

325 Statutory resolution
approving President's
proclamation

That at page 1, line 16, *for* the figure
"1990" the figure "1991" be *substituted*.

*The question was put and the motion was
adopted.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Now, I
put the amended clause 2 to vote. The
question is:

That clause 2, as amended, stand part of
the Bill.

The motion was adopted.

*Clause 2, as amended, was added to the
Bill.*

Clause 1 — Short title.

SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARA-
MANGALAM: Sir, I move:

That at page 1, line 4, for the figure "1990"
the figure "1991" be *substituted*.

*The question was put and the motion was
adopted.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Now, I
put clause 1, as amended, to vote. The
question is:

That Clause 1, as amended, stand part of
the Bill.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Enacting Formula

SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARA-
MANGALAM: Sir, I move;

That at page 1, line 1, for the word "Forty-
first" the word "Forty-second" be *substituted*.

*The question was put and the motion was
adopted.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Now, I
put the Enacting Formula, as amended, to
vote. The question is:

[26 NOV. 1991]

And Motion for 326
revolution of the
proclamation

That the Enacting Formula, as
amended, stand part of the Bill.

The motion was adopted.

*The Enacting Formula, as amended, was
added to the Bill.*

The Title was added to the Bill. SHRI
RANGARAJAN KUMARA-
MANGALAM: Sir, I move:

That the Bill as amended, be
passed.

*The question was put and the motion was
adopted.*

**STATUTORY RESOLUTION AP-
PROVING PRESIDENT'S PROCLA.
MATION UNDER ARTICLE 356 OF
THE CONSTITUTION IN RELATION
TO MEGHALAYA AND MOTION FOR
REVOCATION OF THE
PROCLAMATION**

THE MINISTER OF STATE DST THE
MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY
AFFAIRS AND THE MINISTER OF
STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME
AFFAIRS (SHRI M. M. JACOB): Sir I rise
to move:

"That this House approves the
Proclamation issued by the President
on the 11th October, 1991, under
Article 356 of the Constitution in
relation to the State of Meghalaya."

Copies of the Proclamation and reports of
the Governor of Meghalaya have been laid on
the Table of the House. The Governor of
Meghalaya, in his report dated 8th October
1991, addressed to the President of India, had
reported that as there were reports that some
members of the ruling Meghalaya United
Parliamentary p-rtv had switched their
support the the Onposition-led United
Meghalaya Parliamentary Forum, a special
Session of the State Legislative Assem-blv
was convened on 7th August 1991, on the
advice of the Chief Minister, so that Shri B.
B. Lyngdoh, the Chief Minister, could prove
his majo-

[Shri M. M. Jacob] rity in the House. On 7th August 1991, when the 'confidence motion' was moved in the House, it was found that the ruling side had thirty members against 27 of the Opposition in a House of fifty-eight. But before the motion was formally disposed of, the Speaker, on a complaint from a Congress-I member, suspended the voting rights of five independent MLAs and adjourned the House *sine die*. The Governor further reported that on 17th August 1991, the Speaker passed a final order o' the complaint of the Congress-I MLA and disqualified five independent MLAs belonging to the then ruling group. The Governor further mentioned that on 27th August 1991, Shri J. D. Pohrmen, the leader of the Congress Legislature Party and its allies, staked his claim to form the Ministry. In the meantime, the Supreme Court of India, an a Special Leave Petition filed by the disqualified MLAs, passed an order on 23rd August, 1991 to maintain the status qtto. On 6th September 1991, the Supreme Court issued an interm order staying the operation of the Speaker's ruling in respect of the five independent MLAs. The Governor mentioned that as per the newspaper reports, the speaker announced that he would reluctantly ignore the Supreme Court ruling as, in his veiw, the Supreme Court had no jurisdiction in the matter. The Governor further mentioned .that the Session of the Assembly convened on 9th September 1991 was cancelled in view of the prevailing tension arising from the Supreme Court ruling and the decision of the Speaker not to to allow the disqualified independent MLAs to enter the Assembly. There was the likelihood of a large-scale disturbance leading to serious law and order problems. The Governor further mentioned that on the advice of the Chief Minister, the Assembly was summoned on 8th October 1991. The Governor further stated that on 7th October In the

evening, he received a letter from the Deputy Registrar of the Supreme Court, enclosing a copy of the Supreme Court's order to the effect that the rulings of the Speaker dated 7th and 17th August 1991 had been styled. The letter further stated that the court expects the Governor of Meghalaya to take necessary stpes to ensure strict compliance and prevention of its violation by any person as providfd under article 144 of the Constitution. The Governor sent a copy of this letter to the Speaker for his information as he wanted the Speaker to take note of the same. The Governor further mentioned that on 8-10-1991, the Legislative Assembly met and the motion of confidence in the Ministry headed by Shri B. B. Lyngdoh was moved. The Governor stated that according to the information received by him there were 26 Member of the Opposition UMPF and 30 Members of the ruling MUPP group in the House including four disqualified Members in respect of whom the Supreme Court had stayed the ruling of the Speaker. After division, 30 Members had affixed t'heir signatures for the motion and 26 against. But the Speaker announced the result saying that 26 Members had voted for the motion and 26 had voted against the motion and therefore, there was a tie. The Speaker, therefore, used his prerogative of casting vote in favour of Opposition UMPF group. Thereafter, he adjourned the House *sine die*. The Governor sent, a further message on 9-10-1991 mentioning that he had advised the Chief Minister to tender his resignation in view of the ruling given by the Speaker on the confidence motion of 8th October 1991. However, the Chief Minister refused to resign. The Governor further reported that the oossibility of dismissing the Dresent Ministry and instal-ling another Ministry did not appear to be feasible and he was of the opinion that neither the present Ministry can function in the House without the Opposition cooperation

nor the Opposition with equal number of Members, if given a chance to form a Ministry, would have been able to function in the present situation because this group also consisted of live independent members whose loyalty could not be predicted, otherwise the opposition group, if it were allowed to form a Ministry, would have to depend on the Speaker's casting vote to transact any business. The Governor, therefore, recommended that action may be taken to impose President's rule under article 368 of the Constitution of India keeping the Assembly under suspended animation. The Governor further suggested that if this was not considered agreeable, he would invite the Leader of the Opposition to form a Ministry and ask him to prove its majority on the floor of the House within a period of three weeks. The Union Government considered the report of the Governor and the situation in Meghalaya and decided to recommend to the President of India to issue a proclamation under article 356 of the Constitution and keep the Legislative Assembly under suspended animation. The proclamation under article 356 of the Constitution was issued by the President on 11th October 1991. I may mention that the Supreme Court on 12-11-1991 has given judgment on the constitutional validity of the Constitution 56th Amendment Act 1985. However, the detailed judgment is yet to be received.

In view of the circumstances which I have just explained, I commend, Sir, that the proclamation issued on 11-10-1991 under article 356 of the Constitution in relation to the State of Meghalaya, may kindly be approved by this House.

SHRI G. G. SWELL (Meghalaya): Sir, before we proceed, I would like to say one thing. He has not read out one very important sentence.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): I have called you. (Interruptions).

SHRI G. G. SWELL: He has read out quite faithfully. It is thus clear that the Speaker has not taken into cognisance ... (Interruptions) .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): What you are reading?

SHRI G. G. SWELL: From the Governor's report.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): No, no. He has not tabled the Governor's report. (Interruptions)

SHRI G. G. SWELL: He was reading the Governor's report.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: The Governor's report is on the Table of the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): But he did not read everything. (Interruptions) ...

SHRI G. G. SWELL: No; the Governor had said that the Speaker did not take... (Interruptions)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Mr. Swell, this is not the way... (interruptions)...

SHRI G. G. SWELL: Sir, he did not read out a sentence...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Please resume your seat. ... (interruptions) ... Mr. Mathur". ... (Interruptions) ... Please resume your seats

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
मे निम्नलिखित प्रस्ताव उपस्थित करता हूँ :

“यह सभा राष्ट्रपति से यह सिफारिश करती है कि मेघालय राज्य के संबंध में संविधान के अनुच्छेद 356

[श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर],
के अधीन उनके द्वारा 11 अक्टूबर, 1991 को जारी की गई उद्घोषणा का प्रतिसंहरण किया जाये।”

श्रीमान, मैं मेघालय के संबंध में राष्ट्रपति द्वारा जारी उद्घोषणा के अनुमोदन का विरोध करता हूँ। वास्तव में सुप्रीम कोर्ट के निर्णय के बाद अच्छा तो यह होता कि सरकार स्वयमेव इस बात को स्वीकार करती और यह प्रस्ताव रखने के बजाय कि इसको कंफर्म किया जाए, स्वयमेव इसको वापस लेने के लिए सदन के सामने आती अथवा उसको रद्द करती। जो कुछ मेघालय में हुआ है वह हिंदुस्तान के इतिहास में एक ऐसा काला घण्टा है जिसको हम शायद कभी नहीं भिटा पाएंगे। इसके लिए मैं केन्द्र सरकार और उसके नेता और कांग्रेस दल को जिम्मेदार समझता हूँ।

महोदय, संगमा सरकार क हटने के बाद एक नयी सरकार बनी क्योंकि कांग्रेस और उसके समर्थित दल अपना बहुमत खो चुके थे। अब उनके लिए सिर्फ इतना यह रह गया था कि किसी प्रकार से, येन-केन-प्रकारेण सरकार को हटकर कांग्रेस अपने दल की सरकार बनाए। यह खल महीनों चलता रहा। जो बातें गवर्नर ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में कही हैं, मैं उनको दोहराना नहीं चाहता, लेकिन मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आखिर यह खरीद-फरोख्त का खेल कांग्रेस ने क्यों खेला और किसने यह खेल शुरू किया?

एक माननीय सदस्य : कांग्रेस ने तो यह खेल बंद किया।

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : कांग्रेस ने ही यह खेल शुरू किया और कांग्रेस ने ही यह खेल बंद किया। शुरू इसलिए किया कि उसकी सरकार नहीं थी और बंद इसलिए किया कि उन्हें लगा कि खल कहीं उल्टा न पड़ जाए। कांग्रेस ने दोनों तरह के खेल खेले। मंत्री महोदय ने रिपोर्ट से कुछ तथ्य पढ़े हैं लेकिन पूर नहीं पढ़े। पहली बात तो यह है कि

उन्होंने इस बात का उल्लेख नहीं किया है कि किस प्रकार वहाँ के स्पीकर महोदय ने दो बार सुप्रीम कोर्ट के निर्णय की अवहेलना की। न उन्होंने इस बात का उल्लेख किया कि गवर्नर ने भी अपनी रिपोर्ट में लिखा है कि स्पीकर ने सुप्रीम कोर्ट के जजमेंट को स्वीकार नहीं किया। उन्होंने इसका भी उल्लेख नहीं किया कि किस प्रकार स्पीकर महोदय ने कांग्रेस के लोगों से मिलकर स्वयं को विरोधी दल का नेता बना लिया। क्या आपने कहीं सुना है कि स्पीकर भी बना रहे और वही विरोधी दल का नेता भी बना रहे? यह एक विचित्र घटना है। अच्छा तो यह होता कि जब वे विरोधी दल के नेता बन गए थे तो उनको स्पीकर का पद छोड़ देना चाहिए था। लेकिन अगर वे स्पीकर का पद छोड़ देते तो उनकी खतरा था कि निर्णय उनके खिलाफ जा सकता था। महोदय, यह विडंबना है कि वे स्पीकर भी रहे और विरोधी दल के नेता भी रहे।

महोदय, वे विरोधी दल के नेता हो गए फिर कांग्रेस पार्टी क्लेम करती है कि हमारी सरकार बनाई जाए। तब गवर्नर कहते हैं कि नेता कौन है? तब उन्होंने दूसरा नेता चुनकर गवर्नर को नाम दिया। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जो कांग्रेस के नेताओं ने किया क्या यह राजनीतिक ईमानदारी है क्या यह उचित है? क्या यह लोकतंत्र के अनुरूप है कि कोई विरोधी दल का नेता भी बना रहे और स्पीकर भी बना रहे और उसके बाद जब सरकार बनाने का दावा हो तो उसको पीछे हटाकर दूसरे को आगे कर दिया जाए?

महोदय, जैसा मैंने निवेदन किया, मैं उस रिपोर्ट को दोहराना नहीं चाहता। दो बार सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने आर्डर दिया और उन्होंने अवहेलना की। सुप्रीम कोर्ट कहता है कि 4 एम.एल.एज को माना जाए, स्पीकर कहते हैं कि नहीं मानेंगे। दोबारा सुप्रीम कोर्ट कहता है लेकिन वे तब भी नहीं मानते। गवर्नर ने कहा कि मैंने यह अखबारों में पढ़ा कि स्पीकर महोदय मेरी सलाह को मानना नहीं चाहते।

मैं पूछना चाहूंगा कि इस सदन की एक बड़ी नेता उन दिनों वहाँ क्या कर रही थी ? दूसरे, गवर्नर ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में यह भी कहा है कि उन्होंने जब सदन को बुलाने के लिए कहा तो उनसे कहा गया कि स्पीकर महोदय सलाह करके बताएंगे लेकिन बाद में पता लगा कि स्पीकर महोदय मेन्थालय में हैं ही नहीं। गवर्नर कहते हैं कि मैंने रूढ़ां तो पता लगा कि स्पीकर महोदय कंसलेशन के लिए उपलब्ध नहीं हैं। कहाँ हैं ? दिल्ली आए हैं। दिल्ली क्यों आए ? दिल्ली आए तो क्या कर रहे थे ? ... (व्यवधान) मैं नाम नहीं लेना चाहता, एक महिला मंत्राणी भी वहाँ उपस्थित थीं।

द्वारा एक बात इन्होंने छिपाई। जब अंतिम दिन आता है तो गवर्नर कहते हैं—

"Thirty Members have affixed their signatures for the motion and twenty-six against. But the speaker and now the result say 'that twenty-six Members had voted for the motion.'"

स्पीकर महोदय को वोट दिलवा दिया, सिगनेचर हो गए। लेकिन फिर कहने लगे कि 4 को नहीं गिनेंगे। अगर आप इसी बात पर अड़े हुए थे कि सुप्रीम कोर्ट का आदेश नहीं मानता है तो आपने उनको वोट कैसे देने दिया ? आप उनको रद्द कर देते। क्या यह ईमानदारी है ? मैं तो कहूंगा कि यह बेईमानी का खेल है जो कांग्रेस सरकार और कांग्रेस के नेता ने खेला है... (व्यवधान)

श्री अजीत जोशी (मध्य प्रदेश) : महोदय, किसी भी विधान सभा के स्पीकर के कंडक्ट के विषय में चर्चा नहीं की जा सकती है... (व्यवधान)

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MAHUR: No, he cannot be Speaker now.

श्री अजीत जोशी : (मध्य प्रदेश) : उन्होंने स्पीकर की हैसियत से जो फैसला किया उस पर आपत्ति नहीं की जा सकती...

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद मायूर : श्रीमान्, यह मैं नहीं कह रहा हूँ, यह सुप्रीम कोर्ट कह रहा है। इतना ही यदि होता तो

हम समझते, लेकिन मेन्थालय के स्पीकर क्या कहते हैं ? मेरे सहयोगी ने यहां आने वाले 30 मंत्रियों के साथ प्रधान मंत्री को और गृह मंत्री को पत्र लिखा, 30 मंत्रियों के दस्तखत करके प्रधान मंत्री को मैसेंजर दे दिया कि यह अन्याय हो रहा है। उनके 30 मंत्रियों दिल्ली में उपस्थित थे। क्या इस पर भी केन्द्रीय सरकार और प्रधान मंत्री को विश्वास नहीं था ? इस तरह से प्रधान मंत्री और गृह मंत्री ने सब की अनदेखी की। इससे साबित होता है कि यह सारा मामला राजनीतिक उत्तार-चढ़ाव का नहीं था, यह खुल्लमखुल्ला साजिश थी अन्यथा ईमानदारी यह थी कि प्रधान मंत्री अपने नेताओं को और यहां से जो मंत्राणी भेजी गई थी उनसे कहते कि मेरे पास 30 मंत्रियों के दस्तखत हैं, आपको तुरन्त सरकार से हट जाना चाहिए। लेकिन उन्होंने यह नहीं किया। उन्होंने यह क्यों नहीं किया, गृह मंत्री ने क्यों नहीं किया ? मैं इसका जवाब चाहता हूँ कि कांग्रेस के नेताओं ने उस मैसेंजर को क्यों नजरअंदाज किया ?

अब आखिर में क्या होता है यह देखिए। सुप्रीम कोर्ट रिजेक्ट कर देता है। जब साहब फरमा रहे हैं कि सुप्रीम कोर्ट का फैसला नहीं हुआ। यह फैसला मेरे हाथ में भी है, उनके पास भी होगा। फैसला हो गया है। यह 8-10 दिन का पीरियड है और ये कहते हैं कि सुप्रीम कोर्ट का पूरा निर्णय नहीं आया है। फिर उसके फैसले की खुल्लमखुल्ला अवहेलना की जा रही है। जिस दिन सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने फैसला दिया उसी दिन ऐंबेली को जीवित कर देना चाहिए था। वहां पर गैर कांग्रेस सरकार को बैठा देना चाहिए था। वोट आफ कॉन्फिडेंस ले लेना चाहिए था। लेकिन आप ईमानदारी से यह नहीं किया। आज भी यह बहाना बनाया जा रहा है कि सुप्रीम कोर्ट का आदेश नहीं आया है। आदेश जितने थे, आ चुके, उससे कुछ फर्क नहीं पड़ता। लेकिन 8-10 दिन के काल को आप द्वारा इस्तेमाल करना चाहते हैं अशुभ खेल खेलने के लिए। मेरी अपील है सारे सदन से, कांग्रेस के लोगों से कि

[श्री जदीश प्रसाद माथुर]

आप इस खेल में सरकार का साथ न दें, आप मेरे प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करें और इसको रद्द करें। क्योंकि आज यह हिन्दुस्तान के इतिहास में, हमारे लोकतंत्र के इतिहास में एक कालिख लग गई है कांग्रेस के मित्रों आप उधर बैठे हैं आप इस कालिख को अपने माथे पर लगाकर चलना चाहते हैं क्या? क्या यह चाहते हैं कि सारे देश के अने बलि लोग यह कहें कि ऐसे भी नेता थे, ऐसी भी सरकार थी ऐसे भी सांसद थे जिन्होंने खुल्लमखुल्ला सुप्रीम कोर्ट की अवहेलना की, खुल्लमखुल्ला बेईमानी की और जो आखिर तक अपनी गद्दी बनाये रखने के लिए खेल खेलते रहे। इस कालिख को मेरे मित्रों धो लो। आप धोयेंगे तो आपकी विजय होगी। आपकी पराजय तब होगी जब आप मंत्री महोदय के प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करेंगे। आप अगर हारना चाहते हैं तो आपकी मर्जी। लोकतंत्र की विजय चाहते हैं तो मेरे प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करिये। इतना ही कह कर मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

The questions were proposed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Now Prof. Swell. Prof. Swell, as far as you are concerned, you have a motion and also your name has been given to represent UPG. But you will have only one chance. So you can choose to speak either now or afterwards.

SHRI G. G. SWELL; I will speak now.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I speak on this motion with a feeling of pain rather than anger. I do not want to pick any bones in my friend, Mr. Jacob. But I like him to consider this question deeply and seriously because what has happened is a danger to the entire parliamentary democracy that obtains in this country. I had sought to intervene a little while ago because I understood that Mr. Jacob was making a statement basing himself on the report

of the Governor. He has made quite an honest statement except that he has forgotten to mention that on the 8th of October when voting took place by signing in the register, certainly the Speaker had signed in support of the motion of confidence and 26 were against. And the Governor had stated that the Speaker had disregarded the Supreme Courts direction. That is why he said 26-26 and his casting vote. Now, I am not blaming the Congress as such. Here I would respectfully differ from Mr. Mathur. I am not blaming the Congress Party as such. I am not blaming the Prime Minister, I am not blaming the Home Minister I am not blaming you. But certain things have been done in the State of Meghalaya in the Assembly by the Speaker and unfortunately by the Congress members of the Meghalaya State Legislative Assembly. Now I would like to refer Mr. Jacob to what the Governor had stated: "It was also reported that the Speaker Mr. P.R. Kyndiah, was an elected member of the Opposition. This happened in July. It is a highly anomalous, unprecedented, unthinkable, situation where the Speaker is also the Leader of the Opposition and as a Leader of the Opposition he was trying to manoeuvring defections from the MUP.

On the advice of the Chief Minister a special session of the Assembly was called on the 9th. There was voting. Thirty Members voted for the Government and 27 were against. Mr. Jacob, himself has mentioned that on the floor of the House on a flimsy report by a Congress MLA, without any verification, the Speaker immediately deprived the five Members of the ruling party of their right to vote. You cannot even think of doing such a thing but it was done and the Speaker then adjourned the House *sine die*. From there he proceeded to disqualify these 5 Members without even a shred

of evidence. The Members came Before the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court gave a decision on the 6th. After that another special session of the Assembly was called on the 9th of September. The Speaker announced his defiance of the Supreme Court decision. He announced that he was not taking cognisance of the Supreme Court directive and that he was going to prevent the four Members whose disqualification has been stayed by the Supreme Court from entering the House. Then there was the question of law and order and the session had to be cancelled because of the fear of break-down of law and order. The Supreme Court insisted on the right of these Members to be in the House and on casting their vote. On the 8th of October, on the advice of the Chief Minister another special session was called. The Supreme Court had sent a directive to the Governor that their decision should be complied with. Under Article 144 of the Constitution the Governor had to allow the Members to enter the House. He had to allow them because they had to vote and the voting¹ was by division. Thirty Members voted for the Government and 26 against it. The Speaker disregarded the votes of the four Members in utter defiance of the Supreme Court. Incidentally, I would like to say because of all these actions, the Speaker today is facing contempt of court. I am not blaming the Governor. The Governor had sent a report on 8th October and on the 9th of October. I would like to mention here that in the evening of October 9th, when the Supreme Court was contacted in regard to the defiance of the Speaker against their injunction that votes of the 4 MLAs had been disregarded, it sent an injunction to the Governor and to the Speaker that the votes of these 4 MLAs should be taken note of and that they should be counted. That is what the Supreme Court

said. Mr. Jacob did not mention that. I think you know very well that the Supreme Court had insisted that the votes of these 4 MLAs should be taken into account. When that was still pending, you went ahead and declared President's Rule. I am sorry to say that this action is unjust and that the President has been misguided.

This is what has happened and this constitutes a defiance of the injunction of the Supreme Court. You did not take note of the injunction of the Supreme Court that the votes of the four MLAs should be counted. While suspending it, you took the decision to impose the President's Rule. That is what I say and I say it in pain and I say that it was illegal, it was unjust, and it was a defiance of the Supreme Court's order.

Incidentally, I would also like to mention that there is a petition before the Supreme Court against the imposition of the President's Rule. Petitions have been filed in the Guwahati High Court, petitions have been filed in the Delhi High Court and petitions have been filed in the Supreme Court. The Guwahati High Court issued notices to you, to the Governor and to the Speaker. The Delhi High Court had issued notices to you, to the Governor and to the Speaker. The Supreme Court also has issued notices to draw itself all these cases indicating that the Supreme Court had given enough hint that within a couple of weeks they were going into this question. It would be a sad day if the Supreme Court strikes down the President's Notification and the imposition of the President's Rule. With what face are you going to face this country and face the Supreme Court? I would like you to consider this very deeply. It is not at all a party question. Will you allow a

[Shri G. G. Swell] person, who happened to be the Speaker, to do all these kinds of things, all illegal things, just to promote his own personal interests? I would like you to look into, what the Governor himself had said when he recommended imposition of President's Rule.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, with your permission, I would like to read out from page 2 of the second Report of the Governor on the 9th October. I am quoting from para 3

"It is my considered opinion that neither the present Ministry can function, as it was not able to transact the business of the House . . . with, the Opposition not co-operating—nor the Speaker behaving as he is doing now, they are not cooperating—nor the Opposition with an equal number of members, if given a chance to form the Government, will be able to function in the present circumstances because even if you take into account the five Independents, their loyalty cannot be predicted."

He further says;

"Moreover,"—this is important and this is a warning to you—"my information, which I had already reported in my earlier Report, is that the Speaker has in his mind the aspiration to become the Chief Minister. He did all this because of this. Therefore, even if the Opposition"—that is, you, the Congress (I) in Meghalaya—"is given a chance to form the Government, the Speaker is likely to create . . . problems for them as well."

that, is, for you also! So, Sir, this is something, which cuts across party lines and this is something, which is a threat to the very functioning of, parliamentary democracy and I say this in pain.

He says further:

"Today, two Congress(I) leaders, who are Union Ministers, met me and staked their claim."

From here they went there to stake their claims to form the Government!

I do not know whether Mrs. Margaret Alva wanted to become the Chief Minister of Meghalaya. She went there to stake her claim! This is what the Governor says. He says: "Today, two Congress (I) leaders who are Union Ministers, met me and staked their claim to form the Government and were also agreeable to convene a special session to prove their majority."

So, the collusion is there. This is what the Governor is saying. The collusion is so open. I am sure again that this was not done by you, Mr. Jacob. I know you are a decent man. I know that this has not been done by the Home Minister also because he is too busy with many other things. I know also that it was not done by the Prime Minister. I met him and he himself was very unhappy over the whole thing.

SHRI AJIT P. K. JOGI: Then who is indecent?

SHRI G. G. SWELL: Wait a minute. Therefore, certain people who think of their own personal interests and not the interests of the State, not the interests of the North-East or the country, not the interest of parliamentary democracy, it is these people who went out from here and colluded with the people there, with this sort of a thing. It is a sad thing to say.

Therefore, I would like to appeal to you to think, about this matter. Today you have mentioned that the Supreme Court has passed an order. It has set aside the disqualification of 5 Members. So, the position today is that the MUPP which has already

had a majority again and again—two times it was proved on the floor of the House, and the Governor himself never said that they have lost the majority—today has 31 Members in a House of 59, including the Speaker. It is very, very clear. And I must say to the credit of Meghalaya, whether you want to compliment me or not, that this matter has assumed such proportions that it was because of Meghalaya that the Supreme Court decided to strike down Paragraph 7 of the Tenth Schedule. And they were about to strike down the whole of the Tenth Schedule. There is a division—the majority is not for striking down the whole of the Tenth Schedule, and the minority is. It has come to that stage because of this. And I would like to draw your attention again, Mr. Jacob, to disaffection in the North-East. And the North-East is in trouble today. We do not want to talk about ULFA or NSC and all that sort of thing.

I was there at the time when Meghalaya was formed. I know it was goodwill. And I had gone up and said at that time that 'we shall repay this understanding of the Government of India, of the Parliament, by making Meghalaya a patch of beauty and grace and a shining outpost.' We have not been able to lift our economy, but till today, Meghalaya, in spite of all the troubles in the North-East, remains an island of peace. We still have faith in you. We have faith in this Parliament. We have faith, in the national leadership. We have not gone the ULFA way. We have not gone the Naga way. We have not done anything like that. And as far as I am concerned, this is my fifth term in the Parliament. I had gone through various things. Maybe I am senior to you, Mr. Jacob, in the Parliament. I have seen something. I am committed to this. I know what India is. I know what India should be. I am pained at the manner in which our stock has fallen in the World in the external relations. I am

panned to see the way in which things are moving in this country. I do not want trouble in Meghalaya.

..... not want trouble in the North

East. But think about it. By this kind of illegality, by this kind of injustice that you are imposing, on the people of Meghalaya, do you think you will be able to retain their confidence in you? For your Speaker, who is goaded by personal ambition, for a few people who belong to your Party, who are goaded by the desire of the loaves and fishes of office, for the sake of two individuals, through your Ministry who colluded with the people there, are you going to deprive the people of Meghalaya their faith in you, deprive them rule of law, deprive them justice in this Parliament? The Supreme Court has given us justice. Will this Parliament deny us justice? The Supreme Court has given us justice. The Supreme Court had gone into this question very thoroughly. Will you deny us justice? Now, I can understand your problem. You are saying a little while ago that you have not got the detailed judgment of the Supreme Court. I agree. Maybe you have not. But, I think, that is only a technical question. The operational part is there. Therefore, do not take any hurried decision. I understand your stand on prestige. When the President has notified—of course the President could not notify except with the consent of the Prime Minister and the Home Minister—in what circumstances the Prime Minister and the Home Minister were persuaded to do this? They are busy people. They may not have time to go into all the details. When I spoke to the Prime Minister, he was pained. When I spoke to the Home Minister he was pained. He told me "we shall abide by the decision of the Supreme court". Now the Supreme Court has given a decision. What are you going to do? I can understand that you want this resolution to be passed because it involves the prestige of the party, it involves

343 Statutory resolution
approving President's
Proclamation [Shri G. G. Swell.

[RAJYA SABHA]

And Motion for 344 revolution of
the Proclamation

the prestige of the Government. Now, what is more important from now on is, what are you going to do? My Motion is not in conflict with you. I have not said that I disapprove what you have done. We still give you toe beneat of about. We only want mat we wrong mat has been done should be corrected. Injsuce best has been done should be removed. And Justrce should be done to the people of Meghalaya. That is why we say, please revoke it. Don't create a situation of conflict between the Supreme Court and yourself. If the Supreme Court strikes it down, it will be a serious loss. Please revoke it. Call on a party which has majority to again form the Government and then call the Assembly. Let the Assembly decide in a democratic way. I don't see any other way. The Prime Minister has said that we are for a politics of consensus in this country and nothing is possible in this country today except by consensus. And We have to work together. Consensus on what? Consensus on justice, equality or consensus on the right thing. I think, even you are embarrassed with this action of the Speaker. Anybody would be embarrassed. Take the consensus of all the parties. They will be for the revocation of President's Rule, for the reinstallation of the party and for giving opportunity to the Assembly to decide. That is the consensus. Therefore, don't take any decision which creates more problems. Maybe, you would get your resolution passed today. I understand that will be done. Otherwise that would mean even the fall of the Government. It is too serious a matter. We can understand that. Please take the remedial measures and consult the leaders of the other parties. Do the right thing and do it quickly within the next one week because the Supreme Court will have to go into this question. I understand that the Prime Minister is not here.

You cannot take such importaut decision in his absence. Bu please take note of these things and do the right tning.

SHRI BHUBANESWAR KALITA (Assam): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to support this motion...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH (West Bengal): Which motion?

SHRI BHUBANESWAR KALITA: ...moved by Shri M. M. Jacob. Sir, I have been listening to the points made by Shri Mathur and Shri Swell who are respectable Members of this august House. I have gone through the report of the Governor also which has been quoted by Shri Swell partly to his convenience.

The main point here to be decided is whether there was break-down of the Constitutional machinery in Meg-hayala on which neither Mr. Mathur nor Mr. Swell has anything to say. I am sorry that both of them have discussed what was going on the 8th of October conveniently forgetting as to What happened on 26th March 1990. I was witness to that election which was held in 1988 which brought the Congress-I Government in Meghalaya. I was there and I know under what conditions it came about. Mr. Swell mentioned about the Chief Minister, Mr. Lyngdoh. I have great respect for him, not because he was the Chief Minister of Meghalaya; but because in 1988, on the 5th of February, he showed his statesmanship when his party won 18 seats and our party won 22 seats and Mr. Lyngdoh issued a statement on the 5th of February saying: Even though we are a larger party, next to Congress-I, I will support the Congress-I Government m Meghalaya'. Therefore, I say that we have respect for Mr. Lyngdoh. But what happened subsequently? Why are We conveniently forgetting what liatwened in March 1990? How was the Congress-I Ministry overthrown' What wore the means adopted? You are criticising the Speaker today, and my friends in the oppositon are very

vocal about the Speaker today. But what happened in 1990? Where was their voice then? What about the Speaker's action then? How was the Congress Ministry pulled down even after having a majority?

SHRI G. G. SWELL: The same person.

SHRI BHUBANESWAR KALITA: That is why I am saying that you are conveniently forgetting about 1990. Congress-I Government was formed in 1988 under the leadership of Mr. P. A. Sangma in which Congress-I had 22 members; HPU 7; APHLC 2; MUPP 2, and Independents 8. But after two years, the situation has changed. Today you are mentioning about some names of the Congress leaders. Shall I also mention some names who went from Delhi and pulled down the Congress Ministry in 1990?

DR. RATNAKAR PANDEY (Uttar Pradesh): Yes, mention.

SHRI BHUBANESWAR KALITA: Mr. George Fernandes, the trade-union leader...

SHRI G. G. SWELL: He went to Shillong that time.

SHRI BHUBANESWAR KALITA: Without going there, he can do many things. He was supervising...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): No personal allegations.

SHRI BHUBANESWAR KALITA: The same people changed their loyalty and formed a regional coalition. The same people joined again, and can you say that they will not change sides today or tomorrow? They changed sides twice and thrice. What did the Speaker do? What did the Governor do when there was a tie of votes I will deal with the Supreme Court judgement separately. But when there

was voting and the result was 26 each, the Speaker exercised his casting vote and after that the Governor asked for the resignation of the Chief Minister which he refused. Then, the Governor made a report on October 8th and 9th to the Central Government stating two options. What did the Central Government do? The Central Government decided in favour of his first option that is in favour of President's rule and not in favour of forming the opposition Government, thus keeping the Assembly in suspended animation. How can you blame our party? The party didn't agree to the forming of the opposition Government. But the hostility went to that extent that there was demonstration by both the parties outside the Assembly. MLAs had to go into hiding. The whole law and order situation in Shillong was very bad.

SHRI G. G. SWELL: Nobody went hiding,

SHRI BHUBANESWAR KALITA: Let me complete. You have already had your say. We also know something. Let us express our views also. Under the circumstances, when both the ruling party and the opposition party did not have a proper majority functioning majority and when there was a real breakdown of the constitutional machinery, there was no option left but to promulgate President's rule in the State. There was a tussle between the legislature and the judiciary and the Governor has rightly said—Mr. Swell was approving the view expressed by the Governor—that "the dispute about the Speaker not taking cognizance of the Supreme Court's order is a matter that has got to be decided by the Speaker and the Supreme Court themselves". What has the Central Government or the Governor got to do with this? What options were open for the Central Government? What options were open for the Governor? Either they should invite the opposition to form the Government or pro-

[Shri Bhubaneswar Kalita] mulgate President's rule and give some time for the dust to settle down and whoever holds the majority can claim to form the Government later. What best the Central Government could do? Mr. Swell has rightly mentioned about Meghalaya. I really respect the people of Meghalaya. I really respect their legislative systems. This is the one State where there had been no President's rule for a long time because there was complete understanding among the ruling and the Opposition parties. They always cooperated, whosoever may be in the opposition—it may be the Congress or it may be any other regional party. The same Chief Minister, Mr. Lyngdoh was part of the Congress party. twice, everything ran very smoothly until he was disturbed from Delhi in 1990. The whole political system was disturbed. Shri V. P. Singh was the Prime Minister at that time.

Sir Meghalaya is a border
5.00 P.M. State. Mr. Swell said that he

did not want compliments. But we
compliment them. I personally compliment
them for keeping their.

SHRI G. G. SWELL: When it suits

SHRI BHUBANESWAR KALITA;
It suits you also. ,

I compliment, the people of Meghalaya.
Now, things are cooling down. I hope, good
sense will prevail on the legislators and...

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA (Rajasthan):
On the Speaker also.

SHRI BHUBANESWAR KALITA:
Definitely, we are going to see a stable
Government formed there.

I would like to point out here that these are
situations when we, politicians, particularly,
senior politicians, should show restraint. I am
very sorry about the statements made at that
time by Mr. Lyngdoh, the then Chief
Minister. These, were very very unfortunate.
I do not want to

refer to them. They have been published in
every newspaper. These statements were very
unfortunate and very bad.

Therefore, Sir, at that point of time,—I see,
Mr. Swell also supported it—the
promulgation of President's rule became a
necessity. I welcome the decision taken by the
Central Government.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Mr. Vice-
Chairman, Sir, I rise to oppose the Statutory
Resolution moved by Mr. Jacob, while
supporting the Motion moved by my
colleagues. Mr. Swell and Mr. Mathur.

When the Speaker of a Legislature wants to
be the Chief Minister of a State, one can
appreciate what will happen to the rule of law;
more particularly, how the anti-defection law
can be abused and misused. This is a glaring
example. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, at one point
of time, you belonged to the judiciary. Now,
you belong to the legislature, the Parliament.
You can well appreciate the present situation
in which we are forced to discuss and decide
the battle—whatever you may call it—my
friend, Mr. Kalita, said 'a crisis'—between the
legislature and the judiciary. I would have
been glad if Mr. Jacob—he is a very calm and
quiet person—had brought in this Resolution
after some time. I would have been glad if he
had taken a little more time to bring in this
Resolution studying the Supreme Court
judgement in the meantime. What's the
hurry? The Session is going to last up to the
20th December. According to the
Constitutional requirement this Proclamation
could have been endorsed even by that time,
not necessarily today, tomorrow, or, the day
after. The Minister of State for Home Affairs
himself says that he had not had time to study
the judgement of the Supreme Court. Having
said so, he comes up with a Resolution seeking
endorsement of the Proclamation. What will
happen? Sir, you

can appreciate. Apart from other questions, when the Minister of State for Home Affairs and for that matter the Central Government is aware of the fact that the Supreme Court has made a judgement, good, bad or indifferent, and the Centre has not yet got enough time to study that judgement to examine that judgement and the Centre brings a legislation, a Resolution, what would happen if the Supreme Court took a different position? No Member, whether he is a new or old Member, whether he is a very senior or junior Member, ' would like to have confrontation between the highest judiciary of the country and the highest Legislatore of the country particularly when there is time, when there is an occasion to hurry up. Even if ». agree •with Mr. Kalita my learned colleague coming from that area, that at that point of time it was necessary for the President of India to issue such a proclamation even if I accept it as a necessary evil following the argument put forth by Mr. Kalita or the reports of the Governor will he say that it is still necessary for Mr. Ja-eob to move this Resolution today itself, when the Supreme Court has already given a judgement and the Minister himself has said that he has not yet got the time to study that judgement?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): On Proclamation there is no judgement.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Whether Proclamation or not, is there some judgement or not?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): The Minister has not said it. (Interruptions). That it is on the question of the Tenth Schedule. That is what the Minister said if I understand it. There is no Judgement on Proclamation..

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: He is referring to been, Seneale and the Proclamation. *He* has stated that the Government has not got the time to study the judgement.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Mr. Minister, please clarify. I think you have referred to the judgement of the Tenth Schedule.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: Tenth Schedule has not been struck down by the Supreme Court. Who says that the Tenth Schedule has been struck down by the Supreme Court?

SHRI G. G. SWELL: paragraph 7. .

SHRI M. M. JACOB; That is the jurisdiction.

SHRI G. G. SWELL: Paragraph 7 has been struck down.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: You have stated that the Government has not yet ----

SHRI M. M. JACOB.- Government is awaiting the judgement. That is what I have said. (*Interruptions*).

' SHRI DIPEN GHOSH; I am coming to that. You need not worry. May God save you from choosing a leader in that State, a person like the Speaker who did all these things.

SHRI G. G. SWELL: You must disown the Speaker for your own prestige. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH; So, Sir, it is a clear case because even the Governor has gone on record saying that. It is not that the Centre is to act upon the Governor's report, the Governor himself has gone on record to say what Mr. Swell has quoted. I am not going to quote that, it was the Speaker, who out of the aspiration to become the Chief Minister, did not take

331 Statutory resolution [RAJYA SABHA]
approving President's
proclamation

[Shri Dipen Ghosh] cognizance of the Supreme Court decision. So, in order to satisfy one's proclivity of assuming power, should the Parliament allow one to ride roughshod over the rule of the law?

This is the question. It is not a question simply of imposing. President's Rule in a particular State to avoid a law and order situation or any other situation. This is the basic question which confronts us today. In the instant case, it is clear from the Governor's report itself, yet should we put a stamp on that?

Sir, Mr. Kalita has gone back to the history. I do not want to go back to the history but, at least, Mr. Kalita is aware of the Sarkaria Commission's report. The Sarkaria Commission had gone at length on the issue of application of article 356. Till 1987, when the Sarkaria Commission had submitted its report, the Commission has pointed out that in as many as 75 cases President's Rule was imposed—article 356 was applied—out of which as many as 31 cases could be avoided. Thereafter—you know it better than anybody else—the Sarkaria Commission had laid down a written guideline for the Centre to follow when applying article 356, but the Central Government has not yet come out whether it approves of it or disapproves of it and, in the meantime, they are freely applying article 356. And Mr. Kalita has talked about 1990—and he was all praise for Mr. Lyngdoh. In his first report, the Governor himself has said, in paragraph 3—and I quote

SHRI BHUBANESWAR KALITA: Under what circumstances?

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: I am reading from the Governor's report.

SHRI BHUBANESWAR KALITA: But the Governor cannot report everything. Under what circumstances?

And Motion for 352
revocation of the
proclamation

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: I am reading paragraph 3:

"Consequent upon the voluntary resignation of the P. A. Sangma Ministry following withdrawal of support by Shri B. B. Lyngdoh and others..."

Mr. P. A. Sangma could form a Ministry because Mr. B. B. Lyngdoh and others had supported him. You could get their support and so you could form a Government. But the people who supported you withdrew their support and so you fell through. Again I quote the Governor's report here ... (Interruptions)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR) Let him complete.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: I again quote the Governor's report. Here you have taken two names, of the Minister and the Prime Minister, but I am not debating on that. For the first time the Governor had stated in his second report, paragraph 5:

"Today two Congress leaders, what are Union Ministers, met and staked their claim to form a Government and were also agreeable to convene a special session within such period I may give them to prove the majority."

In what background? The background is in paragraph 2 of the Governor's report:

"On the confidence voting 8-10-1991 it was found that out of 57 persons in the House including the Speaker, both sides have the support of each. The Speaker did not command the support of four members who were earlier disqualified."

by him but in whose case the Supreme Court has stayed the order of the Speaker."

Having known that the Supreme Court had stayed the order of the Speaker, defying the Supreme Court's order the Speaker manoeuvred the voting number—in spite of 30—odd members putting their signatures he put it as 26:26 and, casting his own vote, created this situation. In this background, according to the Governor's report two Union Ministers had gone there and staked claim. This is the ethics! One should consider this aspect. I don't mind when you argue for endorsement of the President's Proclamation because of this situation or that situation. But how do you support these two Union Ministers' action? In the same background, when you support the President's Proclamation, you cannot support the two Ministers' action. You cannot have both. And those two Ministers belong to your party.

SHRI G. G. SWELL: They are Ministers.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: You must try to understand the impact of this thing. It is not that a Congress Government should be installed there. What is there if the Congress Party does not have a Government in a particular State? There are other States where the Congress Party does not have the Government. For that, should the Congress Party or the Congress Government at the Centre allow a particular individual to ride rough-shod over the rule of law in order to satisfy his proclivity of assuming power? Should you not think where we are leading the country to? When the anti-defection law was passed, Mr. Vice-Chairman, you know what the idea of your Government was behind passing the anti-defection law. It was to stop this aaya-Ram-gaya-Ram business which polluted the Indian politics, to cleanse the politics But now what is happen-

ing? In order to satisfy one's aspiration, to fulfil one's aspiration to become Chief Minister, he has denied the Supreme Court's orders.

SHRI BHUBANESWAR KALITA: This President's Proclamation is to stop this aaya-Ram-gaya-Ram business. Otherwise there would have been a Congress Government.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: But you are supporting that particular person. You have made him your leader. Had the Governor agreed with the Union Ministers, the two Union Ministers, there would have been a government of your party, headed by that person.

SHRI BHUBANESWAR KALITA: The Governor recommended two options out of which...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Let him complete.

SHRI BHUBANESWAR KALITA: the Central Government has agreed to one which is not in favour of my party, but it is in favour of stability in the State. (*Interruptions*)

You study the report, and then you say something.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Mr. Kalita, you have spoken. Maintain peace.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: He is a young man, a budding politician.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): He has given a good speech.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: I expect, at least he should see and ensure that an honest, a clean political—atmosphere is developed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): A good hope.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: But, looking to the way in which your party is doing, the way your party has elected the Speaker as the Leader of the Opposition and wanted to make him Chief Minister, the way the two Union Ministers rushed to Shillong to see that your party-supported government comes into being with that person as Chief Minister, I do not know how you can support these things.

Anyway, Mr. Vice-Chairman, this is completely unethical—and illegal and all other things they have stated about it—and unwanted also. There is still time. Up to the 20th of December this House is in session. So, till that time he can withhold it. He can examine the judgement of the Supreme Court because so far as the stay order is concerned, this Speaker's disqualification is concerned, the Supreme Court has already issued the orders. It was issued on 11th November and certified on the 15th of November. I quote:

"The impugned decision of the Speaker, respondent No. 1, dated the 17th of August, 1991, is set aside and the appeal is allowed for the reasons to be set out in the de-dailed judgement to follow. There will be no order as to costs.

In view of the decision in Civil Appeal No. 3500 of 1991 this appeal has been rendered infructuous and is dismissed as such. There will be no order as to costs."

So far as the Speaker's decision is concerned, it has been set aside by the Supreme Court. So what is the position in the Legislative Assembly of Meghalaya? If the Speaker's decision about disqualifying the four members has been set aside then, the votes of those four members who had supported the "confidence motion" become valid. The voting was 31 for the motion and 26 against. This is minus Speaker. If Speaker's vote is taken into account it will be 31:27. So in the background of this decision

and when the Legislative Assembly is in suspended animation, it can be reconvened and resummoned and a fresh voting can take place and we should wait till the result of that voting is known. So anyway whether the MUPP Government is defeated or not whether it exists or not, it has to be decided on the floor of the Legislative Assembly, I would therefore, appeal to the Minister of State for Home Affairs to withdraw his Resolution for the time being and take steps to see that the Meghalaya State Assembly is summoned and a fresh voting is taken up and on the result thereof, a decision can be taken. Thank you.

डा. रत्नाकर पाण्डेय : माननीय उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे गृह मंत्री जी ने मेघालय के विषय में जो प्रस्ताव रखा है में उसका समर्थन करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। महोदय, श्री जी. जी. स्वैल इस राष्ट्र के जाने-आने जनतांत्रिक प्रणाली में विश्वास रखने वाले, नार्थ-ईस्टर्न स्टेट्स के विख्यात व्यक्ति हैं। इनका भाषण मैं बड़े ध्यान से सुन रहा था। इन्होंने कहा कि मेघालय की जो घटना हुई है, यह संसदीय, जनतंत्र के लिए कलंक है। इन्होंने कहा कि दो केंद्रीय मंत्री कांग्रेस सरकार के वहाँ गए और उन्होंने गलत किया कि तत्कालीन सरकार को कैसे मिलाया जाए। बहुमत सिद्ध के लिए वे वहाँ गए। महोदय, इन्होंने गृह मंत्री पर यह आरोप लगाया कि जनतांत्रिक प्रणाली को हमने हानि पहुंचाई है, सुप्रीम कोर्ट का जो आदेश है उसकी अवहेलना की है और इसके साथ ही साथ प्रधानमंत्री ने राष्ट्रपति जी को जो सिफारिश की थी मवनर रूल लागू करने के लिए, उसके पैरा 7 को इन्होंने एकदम गलत बताया है। महोदय, पैरा 7 पर मैं आगे विस्तार से चर्चा करूंगा।

इन्होंने दसवीं अनुसूची को समाप्त करने की बात की है। महोदय, हमने हमेशा मेघालय की उन्नति और वहाँ की

जनता को भाग बढ़ाने की बात की है। आप जानते हैं कि नामालूम और मिजोरम की तरह या अन्य नार्थ-ईस्टर्न स्टेट्स की तरह वहाँ कोई आतंकवाद की स्थिति नहीं है। महोदय, इन्होंने यह कहा है कि मेमालय का न्याय से विश्वास उठ गया है और विधान सभाध्यक्ष लालच में समर्थन कर रहे हैं। सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने न्याय दिया और संसद ने न्याय नहीं दिया, यह भी आप कह रहे हैं। किस हालत में ऐसा किया गया है, यह उच्चतम न्यायालय के सम्मान का प्रश्न है। उच्चतम न्यायालय और संसद में क्लेश न हो, काम सहमति से काम होना चाहिए, यह आपकी स्पीच का जिस्ट था। पैरा 7 पर आपने बड़ा जोर दिया और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री को जो देश में अपनी निष्ठा, सारी दुनिया में अपनी ईमानदारी और राजनीतिक परिणतता के लिए विख्यात हैं, जिनकी स्पीकर के रूप में दूसरे सदन ने और आपने भी बराबर तारीफ की, उन पर पैरा 7 गलत है, ऐसा आपने आरोप लगाया। मैं पैरा 7 को कोट करना चाहूँगा :

"On 23rd August a delegation of Members of the Assembly belonging to the UMFF met me and submitted the resolution passed by the Congress Legislature Party and its allies on 22-8-1991 staking the claim to form the Ministry without naming its leader. I asked the UMPF group to let me know the name of their Leader to consider their claim. On the same day, I also summon an emergent session of advised the Chief Minister to the Assembly to decide the majority on the floor of the House. On 24th August the UMPF group informed me that they had elected Shri J. D. Pohrmen as the Leader of the Congress Legislature Party and its allies. On 25th August, I again reminded the Chief Minister to summon a session of the Assembly by 27th August. Oh 27th August, Shri pohrmen formally staked

his claim to form the Government. I informed Shri J. D. Pohrmen, Leader of the UMFF that I had advised the Chief Minister for a session by 27th August as the decision on the Motion of Confidence which came up for consideration on 7th August was pending and that the claim of majority or otherwise of either group could only be decided on the floor of the House. The Speaker in his letter had also intimated that the Motion of Confidence moved on 7th August, 1991 had not been decided and it would be considered first, when the Assembly was re-summoned."

इसमें वास्तविक रिपोर्ट जो भवनर ने दी थी उसकी चर्चा की गई और इसी के आधार पर भारत के महाबहिष् राष्ट्रपति ने 11 अक्टूबर, 1991 को मेमालय राज्य के राज्यपाल की रिपोर्ट पर और सचवाई की सूचना पर ऐसी स्थिति उत्पन्न होने का विश्वास किया जिसमें कि राज्य का शासन भारत के संविधान के तहत नहीं चलाया जा सकता, इसलिए राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू किया जाए।

मान्यवर, विस्तार से बातें करने के पूर्व मैं कहना चाहूँगा कि "मीठा मीठा गप्प, कड़वा कड़वा पू" की हमारे अपोजिशन के लोगों की आदत है।
... (ध्यवधान)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Seeing the anxiety of Members I may make it clear that there are many speakers who want to speak on this. So the voting would not be there. We will work up to 6 o'clock. Thereafter, we will adjourn. You can continue, Mr. Pandey. I am just clarifying because everybody is coming in.

डा. रत्नाकर पाण्डेय : श्रीमान, मैं कह रहा था कि पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने, हमारी स्वर्णीय इंदिरा गांधी ने, राजीव गांधी ने आसाम और सिस्टर स्टेट्स जो पहाड़ों की उपतिका में बसे हुए हैं और मेघालय जहां बादल किलोल करते हैं, मिलांग की उस धरती को मिला देखा है। चिरपूजी को देखा है जहां सौन्दर्य साक्षात् अपने स्वरूप को निरदिष्ट करता है। केवल प्रतीति में नहीं जीवों में भी, इसनों में भी उस धरती पर राजनीतिज्ञ प्रतिस्पर्धा इतनी व्यापक है कि वहां कब क्या खेल हो जाए कुछ कहा नहीं जा सकता। कई चुनाव में मत्तो जाने का मौका मिला है। 5-6 हजार वोटों पर वहां चुनाव होते हैं। उन चुनावों में जो लोग जीत कर आते हैं वे जनप्रतिनिधित्व के रूप में असेम्बली में बैठते हैं, सरकारें बनाते हैं परन्तु जिस तरह से हमारे भूतपूर्व प्रधान मंत्री राजीव गांधी को घोषा देकर उनकी पीठ पर छुरा भोक्त कर विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह ने हमारे नागालैंड, मेघालय और अन्य नाथ-ईस्ट स्टेट्स में दलबदल की स्थिति की शुरुआत की, 1989 में, उसका परिणाम आज सामने है। उलफा को सिर उठाने का मौका मिला, नागालैंड के मिलीटेंट फोर्स को सिर उठाने का मौका मिला। हमारे जो छोटे-छोटे प्रांत हैं वहां सशक्त दल हथियार से लैस हो गये हैं उनको भी सिर उठाने का मौका मिला। मेघालय में जो स्थिति बनी उसमें लिनडो विश्वास-मत पाने में विफल हुए और मेघालय ने सत्तारूढ़ दल ने अध्यक्ष को हटा दिया। 8 अक्टूबर की यह घटना है और सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने लिनडो के बने रहने की संभावना का जिक्र किया और मेघालय में गम्भीर संवैधानिक संकट इसलिए पैदा हुआ कि सत्ता से शक्ति, सम्पन्नता और अधिकार चाहने की लालसा रखने वालों को जनतंत्र के भीतर मेघालय में जितना नग्न नृत्य करते हुए विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह की सरकार के समय देखा गया उतना कभी नहीं देखा गया। हमारे भूतपूर्व अध्यक्ष स्वैल जो राष्ट्रीय एकता के प्रतीक माने जाते हैं नाथ-ईस्ट से लेकिन यह सहज स्वभाव के छल प्रपंच विहीन व्यक्तित्व के धनी हैं लेकिन विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह के लोमड़ी

की चालाकी से भरे कारनामों में इनके जैसा व्यक्तित्व भी फंस गया और इनका जो राष्ट्रीय व्यक्तित्व था वह भी ऐसे माहौल में परिवर्तित हो गया और देश में इनके व्यक्तित्व की अस्था पर जांच आने की संभावना दिखाई पड़ने लगी। इसमें इनका दोष नहीं है। इस सदन के माध्यम से आपकी अध्यक्षता में मैं सारे देश से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि स्वयं दलबदल करने वाले विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह ने मेघालय में, नागालैंड में और अन्य प्रांतों में किस तरह से सत्ता प्राप्ति का लालच देकर कांग्रेस के लोगों को तोड़ा और उस समय अस्थिरता का वातावरण पैदा किया जिसमें विदेशी ताकतों को नाथ-ईस्ट स्टेट्स में सिर उठाने का मौका मिला। वह इतिहास के पन्नों में, भारत-के जनतंत्र में एक ऐसी अस्थिर और दयनीय स्थिति को प्रकट करता है जिसकी परिकल्पना करके रोंगटे खड़ हो जाते हैं। मेघालय में इस प्रकार गम्भीर संवैधानिक संकट पैदा हुआ और इस संकट में राज्य में विधान सभा भंग करके राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू करने के अलावा संविधान के समक्ष, राष्ट्रपति के समक्ष, इस संसद के समक्ष, सारे देश के राजनीतिक नेताओं के समक्ष कोई दूसरा चारा नहीं था। यह संकट सुप्रीम कोर्ट और विधान सभा के अध्यक्ष में टकराव के कारण पैदा हुआ। 17 अगस्त को विधान सभा अध्यक्ष ने राज्य की लिम्बो सरकार के चार समर्थकों की विधान सभा की सदस्यता यह कहते हुए खारिज कर दी कि उन्होंने दल बदल का उल्लंघन किया है। इस विश्वासघात फौसले को सुप्रीम कोर्ट में चुनौती दी गई और सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने कहा कि जब तक हम दल बदल कानून की वैधता का फौसला न कर लें, अध्यक्ष के इस निर्णय को लागू न किया जाय। सुप्रीम कोर्ट के इस निर्देश को मानने से अध्यक्ष ने इंकार कर दिया और सुप्रीम कोर्ट की पांच सदस्यीय बैंच को भी यह बात साफ-साफ अध्यक्ष ने बना दी कि मैं इसे नहीं मानता। फिर सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने कहा कि उसके निर्देश का पालन करवाना सभी संवैधानिक संस्थाओं का कर्तव्य है। विधान सभा की बैठक इस बीच में बुलाई गई। विधान सभा के सामने प्रस्ताव

पेश किया गया। विधान सभा के अध्यक्ष ने जिन चार सदस्यों को दल बदल कानून के तहत खारिज कर दिया था, वे सदन में आए और वोटिंग हुई। उनकी वोटिंग को काउंट नहीं किया गया। दोनों और 26-26 वोट पड़े। अपने कास्टिंग वोट में चैयरमैन ने 27 वोट कर दिए और सरकार भंग हो गई। इसके बाद अध्यक्ष ने जो मत दिया उससे विश्वास प्रस्ताव गिर गया और विधान सभा स्थगित कर दी। इसके बाद राज्यपाल के पास नई सरकार बनाने का दावा पेश किया गया। सरकारी पक्ष के विधायक बैठे रहे। विवादग्रस्त चार विधायकों को शामिल किया गया। एक अपराध नहीं किया गया, बल्कि जो लोग दल बदल कानून के तहत मेघालय विधान सभा से डिबार कर दिए गए थे उन चार सदस्यों को काउंट करके अपना बहुमत सिद्ध करने का जो प्रयत्न रचा गया उससे राज्यपाल सहमत नहीं थे और यह कहना कि दो-बो मिनिस्टर केन्द्र से गए थे, ठीक नहीं है। जब विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह की सरकार थी तो क्या श्री फर्नांडिस वहां पिकनिक करने गए थे? तत्कालीन नवजवान राज्य गृह मंत्री श्री सुबोध कास्त सहाय वहां भ्रान्त मनाने गए थे? एक व्यवस्था को तोड़ने की साजिश रची गई। अगर हमारी सरकार ने जबरदस्ती करनी होती तो आज मध्य प्रदेश और राजस्थान में सरकारें जो काम कर रही हैं और जनता ने लोक सभा के चुनावों में और पिछले चुनावों में उन्हें जिस तरह से खारिज कर दिया है, वहां अपने मत के माध्यम से राष्ट्रपति का शासन हम लागू करा सकते थे। अस्थिरता आपने पैदा की है। हमारे नार्थ ईस्ट में छोटे छोटे जो प्रांत हैं वे भारत माता के मुकुट में लगी हुई सात मणियां हैं जिन मणियों की दुनिया की कोई ताकत हमसे अलग नहीं कर सकती है। अस्थिरता उत्पन्न करके विदेशी ताकतों को आमंत्रित करने की सजिश करने की शुरुआत विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह के प्रधानमंत्रित्व काल में हुई। हमारी सरकार ने कोई ऐसा काम नहीं

किया है जिस पर हमें किसी तरह से सिर झुका कर बात करने की जरूरत पड़े। हमने जो कुछ किया है वह संविधान के तहत किया है। हमने जो कुछ किया है वह भारत की प्रभुसत्ता सम्पन्न और जनतांत्रिक मूल्यों की रक्षा के लिए किया है और राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू करके वहां की हजारों-लाखों जनता से पूछिए जिस तरह से वहां लोग ताहि-ताहि कर रहे थे और दल बदल के माध्यम से रोज जिस तरह से जनता की आकांक्षाओं आशाओं और विश्वास के साथ खिलवाड़ किया जा रहा था उसको बंद करने हमने सुव्यवस्था, स्थिरता और राष्ट्रपति के शासन के माध्यम से जनता की भावनाओं और उसके जनतांत्रिक अधिकारों को स्टेट के सार्वजनिक हित को देखते हुए उनको करने का उपक्रम रचा इस सब कांड के बाद

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री भास्कर अन्नाजी मासोदकर) : पंडित जी क्वल्यू कीजिए।

डा. राजाकर पाण्डेय : पहला सवाल यह उठता है कि जो विवादग्रस्त चार विधायक थे उनको क्यों गिरा गया, उनको क्यों बलिष्ठ माना गया? राज्यपाल सुप्रीम कोर्ट के आदेश का पालन न करके तो वह खुद अदालत की जवाबदेही के शिकार होते। इससे जुड़ी हुई समस्या यह है कि लिमबोह की सरकार को उस समय विजयी माना जाता था पराजित माना जाता। असल में इन समस्याओं का समाधान सुप्रीम कोर्ट ही कर सकता था या भारत की संसद कर सकती है। संकट से उबरने का तरीका यही कि विधान सभा को भंग करके राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू किया जाय, इसके अलावा कोई चारा नहीं था। मेघालय में भारत का वे संतानें बसती हैं जो कितनी कहीं जाती हैं, जो देवलोक के जीव हैं और

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय
मनुष्य रूप में वहाँ विचरण करते हैं। वहाँ की विधान सभा में जिस तरह से अपनी भौतिक और राजनीतिक शुद्ध पिपासा को शांत करने के लिए कहीं का इट कहीं का रोड़ा जोड़ बटोर करके शासन चलाने के लिए दल बदल को बढ़ावा देने का काम पिछली बी०पी० सरकार ने किया है, उसको निन्दा करने के लिए मैं यहाँ खड़ा हुआ हूँ। हमारी सरकार ने नरसिंह राव जी के नेतृत्व में जो कुछ किया है सारा देश उसकी बंदना करता है। स्थिरता लाने के लिए यह उपक्रम रचा गया है ताकि आग से दल बदल न हो और असंतोष जो जनता में है उस असंतोष का समाधान किया जाए।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR):
Pandeyji, now please conclude.

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय : दो मिनट बड़ी देखकर।
My whip is asking me to speak for five minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): All
right I will give you two minutes.

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय : बार-बार वहाँ समझाते करते हैं कि डेढ़ साल शासन हम करते हैं और डेढ़ साल आप करिए। इतना दल बदल को बढ़ावा देने का जो चक्र रचा गया है भारत के जनतंत्र में, क्योंकि उस सरकार का नेतृत्व करने वाला दगाबाज था, उसने पीठ में छुरा घोंपा राजीव गांधी की। राजीव गांधी की हत्या, माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, 21 मई को हुई लेकिन उस देवतुल्य भारत के राष्ट्रीय शिखरपुरुष की चरित्र हत्या विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह ने बहुत पहले कर दी थी, जब कि उसमें कोई संशय नहीं थी। उसी के तहत मेघालय को भी अस्थिर किया, नागालैंड को भी अस्थिर किया और जी०जी० स्वेन से मैं आग्रह करूँगा कि भूलें होती हैं। उनका व्यक्तित्व राष्ट्रीय व्यक्तित्व है और जनता दल में जूते में दाल बंट

रही है। मली के कुत्ते इस तरह से लड़ने हैं जिस तरह से ये लोग लड़ रहे हैं। जनतंत्र के नाम पर यह कलंक है। मैं इनसे प्रार्थना करूँगा कि वे मेघालय के ही नहीं बल्कि नार्थ-ईस्टर्न स्टेट्स के सरदार पटेल की तरह लोह पुष्प के तप में जनता दल की निन्दा करें और स्वयं भारत के निर्माण के लिए भारत की राष्ट्रीय एकता और अखंडता की सुरक्षा के लिए काम करें। अगर नार्थ-ईस्टर्न स्टेट्स साथ नहीं रहेगी तो यह देश टूट जाएगा। उसी सुरक्षा के लिए जब जी० पी० सिंह प्रधानमंत्री थे... (व्यवधान)... उस समय बार-बार स्वेन साहिब से आग्रह किया गया कि आप यहाँ आर्य और यहाँ समस्याओं को देखें। लेकिन क्या स्थिति थी? कभी फर्मा बीज को तो कभी सुबोध कांत को और कभी किसी को भेजते रहे। उसी दल में रहकर आप उस दल की मान्यता दे रहे हैं। स्वेन जी मैं आपसे प्रार्थना करूँगा कि अगर मेघालय की समस्या हल होगी तो वह आप जैसे राजपुरुषों के नेतृत्व में हल होगी।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Please
conclude.

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय : आपको जनता दल की निन्दा करके और हलात पर पुनः विचार करके राष्ट्रीय धारा में जो हमारी नार्थ-ईस्टर्न स्टेट्स हैं उनको लाना चाहिए। हमारी कांग्रेस सरकार ने मेघालय को जो आर्थिक, भौतिक और व्यक्तित्व का सम्मान दिया है उस सम्मान को सुरक्षा प्रदान करें।

अंत में माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि निष्ठुरता की सीपी के रूप में राजनीति का मोती पलता है।

और निष्ठुर होना पड़ेगा राजनीति के लिए। जो ऐसे तत्व हैं जो इस देश को जोड़ने का काम न कर के तोड़ने का काम करते हैं, इस देश की गरिमा को जो आसामान करने वाले हैं, उसको धरती की गहराई में गड़ने का काम

कर रहे हैं, ऐसे लोगों से दूरफ़ी हो
कर के आइये हम सब मिल कर के राष्ट्र
का निर्माण करें। मेघालय में जो राष्ट्रपति
शासन लागू हुआ है, उसका मैं तहक़िल
से भारत की जनता का प्रतिनिधि होने
के नाते समर्थन करता हूँ तथा जो कुछ
हमारे गृह राज्य मंत्री जी ने इस सदन
में कहा है उसका मैं तारीफ़ करता हूँ,
तहक़िल से समर्थन करता हूँ।

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, much of the ground has been already covered by my friends on this issue. I will try to be brief. To begin with, I say that the developments in Meghalaya defy any definition. The politics, the events, there have touched the nadir. If I can use the phrase, Meghalaya has become a theatre of the absurd. A unique stalemate, political stalemate, has been created by various forces which operate there. I am aware the politics of the north-eastern States is yet to stabilise and our effort has always to be to stabilise the political institutions there. Meghalaya has just undone whatever has been done to stabilise the situation in the north-eastern States. In Meghalaya the events that have taken place are so disturbing that they leave a feeling in any thinking mind as to whether the democratic institution in Meghalaya is not being dismantled or upset. What do we see, what is the political scenario, in Meghalaya? The State has got an Assembly where there are 58 members. The Government, the Lyngdoh Government, enjoyed 30-members support. They say 31: I take it 30. The Opposition led by the Congress has 28 members. In terms of numbers the Congress party and its allies never enjoyed the majority at any time. Even when vote was taken and counting was done informally, it was found that 30 people were on the side of Lyngdoh and the rest were on the side of the Congress party. That was the situation. That was the report of the Governor.

Thirty became 26 because of the disqualification of four Members as a result of the orders of the Speaker who joined the Congress party. He was elected the leader of the Congress party and was an aspirant for the Chief Ministership. That was the state of affairs. The Speaker in an extraordinary manner cast a casting vote in favour of the Congress and its allies and thus it got the majority and the party won. There was a Supreme Court order which was quoted my colleague Shri Dipen Ghosh under which disqualification was removed and votes had to be taken ... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): It was not removed, it was stayed... (*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): He had said stayed.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: But they were not counted. But can you imagine it was done without observing the procedures that are prescribed. A Member can be deprived of his vote or he can be disqualified only after following certain procedures. There has been disqualification of Members here in the Parliament in the past but both the Chairman and the Speaker observed certain procedures that were prescribed. But in Meghalaya none of the rules were observed. This had been done with a view to reduce the majority into minority. That was the purpose and it was motivated. The Speaker was used by the Congress Party at the Centre and the State level to promote their own party interest. Sir, Shri Nrsasimha Rao, when he took over as the Prime Minister made a statement. He said that the Congress party or his Government would not resort to wrong methods to topple non-Congress Governments or destabilise non-Congress regimes in the States. But what happened in Meghalaya? Just the re-

verse. My friend has quoted that two Central Ministers went there and it was also said that Mr. George Fernandes had also gone there earlier. If I remember correctly, Mr. George Fernandes never went there.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: He was operating in that region, in the North-Eastern Region at that time!.. (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Please do not interrupt. I am not quoting you, I am quoting the other Member who said that. He never went there... (*Interruptions*). ..My friend, Shri Dipen Ghosh, helps me now saying that the Governor's report does not say that he was there. The Governor's report does not say that Mr. George Fernandes went there. But the Governor's report says that two Union Ministers—I am told that they are Mrs. Margaret Alva and Mr. Sangma—went there and met the Governor to stake their claim that the Congress(I) should be allowed to form the Government. ..What business have they to do this?

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Because We have a majority... (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: I do not mind the leader of the Congress(I) in Meghalaya Assembly going to the Governor and making the demand. But how can the Central Ministers go there, meet the Governor and make such a demand?... (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI AJIT P. K. JOGI: Because they are Congress (I) leaders... (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: This is your political ethics? ...(*Interruptions*) .. This is your standard. I know it and I do not quarrel with you on that. It shows your standard... (*Interruptions*) .. I thought you had some concern for political ethics and political norms ...(*Interruptions*)...

Sir, Meghalaya reminds me that the "Aya Ram, Gaya Ram" game is coming back once again. We have heard of it in Haryana earlier and now, in Meghalaya, it is being practised in the most clandestine manner. Sir, I am amazed to note that on 30th July, the Congress (I) legislators had made an abortive bid to kidnap the Deputy Speaker even! Why? Why did they try to do that? But they could not succeed in that. There is a report in the Press also and if they deny it, I will feel very happy. There is a report in the Press that the Central Government organized the kidnapping of three MLAs of the ruling MUPP..... (*Interruptions*) .. The report is of 3rd April. Please contradict it and I will be very happy in that case.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): But what happened in Karnataka? You conveniently forgot that ----- (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Mr. Bangrappa is ruling there now because of us. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Do you want us to thank you for that?. (*Interruptions*)
...

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: That is your democracy. We stood by democracy and observed the norms of democracy in Karnataka.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA (Bihar): Hegde style! ... (*Interruptions*)..

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: I* know your feelings I understand your feelings.

Now, is there any instance in which an Assembly is summoned or convened for the purpose of debating a motion of confidence and after the debate is over, the Assembly is adjourned *sine die* without taking the vote? Is there any such instance? Why was it done? Under what rule was it done? The Spea-

ker from the very beginning became a privy to the whole clandestine operation and he was trying to destabilize the lawful Government 6.00 P.M.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): How much time you want?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Just two minutes. I do not want more time because I had already told you that I will be brief. Much of the ground has been covered.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): We will adjourn after you finish.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Therefore, Sir, already damage has been caused. And we have made nonsense of democratic institutions in Meghalaya. And in this context what has to be done? What is the way out? I do not see any way out except to restore the Government of Lyngdoh. Summon the Assembly. Let him face the Assembly. Let the vote be

taken. If he is defeated, he is out. And then naturally the leader of the opposition will be called to form the Government. Therefore, there should be revocation of the president's Rule. The Assembly should be summoned. And Mr. Lyngdoh should be asked to seek the vote of confidence. And that is the only way out. I am afraid, if this is not done, if the elections are held, seeing the things as they are, I do not think there will be stability, I do not think you can bring about stability. There may be more instability. Therefore, I am suggesting this. Let (he Assembly be summoned as early as possible. Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at two minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 27th November, 1991.