

Bringing Back Parts of Azad Hind Monument

2286. SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether some of the parts of the Azad Hind monument that was demolished by the Army of Mountbatten while reoccupying Singapore in 1945 have been kept at the Rawalpindi residence of Mr. Shah Nawaz Khan;

(b) whether this fact was admitted by Mr. Shah Nawaz Khan before the Khosla Commission of Enquiry and also in reply to earlier questions relating to the matter in the Parliament; and

(c) if so, whether further steps have been taken to bring back the sacred parts of the martyrs monument so that proper steps could be taken for their preservation in India?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI S. KUNDU): (a) As stated in reply to earlier questions answered in the Lok Sabha on 20th March, 1974, 9th April, 1975 and 1st December, 1977, Shri Shah Nawaz Khan had informed that a small piece of the memorial plaque of the Shaheed Memorial of the Azad Hind Fauj came in his possession in 1946 and that he had left this portion of the plaque with his family members in Rawalpindi. Later on, his family members had to migrate to India.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) Our Embassy in Islamabad has not been able to trace the exact location of Shri Shah Nawaz Khan's erstwhile residence in Rawalpindi. We have now addressed Shri Shah Nawaz Khan himself in the matter and his reply is awaited.

12.30 hrs.

RECOGNITION TO CONGRESS PARTY (I) AS A PARTY IN LOK SABHA

MR. SPEAKER: I have to inform you that I have accorded recognition to the Congress (I) as a recognised party in the Lok Sabha, and Mr. Stephen as its leader.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara): Sir, I rise on a point of order. (*Interruptions*) I had written to you regarding the Direction of the Speaker with regard to the recognition of the parties and groups. And you were kind enough to tell me that you will allow me to raise this in the House.

While you said that you would go by precedents in this regard, my point was very different. My point was that the entire House rejects the concept of defection and it has been at least stated as the intention of at least some of the Ministers that they will bring forward some legislation.

Now, it is very important that defections should not be encouraged. It is in this context (*Interruptions*) that I had written to you that the present Directions which govern the recognition of parties and groups, that is, Directions 120 to 124, be revised and also a new Direction added that any Member, if he so chooses to change his party affiliation from the party on whose ticket he got elected, shall individually approach you and give you an affidavit in your presence. I am stating this because it is unfortunate that certain forces who want to pull down the democratic structure and party system in this country are active. Man-eaters shall not be allowed to prow around the precincts of this House. That is why I have suggested that you be kind enough to add a new direction and lay down a new precedent. Certain gentlemen have flexible consciences who change

it from day to day. If the recognition principle has to have any content in it, then it has to be well laid down. You cannot say I am sitting with this party today and tomorrow I can sit in some other party and cross over again. I do not want to mention names. They are very distinguished Members of this House and are my friends also but I must say that this is a very basic and fundamental matter and I call for a specific new direction. I am also moving a motion to this effect that the Speaker be kind enough to give new direction and precedent adding to 120 to 124 of the Directions of the Speaker.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAUGATA ROY (Barrackpore): Sir, there have been allegations that Members who have not actually signed for the new party their names have been put in the list. It is necessary for you to actually verify

(Interruptions)

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Idukki): Now, Sir, I do not want to enter into a controversy with any of my friends here on a matter which is between parties. Facts are known to everybody. I do not want to enter into a controversy as to who defected from whom. You have given the decision. The moment you have given the decision, we are a recognised party. The moment we become the recognised party, there are certain conventions to be observed between parties. Any remark which goes in contravention of that relationship, I hope, will not be encouraged. Therefore, I ignore that. But I want to put the record straight. It was stated by somebody, some friends here, that I gave you a list and all that. I want to make it clear that I have not given any list to anybody. No list was submitted by me to the Speaker. The respective Members wrote individually to the Speaker. No list under my sig-

nature was ever submitted to the Speaker. This matter I wanted to put before the House. Members have submitted their letters to you and you might have found that the requisite minimum was exceeded, namely 54 was exceeded, so recognition had to be given and you have given the recognition. I am thankful to you for giving the recognition. I now come into existence as a recognised party.

MR. SPEAKER: I have heard the matter. Mr. Unnikrishnan has sent me a letter. I had examined that letter and I told Mr. Unnikrishnan that I would be bound by precedents. It is up to the House or up to the leaders to meet and change the precedent. As long as that is not done, the Speaker must go by precedents, and the precedent earlier adopted was whenever a group is formed, if that group consists of more than 30 Members, it will be considered as a group. If it is more than 50, it will be considered as a party. It has been done earlier also. Therefore, I have told Mr. Unnikrishnan about that also. I am not looking into the merits of the question. So far as the allegation regarding signature is concerned, it is not proper for me to send for the Members unless it becomes absolutely necessary. I had asked the office to check up the signatures with reference to the register we are maintaining and it is on that basis I have come to the conclusion that there are more than 50 Members. Therefore, I recognise the party as a party in the House and Mr. Stephen as the leader of that party. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: Sir, I have given an adjournment Motion under Rule 56. The Prime Minister of India has made certain statements about the annexation of Sikkim. It questions that territorial integrity of the country. Coming as it does, it is from the head of the Government and it is a very serious matter. So, I propose it is a sufficiently important matter for which the business of the House should be adjourned and this matter be taken up.

श्री मनोराम बागड़ी (मथुरा) .
प्रभ्यक्ष जी, मैं जानकारी चाहता हूँ—आप ने
अभी 'कांग्रेस-आई का एनाउन्समेंट किया
है, कांग्रेस-आई का क्या मतलब है, जरा
कांग्रेस-आई की परिभाषा कर दीजिये ।
जनतन्त्र में जिन्दा आदमी के नाम पर पार्टी
नहीं ठुस करती है और हमारे यहाँ तो संसदीय
पद्धति है—इस के अन्दर आप ने कांग्रेस-
आई कैसे कहा है, जरा इस का विश्लेषण
कर दीजिये ।

MR. SPEAKER: That subject is
over.

श्री मनोराम बागड़ी : आप मुझे यह
बतलाइये कि कांग्रेस-आई का क्या मतलब है ?
क्या यह किसी व्यक्ति के नाम से है, यह कांग्रेस-
आई कैसे है ?

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA
(Delhi Sadar): Suppose some signa-
tures are found wrong and they deny
it . . . (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: The Office has
compared it and I have passed orders.

AN HON. MEMBER: Nobody can
question when a Member has been
elected on Cong(I) ticket; you must
not allow that to go on record.

MR. SPEAKER: I have recognised
that party.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur):
Regarding adjournment motion....

MR. SPEAKER: So far as, the ad-
journment motion is concerned, it is
still under my consideration; I will
pass orders in the course of the day.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: I gave a
notice of a call attention motion on
fabulous wealth being sold in Bom-
bay, reported in the Press.

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot recall all
the things; I do not know.

Now papers to be laid on the Table.

12.46 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE
REPORT OF WORKING GROUPS ON
AUTONOMY FOR AKASHVANI AND
DOORDARSHAN

THE MINISTER OF INFORMA-
TION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI
L. K. ADVANI): I beg to lay on the
Table a copy of the Report (Hindi and
English versions) of the Working
Group on Autonomy for Akashvani
and Doordarshan (Volumes I and II).
[Placed in Library. See No. LT-1733/
78].

Employees' Family Pension (Amend-
ment) Scheme, 1978.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN-
TARY AFFAIRS AND LABOUR
(SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA): I beg
to lay on the Table a copy of the
Employees' Family Pension (Amend-
ment) Scheme, 1978, (Hindi and Eng-
lish versions) published in Notifica-
tion No. G.S.R. 101 in Gazette of India
dated the 4th February, 1978 under
sub-section (2) of section 7 of the
Employees' Provident Funds and Mis-
cellaneous Provisions Act, 1952.
(Placed in Library. See No. LT-
1734/78).

PASSPORTS (SECOND AMENDMENT)
RULES AND STATEMENT RE. ACCEPTANCE
OF TENDERS BY INDIAN MISSIONS AT
LONDON AND WASHINGTON

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN
THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AF-
FAIRS (SHRI S. KUNDU): I beg to
lay on the Table:—

(1) A copy of the Passports (Se-
cond Amendment) Rules, 1977,
(Hindi and English versions) pub-
lished in Notification No. G.S.R.
734(E) in Gazette of India dated
the 7th December, 1977, under sub-
section (3) of section 24 of the
Passports Act, 1967. [Placed in
Library. See No. LT-1735/78].

(2) A statement (Hindi and Eng-
lish versions) of cases in which low-
est tenders have not been accepted