

ered by their respective. State Plan Budgets. Now the per capita plan investment in the hill area sub-plan of Assam is 200 to 300 per cent less than that of other hill States of North East. The State of Sikkim with less than half the population and one-third of the area of Assam hill district receives a per capita plan investment which is double that of Assam hill areas. So also is the case with Nagaland and Arunachal Pradesh.

This has led to extreme backwardness in terms of literacy rate, revenue generation, health care index, poverty and other vital aspects in the hill districts of Assam. Therefore, as the sole representative of the two hill districts of Assam, I urge upon the Government to change the policy of plan fund allocations immediately so as to bring the per capita plan investment in Assam hill area sub-plan at least at par with that of other hill States of North East. Thank you.

- (viii) **Need to fix floor price for pepper produced in Kerala at Rs. 6000/- quintal and other measures for the benefit of pepper cultivahior**

SHRI PALA K.M. MATHEW (Idukki): The small pepper cultivators in the country are reeling under a terrible situation. India's production of pepper is mainly concentrated in Kerala. 98 per cent of the pepper is produced in the State. The price of pepper which was Rs. 6,000. per quintal three years back is now only Rs. 3,000. since last three years the cost of all inputs and services have more than trebled. In addition to this slump in price, vast areas of pepper cultivation have been totally devastated on an unprecedented scale by epidemic diseases. As a result the poor peasants are on the verge of total ruination.

Immediate steps should be taken to fix a floor price of Rs. 6,000 per quintal for pepper. Research work should also be done for finding out and preventing this killing disease on a war footing. Compensation for the losses already suffered, aids and assistance for replanting the ruined areas

and rehabilitation of the thrown out peasants must be arranged without delay. A Pepper Corporation of India to look after all the interests of the cultivation and farmers must be set up immediately. I urge upon the Government to take these steps at the earliest.

13.24 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned for Lunch till twenty five minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at twenty-eight minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.

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

STATUTORY RESOLUTION *RE* APPROVAL OF PROCLAMATION IN RELATION TO THE STATE OF MEGHALAYA AND MOTION *RE* REVOCATION OF PROCLAMATION INRELATION TO THE STATE OF MEGHALAYA-*CONTD*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Purkayastha will continue.

14.28 hrs.

SHRI KABINDRA PURKAYASTHA (Silchar): Hon. Deputy-Speaker, Sir while I was discussing yesterday regarding Meghalaya, I mentioned that the Speaker of the House who is the philosopher, guide and custodian of the Assembly could solve the problem very easily. But without solving the problem he rather made it more difficult.

Sir, it is very unfortunate that the Speaker of the Meghalaya Assembly who belongs to the congress Party did it. It is also a fact that as soon the Speaker is elected, he becomes a non-party man and his activities are non-partisan and that is expected everywhere and that is done everywhere. But, Sir, in the

[Sh. Kabindra Purkavastha]

Meghalaya Assembly we all observe that the Speaker.....**.....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Purkayastha, here you are not expected to discuss the character of the Speaker.

SHRI KABINDRA PURKAYASTHA: I am speaking on the role of the Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Kindly excuse me. You should know the limitations, you cannot cast any aspersion.

(Interruptions)

[*Translation*]

SHRI MOHAN SINGH (Deoria): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I have a point of order. The Speaker of that state assembly has now become the leader of the Congress party. When we discuss his conduct and behaviour as the leader of Congress Party, which was not proper, we will be constrained to refer to him as Speaker also. How this problem can be resolved. That is our difficulty. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARAMANGALAM): Sir, it should be expunged. You should not allow it to the extent that it is factually wrong. We cannot discuss the conduct of the Speaker of another Assembly on the floor of this House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Speaker may belong to any political party, but the rule is that we cannot discuss the conduct of any Speaker in the House.

[*Translation*]

SHRI MOHAN SINGH: He was the leader of Congress Party.

[*English*]

SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARAMANGALAM: It is factually wrong; he is not the leader of the Congress Party. Allegation cannot be made. I have been watching the hon. Member going ahead and making allegations as he wishes. It cannot go on record. It is not that we should defend anybody.

[*Translation*]

SHRI MOHAN SINGH: The leader of Congress Party wanted to become the Chief Minister.

SHRI KABINDRA PURKAYASTHA: Regarding the Speaker, the Governor in his report mentioned that he wanted to be the Chief Minister. Is it not a fact? I am simply telling what was said by the Governor of the State. It would not have happened if the Speaker had not had the mind to be the Chief Minister. The promulgation of President's rule becomes automatic as per the Governor's report. The Speaker did not obey the verdict of the Supreme Court also. If he had acted according to the verdict of the Supreme Court, then this problem would not have arisen. So, in all respects it is very clear that the role played by the Speaker was solely responsible for the ultimate promulgation of President's rule in the State of Meghalaya. Now you can see the case of Manipur and if it is not checked all the North Eastern States may go the same way. The crisis that is prevailing in the State of Meghalaya has become more important to be discussed in other respects too. It is my opinion that the promulgation of the President's rule in Meghalaya should be revoked and this will bring peace and tranquility in the North Eastern region. So, I appeal to the House and through you to the Government that this

promulgation of the President's rule should be revoked in the interest of the people of the State of Meghalaya and in the interest of peace and tranquility in the North Eastern region.

14.33 hrs.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY (Nominated Anglo-Indian): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I have always had the highest regard for my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition not only for his dignity of manner, but above all for the subtlety of his mind and I do not think most of the speakers understood the subtlety part of his speech. As I saw it, he vented all his steam on this gentleman, who was the Speaker and he felt that it was bizarre for a person who was the Speaker to act in that particular way and then convert himself into the leader of the party in order to become the Chief Minister.

Sir, in fact I am friendly with Shri Peter Marbanigae and I have got the facts from him. I know that he has got a long period of legislative service, apart from having been the Speaker for one year. He was a Minister for 12 years and today he has the majority. All that the President has done was to accept the report of the Governor that there is no opportunity of forming stable Government there. It was in the context of the fact that the Supreme Court had restored four members out of the five members of the Assembly who have been disqualified for defection. That is the crucial part.

When I welcomed the present Speaker, one of the points I made—although with no negligence experience of all this 36 years—was that the Speaker is the linchpin of the sovereignty of this House. He symbolises his own sovereignty and through his sovereignty, he symbolises the sovereignty of this House. He is not subjected in any way to the Supreme Court. He need not answer any summons from the same Supreme Court. That is why my respectful submission is that the matter relates itself to something that is clear.

With great respect to the Supreme Court where I have put in 39 years of front rank service in the Supreme Court, I know what happens in the Supreme Court. One court often differs from another. I know this from practical experience.

I have the privilege of defending Mrs. Indira Gandhi when she was the ex-Prime Minister, for 2 1/2 years. I was never a member of the Congress Party. But she chose me as her counsel from the whole array of independents to defend her. I was able to have her exonerated. She was tried by the former Chief Justice, Mr. S.C. Shah who ordered her prosecution as well. I had all that struck down. One of the points that I made was that the Supreme Court has no jurisdiction at all over the Speaker.

When I welcomed the Speaker, I said, he is the linchpin of the sovereignty; he is sovereign in his own right. The Supreme Court cannot even summon him. If he is summoned, he can ignore it. That is where the Supreme Court in my respectful submission obviously has erred in setting aside four of the five people who were axed. That was alone the sovereign right of the Speaker axing the five people there. Obviously there is only one major party in Meghalaya. The rest are all splinter groups. It may be four members two members, three members and so on. With the five members there, obviously the Congress party would then be in a majority.

Here is another unwarranted attack, I think. I do not know the gentleman Mr. Lyngdoh who was selected to be the leader of the Party. All that the President did was to keep the Assembly in suspended animation. They would have met with the five people and they would have formed it. That would have met with the five people and they would have formed it. That is the end of the matter. It is unfortunate that the person of the dignity of the leader of the house should have been disregarded. He used the powers of the bizzare—he should first have become the Speaker then he should exercise the power of expulsion; then should make himself the

Chief Minister. There is nothing of the kind that happened. It did not happen at all. One Mr. Lingdo was chosen as the Leader of the Congress Party. With these five people there, in terms of the Ordinance of the President of India, they would have met and would have formed the majority and formed the Government.

May I say this? This is my 37th year in this august House and never has this country faced the splintering that it is facing now. Never before has it faced. I do not want to name. But what was the motivation of the people who form the splinters? The motivation is euphemism. Obviously, the motivation is political corruption. Somehow or the other, their motivation is to form little groups and none of them was able to form anything approximating to a majority. But they built up backwardisation of this country. I had the privilege of leading and being the accredited leader of the Anglo-Indian community. I say that I was first nominated to the one seat that we had in the Central Legislative Assembly, as it was called then. We were then MLAs. 65 per cent of minority community throughout the country had elected me as the President and Chief. The Vice-roy had nominated me as MLA. After that, I was elected to the Constituent Assembly. In the Constituent Assembly, I had the misfortune to belong to the only minority and to be put into the same chapter with the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes. What has happened is this. Even the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes had time-marked protection. We had quotas for certain services. We had financial quotas and under Article 334, we had a joint provision with the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes with regard to reservation. Muslims had asked for reservations. They were refused. Sikhs asked for reservations. They were refused. The Christians for asked reservations. They were refused. How about the Parsees? I do not want to say anything on behalf of the Parsees. We are today of the same size as the Anglo-Indians. If you give the Anglo-Indians anything, you give it to us but we ask for nothing.

I was able, particularly with Mahatmaji and then through Sadar Patel who was the Chairman of the Minorities Committee, to get Articles 331, 332 and 234 to be a composite Article and made reservations for the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes and Anglo-Indians conjoint. There were 15 million Scheduled Castes, 7 million Scheduled Tribes which worked out to 22.5 per cent. Bases on that my quota was 60 per cent. We find today this unique provision that in this House, there are two nominated Members, two Anglo-Indians because of that in Article 234. That is the whole position.

What I am trying to say is this that in spite of his dignity and very civilized behaviour, to refer to the conduct of a gentlemen and to say that it is a bazar and that it was unbridled, is unfounded because there was no question of his coming back as the leader of the party. He would have continued, if at all, as the Speaker and as a Speaker his purpose was weaved.

[Translation]

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Gandhi Nagar): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, yesterday when the Minister of State for Home Affairs had moved a proposal, I had suggested that the House should recommend to the President that the order proclaiming President's Rule in Meghalaya in October last should be withdrawn. About 15 Members participated in the Debate and most of them supported my proposition. I want to thank them all.

Most of the Members draw attention to certain facts. I would be very brief. The MUPP Government came to power under the leadership of Lingdo in March 1990 and was in power till October, 1991. Throughout its tenure it was in majority in the Assembly. Twice a no confidence motion was moved. First time when the confidence vote was moved on August 7, 1991, the Chief Minister was supported by 30 Members whereas 27 opposed him, second time the confidence vote was moved on October 8, 1991. At that time the Chief Minister got 30 votes to 26. But

then the Speaker declared 4 votes invalid as those members had been disqualified by the Speaker earlier. The decision of voting that he announced was 26-26 i.e. 26 in favour and 26 in opposition. The Speaker then exercised his right of casting vote and that vote was a decisive vote against the Chief Minister. After this decision of October 8, 1991 the President's Rule was imposed on October 11, 1991. I think most of the Members here also were against imposing President's Rule in the State. This was reflected in the Debates as well. All the hon. Members want *status quo* there prior to imposition of President's Rule. Though there were Members who said that the leader of the Congress Party, being a majority group, should be invited to form the Government. Now the Governor has made a recommendation for the dissolution of that Assembly. Those of us who demanded *status quo* and those who said that the leader of majority party i.e. the Congress Party should be invited to form the Government, both have opposed the recommendation of the Governor for dissolution of the Assembly. This was so because even the Congress knows that after dissolution of the Assembly the leader of the Congress party would never be invited to form the government. Our opinion is that the Assembly must not be dissolved and the Centre has every right not to be bound by the recommendation of the Governor. Meanwhile the Hon. Prime Minister has called leaders of various political parties for a meeting on this issue. The hon. Minister of Home Affairs, the hon. Minister of parliamentary Affairs and also the State Ministers of the Ministries of Home Affairs and Parliamentary Affairs were present. The discussion took place in their presence. The Hon. Prime Minister in that meeting told the leaders of the opposition and all those who were present that the Government did not take any action in spite of the fact that they received Governor's recommendation to dissolve the State Assembly four days ago. It reveals that they are in favour of a popular Government being formed there. However, the situation at present, is so complex that if both the Houses do not approve, the President's Rule by December 10, it would create a Constitutional impasse.

It has been pointed out that if this recommendation is not approved by 12.00 tonight, particularly in the situation when the Governor has made it clear that stable Government cannot be formed because there is no leader capable of heading a viable Government constitutional deadlock will be created, which is not good. In this regard, despite our unchanged stand on the issue we want that the problem should be solved without creating constitutional deadlock. At the same time, as the Hon. Prime Minister has stated we would also like the opinion of the House to be conveyed to the Governor—that the House is not in favour of dissolving the Assembly in the present circumstances.

Another suggestion supported by most of the members of the opposition is that President's Rule should be withdrawn and the earlier situation should be restored. But I am aware of the constitutional aspect which the Government has presented before us. It is an area in which the Central Government never directs the Governor; it is purely his discretion to invite a party to form Government, if at all the Government is to be formed. Therefore, I feel that no directions can be issued in this regard. However, it may be conveyed to him that the Government which was formally elected last year and did not lose its majority during their one and a half year's tenure, despite four of their members were disqualified reference to which has also been made in the first report of the Governor, which said:

[English]

"It is thus clear that the Speaker has not taken cognisance of the Supreme Court's ruling."

[Translation]

Last week again, he in his report, opined that the verdict of the Supreme Court should be accepted. In this situation the views of the Members of the House should be conveyed to him that the earlier situation should be restored and that as per the Members of the Congress party their leaders would be in-

[Sh. Lal K. Advani]

vited there. All it means that the Assembly should not be dissolved and fresh elections should not be ordered.

Besides, I would like to emphasise that the discussions and the decisions whether a party in the State Assembly is in majority or not, should be taken in the Legislative Assembly and not in the Raj Bhawan. When the Members wanted to know how long it will take to decide the matter, the Hon. Prime Minister suggested them to fix a time limit that seemed appropriate to them. Thus the Members suggested that the decision should be taken within one week i.e. by 16th of the month. In view of this decision all the members of opposition agreed that though they did not approve President's Rule in the State they would not like to oppose it because they were not in favour of creating constitutional impasse. At the same time they would like to get the similar assurance. I was aware that both the motions—the one introduced by me and also the other could be passed. But it was apprehended that this would create a wrong convention. Therefore it would be better not to pass it today.

I do agree that whether the House recommends to the Presidents or the Government gives an assurance—both are significant. If the Minister of Home Affairs gives an assurance to the House, just as the Hon. Prime Minister did to the opposition, the members would be able to express their views properly in regard to both the motions.

Once again I extend my heartiest thanks to the members of the House that they participated in the discussion on a complicated problem and reached this conclusion.

[English]

MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTRY OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI M.M. JACOB): Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, I am very grateful to the members of this House who participated

in this debate. All the members, cutting across the party lines, expressed their keen interest to see that stability is restored in the entire north-east. I was very happy to listen to their speeches when all of them thought that peaceful life in the north-east will have to be restored. This Government is always committed to maintain peaceful relations with the people in the north-east because they have always stood with us in any troubles in the past.

The situation here is, if some other members said that the Congress is intending to form a Congress Government instead of the other Government in the State, it is not true. Look at the facts. The Governor's report, which was sent earlier, based on which we had the promulgation of the Rashtrapati for which I have come for ratification before the House...

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: If you have not said this I would not have pointed it out. I have seen the Governor's report which says on page 2 "today two Congress leaders, who are Union Minister, met me and staked their claim to form the Government."

SHRI M.M. JACOB: The real situation at that time, as you correctly know from the Governor's report, was that both sides staked claim. But the Governor sent a report and said "I suggest the second alternative". Then he suggested "action, may therefore, be taken under Article 356 of the Constitution of India, to keep the Assembly for a short period under suspended animation and the situation watched. However, if this is not considered to be agreeable, I would invite the Leader of the Opposition, that is Congress, to form the Government and to prove his majority on the floor of the House within a period of three weeks." I thought, the entire House will be happy when I actually moved this Resolution for ratification because we did not go in for that option given by the Governor, giving three weeks' time to the Leader of the Opposition to experiment whether he can form the Government. We are convinced that we should have a stable Government in that State. Because it was

not possible to have a stable Government, the Governor recommended like that. This Government scrupulously follows the recommendations of the Governor, not only of this State, but of all the States. We wanted to show this State as an example because this is the first instance of this nature that came to this Government. The Governor's recommendation is right here. The Governor recommends two alternatives—either you form the 'X' Government or keep the Assembly under suspended animation. We chose the other alternative to keep it under suspended animation.

15.00 hrs.

In case, if somebody is able to come and prove the majority, it is fine. Meanwhile, the Supreme Court's judgment came; the Speaker's reaction came and all those things were mentioned in the subsequent report of the Governor, that is dated 4th December. In that report also, the Governor says that he is not convinced that any group can form a Government at the moment. So, he is not in favour of reviving it immediately.

As Shri Advani has correctly mentioned in his speech, today we had a meeting of the opposition leaders. Most of the party leaders were present in it. The latest report of the Governor was shared with the leaders who met there. We discussed the pros and cons of it. It is a fact that today is the last day of the Presidential Proclamation to impose President's Rule in Meghalaya. So, some decision has to be arrived at by tonight. In the best interest all the party leaders thought and expressed it so, that let us agree for the ratification of the Governor's recommendation. I am thankful to all the party leaders for this forth right suggestion that we should accept the recommendation of the Governor. Based on that, I have come before you for its ratification.

Subsequently, another point was also discussed as to what will we do next—if we do not do it today, what will happen tomorrow. It is a constitutional crisis. There is no Government; there is no Chief Minister.

Somebody will have to be found as the Chief Minister. We do not know whether the Speaker is going to allow this or not. Even if it is allowed, the stalemate continues. That is our anxiety. Even if those four disqualified Members are taken into account, after the recent election—when one more Member is elected to the Congress and one more independent joining the Congress—again they are striking the balance. We do not know what is going to happen. So, in the best interest of the State and the people of Meghalaya, we thought that we have to wait and see as to how best it can be sorted out. We have no interest at all in creating any particular Government. We want some Government to come to power.

We will convey the sentiments expressed by the leaders of the opposition this morning, to the Governor. I am reiterating this. I will convey immediately the sentiments expressed by them that we do not want the dissolution of the House; we want that democracy is revived; and we want to see that some Government comes to power. All these things, as you said in the morning, will be conveyed to the Governor. With the willing cooperation of all of us, we have to see that Government is surviving. It is very bad if we encourage defections, this side or the side, whatever side it may be. I am very emphatic on that. I will be the last man to go and engineer defection in any State whatsoever.

Though Meghalaya had a Government in 1988 with Shri P.A. Sangma as the Chief Minister, after couple of years when national change came suddenly that State Government also changed; this very same Chief Minister Shri Lyngdoh who was Minister under Shri Sangma switched over his loyalty to another side and formed a party. So, my point is even now the House must be aware of the situation there.

I still pray God—because I believe in God—that some Government comes to power there. ~~55~~ party strength there is like this: HPU (BB)- 4; HPU (BC)-7; HPU (O)-5; HSPDP-4; HSPWP-2; PDIC-2; Independents

[Sh. M.M. Jacob]

6. (5 are disqualified). All this come to 30. If you see the other side it is like this: Congress (I) - 22. Plus one Member; and associates - 6. That means, its total is also 29. So, both the sides went to the Governor and claimed that they are having 30 Members. We do not know the actual situation, but it is an honest attempt. When both the sides claim equal number of Members, we have nothing else but to ask the Governor. Instead of dissolving the House immediately, we have asked you to explore the possibility of reviving a Government, reviving a democratic set up. We are all for a democratic set up and we want the democratic set up to flourish in all the States. I assure Shri Advani that we will not try to dissolve the House as he apprehends now. We want a Government to come back to power in Meghalaya, as early as possible. His intentions and desires will be conveyed to the Governor.

I am not going to answer the other questions whether the Supreme Court or the Speaker is important. It is debated in other States as well, now. In Manipur yesterday, the Speaker did not allow something, etc. All these problems are there. But I am not debating that now. (Interruptions) I am avoiding a debate on the Speaker versus the Supreme Court because I am leaving it out now. We will get another opportunity, perhaps at a later stage, for discussing that thing. (Interruptions) I am not even referring to Ayodhya. I am on a limited point.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are referring to Manipur. (Interruptions)

SHRI M.M. JACOB: It is only Meghalaya now. We are all concerned about Meghalaya. My limited request to you is to ratify the Presidential proclamation issued on the 11th October. Today is the last day. So, I hope the hon. Members will appreciate the position of the Government and support the statutory resolution.

I request Mr. Advani not to press your Motion.

SHRISRIKANTA JENA (Cuttack): What about the assurance regarding 16th that something will emerge? (Interruptions)

SHRI M.M. JACOB: When I say that I will pass on all the gist of what has been deliberated this morning, it includes that also.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: What we understood from the leader of the opposition was that there was an assurance given by the Prime Minister today morning in the all-parties meeting that something would emerge by 16th. (Interruptions) Is there any assurance from the Home Minister to the House that before 16th, there will be a new Government there?

(Interruptions)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore) No, no; nobody can give such an assurance. (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The Hon Minister is on his legs. He is answering. (Interruptions) Let us hear him.

SHRI M.M. JACOB: It seems that some of the Members must have misunderstood my words or sentences which I used. I said, when we—the leader of the Opposition as well as other leaders of the parties met in the morning, all of us expressed certain viewpoints. We expressed our anxiety and said we want a popular Government within a week.

I mentioned in my speech that I will convey all these things which emerged this morning, to the Governor for his report. We will be immediately getting the report, as suggested in the morning. We hope the things will be all right by that time.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: By 16th?

SHRI M.M. JACOB: By 16th. that is what I said. With this, I hope, you will withdraw the

motion and allow the statutory resolution to be passed.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I shall now put statutory resolution moved by Shri M.M.Jacob to the vote of the House.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: So far as the motion that I moved yesterday is concerned, I do not want to press it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I shall now put statutory resolution to the vote of the House. The question is:

"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."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Consequent on the adoption of the statutory resolution moved by Shri M.M. Jacob, the motion moved by Shri Lal K. Advani is governed under rule 338.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I am afraid you have taken the analogy from the disapproval motions pertaining to ordinances which is not correct in this case. In this case, what has been done by the House now, is approval of a decision taken by the Government two months back. Even after that, this particular Motion of mine is valid. Even today, after adopting that Resolution, the House can come to the conclusion that the President's Rule be revoked. Therefore, the only course is to put to the House as to whether or not I have the leave to withdraw my Motion.

SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARAMANGALAM: I would like to draw your attention, Sir, to Rule 338 which says:

"A motion shall not raise a question substantially identical with one on which the House has given a decision in the same session."

Now, what has been sought by Mr. Advani is not disapproval, if I may bring to the notice of the Chair. It is a separate Motion asking for revocation which is a prospective act and not a retrospective act. Therefore, this Motion can stand on its own and may be put to the leave of the House to be withdrawn.

MR. LAL K. ADVANI: I seek leave of the House to withdraw my Motion.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Has the hon. Member leave of the House to withdraw the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

15.12 hrs.

DISCUSSION UNDER RULE 193

General Deterioration In Law And Order Situation In various parts Of the Country with reference to recent spurt in incidents of terrorism, secessionism and kidnappings

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We will now take up Item No. 10, namely, discussion under Rule 193 regarding general deterioration in law and order situation in various parts of the country.

Shri Indrajit Gupta.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore) : Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, the discussion under Rule 193, which I am raising, refers to the law and order situation in the country with particular reference to recent spurt in incidents of terrorism, secessionism and kidnappings.

Sir, I do not wish to treat this subject as a party matter. I hope the discussion which follows will also be free from accusation