

[Smt. Usha Choudhari]

situation, the Central Government should sanction some amount as an immediate relief for the affected farmers. At the same time a central team should be sent to that area to make an assessment of the losses so that actual position may become clear. These crops may also please be included in the crops insurance scheme.

13.28 hrs

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE: APPROVAL OF PROCLAMATION IN RELATION TO STATE OF KARNATAKA AND

AND

MOTION RE: CONDUCT OF GOVERNOR OF KARNATAKA *Contd.*

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Now, we will take up next items, namely item No. 16 and 17 together.

Now, Shrimati Basavarajeswari.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI (Guwahati): When will be the reply?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The reply will be around 2 O' clock or 2-30 p.m.

[Translation]

*SHRIMATI BASAVARAJESWARI (Bellary): Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, Many hon'ble members have expressed their views regarding the recent developments in Karnataka. The opposition party members have said that the Governor's action was unconstitutional. But the general opinion in the country is different. The people in the coun-

try and especially in Karnataka have welcomed the decision of the Governor recommending the dismissal of Karnataka Government. Many members spoke about the inefficiency, corruption and injustice of the Janata Dal rule. I want to confine only to the Governor's decision. My only question is whether there was any Government in Karnataka for the last two years at all? Neither there was any Government nor any administration. Administration had collapsed in the State. Corruption was rampant. There was injustice everywhere. There was no one to listen to the grievances of the poor farmers. The Government had partisan attitude. The Janata Dal Government betrayed the faith reposed on them by the people of Karnataka. Shri S. Najalingapa is a veteran politician of our country. In Karnataka his words carry weight. He says that the Governor should have recommended president's rule one year ago. That would have benefitted the people of the State. You can well imagine to what an extent Janata Dal rule in Karnataka had pained him.

Farmers thought that the Janata Dal was a pro-farmers party. Hence lakhs and lakhs of farmer supported the Dal and it thus came to power in the State. But now the life of farmers in the State has become miserable. I, therefore, wholeheartedly welcome the decision of the Governor.

Janata Dal had several slogans when they went for polls. "Value based politics/and "decentralization of power" are important among them. Then they conducted elections for the district council mandal parishads. But how did they conduct the elections? The whole country knows how they manipulated the elections. At that time we had told them not to hold those elections as there were no funds. We told them not to take politics upto mandal level, because that would spoil the peaceful atmosphere prevailing in the villages. Our State party President Shri Veerendra Patil also suggested that they should not hold the elections. The Janata Dal did not yield to any of our suggestions. They

* Translation of the speech originally delivered in Kannada.

went ahead with the elections. What is now happening in the villages is known to everybody. Quarrels, thefts, robbery etc. have become common in the villages and the poor people are made to attend the courts regularly. There are no funds to run the district council. Even the salaries of those working in those councils have not been paid. The money given to them is not sufficient enough for the expenditure of the President and the Vice President of the council. Hence where is the money for development works?

Some of the mandals are in the hands of Janata Dal and some others are in the hands of Congress (I). Janata Dal had the power and hence could destroy 15 to 20 mandals of Congress (I) in my Constituency alone. Why did they stoop to such a low level? The village people all over the State are crying for retaining the mandals. They want to retain their self-respect. But they are in tears today, and their curse made the Janata Dal to crumble under their own weight.

The farmers faith in the Janata Dal has been shattered. I hail from the Thunga-Bhadra area. In that area about 10 to 20 lakh acres belonging to Raichur and Bellary districts have irrigation facilities. But what happened there recently? There was no water supply to that area and that affected the crop in 4 1/2 lakh acres. Crop was destroyed completely and the total estimated loss was about 300 to 400 crores of rupees. The farmers went on strike. They agitated and took out procession. But there was none to come to their rescue. Finally the concerned Minister came to that area. He invited us also to hold meetings with the farmers. We did not attend those meetings. We wanted him to face the affected farmers. But that time the water in the Thunga-Bhadra rivers was completely dried up. This is the magnitude of callousness which the Janata Dal Ministers had towards the farmers. They sold the industries and they went to the extent of selling water also to other States. If this is the condition where shall we go? What will the farmers grow in the absence of water? Most of the farmers have taken loans from the

Banks. How can they repay the loans? A serious situation is prevailing in the State. This is the gift the Janata Dal had offered to the farmers of the State.

Mr. Bommai who took over from Mr. Hegde was under tremendous pressure. All the 111 MLAs wanted to become either Ministers or Chairmen. All of them wanted B.D.A. sites, Maruti vans and Cars. Hence Mr. Bommai must be feeling a much relaxed person now. It is very difficult to pull on the family affairs with one wife. Then how can Mr. Bommai pull on with 111 very ambitious and greedy M.L. A.s. This is not first time that problems started mounting up on this Government. In the M.L.C. elections there was an utter confusion among Janata Dal party MLAs. Mr. H.D. Devagowda was pulling the members to one side and Mr. Hegde was pulling the members towards the opposite side. This kind of tug of war became a permanent feature of the Janata Dal Government. Horse trading reached its peak during the last Rajya Sabha elections in the State. Mr. Ram Jethmalani sneaked in and succeeded in getting elected to the Rajya Sabha. Many Janata Dal members have become rich persons today. But people know how they have accumulated so much wealth within a short span of time. The Government of India has given the 20 point programme for the upliftment of the poor people of the country. This 20 point programme is not acceptable to the Janata Dal legislators because our late lamented leader Indira Gandhi was the founder of that programme.

The M.L.As and Ministers made it a point not to invite the M.Ps for the flag hoisting ceremony during independence day and republic day.

The money provided by the centre was not utilized properly. They were telling the people that the centre was not giving any assistance at all. They changed the names of all programmes and gave new names which suited them. During the three year drought period in the state there was none to hear the problems of farmers. They went on blaming the Centre and at the same time

[Smt. Basavarajeswari]

diverted all the funds made available by the centre for drought relief programmes. There were several instances of Government cheques being dishonoured. If the individuals cheque is dishonoured there is some punishment. What punishment is there for the State Government if its cheque is dishonoured? Entire Karnataka State has become bankrupt.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sir, she is going out of the way.

SHRI G.S. BASAVARAJU: No, she is not going out of the way.

SHRIMATI BASAVARAJESWARI: Sir, I am not going out of the way. In fact I have never done that. I am speaking about the performance of the Govt. of Karnataka. I want to prove that there was no Govt. in Karnataka.

[English]

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE (Jadavpur): It was only a malady Govt.

SHRI M. RAGHUMA REDDY (Nalgonda): Just like your Government. (*Interruptions*)

[Translation]

SHRIMATI BASAVARAJESWARI: Many aspects have been explained by Mr. G.S. Basavaraju in his marathon speech yesterday. In spite of that the opposition party members still think that the people would give their votes to them. People are not fools. In Karnataka the people elected 24 Congress-I candidates out of 28. Then immediately after that they elected Janata Party to rule the State. They are more intelligent than what the opposition party members think.

The State Government employees are not getting their salaries regularly. The employees are being compelled to invest their salaries in savings. All the subsidy

amount in Subjected to savings. In fact, this Government is now being called as the "Savings Govt." They get about 85% loan from the Centre and even then they insist on savings.

The Janata Government went on hoodwinking the people. Mr. Devegowda laid foundation stones of so many irrigation projects. But not even one of them has been taken up. Irritated by this attitude of Chief Minister, Mr. Gowda resigned from the Cabinet. The State Government had no money to any programme. The economic condition of the State was deplorable. Entire administrative set up had become inefficient. Corruption was rampant and the Governor should have recommended for the Government's dismissal two years ago. In fact, Mr. R.K. Hegde himself has admitted the inefficiency of the Government, and this has appeared in the local newspapers. Most of the people in the country had expected the downfall of the Government on the day of cabinet expansion. We have discipline in our party. We have our congress cult. Even for some mistakes our Prime Minister has replaced the State Chief Ministers. But the Opposition parties are not prepared to accept this stand. Even if there are number of charges against a Chief Minister, they would praise him and they never think of replacing that Chief Minister.

Immediately after the dismissal of the Karnataka Government, there was happiness everywhere in the State. Crackers were burnt worth of several thousands of rupees. Now let us face elections. You are all power hungry people. In Andhra Pradesh, one leader of the Opposition charged our Prime Minister with several allegations while commenting on the Thakkar Commission report. You too have mothers and children. Should you not behave as responsible politicians? (*Interruptions*)

You are all power hungry politicians. You are keen about your chairs. You never bother for the problems of the people. As our state party President said in his speech let us face the people. They will teach you lesson

and that will be the end of your political carrier.

I support the promulgation, imposing President's rule in Karnataka, and congratulate the Governor.

Sir, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak and with these words, I conclude my speech.

[English]

SHRI H.N. NANJE GOWDA (Hassan):
Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Statutory Resolution moved by the hon. Home Minister and also to oppose the motion moved by Shri Dinesh Goswami.

Sir, personally I am not happy about the exit of the Bommai's Government. Not because I like Mr. Bommai. If he were to be continued for another three months, the Janata Dal would have reached rock-bottom. That would have happened. Several hon. Members have discussed about the technicality and other things. But nobody seems to have analysed the reality.

I think Shri Krishna Iyer is here. Is Shri Shankara Gowda a Member of Your party? He is a very senior Member. He says in Kannada, "*Rashtrapati Aalvikege Bommai-Hegde Karana*". So, his own senior Party colleague is accusing Mr. Hegde and Mr. Bommai.

Now, let us see what Mr. Bommai has, himself, to offer. On 23rd, addressing a Press Conference, he says, among other things,

"Mr. Bommai confessed that he might not have been able to pull on for 10 months with his crisis-ridden regime because of pulls and pressures within the legislature party".

He himself had admitted it.

Though everybody might have read this

editorial, I pick up one sentence from this editorial from the *Indian Express* for the argument sake.

"For the last two years, the Janata Government in Karnataka had become a liability - for the Opposition as much as for the people of Karnataka."

Not only for the Congress or for the Opposition but also for the people of Karnataka. Why I have quoted this is, there is what is called an element of humanitarian consideration. There is a patient who is under coma for more than one year. Oxygen is being given to him. The relatives are fed up and everybody is fed up. They want him to die. But the doctor is telling, 'I am giving Oxygen'. Mr. Bommai's Government and Mr. Hegde's Government were in coma, for the last two years. Now, under humanitarian considerations, these 19 MLAs have killed. Not the Congress or the Governor. It is called mercy-killing. People know what sort of man Mr. Hegde is. I personally want an Opposition, a sound opposition in the country, a very strong opposition in the country. But what is happening? Suppose I am to be strong and suppose I am having cancer inside the body. Unless it is removed, how can I become strong? Either I should not have developed cancer or even if I developed cancer, it should be operated and removed. So you are having MR. Ramakrishna Hegde. How can you become strong? He is like a cancer to the growth of the Opposition. With all these, you adore him. Why do you adore him? I think you adore him because he collected more money. In Karnataka, from the Excise Office, the Government is getting the largest revenue. What * and * have collected is more than what the Government has received. (*Interruptions*)

For that purpose, because he is having tonnes of money, you want to adore him.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You generally say it.

No particular allegation has come.

SHRI SURESH KURUP (Kottayam): Have you given him permission, Sir? I want to know whether it will go on record. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If at all there is a specific allegation I cannot allow.

SHRI SURESH KURUP: You please check up the records. He has made a specific allegation against "... " and "... " for raising more money than what has gone to the Government exchequer.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will check. No names should be mentioned. The names will not go on record.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI H.N. NANJE GOWDA: Sir, I will take only one minute to explain. I will not mention the names. Take, for example, there is a distillery. It manufactures liquor. Tax per crate liquor is Rs. 425 and, as such, tax per truck will come to Rs. 27,000/-. One permit is required for one truck load but on one permit they allow ten to twelve trucks. So the consumers would have paid all the tax but the tax is not remitted to the Government treasury as the middlemen eat away the tax for other truck loads. I would like to know from this august House whether you have no responsibility when consumers are exploited.

I would like to give another example. Let us take a particular State. Here is a State where there are elected representatives like MLAs and MPs. I am an elected representative. That does not mean I am the best available in my constituency. I have been given the opportunity. That is all. That does not mean I am the best. Here we had a Government which thought it was a Government not of the people but they thought it is the property of the Janata Party. Suppose villagers wanted drinking water or a school

room. The reply they would get is since they had not voted for their party as such there is no drinking water or school room to be made available to them. Supposing somebody had committed theft in my house there would be no registration of the FIR since I had not voted for their party. Even murderers are harboured by the politicians. Under the IRDP list the poor and the deserving are not enlisted. Only people with tens of acres of land are enlisted because they were Janata Party supporters. I would like to know do you want this system to continue? Do you want Government for all the people or only for a section of the people? I want to say supposing Congress Government at the Centre gives step-motherly treatment to a non-Congress Government in any State I would not have tolerated it.

Sir, you cannot make police personnel as the workers of the Janata Party. I was ashamed to hear from one of the senior-most IPS officers that he could do nothing since his Sub-Inspector was not subordinate to him. He is subordinate to a Janata worker. So I would again like to ask would you like such a system to continue?

I would like to give one more example and then conclude. You can get it even verified. An MLA was not at the headquarters. His wife went to the police station and asked the Sub-Inspector there to arrest such and such a man immediately. The Sub-Inspector told her that it would take some time because the village is at some distance. Madam said that she would go to Hasan. The man should be arrested and brought to the police station. A call should be booked to her. The line should be kept open so that she could hear the beating on the phone sitting at Hasan. That particular person was brought to the police station. People collected there and asked for what crime he had been arrested. The Sub-Inspector replied if I had not arrested him then I would be transferred. He promptly booked the call and kept the line open. He told that person that he would beat the pillow but he should cry so that Madam sitting at Hasan could hear the beating and crying. Would you like such a system to

survive? Even if it had been a Congress Government I would have banged it. On technicalities we should not forget realities. We should have a system which should work for eternity and for the welfare of all.

14.00 hrs.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI (Guwahati):
Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am thankful to all the Members who have participated in my motion—whether they have supported my motion or they have opposed it. In this debate a number of important constitutional issues were raised. From our side the points raised were that the Government acted unconstitutionally in dissolving the Assembly; that whether Mr. Bommai's Ministry had a majority or not ought to have been tested in the Assembly; that on the day of the dissolution Mr. Bommai had majority and confidence of the legislature; that the Janata Dal members at no point of time informed the Governor that they have resigned from the Janata Dal and Janata Dal, therefore, did command majority; that what the Governor has done is against all recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission, conferences of Governors and Presiding Officers.

Sir, I have gone through most of the speeches in favour of the proclamation. The friend who preceded me also has spoken in the same vein that the Bommai Ministry was one of the most corrupt Ministry in the State of Karnataka. There was rampant corruption, total maladministration, financial instability and so on and so forth and, therefore, it was politically right that the Ministry was dismissed and the Assembly was dissolved. The point I would like to make and we have made all along is that whether a Government is a good Government or a bad Government cannot be a ground for invoking Article 356 of the Constitution of India. A Government may function properly; a Government may function improperly; a Government may be a good Government or it may be a bad Government the ultimate judge of it is the people. The Governor and the Central Government cannot be a judge of it. Prof. Dandavate referred to the debates of the Constituent

Assembly where Shri H.N. Kunzru had specifically asked this question whether Article 356—at that time it was Article 278—could be invoked if a Government is not a good Government. The reply from Dr. Ambedkar was positive 'no'. After all the question of good Government or bad Government is to be judged by the people. It will always be a matter of subjective opinion. Members from the opposite have said that Bommai Government was one of the worst. Janata Dal members have said that it was a very good Ministry. Now who is going to decide? If good or bad administration is a ground for dismissal of a Ministry then we are being critical of Rajiv Gandhi Ministry everyday. According to us Rajiv Gandhi's Ministry is one of the most corrupt Ministry in this country. The country has been managed with rampant corruption. (*Interruptions*)

You will disputed it but what you are saying we dispute. Now who will decide? Whether it is Rajiv Gandhi's Government or Profulla Mohanta's Government or Jyoti Basu's Government those who support the Government will say that there is a good administration and those who oppose the Government will say that there is a bad administration. Who will be the judge? Is it the Governor or the Union of India? What are the implications of permitting the Governor or the Union of India to judge whether the administration in a State is good or bad? Do you equate a good administration or a bad administration with the failure of the Constitutional machinery? Let us not forget that only about one and a half years back, there was a controversy in this country, the controversy of power of President to dismiss an elected Prime Minister of this country on certain grounds. I gave notice on a motion at that time. Even though I have been critical of this Government, I gave a motion, a substantive motion at that time that no President has the power to dismiss an elected Prime Minister; the power rests only with the Parliament and ultimately rests with the people when the time comes for the people to give their verdict. Similarly, the power whether a Government is a good Government should be decided by in the House. The power to

[Sh. Dinesh Goswami]

give the mandate to run the State again rests with the people and not on the subjective opinion of the Governor or the Union of India. Unfortunately, the ruling party Members tried to equate the bad administration or a maladministration with the failure of constitutional machinery. There is a very very wide gap between the maladministration and the failure of the constitutional machinery. Mr. Veerendra Patil is not here now. He is one of those politicians to whom I have the highest respect. He made certain points. He said that when he was the Chief Minister of Congress (O) in Karnataka, certain Members left his party and he was reduced to a minority. Then they came back. The Governor called him back and told him that the Members had come back to him now and therefore, he could continue. But he said that because he felt that he should not continue, and keeping in view the highest political morality, he resigned. If he is not here now. But if he would have been here, I would have asked him as to how much money did he give for those Members to come back. I would have asked him, 'Did you offer money for those Members to come back?' His answer would be 'No'. If the Members can come back to Mr. Veerendra Patil without any offer of money, how do you conclude that Members cannot come back to Mr. Bommai without offer to money?... (*Interruptions*)... This seems to be the practice in Karnataka. Members go and come back. I have no doubt that at the time of Mr. Veerendra Patil he did not offer any money and he would not have offered money. Now, this is the tradition there. (*Interruptions*)

Please listen to me. Try to understand. I have not said that Mr. Veerendra Patil has paid money. That is not my contention. My contention is that the Members on their own accord came back because they felt that after all the dissolution may lead to the termination of their period one year earlier. Hence, they came back. But the same thing happen to Mr. Bommai also. How does the Governor conclude that merely because the Members came back to Mr. Bommai, there

was pressure, horse-trading etc.? That is the point I am making. My point is that even Members in the past followed the same practice. Mr. Patil said: I was asked by the Governor, I was told to continue and keeping in view the highest political tradition I decided not to. I would like to ask him, keeping in view the same highest political tradition, was it not the duty of the Governor to call Mr. Bommai also and tell him, 'Now the Members have come back. You please continue.' Whether Mr. Bommai would have acted in the spirit of the highest political tradition like that of Mr. Veerendra Patil or not is a different matter. But my point is that there was a practice of calling the Chief Minister back and telling him that he has now the confidence of the House and requesting him to continue. It is up to the Chief Minister to continue or not to and it was not followed by the Governor. That is the reason why I have been compelled to give this motion. Then, Mr. Patil said that those who live in glass houses should not throw stones at others. He cited that in 1977-80, the Janata Government dismissed 9 Ministries and in 1980 also, a similar practice was followed. Then he said that Mr. Devraj Urs was also de-throned inspite of the fact that he had the majority. I oppose the dissolution of 9 Ministries in 1977 as being totally unconstitutional. The dissolution of the Ministries in 1980 was totally unconstitutional. I asked him whether he approved of it. I must say that Mr. Patil was fair enough to say that he did not approve of the dissolution. I would have expected that if he would have been here in the House today that keeping up the highest political morality that he showed at that time, he would have got the political courage to oppose the Proclamation on the ground that he did not approve of it in 1977; he did not approve of it in 1980 and he did not approve of it the dismissal of the Devraj Urs Ministry and he would approve the dismissal of this Ministry also.

Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, Mr. Sontosh Mohan Dev made a very intrusting statement that the Sarkaria Commission Report is irrelevant. If the Report is irrelevant, why is the Home Minister asking us to discuss this?

The Report is irrelevant—this is what he said; you can please go through the records. May be he would have said it unconsciously. If he has said it unconsciously, that is different. But the point is that he said that the Sarkaria Commission Report is irrelevant. If he says that it was a slip of the tongue, then I can understand. But he said that the Sarkaria Commission Report is irrelevant. The Sarkaria Commission Report cannot be irrelevant. The Sarkaria Commission Report is before the House, before the country and before the Government. Government can take up a position that they do not accept the recommendations; the Government can take up the position that they have not studied the recommendations.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV): Sir, he has not heard my speech properly. I said that so far as the Report is concerned, it has been debated in both the House and also in the Consultative Committee. The Government has an open mind. But at this stage, it is not relevant on this issue. I did not say that it is irrelevant. He has heard one word only.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: I listened Mr. Sontosh Mohan Dev's speech very carefully. It may be that he did not express what he meant. I was here at that time. You can play the tape even. He used the word 'irrelevant' and may be he used the word unconsciously. It may be a slip of the tongue. But the point is that can you deny the justifiability of the Sarkaria Commission Report that the strength should be tested in the House. Is it not the Report of the Sarkaria Commission I have the recommendations of the Governors alone. Who are Governors who prepared this report. They are eminent persons. Mr. Baghavan Sahoy was the Chairman of the Committee of Governors. Mr. B. Gopal Reddy, Mr. V. Vishwanathan, Mr. S.L. Dhanwan and Mr. Ali Yauvar Jang were the Members of that Committee... (*Interruptions*)... What they have said in the report is 'Where the Governor is satisfied by whatever process or means, that the Ministry no longer enjoys majority support, he should

ask the Chief Minister to face the assembly and prove his majority within the shortest possible time. If the Chief Minister shirks this primary responsibility and fails to comply, the Governor would be duty bound to initiate steps to form an alternative ministry.' It is not the Sarkaria Commission. But the same recommendation followed in the Presiding Officers Conference. It is the Governors who have held consistently that whether a Ministry has the support of the majority or not should not be tested in the drawing room of the Governor. It should be left to the Assembly itself to be tested. This is the most salutary principle. One thing which has not been explained as yet is as to why this has not been followed.

SHRI P.J. KURIEN (Idukki): That is there when there is a doubt for the Governor. When the Governor is actually convinced, then this is what he should do.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: I will read again. 'Where the Governor is satisfied by whatever process or means, that the Ministry no longer enjoys majority support, he should ask the Chief Minister to face the Assembly.' If he is not satisfied, the question of asking him to face the Assembly does not arise at all. The presumption is that the Ministry duly constituted continues to enjoy the confidence of the majority and only when the Governor is satisfied that this presumption does not hold true, then he has to ask the Chief Minister to convene the Assembly at the shortest possible time..... (*Interruptions*)

If it is the case of the ruling party that Tamil Nadu should be followed, I have nothing to say, but that could not be the precedent for the country.

Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev made another point that the Gauhati High Court matter is under adjudication in the Supreme Court and that there was a difference of opinion. It is not correct. The point raised in the Gauhati court was that the Governor's report was wrong. Both the judges held that the Governor's report was untenable. Then, the Attorney General contended that the power to

[Sh. Dinesh Goswami]

impose President's rule accrues to the Government of India not only on the Governor's report, but on other materials also, because Article 356 says that on receipt of report from the Government or otherwise etc. The contention of the Attorney General was that the dissolution was not on the basis of the Governor's report...

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS
(S. BUTA SINGH): Only.

SHRIDINESH GOSWAMI: But on other materials also.

What it was contended, one of the Judges said that the Government is duty bound to place the other material also before the Court for scrutiny. The Attorney General argued that though the Governor's report is a subject matter which can be enquired into by the Court, Government is not bound to produce the other material. There was a difference of opinion and the matter was referred to a third Judge.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: I have now with me the debate. Should I read out the relevant portion. I have never said 'irrelevant'.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That has been explained.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: You please look to the tape.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: I cannot go to the tape.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: I stand by what I have said.

Sir, it is not that merely because a special leave petition is filed in the Supreme Court, the judgement vanishes in the thin air; the judgement stands. Of course, the court by a stay order may say that it will not be given effect to.

The point regarding the appointment of the Governor has not been raised for the first time. I find very interestingly that in the Constituent Assembly debates, Shri Vishwanath Das said:

"I have bitter experience in this regard. I was the Prime Minister of a province and I know how the Governor of my province was out to break my party."

One of the members of the Constituent Assembly, Shri R.K. Chaudhari, who comes from my State, forecasting the future, said:

"The Prime Minister of India sends out a Governor to the province. Is the Governor going to be in harmony with the Government run by another party? Will there not be more occasions for friction? This is quite obvious. Then, how can you assure that for all times to come, the Congress Party or a particular party shall remain in power not only at the Centre, but the different provinces also?"

You can find out what the founding fathers of the Constitution right from Shri H.N. Kunzru have said. May I point out that in this Article 356, one of the strongest position was taken by no less a person than Pandit Govind Vallabh Pant:

"The situations may come in a federal character where a party may rule the Centre, there may be other parties in the States frictions may arise. And since frictions may arise, it is because of this that salutary principles are to be evolved."

The Governor says that the Chief Minister pressurised the members. Obviously, if I am the Chief Minister, I am the leader of a party, I may pressurise my party members to remain in my party. What is happening in the Congress Party. Everyday are not the Ministers being sent to Bihar and Gujarat to pressurise the Members that they should not revolt?

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not true.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: All right; Be happy by saying it that it is not true. But there are newspaper comments that Ministers are not getting time to look to their files because they are now busy with sorting out their internal problems. Obviously, in all political parties internal problem arises and, I feel, if I was the President of the Party, I would like to pressurise. But can pressurisation be used as a ground for dissolution of the Assembly? My respectful submission is that it cannot. The point which has not been answered as yet is that on the day of the dissolution. Mr. Bommai had the majority and if he had the majority then he had the right to run the Government; Otherwise, dangerous consequences would follow because not only in the States, tomorrow an idea may come to the President that he has a super constitutional power to dismiss the Prime Minister at the Centre on the ground that the Government at the Centre is not acting properly. That power is not available to the President; that power is not available to the Governor; that power is available only to Assembly and the people at large.

Sir, I referred yesterday that the great jurist, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar who while piloting this article in the Constituent Assembly hoped that this Article would never be used. But in 1953 when the PEPFU Government was brought down that very same Dr. Ambedkar commented in the Rajya Sabha that the most violent kind of rape of the Constitution had been committed. You can appreciate the feeling of anguish that a person like Dr. Ambedkar must be feeling when he used this language. If I would have used this language today, probably that would have been held as unparliamentary. If Dr. Ambedkar would have been present today probably he would have said that not only the most violent kind of rape but there has been a gang rape of the Constitution under Article 356 when the Opposition Government has been brought down times without number for political reasons. If the Janata Government would have gone down for their internal quibblings, for their failures, I would have no tears to shed. I am not approving what the Janata MLAs did. I feel, it is not proper for the MLAs to write to the Governor and then write something.

But one wrong does not justify another wrong.

My friend said, let us clear the political situation and the maladies that have accrued. I feel the Governor's Rule is no solution for curing political maladies in fact, it will add to the malady. If you try to clean a dirty table with a dirty cloth you cannot clean it. You will add to the dirt. Therefore, what is necessary is that if you are really interested in clearing the political mess and the deteriorating standard of politics in the country, then it cannot be done through the use of Article 356; maybe that we all must sit together, maybe the remedy lies ultimately with the people and the people will throw all those out who do not confirm to the standard expected of by them. But the answer to this problem does not lie in a distortion of the Constitution and that is why Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I have moved this resolution because I feel that a serious Constitutional question which has far reaching bearing on the federal character of the Constitution has come into the forefront because of the action of the Governor.

As I said, I am not bothered whether Janata Government is doing well or bad. It is for the people of Karnataka to decide. My own feeling is that if the federal character of this Constitution is to survive, then the Opposition-ruled States must be given the due respect and also the support of continuity and the Constitution must not be used with violations of the letter and spirit to bring down the Opposition-ruled Government. That is why in my considered views, which have been expressed by Shri Indrajit Gupta, that this Government of the Opposition has been brought down as elections are getting near, for political purposes, I oppose this proclamation and I command my Motion for the acceptance of the House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: S. Buta Singh.

(Interruptions)

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC
GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS AND MIN-**

ISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM): We don't change our minds like the Janata Dal MLAs.

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO (Parvathipuram): But you have changed your mind about the anti-Defection Bill.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): Mr. Veerendra Patil went to the extent of fighting Smt. Indira Gandhi in the Chikmagalur constituency but later he joined her.

[*Translation*]

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (S. BUTA SINGH): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, this august House is discussing Karnataka to-day and more than a dozen hon. Members have participated in this debate. Now, while speaking on his motion, Shri Goswami has repeated some of the questions. Before I come to Shri Goswami's questions I feel that in to-day's debate it will be a injustice to Shri Madhu Dandavate if I do not take up his speech in the first instance. As such, first of all I would like to start from Shri Dandavate's speech.

He said here yesterday—

[*English*]

"We were very keen that on 21st we had discussed the issue. We would have exposed the conspiracy and we would have brought it to the notice of the country that here is the conspiracy to destabilise the Janata Government."

[*Translation*]

I am extremely sorry to note that Shri Madhu Dandavate, who is pretty Senior Member of Parliament had to come to Parliament for a reply to this question. I would like to make a reference to a press interview given by Shri Ram Krishna Hegde, the vice-President of the Janata Dal, to-day. It is not possible for me to make a reference to

earlier, ones because it is the distinctive quality with the Janata Dal stalwarts who make one statement in the morning, other statement in the noon and some other statement in the evening during the course of their interviews.

I would like to read out the statement to the hon. Member of the House, which was made by Shri Ram Krishna Hegde during the course of interview to-day. I would like to tell that Shri Ram Krishna Hegde has given a reply to-day at Bangalore about the conspiracy, an indication of which was given by Shri Dandavate in this House. In the course of an interview to the Times of India he said this thing. He has given full picture of the conspiracy that you have mentioned.

[*English*]

"The main reason for the downfall of Janata Dal Government was the dissension in the erstwhile Janata Party encouraged by the higher ups in the Janata Party."

This is stated by the Vice President of Janata Dal, Shri Ram Krishna Hegde in an interview with the Times of India. Further it says:

"I was aware of the conspiracy of the Janata Party leaders who had worked out a master plan 10 days before the Ministry was expanded but I could not gauge the magnitude of the problem... He also speaks about his incompetence that "I could not gauge the magnitude of the problem because I believed some of my colleagues, particularly the legislators from my own district, I never thought that they would do such a treacherous act."

So, which conspiracy are you going to expose in this House, Mr. Dandavate? Is it the conspiracy of Shri Hegde? (*Interruptions*)

This is the interview given by Shri Ram Krishan Hegde. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You can say

whatever you want after the Minister's reply, not now.

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO:
One clarification, Sir.

S. BUTA SINGH: Why are you bothered? I am answering the question put to this august House by Prof. Madhu Dandavate and the reply given by Shri Hegde to his question.

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO:
Just one minute...

S. BUTA SINGH: Your name is not there. You have not mentioned anything.

So, Sir, he had asked this question. He said that he would have exposed the conspiracy. According to Shri Ramakrishna Hegde, the Vice-President of the Janata Dal, some higher ups in the party itself hatched the conspiracy. Will you do a service to this august House by naming those high-up leaders in the Janata Dal who hatched this conspiracy in Bangalore? If you are true to your statement here, you owe it to this House. This conspiracy has been exposed by no less a person than the Vice-President of your Janata Dal Party.

PROF. MADHU DANDEVATE: If you are asking a question, I am prepared to reply. Since you want to know which is the conspiracy, I tell you. I made it very clear. I say, what happens in the party, what happens in the Government, what happens about the performance of the Government is altogether a very different point. Parties will take care if there is any conspiracy inside. But the question here is about the constitutional crisis that has taken place. For that the Governor who acted like a bonded labour to the Centre is responsible.

DR. KRUPASINDHU BHOI (Sambalpur): I object to the words 'bonded labour'. How can he use such a term for the Governor?

PROF. MADHU DANDEVATE: When I am demanding his removal, I am justified in

calling the Governor a bonded labour of the Central Government. (*Interruptions*)

S. BUTA SINGH: You have not answered my point. I only repeated what Prof. Dandavate has stated on the floor of the House. And the reply to his question of conspiracy is given by no less a person than the Vice-President of the Janata Dal.

PROF. MADHU DANDEVATE: It has nothing to do with the conspiracy of the Governor.

S. BUTA SINGH: What else has got anything to do with it? Do you want me to tell you that I hatched the conspiracy? Will you be happy then? I do not know why such double standards are being applied by Prof. Dandavate. There is a straight answer to his question by Shri Ramakrishna Hegde in today's paper. I do not know, maybe by now he must have retracted it!

PROF. MADHU DANDEVATE: He was referring to what happened in the Party. And I referred to the constitutional crisis which arose due to the Governor's conspiracy.

S. BUTA SINGH: Your leader has exposed the conspiracy. Will you now take it up in your party and find out as to who are responsible for hatching this conspiracy and bring it to the notice of this country? The people of Karnataka want you to tell this. This House wants you to tell us. If you are really sincere and true to your party, kindly expose that conspiracy.

PROF. MADHU DANDEVATE: He does not understand! He does not understand the difference between a constitutional crisis and a private crisis inside the party.

S. BUTA SINGH: Well I do not know. I am a simple man. I do not see any difference between the conspiracy which you mentioned and the conspiracy mentioned by Shri Ramakrishna Hegde.

PROF. MADHU DANDEVATE: Obviously, these are two different things.

S. BUTA SINGH: This is the same conspiracy. Not only that. Let me quote what Shri B.B. Sivappa, the BJP leader in Karnataka said. I am sure Shri B.B. Sivappa is the BJP leader in Karnataka. I read it in the papers. The BJP has disowned its own MLA. Anyway, you know the people of Karnataka very well. I think you will be able ascertain whether it is true. Shri B.B. Sivappa, the leader of the BJP in the Legislative Council feels that the Janata Dal itself is to be blamed for its downfall. In fact, the Government was in danger.

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO: But how does it justify the Governor's action? What has it got to do with the Governor's action? We are not bothered about their internal fight. This motion is something else. We are discussing the Proclamation. *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please sit down. How can you interfere like that? If there are any unparliamentary words, you tell me and I will see that they do not form part of the record. But allow him to speak.

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO: What have we got to do with the inner squabbles of the Janata Dal? How does it justify the Governor's conduct? How is it relevant to the motion under discussion?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is his way of replying. What can I do. Please sit down.

(Interruptions)

S. BUTA SINGH: I do not understand this kind of reactions. When there is a mention of conspiracy, all that is relevant to the conspiracy must be brought here.

In the same report, another leader of the Janata Dal, Shri M.S. Narayan Rao felt that the fate of the Ministry had been sealed when Shri Bommai took over as the Chief Minister. The seeds of the downfall of his Ministry were sown then itself and the result came only after nine months. So, these are the various facts of the conspiracy.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Do you know who this Narayana Rao is? He is the person who left along with Shri Deve Gowda. He is a member of the Janata Party and not Janata Dal.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: That is all right. Everybody is trying to destabilise. *(Interruptions)*

S. BUTA SINGH: Mr. Acharia, this is my biggest dilemma. As a Home Minister, I have to check up thrice in the day which Leader is in the Janata Dal and which Leader is in the Janata Party. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI HANNAN MOLLAH (Uluberia): Just like the Congress Ministers.

S. BUTA SINGH: If this is the fate of their Party...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: It is the fate of your own man. Because Mr. Veerendra Patil, who spoke here, was also in the Janata Party and fought against Mr. Indira Gandhi and after getting defeated, he joined the Congress Party. You should also take note of it.

S. BUTA SINGH: No, I am talking about the daily fluctuation.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura): Sometimes, we also fail to recognise your Ministers.

S. BUTA SINGH: Not only that. My hon. colleagues Shri Veerendra Patil, Shri Jaffer Sharief, Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev and Shri Nanje Gowda have just now read something from the *Indian Express*. It is a paper which is very-very close and dear to the Janata Dal Leaders. This is a paper which day in and day out props up Janata Dal. It has given basic...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: We have no *Bible* to which we are committed.

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO: The very fact that he has to quote the *Indian*

[Sh. V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo]

Express to defend himself shows how weak his case is. (*Interruptions*)

S. BUTA SINGH: It has given a long title. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Having attacked the *Indian Express* day in and day out, now they want to quote. What a tragedy?

S. BUTA SINGH: Why not? By compulsion, if they have revealed certain truths which have come in their paper... (*Interruptions*)

I will quote wherever truth is, even if it is a devil's quotation. If it contains truth, I will definitely quote.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Whatever suits them is truth. (*Interruptions*)

S. BUTA SINGH: Now, let us know what the *Indian Express* had said. There are six paragraphs. I will not read all the six paragraphs. I will only highlight three major lessons that they have drawn.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: You talk about the constitutional crisis.

S. BUTA SINGH: I will come to that. Why are you worried now? For two days, you have been talking about it and I have to meet your points. (*Interruptions*)

The first lesson that they have drawn is, "The Government has been brought down by the Janata men themselves. This is the first lesson that will be remembered by the people for the future." This is one lesson.

The second lesson that they have drawn is, "That decency, that policy of appeasement did not save the Government for the party."

The third lesson, they say, is "for the V.P. Singhs, if they would heed anything. Throughout the two years, Shri V.P. Singh

has kept aloof from what his colleagues have been doing to his colleagues." This is the quality of the leader—what his colleagues have been doing to his colleagues. It says, "He has been kept aloof." First, on the excuse that the manoeuvres concerned the Janata Party and he was only in the Jan Morcha, more recently, on the excuse that he is busy with office work, with finalising the endless list of office-bearers for the units of the Janata Dal, to be precise. Of what avail is it to issue press statements now about proper procedures?" It further says.

"True, there were motions to be gone through."

You have been talking about Governor. He talked about Governor. He criticised the Governor.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He has also talked about Shri Buta Singh. You read that. You read what *Indian Express* has said about Shri Buta Singh.

S. BUTA SINGH: After criticising the Governor, now he says by referring to Sarkaria Commission that "the Governor should not have acted in this manner." In the concluding para, which is very meaningful, he says that "these proprieties should have been observed. But they do not alter the basic fact: the Opposition killed its own Government."

Now coming to Shri V.P. Singh, in the last para again he says that "Unless Shri V.P. Singh and his colleagues remove these elements from harm's way; unless the Devi Lais get over the opportunism of aligning with these elements from time to time to gain a jump over their immediate rivals; unless Governments such as those in Andhra Pradesh and in Haryana put their houses in order; and unless having done all this, these leaders climb out of the endless exercises of appointing bearers to non-offices..." Now, this gives you a clear picture.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Will you also read what the *Indian Express* has written about you?

S. BUTA SINGH: This gives you a clear picture of the hotchpotch that was heading the Janata Dal Government in Bangalore. Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh, who has now become the leader of the Janata Dal, has been talking about high moral values, talking about corruption-free Government, talking about his detachment from the lust for power. You have only to look at his performance in Allahabad. You know what happened. After the Allahabad elections two big forces which helped him, namely the RSS and the Muslims came out. The RSS were the first to come out that "he had cheated us". Shri V.P. Singh cheated the RSS when he won from Allahabad.

SHRI HANNAN MOLLAH: It shows your panic only.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: What has that to do with the constitutional crisis?

S. BUTA SINGH: They were promised that he would stand by them.

Achariaji, I tell you, this is for your interest. The RSS passed a resolution against Shri V.P. Singh that he had promised them, that he would move for the abrogation of the special article on Jammu and Kashmir, that he will go for the dissolution of the Minorities Commission and on the country, on the other hand, what happened? Shri Haji Mastan has written a letter.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: How is it relevant?

S. BUTA SINGH: I have to tell what kind of a leadership has been heading the party in Karnataka.

Shri Haji Mastan has written a letter publicly, a letter which was published in the Press. He has publicly charged Mr. V.P. Singh of letting him down. According to him he has contributed in the election of Mr. V.P. Singh huge amounts by mobilising the people from various metropolitan cities with the promise that Mr. V.P. Singh will get him the Babri Mosque, and Mr. V.P. Singh will get

the support of the Muslims. I am only going along the lines which the *Indian Express* has gone, on the type of leadership that Shri V.P. Singh has provided.

Now coming back to the points of Shri Madhu Dandavate,...

PROF. MADHUDANDAVATE: I thought that Mr. H.K.L. Bhagat can be very irrelevant. But he is outwitting Mr. Bhagat also.

S. BUTA SINGH: Prof. Dandavate has said that. (*Interruptions*) There are two reasons given by the Governor of Karnataka in his report. The first reason is the ruling party has lost its majority. The second reason is that horse-trading started in buying back the MLAs.

[*Translation*]

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: How did you come to know?

S. BUTA SINGH: I am just telling you how did I come to know. Sir, you need not go too far for this you just go through the letter of Shri Govind Narain forwarded to centre in 1977. Shri Govind Narain had given these two reasons, these two very arguments in his letter of December 1977 while forwarding his report to the president.

[*English*]

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRAS. DEO: Those MLAs numbered less than one-third. How did the Governor take cognizance of it? (*Interruptions*)

Through the back door you cannot subvert the Tenth Schedule.

[*Translation*]

S. BUTA SINGH: There is no need for you to bother for this. You go through the Governor's report only. From that you will come to know that time the Governor had given these two reasons only. He had also given these two points.

[English]

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO:
You answer me. I said it in my speech. He was not present when we spoke. He does not know what points were raised. He is not answering my points.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You take your seat. I cannot allow you. Without my permission what he says will not go on record.

(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He will explain. You sit down.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: It is a very valid legal point that he has raised.

[Translation]

S. BUTA SINGH: Sir, at that time the Governor of Karnataka while forwarding his report to the President had given these two arguments only. Shri Govind Narain had written in para-10 of his report:

[English]

"Ordinarily testing of the strength of the Ministry should be done on the floor of the House. But in the present situation special features have been urged before me."

[Translation]

What were the special features in it. In para-12 he writes:-

What are the special features?

[English]

"There are indeed grave apprehensions in various circles that undue influence will be used to win over the support for the Govern-

ment by the time the Assembly meets".

[Translation]

Apart from this, the press note issued by the then Government of India is worth noting. Prof. Madhu Dandavate was a Minister in the Government at that time. I do not see any more faces on the other side, but Mr. Dandavate was a Minister. It will be clear to you if you go through the press note issued by your Government in 1977. Shri Venkata Subaiah has given the same reasons which were given by Shri Govind Narain at that time. (Interruptions)

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura):
Why did he give?

S. BUTA SINGH: If Mr. Acharia will go through the reasons, everything will become clear to him.

[English]

This is the press note given by the then Government of India, headed by Shri Morarji Desai. It says:

"The Governor's report received today made it necessary for the Government to review the matter afresh".

[Translation]

At that time, Shri Govind Narain wrote a letter in the first instance and then sent a message on teleprinter. In the present case also Shri Venkata Subaiah first wrote the letter and when he came to know that horse trading is taking place, he sent a message on teleprinter that he had received reports that some M.L.As have withdrawn their letters. The Statesman has gone to the extent of writing that sale counters have been opened like a Vegetable mandi in Bangalore. Assessment of M.L.As price has started taking

[S .. Buta Singh]

place. This is what has been published in the statesman. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRIBASUDEBACHARIA: You started this horse-trading...(*Interruptions*)

S. BUTA SINGH: No, I did not. Mr. Bommai started it. Mr. Hegde started it... (*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDEVATE (Rajapur): Mr. Buta Singh, any where the horse trading is bad. Mr. Bhajan Lal was not only a trader but a wholesale trader: He took the entire Cabinet from one side to other. What have you to say about this?...(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

S. BUTA SINGH: The press note issued by the then Government says (*Interruptions*) We are discussing Karnataka now; when Haryana is brought up for discussion, I shall speak on that too. According to the Press note issued by the then Government:-

[*English*]

The Governor has pointed out that undue influence bribery and intimidation are vitiating the political atmosphere in the State and that there were grave apprehensions whether even the proceedings in the Assembly, which is scheduled to meet on January 3, will be free and orderly.

[*Translation*]

This was said by the then Government which was led by Shri Morarji Desai. Hon. Shri Dandavate was a part of that Government. The session of the Assembly had been called and the Chief Minister said.

[*English*]

"Give me a chance. I am going to the Assembly."

[*Translation*]

But the then Government was not willing to give him that chance. The Government said that they were dissolving the Assembly as Members were being intimidated and free and frank discussion was not possible in the Assembly. Look at the difference, Shri Dinesh Goswami. That is the difference. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI(Guwahati): Mr. Buta Singh, did you not oppose it at that time? You opposed it at that time...(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

S. BUTA SINGH: The difference was that the then Chief Minister claimed that he enjoyed majority whereas the present Chief Minister never claimed to have majority. He requested for time to muster majority..(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

PROF. MADHU DANDEVATE: He is misquoting. He said: "even before 27th I am prepared for a test."...(*Interruptions*)...

[*Translation*]

S. BUTA SINGH: So give me permission to go to the Assembly, I shall prove my majority in the Assembly...(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: Do not misquote...(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

S. BUTA SINGH: Till today Mr. Bommai has not claimed that he enjoyed majority on 19 and 21. Mr. Hegde too did not make any such claim. In the Janata Dal Party meeting there were 95 members present, but the Press was told that the number was 98.

According to information received, there were 82 members when the Chief Minister and his colleagues went in a procession to Rajbhavan. But I shall not discuss that point right now. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: How do you expect all of them to be in Bangalore?

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

S. BUTA SINGH: When they went to Rajbhavan Shri Bommai did not tell the Governor, that he enjoyed majority.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: Why didn't they go to the Assembly? What is surprising is that he went from the Vidhan Soudha with Shri Bommai. Shri Ramakrishna Hegde did not go inside the Rajbhavan but sat outside the gates.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: How could he go?

S. BUTA SINGH: Prof. Dandavate, this is a mystery. On the basis of some guesswork, we can say that Shri Hegde did not have the moral courage to have a face-to-face talk with the Governor. It is rumoured in Bangalore that Shri Hegde could not face the Governor as it was Shri Hegde who was instrumental in Mr. Bommai losing the majority.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: This is not true.

S. BUTA SINGH: It is hard to understand why Shri Acharia is so troubled... (*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I have said it..you did not listen.

S. BUTA SINGH: Shri Hegde is a great artiste and a professional politician. He thought that if he went inside, the reality

would come to light. So he squatted outside the gate and got his photograph published in newspapers. When I showed the photograph to my friends in Bangalore, they said that there was not a single M.L.A. in it. This means that he did not have majority even at that time.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: Why was the Assembly not summoned?

S. BUTA SINGH: Let me explain why it was not summoned. I want to ask those who talk of morality. If the Chief Minister enjoys majority he has a right to summon the Assembly. He has no such right when he does not enjoy the majority. Since yesterday, I have been listening to the views and arguments put forward by the leaders of the Janata Dal. Summing up those views...

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO: How could you listen without being present here?

S. BUTA SINGH: The full debate is in front of me. I have read the whole thing. How could I have spoken without seeing it? It is not necessary to be present in the House as my room is equipped with listening facilities. I come after reading the whole debate, so please keep quite.

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO: That is why you are giving such reply. (*Interruptions*)

S. BUTA SINGH: I am replying to the debate, you please listen. Leaders of the Janata Dal and Telugu Desam and Shri Indrajit Gupta talked of adhering to principles to save Parliamentary democracy. Parliamentary democracy can be safeguarded only if its basic tenets are kept above the Party's interest. The only complaint Shri Dandavate and Shri Goswami have is that hon. Shri Venkatasubbaiah did not support the Janata Dal Government.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: I have no such complaint.

[Sh. Dinesh Goswami]

[English]

I have nothing to do with the Janata Dal Government.

[Translation]

S. BUTA SINGH: What alternative did the Governor have when

[English]

a number of MLAs gave in writing signed letters to the Governor?

[Translation]

They asked as to why the anti-defection law was not enforced. As the hon. Members are aware, there are no provision for the Governor in this law. The hon Speaker has to interpret the anti-defection law. As Chief Minister, Shri Bommai should have approached the hon. Speaker and said that 19 M.L.As of his party have given in writing to the Governor or that have withdrawn their support to him. He could have asked the hon. Speaker to enforce the anti-defection law, so that those Members could be expelled from the Party.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: But they withdrew their letters.

S. BUTA SINGH: I am talking of the hon. Speaker not the Governor. Shri Bommai could have given such a document to the hon. Speaker. He could have given an application explaining the explosion of 19 M.L.As of the Janata Dal who had withdrawn their support to him. I think this would have been the right course since it would have saved their Government..(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO: Why did they not resign from the Assembly then?..

(Interruptions)

S. BUTA SINGH: Forget about it. It is not for me. You give this advice to Mr. Bommai.

[Translation]

What I am saying is that it is a straight forward question. If they wanted to benefit from the anti-defection law, they could have approached the hon. Speaker with an application that 19 M.L.As of their Party had written letters to the Governor and acted against the Party's interest. Perhaps what the opposition leaders in this House expected on Shri Venkatasubbaiah to do was to hand the letters back to Shri Bommai with the hope that the latter would do the needful to keep the Government in power. Perhaps then the Governor would have been praised. But the Constitution says that once a document is submitted to the Governor he must take action on it. He cannot run away. He has to report. Shri Govind Narain took similar action in 1977, but not on the basis of any letter. It was the news of All India Radio of Shri Lal Krishna Advani. On the basis of which he acted. Strangely, that act was considered constitutional while the present step taken by the Governor after verifying 19 letters is being held unconstitutional. I think Shri Dinesh Goswami is belittling the Governor's office...(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: Will you please yield for a moment? Did you support the action of Govind Narayan ji in 1977?...(Interruptions)

S. BUTA SINGH: Why should I?...(Interruptions)

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: We opposed that at that time and we opposed it even today. That was unconstitutional and this is also unconstitutional..(Interruptions)

S. BUTA SINGH: When you are quoting high morals, when you are quoting high traditions, I have to quote what have done, or your party has done.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: I was not there.

S. BUTA SINGH: I am not saying you....(*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, tomorrow if any non-Congress Government come at the Centre and brings an Emergency and says that because they had brought Emergency in 1975, so, now also the Emergency is justified, will he accept that logic? Let him say that.

[*Translation*]

S. BUTA SINGH: Prof. Dandavate, please listen. I shall reply to this point also. This situation arose in Nagaland. Over there, 13 M.L.As had written letters to the hon. Speaker, criticising the Congress (I). The hon. Speaker took notice of that. I went there as an observer on behalf of the Party. Till that time action had not been taken. The then leader of dissidents, Mr. Chisi came to meet me. He said that they were willing to withdraw the letters on the condition that the leader be changed. I told them that they had taken a wrong step. If they were interested in the change of leadership, they should have first consulted the Congress (I) high command in Delhi. As they had already sent the letters to the hon. Speaker, it was then for the public to decide. We had recommended dissolution of our own Assembly. Why do the opposition leaders forget it. We gave right to the people of Nagaland to elect their own Government. The same thing happened in Mizoram. That for should not be lost right of.

[*English*]

In Mizoram, one-third of the MLAs of the ruling party resigned.

[*Translation*]

With the result that the then Government was reduced to minority and those who had resigned gave in writing to the Governor that they were ready to form a coalition with the Congress (I). A proposal was made but

in accordance with the convention, we said that we were not going to misuse the anti-defection law even though 1/3rd of the MLAs had resigned first to circumvent the anti-defection law. We shall leave it to the people of Mizoram to decide. We dissolved the Mizoram Assembly. The Congress (I) assemblies have been dissolved. We have never shown consideration to anyone in this matter.

15.00 hrs.

Mr. Saifuddin, we are not talking about you, and so you may kindly sit down. Sir, I was only saying the Governor did not have any other way out. Does the hon. Member want that the Governor should take upon himself the responsibility of making the Janata Dal effective? This can never be permitted because it is against the Constitution. Now I would like to discuss value-based politics which has been referred to by the hon. Member...

SHRI M. RAGHUMA REDDY (Nalgonda): You tell the House as to what happened in Andhra Pradesh in 1984?

S. BUTA SINGH: What can I say as to what happened there in 1984? All right, I shall enlighten the House about it also. Please take your seat. (*Interruptions*)

Please, sit down. He want to know as to what happened in Andhra Pradesh in 1984. Let me tell him about that first. You talk about Andhra Pradesh here when the saboteurs and their supports both are sitting by your side. Do you want me to name them? I will not name anybody in the House. (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, much has been said in this House about value-based politics.

[*English*]

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY (Katwa): Sir, I have a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is your point of order? Under what rule you are you are raising point of order? When the Minister is replying to the debate you want to interrupt him.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: He has a point of order. Please allow him.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sir, without quoting the rule, he is raising the point of order.

S. BUTA SINGH: All right, I yield to him.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY: Sir, here time and again, it is being referred that in 1977 there was an imposition of President's Rule and in 1980 there was an imposition of President's Rule. Both Congress (I) and Janata were party to this. I want to know who had adhered to the Constitution at that time?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is not a violation of procedure. I over-rule it. There is no point of order.

[*Translation*]

S. BUTA SINGH: Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, much has been said in the House about value-based politics, high moral values political decency and Parliamentary democracy. In this context I think it will be appropriate if I apprise the House, in brief, of the high values which have been upheld in the Karnataka Assembly during the last 2 years. The hon. Members must be knowing about the situation prevailing there during these last two years. I will not take much time of the House and it will be over in a minute. Shri Ayyapu Reddy was the first person to refer to high values and value-based politics. The same was reiterated by the M.L.As of the State Assembly, and the leader of the Janata Dal, Shri Ramakrishna Hegde made much hue and cry about it and said that he was committed to value based politics and would like to establish the same in the country. Looking at his style of functioning, I tried to look into the dictionary to find out the meaning of the word 'value'. The dictionary mean-

ing of the word is 'Mulya'. It is also synonymous of price. During the rule of the Janata Party and that of the Janata Dal, the price of an M.L.A. has revised upwards 8 times since 1987. For the first time, the price was fixed when the elections for the Rajya Sabha were held. It was fixed at Rs. 2 lakhs per M.L.A. I have been a victim of it myself and Sir, you will be surprised to hear that 2 M.L.As approached me at 1.30 a.m., i.e. past midnight and woke me up saying that the Janata Partymen had thrown a bagfull of cash in their room which they have brought with them to show it to me. I called for a meeting of my party immediately. It is nothing to laugh at, it should be carefully heard...(*Interruptions*)...Shri Acharia, may kindly listen.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the rest of the night was spent in collecting the party members and the first thing in the morning..(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: Don't say all these things.

S. BUTA SINGH: Why not? Just listen. If you listen you will realise. Let me complete. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: You have started it.

S. BUTA SINGH: You know what happened the next day? The leader of our party in the Karnataka Assembly took this money to the Speaker and deposited the entire amount with him..(*Interruptions*)..

[*English*]

You listen. Achariaji, when you listen, you will realise.

[*Translation*]

That money is still in possession of the

Speaker of Karnataka Assembly. The matter is still under enquiry. It has not been decided so far. In 1987, the price of an M.L.A. in Karnataka was Rs. 2 lakhs. As regards, the subsequent developments, you are familiar with them. Shri Rama Krishna Hegde resigned and thereafter he said that he would like to seek a vote of confidence and accordingly, the price of a Janata Party M.L.A. rose to Rs. 5 lakhs. On the third occasion, Shri Bommai was to be elected. At that time, Shri Rama Krishna Hegde was compelled to leave office for having indulged in serious corruption. He got the telephones of his own partymen tapped and also of the members of the Opposition. He went to the extent of even getting the telephones of his paramours tapped. That is why he was compelled to vacate his office. During the election of Shri Bommai, the price of an M.L.A. increased from Rs. 5 lakhs to Rs. 10 lakhs.

There was a split in the Janata Party for the fourth time and one of its factions...*(Interruptions)*

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE
(Panskura): Sir, how do you know the exact details?

S. BUTA SINGH: Gangaji, you are untrained. We are not talking about you.

[*English*]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Her name is Geeta.

[*Translation*]

S. BUTA SINGH: For me Geeta is as pure as the Ganga.

Sir, at the time of split of the Janata Party, the price of an M.L.A. rose from Rs. 10 lakhs to Rs. 12 lakhs for securing affidavits from them. The Cabinet was expanded twice and during its expansion for the second time, the price of an M.L.A. was Rs. 10 lakhs in addition to other facilities like Chairmanship of one or the other committee or organisation, a plot in Bangalore, a Maruti car and 10

transfer orders at their behest. If you want any verifications in this regard, it can be verified by the number of plots allotted to the Janata Dal M.L.As at that time. The number of Maruti Cars distributed is an additional proof of this fact and I will present the entire list in this matter shortly. The number of transfers which took place at the behest of each M.L.A. is the third proof. Finally, it was after 19th of April that there was evidence of the value-based politics in the state. This can be proved by a letter which Shri Vaswanippa wrote to the Governor in which he wrote that:

[*English*]

" His Excellency Governor of Karnataka,
Raj Bhawan,
Bangalore.

Respected Sir,

I had given your goodself a letter stating that I have withdrawn my support to the Government headed by Shri S.R. Bommai. It is welcoming that you are already initiating the constitutional action, but subsequently yesterday some of the members of Shri Bommai's Cabinet brought undue pressure on me and physically enforced me to sign a different type of letter. This might have also been sent to you by them. But today even at this hour I affirm and confirm that I have withdrawn my support to the Government headed by Shri S.R. Bommai."

(Interruptions)

[*Translation*]

This news got coverage on the first page of the newspapers like 'the statesman' and the heading was given as follows:

[*English*]

"A fair Encounter failed to click".

[S . Buta Singh]

[*Translation*]

It was clearly reported that it has become a much talked about topic in Bangalore that each M.L.A. is being paid Rs. 20 lakhs, out of which Rs. 10 lakhs is paid in cash immediately and the rest is paid at the time of their submission of the letter to the Governor and their parading in front of him. (*Interruptions*)

Shri Achariji, the price of an M.L.A in Karnataka which was fixed at Rs. 2 lakhs initially has been risen to Rs. 20 lakhs.

The Governor, Shri Venkatasubbaiah, reported to the President on the basis of facts before him and this step on his part checked the horse-trading prevailing in the State and democracy got a chance of survival once again under him.

Shri Venkatasubbaiah did not misuse his office or the assembly and did not invite any other party including the Congress to form the Government. He categorically stated that under the prevailing situation...

[*English*]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He is a paragon of virtue. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S.M. GURADDI (Bijapur): I rise a point of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: Under which rule?

SHRI S.M. GURADDI: The hon. Minister has said about MLAs. Do you think they are for sale?

(*Interruptions*)

You have to prove it. Otherwise you must resign.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This is not a

point of order. No.

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

S. BUTA SINGH: Sir, I am not saying this. This is...

[*English*]

SHRI THAMPAN THOMAS (Mavelikara): He is bringing the parliamentary institution to degradation. The whole legislature has been degraded because of his speech. Let him answer about the conduct of the Governor on the subject. In Karnataka, even today we have got the majority. If anybody tries to test it, we will prove it. (*Interruptions*) He is degrading the legislature institution, in the eyes of the public.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please, Order.

[*Translation*]

S. BUTA SINGH: It is not my personal opinion, but it is all there is the Press as to what has been said about the conduct of Shri Ram Krishna Hegde by the Members of his own party. I have only quoted the Press reports. A senior leader like Shri Nijalingappa...

[*English*]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He should better go to *Dhobi Ghat* rather than coming to Parliament.

S. BUTA SINGH: I am sorry, I have to do it for you to show to the people how high moral value you have. This is how you people try to exploit the poor masses in the name of high moral values. I am not the only one who is telling. The whole Press in the country has said. Shri Nijalingappa, our respected leader, a great freedom fighter, has condemned it and this should have been done one year

before. We have done it one year later.

Let me tell you what Mr. Madhu Limaye, a great parliamentarian has said. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He is quoting Mr. Madhu Limaye. Is he prepared to quote Mr. Madhu Limaye where he has said about Rajiv Gandhi Government... (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you go on rising, it is not good. Please take your seat.

(*Interruptions*)

S. BUTA SINGH: I can have only sympathy with you.

SHRI M. RAGHUMA REDDY: Mr. Guraddi has challenged that if the Minister has not proved it, he should resign. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is not a place to make challenges.

S. BUTA SINGH: Why should I take the responsibility? I am quoting from the press. Every day you quote from the press. I do not believe in these cheap things. I do not listen to such things. I have great regard for the press. This has been written by almost every paper that there is a large-scale..(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not allowing any challenges here. Please go and take your seats.

SHRI THAMPAN THOMAS: You resign.

SHRI V.S. KRISHNA IYER (Bangalore South): Let him accept Mr. Guraddi's challenge.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not allowing any challenges here. Please go ahead, Mr. Minister. This is not the place to make challenges.

SHRI THAMPAN THOMAS: When he made an allegation against an MLA, he has to prove it. Otherwise, he must resign. (*Interruptions*)

S. BUTA SINGH: Here are the papers which have written this.

SHRI THAMPAN THOMAS: You have degraded the institution of Parliament.

S. BUTA SINGH: Let them proceed against the press. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI THAMPAN THOMAS: We want proof for what Mr. Buta Singh said. He should prove. Accept the challenge.

S. BUTA SINGH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I can file any number of leading newspapers in Delhi and in Bangalore which have brought out these things. I am mentioning it. If they are concerned about it, let them prosecute these papers. Let them challenge them in the court. Let them face the Music. Why should I take the responsibility? It is these papers which have said this. All these papers have written this openly. (*Interruptions*) Shri Achariaji, I would request you to advise them. Let them go to the court of law. Let them bring it there. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: In the matter of Bofors, when the newspapers said so many things, did you accept them?

S. BUTA SINGH: Mr. Dandavate, your whole parliamentary performance is based on papers. You always quote newspapers. If I have quoted from newspapers, it is for the Janata Dal to go to a court of law and prosecute the press and the persons who have said these things. Why should I be held responsible for that?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I have quoted from the Constituent Assembly debates, from Dr. Ambedkar and from the Sarkaria Commission Report and from the High Court judgement.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (PROF K.K. TEWARI): He quoted Mr. Hegde also on a number of occasions. He should mention that also.

S. BUTA SINGH: In almost every section of the press, whether it is in Bangalore or Delhi, these are brought out. If there is a ground, they are free to go to a court of law.

Now, having said that, let me come to...*(Interruptions)* I have quoted from the press. I am prepared to give it to you. The discussion boils down to this that the Janata Dal and the leaders of the Opposition are angry with the Governor of Karnataka because he could not play their game. He has discharged his duty under the Constitution without fear of favour. This is what the Governor of Karnataka has done.

I think, it is for this august House to uphold the principle that he has mentioned in his report that no party was in a position to form the Government; that the present Government had gone into minority and there was a horse-trading going on in Karnataka. All these facts have been mentioned in the Report of the Governor of Karnataka. Based on that, I will commend to this august House to approve the Proclamation which the President has signed and sent to this House and reject the Motion moved by Shri Dinesh Goswami which is absolutely baseless, which is politically motivated.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: First, I shall put the Motion moved by Shri Dinesh Goswami to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That this House condemns the blatantly partisan attitude of the Governor of Karnataka in initiating action against the State Government without giving opportunity to the Chief Minister of the State to demonstrate majority support to his Ministry in the Assembly and demands removal of Governor of

Karnataka from his office forthwith."

The motion was negated

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I shall now put the Statutory Resolution moved by Shri Sontosh Dev to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That this House approves the Proclamation issued by the President on the 21st April, 1989 under Article 356 of the Constitution in relation to the State of Karnataka."

The motion was adopted

15.22 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS, 1989-90

[English]

Ministry of External Affairs-*contd.*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The House shall now take up the next item i.e. further discussion and voting on the Demand for Grant under the control of the Ministry of External Affairs.

Shri B.R. Bhagat has explained his position for being absent from the House when he was called to continue his speech last time. As a special case, I shall allow him to continue.

Shri B.R. Bhagat.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT (Arrah): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, on Friday, I had just started. I began by saying that there was a marked improvement in the international climate during the whole of the year 1988 both globally and regionally. This has started...

SHRI THAMPAN THOMAS (Mavelikara): Sir, on Friday at 3.30 p.m. you told us that we would meet on Monday to discuss