has been.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : Very funny.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Coming to the Supreme Court judgment, I beg to differ with the judgment. I do not think that the Bench was justified in taking the view that anybody could refuse to sing the national anthem on religious grounds or on conscience grounds. Article 51A is categorical. But then I do not know why the court sometimes mixes up issues. The court should have confined itself to the adequacy of the legal sanction. In my view they did deal with this aspect, and the court's view was that the legal sanction was not adequate. They referred to the Prevention of Insult to National Honour Act of 1971 and said that, if somebody stood up when the national anthem was being sung, it was enough; the

Act did not specify that the person should also participate in singing. In my view, this view of the court was very narrow, conservative and technical. Therefore, I am not at all in agreement with the Supreme Court's judgment...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : What is the time you require ?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Another five minutes, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Try to finish in five minutes.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : If somebody in a vast crowd did not participate in the collective singing inadvertently, that could be ignored. Inadvertent non-compliance could be ignored. But in the instant case what happened was, the refusal was deliberate, it was recorded...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Order, order. Don't conduct another Parliament there.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : The Jehovah's Witnesses in some other country refused to respect the National Flag saying that, according to them, it was tantamount to an image. I do not think that any Constitution in the world is more secular than that of India and no song in the world can be more secular than *Jana Gana Mana*, and no poet or a person could be more secular than Gurudev Tagore. I do not know how such a sublime song could be objected to on religious grounds or on grounds of conscience.

There was also another aspect. In that very State, the strange State of Kerala, another Sanskrit teacher by name Krishna Warriar wrote his own national anthem. He thought he had acquired national copy right ? *(Interruptions)*... Until he was instructed by the DPI, he did not allow the national anthem to be sung in his school. After the Supreme Court judgement, again he had went back to his own pet Sanskrit national anthem with a vengeance.

At this rate there will be chauvinists belonging to many religious taking pseudo

conscientious objections to our sacred symbols of the nation like the national flag and the national anthem. A Hindu chauvinist could sometime say that Chakra relates to Buddhism and therefore he would not sing. We cannot allow this to go on.

I want to make one point very clear towards the end and that is, I don't know why the Government preferred an appeal before the full constitutional bench... *(Interruptions)* Even if it is technically maintainable...*(Interruptions)*...I am not a student of Law as Mr. Somnath Chatterjee or Mr. Chidambaram.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : I am not a scholar. Mr. Somnath Chatterjee is.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I don't know whether Chidambaram knows Indian Constitution; but he knows the US Constitution...*(Interruptions)*

I am prepared to learn from everybody Sir. This appeal before the Supreme Court is not well advised. When we take a political view, that is not a narrow technical issue and when we are competent to legislate, why can't we come forward with a specific piece of legislation which can be adopted without discussion in this House ? We are ready to adopt it, approve it and support it without discussion, without any loss of time.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Provided the language is correct in their amendment !

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Of course, we cannot really take their expertise for granted. We have seen many of their experts for so long.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You have already taken 20 minutes, please conclude.

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Only one minutes Sir. If the issue is allowed to be argued before the constitutional bench, the arguments will range from etherial international liberalism, romantic individualistic libertarianism to Hindi Jingoism and

[Shri S. Jaipal Reddy]

minority backlash. Are you going to allow another polarisation to take place on this issue? Why not we put an end to this and stop this? (*Interruptions*)...Bring a constitutional amendment. I want the Minister to react to this.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : I don't fully agree with you, but your English is very good. If they had a dictionary, they would have understood it !

MR, DEPUTY SPEAKER : I don't know whether Mr. Chatterjee has gone to refer to a dictionary !

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I learnt all the words from Mr. Somnath Chatterjee, Sir.

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM : Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir: Today we are discussing on the need to preserve, sanctify...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : They are trying to make up for their failure of yesterday Sir.

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM : Have you finished Mr. Jaipal or shall I sit down ?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Since you did not allow me to speak uninterrupted, why should I not reciprocate it ?

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM : I have not even started. If you start interrupting me before I start, what I can do ?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : You can only expect me to react with a vengeance.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Don't have any vengeance.

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, today we are discussing the need to preserve sanctity and dignity of the national symbols. It is rather unfortunate that when such a serious matter has come up in this House, we found that the Members from the Opposition were

treating it very lightly with snipe remarks including a comment on the national anthem.

SHRI AMAR ROYPRADHAN (Cooch Behar) : No, no.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Your refusal to come forward with an amendment shows your light-heartedness.

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM : It is unfortunate that we find persons who seem to be very well-versed in law, without having been really in the field of law emphasising with great emphasis the need for an amendment...(*Interruptions*).

The symbols, whether it is national anthem or the national flag, are symbols of patriotism. These are not symbols of any and every organization or an institution. These are symbols which are born not out of any whim or fancy but out of freedom struggle. Those who attempt to defile these, to say the least, are non-patriotic and definitely anti-national. Whether they are persons who occupy positions enshrined in the Constitution or not, or whether there is any individual or any citizen, of this nation, anybody who attempts to defile any of these symbols, to say the least, is an anti-national person.

We are a young country and our symbols are also young. It is, therefore, necessary for us to protect these symbols, preserve their sanctity and their dignity.

The matter of national symbols, unfortunately, in our country at times is looked upon a little lightly. If one goes outside the borders of our country to the very loose democracies in the world, as they are called, the West, which Mr. Jaipal Reddy admires quite often and quotes the United States of America.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I did not.

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM : I said —admires quite often

Even there the symbols are respected. More than two hundred years have passed,

but even there the symbols are respected to the extent that penal punishments are provided.

What has happened in the recent past is that a few school children refused to sing the national anthem not because they did not know the national anthem, not because they were hesitant as they were not sure how well they would sing it, but they refused to sing the national anthem on a matter of principle. Young children are taught by their parents not to sing the national anthem.

We have spoken a lot in this House of Jehovah's Witness sect, but do we know what really is their religion. Their religion says that the States and nations are creations of the devil. They say, respecting any State, any nation, or any symbol of the same is respecting a symbol of the devil. Therefore, when they refused to sing the National Anthem, they refused to sing it because they call it a symbol of the devil. That is what was taught to them. We accept that they are innocent children. But can we encourage such an act and say that Article 25 of the Constitution is an Article of faith in the Constitution incorporated in recognition of the principle that the real test of our true democracy is the ability of even an insignificant minority to find its identity under the country's Constitution? I say that this is to cover up an act of calling the National Anthem as a devil's symbol. Can there be any other doubt in the intention, in the attempt of the act of not singing the Anthem was not a slip? Here I would like to say that it is not as if we are trying to force people. But the issue is, what was the intent behind that act? The intent was very clear. It was to defile, to damage the dignity, to attack upon the sanctity of our National Anthem. If we permit it, then on what basis are we criticising the various secessionist movements, sectarian movements, various communal elements that are there in our country?

The Supreme Court in its judgment has said that there is really nothing wrong in it and that not singing the Anthem does not amount to showing disrespect. Even though the Supreme Court admits that the Jehovah's

Witness religion speaks of statehood and nationhood as devil's games in the universe or in the world, it is surprising how the Supreme Court looked into this matter.

Before I go any further, I think that it is relevant for me to point out what are the restraints we have under this Constitution in so far as the Supreme Court and the judges of the Supreme Court are concerned, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I would like to refer to Article 121 of our Constitution which says :

"No discussion shall take place in Parliament with respect to the conduct" (I repeat 'the conduct') "of any Judge of the Supreme Court or of a High Court in the discharge of his duties except upon a motion for presenting an address to the President praying for the removal of the Judge as hereinafter provided."

Under Article 124 (4) it is provided :

"A Judge of the Supreme Court shall not be removed from his office except by an order of the President passed after an address by each House of Parliament supported by a majority of the total membership of that House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the members of that House present and voting has been presented to the President in the same session for such removal on the ground of proved misbehaviour or incapacity."

Again, Article 124 (5) says :

"Parliament may by law regulate the procedure for the presentation of an address and for the investigation and proof of the misbehaviour or incapacity of a Judge under clause (4)."

A small question arises Mr. Deputy Speaker. Can a judge in a written judgment commit an act which definitely is an act of violation of the Constitution, that is, show disrespect to our National Anthem and to our National Symbols. That is exactly why right in the beginning, I mentioned that

[Shri P. R. Kumaramangalam]

however high a position he may occupy, whether it is constitutional post or any other public office, no citizen of India has the right to defile or throw mud at any time on our national symbols. It attacks at the very root of the unity and integrity of this nation. The judgement of the Supreme Court does exactly that. It holds very lightly the prestige and esteem of our national anthem. It says as long as the students stood, it was sufficient. The very next step would be to say that as long as the students did not mouth directly contempt against the national anthem it is a sufficient compliance of showing respect. It is my personal opinion that this judgement categorically lays down a principle which permits and encourages showing disrespect to the national symbols. Is this judgement in itself not a document, that is, showing disrespect to our Constitution? That is the question I raise. It is not the conduct of the judge in a court; it is not the conduct in the discharge of his duties that I am taking up, it is not how he behaved that I took up, but the point is quite clear and that is, can a person who hold a public office defile the Constitution, defile the national symbol and say that he is still eligible. Every judge and every one of us takes the oath. Under Article 193, none of us can come and sit in this House, let alone vote if we do not take the oath. No Supreme Court judge can exercise or discharge his functions except after taking the oath under the Constitution. Is it not true that when you interpret Article 51 (a), it is the duty of every citizen to abide by the Constitution and respect the ideals and institutions and national flag and national anthem and if by a judgement, showed disrespect to the national flag and the national anthem, you are becoming ineligible, incapacitated to continue. That is why, when the Prime Minister was speaking, few of us raised the point that, whether it is necessary that a motion for impeachment be brought in. There is nothing wrong in demanding a motion for impeachment. It is our right as Members of this House to demand it. The law as it stands is sufficient to protect. But the point that arises is, is that the intention, is that the motivation of patriotism in the minds of all the citizens of India. As long as there is a will, there is always a way. In this particular case, the

judgement proved that the will was lacking to protect the national anthem, to preserve the national anthem to give it, its due dignity. I would only like to end by saying that this case and the present set of circumstances have created a situation—that a most unfortunate situation—that we are constrained to discuss this subject. I know Mr. Saifuddin is quite serious about this subject. Initially he did take it a little lightly. But I can notice that he is very serious. In addition to that, there is only one factor that goes along in addition to the national anthem. Recently, we have seen parts of the Constitution being burnt; national flag being burnt; different States have declared new institutions being created, new centres of Government being established. This also forms part of an act of defilement. It is necessary that this House condemns such methods, and does not encourage any person to indulge in this.

With these words, I only appeal to this House, as a whole House, to take up the question of taking exemplary action to ensure that at least in future, no citizen of India, however highly placed he is, whatever be the power in his hands—whether it be by means of the pen or by means of the sword, has the courage, directly or indirectly, to defile the national anthem.

[*Translation*]

*SHRI P. SELVENDRAN (Periakulam): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, on behalf of the A. I. A. D. M. K., I would like to place before this august House my views while taking part in the discussion on the need to preserve the sanctity and dignity of the National Symbols.

Sir, after 39 years of independence, this kind for discussion is taking place in this House. In fact, all these 39 years, patriotism should have been instilled in the minds of the people of this country. The people should have been taught and preached to honour the National Symbols and we should protect our National Symbols at all cost. But unfortunately we have to some extent erred in doing so. I am very sorry to mention this fact which may be unpalatable

*The speech was originally delivered in Tamil.

to some of the Hon. Members here. Sir, disrespecting the National symbols and not caring to maintain their sanctity and dignity is not only a shame to everyone of us but it is also an act of shame shown in the eyes of others. It is a sorry state of affairs when we come to know that the case of refusal to sing the National Anthem was referred to the Supreme Court of India. In Kerala, three students belonging to Jehova's Witness sect refused to sing the National Anthem and they were sent out of the school. The reason given was that they refused to sing National Anthem. The Kerala High Court has agreed to the action taken by the School in turning out the students, from the school. But the Supreme Court opined that the conscience of the minority group should be allowed and, therefore, they should be readmitted in the School. All of us know that this decision of the Supreme Court has created some agitations in the minds of some people in the country. Why we are discussing this matter in this House is also known to everyone of us. This has now been referred to the Constitution Bench by the Attorney General. I do not want to go into it in detail because the case has been referred to the Constitution Bench. But, at the same time, I would like to draw the attention of this House that an incident of this kind had happened in America, in 1940. In Pennesylvania, in a place called Minersville School District, two students of a local public school had refused to salute the American National flag. They also belonged to Jehova's Witnesses sect. These students had said that their religion did not allow to bow before the flag. Therefore, they refused salute the flag. This case was referred to the Supreme Court of America. At that time, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Mr. Frank Furter held that :

“Religious freedom must give way to political authority as National unity was the basis for the national security and that a compulsory flag salute was an effective means to creating national unity ”

This would mean that all of us should salute the National Flag I would therefore request the Hon. Minister to take this decision in to consideration.

In this context, I would like to draw the attention of this House to a press note in the 'Week' dated 7th Sept. 1986. It has been mentioned there that on 22nd August this year, our President Shri Zail Singh, visited Bombay and took part in a congregation arranged by the Jain monks. At the end of the function, when the National Anthem was sung, our President stood up and honoured the National Anthem. But till the end of the National Anthem, none of the Jain monks who assembled there stood up and paid respect to the National Anthem. They did not care for the National Anthem as the President of India.

I would also like to bring to the notice of this august House another incident. On 22nd March, 1973, when the Bombay Municipal Corporation brought forward a Resolution to the effect that in all the functions, National Anthem should be sung, the Councillors who took part in the discussion argued both in favour as well as against the Resolution. Shri Amin Khandwani belonging to the Muslim community and a Congress Councillor took part in the discussion and expressed his opinion against the Resolution. He said :

“Muslims will only bow their heads to Allah. Since bowing is an important part of singing the Anthem, we will not sing it.”

I do not say that all the Muslims accept this opinion. But what I would like to state is that this kind of opinion has been expressed.

Sir, I would like to mention one more point in this House. We find unity in diversity in our country. The people living in South wear dhoti. In North India, some wear pyjama and some others wear 'dhoti' in a different manner. With different kinds of dress prevailing in different parts of our country, we all live as Indians and we show our unity in diversity in this way. The rice eaters of South and the wheat and barley eaters of North live in this great country belong to only one Nationality, that is, Indian Nationality. Sir, my mother-tongue is Tamil and I belong to Dravidian race. It

[Shri P. Selvendran]

is cent per cent correct. But at the same time, it is also cent per cent correct that I am an Indian. I am very glad to hear our Prime Minister who spoke in this House about half-an-hour back, on this subject. For attaining independence for this country, the people had to sacrifice a lot. The Prime Minister's speech was just like paying homage to lakhs and lakhs of people who sacrificed everything for the cause of independence.

Sir, a citizen of India must necessarily sing the National Anthem. For this, no religion or any other beliefs should stand in the way. If any citizen of India refuses to sing National Anthem, he or she should be stripped off his citizenship. I would request the Government to bring forward a law to this effect. With these words I conclude and I am thankful to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, for giving me this opportunity of speaking on this vital subject.

[English]

SHRI AMITABH BACHCHAN
(Allahabad) : For the past few days we have been discussing in this House the need to protect the sanctity and dignity of our national symbols. Many Members have spoken. Some of them have given it a political angle; some have gone into the legal niceties of the discussion. But I would like to say here that by far the most fitting finale to this entire discussion was made by the words spoken by the Prime Minister just a few minutes ago in this very House. I think, he has got the entire gist of the discussion and summed it up in a most beautiful fashion. I would like to express my deep gratitude to the Prime Minister for his words.

In my very small capacity, I would like now to say a few words. I know that there is not much time. I feel that today, in our nation, we do not have a single slogan that can truly be identified as a national slogan. We do not have a single song which can truly be identified as a national song. Do we have a song that can be understood and sung in every corner of this country? And the one song that is constitutionally and legally declared as a national song is Jana

Gana Mana. But, unfortunately, we have got to go to the Supreme Court for permission to sing it. I think, this is a sad-state of affairs for the country. It does not speak very well for us. We all call ourselves citizens of India. I think, the very fact that we agreed to have a discussion on the need to protect our national symbols, we are exhibiting some kind of a weakness within ourselves. We are admitting that there is some fault within ourselves.

The National Anthem, as Mr. Madhav Reddi has said in the House, should come about as a result of patriotic fervour within ourselves. It is an emotional experience. The blood should rush in our veins when we sing that song and the adrenalin within the body should be pumping at its very maximum. Such is the kind of emotion that is there. How can anybody, who calls himself citizen of India, want to take this matter to the Supreme Court for permission to sing? It does not speak very well for our countrymen. It does not speak very well for the spirit of this nation.

Many attitudes and angles have been spoken of during the discussion. I just want to ask : what are we doing to create this patriotic fervour within ourselves? That is more important. This should come from within. This cannot be thrust upon anybody. We must feel the need to bow before the national flag. We must feel within us to sing the National Anthem. We must feel within us to respect the national symbols. What are we doing for our coming generation? You and me have inherited these national symbols. We have inherited the independence of this country. We are fortunate that we are breathing in a free atmosphere. We must respect our elders, our predecessors, who worked and gave their blood and life to create this atmosphere for us. Now that we have inherited this independent atmosphere, what are we preparing for our coming generation? Will the coming generation look upon us with equal pride like we do our predecessors. We have great pride in Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru. But what are we doing today so that the coming generation will look upon us with equal pride? I think, it is a sad state of affairs that we should be sitting in this House and discussing whether there should be a

need to protect our national symbols. It should come automatically. There should be no need for a discussion. I merely want to say that there is one medium which should be encouraged as far as protecting the national symbols are concerned. I know that you have a smile on your face. Sir, unfortunately, I am not going to mention films and their role. I feel that the sports medium is one such event where masses of people get together. They may come from any religion. They may come from any caste or creed but they come with a national purpose in mind. They come to back their national team. I think it is in events such as these that the national symbol should be emphasised—the flag, the song.

We have witnessed recently in the Seoul ASIAD in the Olympics how different nationalities cheered their team. How they sing to encourage their team-mates. How they wave their flags. Unfortunately that feeling does not exist among us. In the Asian Games, I noticed in the hockey match little Korean children of five or six years old cheering their team. I do not think they even understood hockey. But the fact is they were encouraged to go to the field and encourage their national team. I think that kind of spirit should be infused in our country, in our children.

I had the good fortune of being in Los Angeles Olympic Games and I had the fortune of seeing history almost being created by P. T. Usha when she lost a medal by a fraction of a second. The race was won by a Moroccan girl and in that 90,000 capacity stadium full of Americans there was just a small contingent of ten people belonging to Morocco. After this girl won the event, they screamed, they pulled out their notional flag, they ran down on the track, they gave her the flag. She held it. She wept. She did her victory lap; around the stadium and the entire stadium applauded.

I feel that if there had been just ten Indians who could have shouted for P. T. Usha on that occasion history may have been created.

We lack that spirit. We lack that spirit to enthuse our people, to encourage them. Why do we want to deny ourselves that we are Indians? Why do we want to deny ourselves the fact that tricolour is our national flag. We must bring it into practice and I think through the games this will be a very nice effort.

I would like to make a small observation to the Minister. If he thinks that this observation is relevant I hope he will pay heed to it, otherwise I hope he will pardon my impertinence. Our national symbol is the Ashok Sthambh. It has always occupied a pride of place in the Nation. We place it on top of the Parliament House. That is a pride of place. We place it on top of Vidhan Sabha. That is a pride of place. On the Chair that you occupy, we place it on top of that Chair. We give it a pride of place. The Ashok Sthambh is found on the caps that are worn by our Army men, by our policemen. They are the guardians of our borders. They are the guardians of the law of this nation. We give them that honour. It is a privilege that we even deny to our Prime Minister and the President. Even they are not allowed to wear the Ashok Sthambh on their head. I think this is something to be proud of that we give so much pride of place to the Ashok Sthambh.

I just want to make one observation here. There are many cars in the Rashtrapati Bhavan and also in the Government houses where the Ashok Sthambh is relegated to the position of a number plate. Is that correct or not? Are we going to accept this fact that the number plate of the car is going to be a pride of place for the Ashok Sthambh? I want an answer to that.

17 59 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till
 Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday,
 December 3, 1986/Agrahayana 12,
 1908 (Saka)*