

565 *Statutory Resolution AGRAHAYANA 18, 1913 (SAKA) and Motion re. 566*  
*re. Approval of Proclamation in* *Revocation of Proclamation in*  
*relation to state of Meghalaya* *relation to state of Meghalaya*

Government has announced payment of an assistance of Rs. 10,000/- each to the victims but how much amount the Central Government is granting for them?

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hitherto, the well established principle is that whenever an hon. Minister makes a suo-moto Statement, Members cannot ask clarifications.

PROF. PREM DHUMAL: Sir, I am asking it on a humanitarian ground.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is because you are asking a question based on a *suo motu* statement. Whenever a *suo motu* statement is made, the rules does not permit for asking clarifications. Prof. Dhumal, you do one thing. If you have anything in mind, you can ask the Minister later on. The Minister himself will invite you for a discussion. If you want to make any suggestion or if you feel that there are lacunae, certainly the hon. Minister will co-operate.

PROF. PREM DHUMAL: I want an information. Have they announced anything?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: At this stage, you cannot extract any information because this is a *suo motu* statement.

15.51 hrs.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE.

APPROVAL OF PROCLAMATION IN  
RELATION TO STATE OF MEGHALAYA

AND

REVOCATION OF PROCLAMATION IN  
RELATION TO STATE OF MEGHALAYA  
-CONTD.

[English]

DR. JAYANTA RONGPI (Autonomous District): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I stand here to express my solidarity with the Motion placed by the Leader of the Opposition to

recommend revocation of President's rule promulgated in Meghalaya.

As I see it, this is not an isolated case, this is a part of the greater malady. It is almost ritual that when any new Government comes to power at the Centre - whether it is the Congress Government or whether it is a non-Congress Government - we find that there will be a series of changes or the process of destabilisation takes place in the States which are ruled by the parties other than the one that is ruling the Centre. This you could have seen in the States of Punjab, Jammu and Kashmir and the North-Eastern States. As was pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition, it is mainly because of the wrong policy or wrong attitude or non-tolerance the other parties to remain in power in different States. So, that has led to a greater tragedy in the States of Jammu and Kashmir, Punjab and so on.

So far as Meghalaya is concerned, I do not want to go into any controversy by commenting on the sovereignty of the Speaker or what the Supreme Court has given. It is for all of us to see. But what I want to point out is that the country cannot be governed only by the democratic principles by just going through the black letters of the Constitution. There are many countries in the world which does not have any written Constitution but still those countries are running in a better way than our country. We have a very big Constitution and we have so many rules.

So, the most important thing is the attitude of the Ruling Party, the very spirit of tolerance, the very spirit of acceptance of the multi-party democracy. If we cannot accept this fact, then there is definitely going to be a problem in so many other States.

So far as Meghalaya is concerned, as many of the Members including from the Congress have been saying that if you want that any political party should prove its strength on the floor of the House, then immediately the President's Rule should be revoked and status-quo ante should be

[Dr. Jayanta Rongpi]

maintained; the session of the Assembly should be called for testing the strength of the different political parties.

I would also like to point out that so far as North-East area is concerned, where political turmoil is going on, where a large number of people have started challenging even the existing system of the country, in such a volatile area, in such a very sensitive State or zone, the Government of India should think twice before taking any such steps.

As the things have developed in Manipur, as you have seen, Mr. Deputy Speaker, now the situation in Manipur is also not good. There is also a design to destabilise the Government led by the Opposition.

And also the way the things have developed in Nagaland where a particular group is trying to change the Governor in order to topple the Government, this will create more problems in the North-Eastern States.

And even inside Assam where the Congress Party is in power, there are two autonomous District Councils ruled by Opposition Parties. Even inside Assam, the Ruling Party, Congress is trying to destabilise the autonomous District Councils. This is a very wrong trend. The hon. Home Minister is here. I request the Government of India through you to take note of the sensitiveness of the North-Eastern States and thereby to think twice before taking some such steps.

I again request the Government of India to revoke the President's Rule in Meghalaya and maintain the *status-quo ante* and call the session of the Assembly for testing the strength on the floor of the House.

**SHRIBHOGENDRAJHA (Madhubani);**  
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, today, we are discussing an issue which relates to a small State of our country-Meghalaya. In the beginning, I want to say that we do support

the motion moved by my friend, Shri Lal K. Advani. I also do demand that the President's Rule should be revoked and the Assembly should be allowed to function.

State is small but the issue is big. In our system of democracy in India, there can be, have been and shall be different colours of governments at the Centre and in the States. From the very beginning, the Government at the Centre, the Congress Government, was intolerant of any government at the State level formed by any other political party; and the first blow against democracy was given in 1959 when there was a Communist led Government in Kerala. When the Congress Party failed to cause any defection, to win over a single legislator, then they dismissed the Government from above; there was absolutely no pretext. Still demonstrations were organised and then that became the only practice. The country did not like it; even the non-Communist sections of our population did not like it. But the Congress Party did it. Some other places witnessed such a thing. In Patiala State, at that time, the Congress Party could not secure a majority and again dissolved the Assembly which was a separate State at that time in Patiala. Later on, in 1977, the Janata Party came to power.

16.00 hrs.

It dismissed seven State Governments in one blow, giving the argument that because the Congress Party had lost the majority at the Centre, the State Governments formed by it had no mandate to rule the States, the seven State Governments were dismissed, the Assemblies were dissolved and elections were held.

Again, the Congress party came to power in 1980 and it also dismissed seven plus one State Assemblies, dismissed eight State Governments and it tried to surpass the Janta Party Government in giving a blow to democracy. This trend has been developing.

But a major blow against democracy

which became a blow against national integrity, was struck when the Congress Party at the Centre caused defections in the National Conference to remove the Chief Minister Dr. Farooq Abdullah and tried to install, and did instal his brother-in-law Mr. Shah as the Chief Minister of Kashmir. That destabilisation led to certain developments, and we now see that between the people of the State of Kashmir and the Central Government there is no democratic strata at present available. The only relation is to run this side or that side.

Again, there was a chance when we had supported in 1990 the Government led by Shri V.P. Singh. It also under pressure from one of its supporters, forced a Governor on Kashmir, which was stoutly opposed by Dr. Farooq Abdullah and Dr. Abdullah had to resign. Not only that. ON the recommendation of that Governor the State Assembly was dissolved.

This intolerance, by any Government of any colour, had led to an abysmal crisis and to a problem with which we all are concerned today, to the detriment of our national unity and integrity. Punjab is another example where Parkash Singh Badal was the Chief Minister. As I have just mentioned, in 1980 along with the seven other State Governments that Government was also dismissed but it was not only particularly meant against Punjab. Eight State Governments were dismissed; and their Assemblies were dissolved. But the late Shri Darbara Singh was a Congress Chief Minister, a cent percent secular person, a freedom fighter, who has never even hobnobbed with any Akali groups or any party groups. But those at the helm of affairs at the Centre at that time led by the then Home Minister, did not like Darbara Singh and some his Government has dismissed. That dismissal was again supported by the parties whom we were organising into a Conclave at that time. We are also a party to it. The conclave at Srinagar had demanded that whatever type of Government at the State level had a majority, must not be dismissed by the Central Government. Just

after two days, Darbara Singh's Government was dismissed but perhaps because he was a Congress Chief Minister, the Conclave parties supported the dismissal.

This opportunistic display on party line- whoever has done it- has brought calamity to our country. And today we find a situation where Punjab is. We are very much concerned with it. The whole country is concerned with that. We, the communists, have given largest number of martyrs for the sake of national unity in Punjab. About 200 valued comrades have lost their lives.

Here is a point for heart searching. I ask my Congress friends, who are giving arithmetic of this State or that State. Who can guarantee in a democratic system only capable people can form the Government? Are those on treasury benches only capable persons? Are the other persons sitting on this side are incapable persons? Can we ensure that those of us who have been elected to Lok Sabha are the only able persons in our constituencies and all other are unfit to become Members of Parliament? Democracy can never guarantee that. Only ability will prevail. Only truth will prevail. Democracy is the best possible form of Government evolved by human civilisation upto now. With all its defects, with all its troubles, there is no other alternative but to the democratic path. And hence, there is a need of a democratic temperament to tolerate the Governments which opposed them; to tolerate the views of the parties and groups who oppose them. We any not like their views, their actions; we may oppose it and we may disapprove it; but we have to tolerate with it.

Now this is a time not to lose the chance in Meghalaya. The case of Manipur is coming up. Even the case of Nagaland may come up. The ruling party here must not fall victim to a temptation that some Congress man should be made as the Chief Minister; day after tomorrow he may not even be the congress man. In the very process, we will turn our North Eastern States into what we were seeing in the North West. So, that is the

[Dr. Jayanta Rongpi]

bigger stake, the bigger danger to our national integrity and people will lose faith in our democratic procedures, in the democratic methods. They will not only lose faith in the party at the Centre but they will also lose faith in the Indian nation, in the Indian State as in happening, as we are seeing it in Punjab and Kashmir. That must not be allowed to happen. That is the basic and that must be the decisive factor.

Hence, I urge upon treasury benches that they must not fall victim to the minor temptation and they must allow the democratic procedure to have its own way. We may not like the Chief Minister. But none can here guarantee that he will be the best Chief Minister.

16.08 hrs.

[SHRI SHARAD DIGHE *in the Chair*]

People say that there will be horse trading and there will be defections. We have seen here. Many Prime Ministers from that side came to this side and they became the Prime Ministers. We have seen here several times. We have supported them and we have opposed them. That is a different matter. In such a situation, the behaviour of the Speaker is a minor thing.

I entirely dislike the behaviour of the Speaker in this case. But then, it is a minor thing. Had his behaviour been good, in that case the majority party or the party having the largest following in the Assembly if not in majority, must be allowed to form the Government. We are at the Centre. Here we have not a Government formed by a majority party but formed by the largest party. That is why, there also the person having the largest support inside the Assembly, should be allowed to form the Government. And for that the President's rule must be revoked and democracy must be given a chance to function. Let the Assembly decide; let the legislators decide whom they choose as Chief Minister and whom they do not. If the

legislators do not behave, they are the electors, they will decide. That must not be allowed to be decided in the Raj Bhavan. It must not be left to the whim or decision or judgment of the Governor. So in such a situation, it is very tragic that the Governor, before whom 30 legislators were paraded twice, recommended dismissal of the Government.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRIM. M. JACOB): Next day out of 30, it is said by them that two of the same people went to the other side and presented themselves before the Governor that they supported the other side. This is the situation.

SHRI BHOGENDR A JHA: As I have said, this is a human problem. People change their views even honestly. I have told you that several times the people of India had defeated the Congress Party and yet after defeating the Congress Party, the Prime Minister had been the Congressmen in this House itself. Why do you talk of Meghalaya? Here in this very House, the Congressmen from that side came to this side and became the Prime Minister and not once. So why do you want to penalise Meghalaya for that? Here two persons changed sides more than once. We know what happened in Haryana. There were the legislators, the Chief Minister and his Cabinet of the Janata Party led Government. At the Centre the Congress came to power. And the whole Cabinet defected to the Congress Party backed by the majority of the legislators of Haryana Assembly. But for that the people have to decide. Democracy is not only an end itself but it is a means to an end also. So let the people there be given a chance whom to elect or whom not to. So it has to be left to them. If two persons change sides, more can change. I for one cannot guarantee about a single person that he shall not change sides hereafter. Nor you should have the courage to say that those who claim to be Congressmen today in Meghalaya shall remain so even after six months. So in

573 *Statutory Resolution AGRAHAYANA 18, 1913 (SAKA) and Motion re. 574*  
*re. Approval of Proclamation in* *Revocation of Proclamation in*  
*relation to state of Meghalaya* *relation to state of Meghlaya*

such a situation, the only thing to be depended upon is the democratic procedure, democratic method and the procedure established by our Constitution. In this case, some other problems have also cropped up - whether we give preference to the judiciary or the legislature. Under our Constitution we have three major wings - legislature, executive and the judiciary. All together run the same State, serve the same nation. So there can be there have been and there shall be occasions when they shall sometimes collide and sometimes collude - many a time collude and some time collide. This is unavoidable. This is inevitable. These problems have to be sorted out as they arise. Their cannot be fundamental position, any dogmatic position on minor issues in this regard. In the case of Meghalaya, the Supreme Court's judgment has to be abided by all. In the case when we in this very Parliament have raised the issue of the functioning of the Speaker inside the Parliament, in that case the Parliament's will has to prevail, the Speaker's decision has to prevail. So, there are occasions. There cannot be hard and fast rule for all occasions, in all circumstances for every person concerned. There cannot be any single hard and fast rule. But, in the case of Meghalaya, the decision of the Supreme Court that disqualification of 5 Members was wrong should be accepted. There is no alternative for us; unless we demolish the very fabric of our Constitution, which we must not dare try.

We know the history of Nagaland. What was the situation there about a decade earlier, what about a situation there just after independence for several decades. But, once given the chance, patiently but firmly the democratic processes have worked their way, even though not fully satisfactorily, more or less tolerably well. The same thing must be applied in the case of Meghalaya today, in the case of Manipur tomorrow which is also coming up. I do not think even from the point of view of party interests, the Congress Party is going to gain very much. When it tried to gain much in the case of Kashmir, when it tried to gain much in the case of Punjab, it lost both... (*Interruptions*). We lost and the country also lost. So, that is

a national loss. Please do not cause that very loss in our North-Eastern sector which is coming up on the democratic path. Many States have been fragmented, new States have been formed, people have got their new aspirations, new opportunities for democratic functioning, as to what we call horse trading is not impossible, it cannot be ruled out at present. But, despite that the Assembly must be allowed to have its course and let people learn. You educate them and tell them what is horse trading, why it is not good. It is our task. We must do that. We must fulfil that task. But, this is not the task of the Raj Bhawan to recommend the President's Rule, to perpetuate the President's Rule, that must not happen. Many a Governor, many a Rajyapal may have a temptation, may be it is quote possible any one can have, even I may have that I can be a better ruler than this Governor even any M.P. may have a temptation, that can be a correct temptation; also may be factually correct for that particular point. But, a bad democracy taking the longer the larger perspective is better than a good autocrat, a good dictator, in the long perspective, in the long run. And a country like India, a nation like India - multi-lingual, multi religious, multi cultural is still one nation. This nation has the strength and the people who are running this Government here must have that largeness of heart and larger perspective to see that for a small thing, we must not destroy the fabric of our national unity. For the sake of some prasadi, we should not destroy the temple of national unity, the temple of democratic process, democratic methods, democratic functioning. That is why I say the largest number of Legislators is at present supporting Lingdoh. Let him form the Government. Tomorrow people may defect. It is quite possible that they may defect. I do not know. Many people here in Delhi also are waiting in the corridors that their names may be called for swearing in some day, and that is not impossible for Meghalaya or any other place. In our State of Bihar, we have seventy-five Ministers and the rest of the legislators of the ruling party have been made the Chairmen of the various Boards. Only a few who have refused are left... (*Interruptions*).

[Sh. Bhogendra Jha]

That depends on your taste at what stage you say *Zindabad* and at what stage you say *Murdabad*. But this is a fact. Reality is reality. One may like it, one may dislike it. One may call it *zindabad*, one may call it *Murdabad*. It has a straight bearing on the State exchequer which is bad. I do not say it is good but it is there and it is not for the Governor, for the Raj Bhavan to decide that these legislators, this government, this Assembly must not be allowed to function. That is why I have said the democracy is a means also and an end also, a procedure, a method, a process also.

Sir, as I am taking much of your time, I do again insist and appeal to Treasury Benches that accepting of this Motion by my friend Shri Lai Krishna Advani, even by the ruling party, will not be a slur against the ruling party. It will not mean a defeat. Let this House unanimously decide - not that if we win, they lose or if they win, we lose - that unitedly we stand for democracy, unitedly we stand for democratic procedure, unitedly we stand against President's rule and, so, in Meghalaya, President's rule must be revoked. I think they should have the wisdom, the courage to decide accordingly. Hence, again pledging my support to the Motion, I appeal to them and I hope that this House will be in a position to accept it unanimously.

[Translation]

**SHRI SHIV CHARAN MATHUR** (Bhilwara): Mr. Chairman, Sir, there are two types of motions under consideration of the House. The first one has been presented before the House by the hon. Home Minister as a statutory resolution through which...

[English]

**SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA**: Excuse for a slight interruption, Sir, I would like the hon. Member to speak as a free man. He should speak in that spirit.

[Translation]

**SHRI SHIV CHARAN MATHUR**: The

hon. Minister has moved a resolution seeking approval of the proclamation imposing President's Rule, in Meghalaya issued on 11th October. As against if the leader of the opposition, hon. Shri Advaniji has moved a motion to revoke the President's Rule, and to restore the Legislative Assembly in Meghalaya. I was going through the first report of the Governor sent to the Government of India. Narrating the history of part three years the report says that first Government was formed there in February, 1988 through general elections and thereafter Governments fell one after the other due to floor crossing. 5th February, 1988 after the first elections hold on a Congress supported Government was formed under the Chief Ministership of Shri P.A. Sangma. Mr. Chairman, Sir, the House might be knowing that that Government was having a support of 48 out of 60 Members and all of us know that Government worked very well in Meghalaya. Gradually, Government reduced minority due to floor crossing. As a result, another Government headed by Shri Lingdoh was formed. After sometime that Government too proved to be unstable. On the 7th August, the session of the Legislative Assembly was convened to test the strength of both the sides. At that time, the Speaker disqualified some Members by using his discretion and the action of the Speaker was challenged in the Supreme court. The point is that the amendment to the Constitution was made in respect of Defection under Schedule 10 if I am not wrong the Schedule 10 was passed by this House unanimously and everybody knew the inherent difficulties but at that time, it was thought that whatever the difficulties arise, we will face the, and it will be our duty to accept the decision of Assemblies and the Parliament, accepting them as the supreme body. That is why the section 7 of Schedule 10 was not made justiciable.

Just now, Mr. Bhogendra Jha has rightly said that a bad democracy taking the longer and larger perspective is better than a good autocrat, a good dictator, in the long perspective, in the long run. You know when this long run will come. We have knowingly

accepted it, that a change should be brought in the Constitution for which there can be a mistake and when we go to the court of the people for rectifying our mistakes the verdict of the people will be before us. The people only can rectify our mistake. In my opinion, the people are the greatest judges, they will never forgive any mistake committed by anybody or any party. Our mistake can be corrected, whenever the elections will take place after one, two or five years. The largest chain of our democracy is the public and the public opinion. Accepting the public feelings, we have knowingly amended the Constitution. We have tried to bring this change. Knowing fully well, we used to think that the institution of the Speaker in our country, whether one is Speaker of Lok Sabha or of the Legislative Assembly, is supreme and no party should field any candidate in the elections against the Speaker and I understand that since 1952, till today this question came before us time and again; but I beg pardon, no hon. Member from either side has ever agreed that the institution of Speaker should be made so safe that nobody can make any allegation against him.

The situation has not changed. It is clear that the Speaker does belong to certain party. Many times it happens that formally the Speaker does not give his decision. Such a situation has not been accepted in the 10th Schedule. Therefore, it has been provided that the decision of the Speaker would not be justiciable. We should accept his decision. You do not accept the decision because it goes in favour of other persons. Other party does not accept it because it does not suit it. These two things can not be accepted. We have to accept that the decision of the Speaker. I do not want to mention the name of any speaker but I know that many times the Speakers have tried to give decisions by deliberately making wrong interpretation of the law to support his party. We had already accepted that situation.

I would like to say to Shri Sharad Dighe, who is presently presiding in the House, that we should accept the supremacy of the

Parliament and of the Legislative Assembly. We all should accept that no court or the Supreme Court can challenge the decision of the Speaker. It is true that in course of time your decisions may prove wrong. Therefore this House is Supreme and the House should discuss the 10th schedule again. Then you can amend it, if you want. Nobody would object to it. But so long as the provision of section 7 of schedule 10 is there that Speaker's decision cannot be challenged, we will have to accept it. As long as this provision is there, we have to accept it. If any ruling goes in your favour you consider it right and if it goes against, you consider it wrong. Such double dealing cannot be accepted.

Therefore, without involving myself in legal complications, I would like to say that though it is not justiciable yet so long as Section 7 of the 10th schedule, is there, we have to accept the decision of the Speaker, whether it is wrong or right. If we have given wrong decision people will decide it but no court should be allowed to interfere in the matter.

Therefore, when we talk about Meghalaya, we see that the Speaker of Meghalaya Assembly had disqualified four five M.L.As. Then they went to the court and they did not accept the judgment of the court. It does not happen only in Meghalaya. Such things have happened in many other states and many Speakers have not accepted the judgements of the courts. So long as there is Section 7 of the 10th schedule, I think that it is not wrong on the part of the Speaker of Meghalaya Assembly if he refuses to accept the judgement of the court. Therefore, I have presented this legal aspect before you.

It has a practical aspect too which I would like to present before you. Today there is an atmosphere of instability in Meghalaya. It is true that no party can claim majority and no party can form a stable Government which may give justice to the people of Meghalaya. Nobody can claim anything definitely. There is provision of

proclaiming the President's rule to face such situation. Therefore, we have no other alternative except proclaiming the President's Rule there.

So, I would like to say that the hon. Minister of Home Affairs has moved the motion under certain compulsions we have no alternative except the President's Rule and we want to run the Government of that state for the time being so that a majority party can form a stable Government in that state. There can be no other alternative except imposing President's Rule.

We have seen the disastrous results of the elections so that we can't hold election in Meghalaya in the present situation. The only aim of the Central Government is to give a chance to the legislature so that it can form a stable Government in the coming days. Therefore, we have a resolution before us here extending for President's Rule there.

My clear view is that the House should accept the motion moved by the hon. Minister of Home Affairs and should wait for some more days so that some party may be able to form a stable Government. I would like to say only this much on this occasion.

I would like to refer to the two arguments advanced by the hon. Leader of the opposition. On the one hand he concedes that the law regarding member's disqualification has been made knowing fully well that such things can happen and now he says since the Supreme Court has given its verdict, it should be accepted. These two things are contradictory to each other. When we accept one thing then we have to accept that we have no other alternative except to impose President's Rule. Therefore, I emphatically support the motion for extending the President's Rule in Meghalaya moved by the hon. Minister of Home Affairs.

SHRI YAIMA SINGH YUMNAM (Inner Manipur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I thank you very much for giving me the chance to speak on this Motion. I rise to support the Motion for the revocation of the President's rule in Meghalaya moved by Shri L.K. Advani, the Leader of the Opposition. I support the Motion because, I think, it will promote democracy in the country.

Sir, as we know, India is the largest democratic country in the world. It has been upholding the principle of democracy that until now, although the neighbour countries Pakistan and some others were subjected to dictatorial rule. So, to protect that interest for the future also, I support the Motion so that the President's rule may be revoked and the majority rule established in the State of Meghalaya. While hearing your speech, I was inspired by it very much because I also share your view that the Speaker's decision must not be interfered by the judiciary.

I recall that when I was the Speaker of the Manipur Assembly for a term of five years, I attended the Conferences of Presiding Officers at Patna, Bombay and Calcutta. In Patna, it was Shri Radhanand Jha, the then Speaker who raised this issue. At that time, he was summoned by the High Court on a particular case and the unanimous decision of the Conference was that it should be ignored. Likewise, in Bombay and also in Calcutta, such questions were raised and in all these Conferences, the unanimous decision was that the interference from the High Court or the Supreme Court or from any other Court must be ignored by the Speaker. That means the decision of the Speaker must be made final. I am also inspired by this very much. It is my opinion that in this case of Meghalaya and in Manipur also where there was a trial of strength between the present Government and the Opposition, the Speaker did not agree to abide by the observation of the Supreme Court. The Speaker's stand was that until Clause 7 of the Tenth Schedule is amended or repealed, he will not be superseded by the

Supreme Court. The Congress Party boycotted it. I do not know where it stands. So, it is my considered view that the role of the Speaker in the case of Meghalaya appears to be a little beneath the dignity of the Office of the Speaker. I have no idea whether the report sent by the Governor that the Speaker aspired for the post of Chief Minister, is correct or not. It is subject to correction. If the report as quoted by the Opposition is correct, that the Speaker was aspiring for the post of Chief Minister, then why didn't he leave the post of Speaker, why didn't he resign so that he could become the Chief Minister? When he was holding the office of the Speaker, he should not have aspired for this and that. He must be have to the office that he is holding. If he has aspire for any other higher post, then he has to leave the post, so that the office of the Speaker may be impressive. In U.K. the Speaker resigns from the membership of the party as soon as he becomes the Speaker. The Opposition Parties also do not contest in a constituency where the Speaker stands for re-election. We have to make such concessions and such privileges.

If the report was correct, I am not agreeable with role of the Speaker of Meghalaya that he aspired for the post of Chief Minister and that with that in aim, he took the decision of disqualifying the four MLAs. I did not say that the method or the device used was beneath the dignity of the office of the Speaker.

As regards the interference of the Supreme Court, I am very much inspired by your arguments that the decision of the Speaker must be made final. But I want to be more enlightened in this matter. If the Supreme Court issues any contempt charge against the Speaker, what will be the fate of the Speaker in such a situation. I would like to be enlightened on this point.

Now I oppose the Statutory resolution moved by the Home Minister. This is on the basis of principle. I do not approve of the method or process devised by the ruling Party at the Centre for toppling such small

States in the Northeastern areas, say Mizoram, Manipur, Nagaland etc. Why are they creating such a situation? The Congress Party has been engineering such a thing in the States....

SHRI M.M. JACOB: It is not a true statement. All the toppling is done by the Opposition. Where has the Congress Party done in respect of any State Government after coming into power?

SHRI YAIMA SINGH YUMNAM: I have been saying that your partymen have come there. They have engineered and lured the members of the other side, that is, the ruling party at the moment in the State to come out. They assured those members of various posts. They are asked to come outside so that they may be made Ministers etc. These are the facts there. I am not belying the facts. I am only putting the facts before you, whether you accept it as good or bad, that is your consideration. But it will be in the interest of the North Eastern region which is known as dark region, which is neglected and which is not looked after by the Centre for a long time. That State should be left to the people to govern themselves without any interference by the Centre. That is my proposition. I think you will accept that.

Now, what are you doing in Manipur? Your former Chief Ministers—I should not mention the names—I am sorry for that—were made to resign by the late lamented Madam Prime Minister Indiraji and by Shri Rajivji because they had links with the extremists, they utilised the services of extremists for running the Government. That is why, they were made to resign. Now they are being engineered again and they may be made Chief Ministers.

Today you have seen what happened in Manipur. Your people allured the ruling party MLAs to defect. This is the present position. Is it in the interests of the country when you are busy with Kashmir, Punjab, Assam and the ULFA etc? You are provoking them to create problems in Manipur. That is what I

[Sh. Yaima Singh Yumnam]

do not like. It is not in the interest of the people or the country.

It is in the interest of the whole country that I am putting this before you. You think of that region. The people there feel betrayed. You open the merger agreement. How Manipur was allured to merge with India? How have they become a part of this country? Now they feel betrayed. That is why they are raising a movement for secession. That is why extremists are coming up now. You have promised to recognise Manipuri as a national language. You betrayed them. You are denying it. So they are revolting. You know in Manipur now no Hindi picture is allowed to be shown by the students and youths because Manipuri is denied to be recognised as a national language. It is in retaliation to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Confine yourself to Meghalaya.

SHRI YAIMA SINGH YUMNAM: Today if you go to Manipur, you will not be able to see any Hindi picture.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Yaima Singh Yumnam, don't discuss Manipur politics. Confine yourself to Meghalaya.

SHRI YAIMA SINGH YUMNAM: I am disturbed by Mr. M.M. Jacob for a moment. I feel a little sentimental. I feel it very much.

What I have said is pertinent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May be pertinent but not relevant.

SHRI YAIMA SINGH YUMNAM: I shall come to Meghalaya. My proposal is democracy must prevail in Meghalaya also. Let this imposition of President's rule be revoked and if there is no chance of legislature functioning properly, let the mandate of the people be sought by allowing fresh election. Animated suspension is the one way, process or method or strategy for allowing

horse - trading and for creating a situation under which the ruling party at the Centre can make their men rule the State there.

With these observations, I again implore the Government through you for revoking this animated suspension, I mean the imposition of President's rule in Meghalaya.

SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARYA (Jadavpur): Thank you. I rise to oppose the resolution moved by Shri M.M. Jacob and to support the motion brought by Shri Lal K. Advani and Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee. Since this discussion has been going on for some time, I would not like to repeat what has already been said before. I would just make two or three points as briefly as possible.

Firstly, the question of arithmetic has been brought up with regard to the fateful day when the Speaker of the Meghalaya Assembly took a particular decision. Whether it was 30 versus 28, or 30 versus 26, or 26 versus 26 is a question which has been raised. It has been said that so far as the Speaker's decision is concerned - the speaker being the highest authority in the Assembly on that day - it was 26 against 26. I would like to point out that it was 26 against 26 only because only after the five Members had been disqualified by the Speaker. It is the legality of this disqualification itself which is in question. Subsequently, this question of legality was carried to the Supreme Court. Four of the five MLAs went to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court gave a certain verdict. This verdict of the Supreme Court gave a certain verdict. This verdict of the Supreme Court with relation to the decision of the Meghalaya Speaker has been interpreted as the interference of the judiciary into the functioning of the legislature. Now, I would just like to submit very humbly with all due respect to the august Chair that the concept of absolute authority, whether it is the authority of the legislature or of the Executive or the judiciary, is itself a very dangerous concept and a fetish should not be made of this matter.

Sir, the Speakers, Governors, the

Supreme Court Judges are all human. Being human, they are all fallible. It is possible for them to make mistakes. It is our experience that occasionally they do make mistakes. I am not going into the question as to whether it was a mistake or whether it was deliberate, whether there was a political design behind it, whether the Speaker was motivated or not. I am not going into that at all. Let us say that even if the Speaker had made a mistake on that fateful day, if there was such a mistake, there should be means of rectifying that mistake because we know that when such mistakes are made in important areas, in sensitive areas, we have to pay the price for it in blood and tears.

Now, a question has been raised as to whether it is right for the Supreme Court to bring under its purview the decision of the Speaker to disqualify a Member, that is, whether the decision to disqualify a Member should be made justiciable or not by deleting a particular Clause in the Anti-Defection Law. People have spoken about it. Other Members have spoken about it. I am not going into that. All that I am trying to say is that whether the decision made by the Speaker on that day followed the Clause of the Anti-Defection Law or not. The Supreme Court's verdict seems to think that the decision of the Speaker did not follow the Clauses of the Anti-Defection Law. Although we are not legal people, as a lay person, it seems to me that the letter and spirit of the Anti-Defection Law was certainly not followed in the Speaker's decision. I would like to know whether the decision to suspend the voting rights and subsequently to disqualify five members was in accordance with the letter and the spirit of the Anti-Defection Law. That is the question that we should basically answer with relation to the Meghalaya crisis. It seems to me that because these five MLAs were independent MLAs and because it was merely an allegation from an MLA from the other side, which led to the suspension of voting rights and then disqualification, I think, that it did not follow the letter and the spirit of the Anti-Defection Law. Therefore, it seems to us that at least in this particular case the verdict

of the Supreme Court is more in accordance with our common sense interpretation of the Anti-Defection Law than the Meghalaya's Speaker's interpretation of Anti-Defection Law.

The other thing that I would like to say is that I have been pained at the way in which some of my colleagues on the other side seemed to see this President's rule in Meghalaya merely as a prelude to the Congress(I) rule in the State without going through the electoral process again. I have noticed this. This has been the tone of many of the hon. Members who have spoken on the subject. Although this Parliament is only meant to ratify, to approve the proclamation issued by the President, if it had been possible for this Parliament not only to ratify the President's proclamation but also to install the Congress (I) Government in the State, it seems, some of the Members would have been very pleased. This is not all. It reflects what has been happening for a very long time, what has happened, in fact, too many times namely, the manipulation of Article 356 to suit the interest of the Government at the Centre. It had happened in the past in West Bengal. It had happened in Punjab. Look at Punjab. The elected Government was pushed out using Article 356. What was the result? Did law and order situation in Punjab improve? It did not. It deteriorated. So, this motivated use of Article 356 and to continue the President's rule so long as particular political party is not sure of coming to power in a particular State, is an assassination of democracy and it is an insult to the people's verdict.

I am not saying that if the President's rule in Meghalaya is revoked, if the *status quo ante* is restored that would mean stability of the existing Government, the MUPP Govt. That would not mean stability of the MUPP Government. Much has been said about the fear of instability and it is true that in Meghalaya non-Congress(I) Governments have not been able to have a stable period of rule. This may partly, of course, be only the weakness of a particular State Government that it is not able to continue its

[Smt. Malini Bhattacharya]

rule for five years. But in the case of Meghalaya as in the case of many other States, can the Congress(I) party say honestly that it has no responsibility in the horse trading and the floor crossing that has gone on in these different States?

17.00 hrs.

Therefore, supporting this motion for revocation of President's rule in Meghalaya, I also demand that Article 356 be revoked so that this kink of assassination of democracy, this kind of travesty of democracy, this kind of mockery of democracy is no longer possible so that a better phase may be ushered in the Centre-State Relationships.

**SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV** (Azamgarh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I think that this issue is a very important issue. It may relate to only Meghalaya State. But it raises a very major issue in the life of our parliamentary democracy. It brings into light the role of the Speaker and also the Speaker's verdict in disqualifying the Members who were elected by the people. It also brings into light as to what should be the relationship between the highest judiciary court of the country and the verdict of the Speaker. It also brings into focus such a delicate situation where the Supreme Court is involved, where a State Legislature is involved and the stability and the functioning of the Government in a very sensitive area is involved, as to what should be the role of the Central Government vis-a-vis the President of India.

Therefore, these are all very major issues which I think have to be considered very seriously. Perhaps, this event will invoke a thinking in all political parties and also in our Parliament and we must take a final decision when a situation of this kind arises, as to what should be the role, particularly, after the Defection Law had been passed. Can we take that the Speaker will become all powerful and shall we have to accept whatever verdict that he will give? If he disqualifies half the Members, in his wisdom,

what will happen? Is he all powerful or is there any way which will be considered in such an eventuality?

I am not going into the question of as to what was the motivation there. Everybody knows that. Most of the States, particularly, in this period, when there is no majority for a particular political party, efforts are made to secure majority. It is all part of a political game. And this always happens in a parliamentary democracy. But unless and until we stick to certain norms and forms which strengthen our parliamentary democracy, I think, we will be creating a situation where democracy itself will be in danger.

While discussing this, I think, it is high time that we would very seriously give a thought to the election of the Speaker. The Speaker, who is elected, should be a person of high stature, a person who is well-known and widely respected in the public life of that State or in the national life, so that his judgment, his verdict should not be questioned and the people should not think that it is a partial verdict. And that was the reason why, in the beginning, there was a proposal that the Speaker should not belong to any particular political party. This was considered but unfortunately, because of certain situations, it was not accepted. It was also being considered that the Speaker when he goes to polls for election, decides to contest the election, no party should set up a candidate against the Speaker. He should go uncontested. The idea was that the Speaker should be above the party and he should be, as we say very often, the guide, philosopher and the custodian of the House. I think this is high time that we again reconsidered this issue.

We, in our parliamentary life, are entering into such a phase where many important issues have to be given a very serious consideration, so that certain parliamentary values, certain parliamentary traditions are strengthened in our political life.

It is not the question of the Speaker of

Meghalaya only. The other day how did the Speaker of UP behave? He just gave a verdict that a political party in his opinion has split. He announced his verdict that a political party will be divided into A and B. I don't think this was the jurisdiction of the Speaker. He had only to ascertain whether a person who had been removed from the position of the Leader of Opposition commanded the majority or not. He had no business to give his verdict. He does not belong to Congress Party or any other party. It is not the question of party here; it is the question that we must consider here.

I am trying to draw the attention of the House that we have to very seriously consider this. In this particular case let us see what the Governor's report is. I was saying that the Governor tried his best that certain high tradition should be maintained. Whatever decision is taken, it is taken on the floor of the House. This is every party's demand also in this country that the House should be the master. The House should be the final authority to decide whether a particular party or a particular leader commands the majority or not. I fully agree with this point of view that the House should be the final custodian, should be the final form and its verdict should be accepted.

Another point that I am raising is; I am not challenging the supremacy of the house, I am supporting it; if the Speaker becomes partial, if he does not give an impartial verdict, then what will happen. In this case of Meghalaya there is a genuine doubt that the Speaker did not show impartiality. Firstly, when the House met on 7th August, the Leader of the House was seeking the vote of confidence. The voting could not take place; that is on the record. On the final day, the 10th October, the voting was going to take place. Before that the Speaker had disqualified five members. It was a fact that the Speaker cancelled their passes and did not issue them the permission to enter the House. On the 8th of October the Speaker, all of a sudden, agreed that they should come and attend the House; they should be present in the House. when they were present

in the House, what was there on the agenda? Besides seeking the vote of confidence which was a pending affair, there was a vote of no-confidence against the Speaker also. In the situation the impartiality demanded that the Speaker should not have been in the Chair. He should have maintained the high tradition set up by Shri Mavalankar, Shri P.D. Tandon that when there is a vote of no-confidence against the Speaker he should ask somebody else - maybe the Deputy Speaker or any other senior member agreed upon - because there is a vote of no-confidence against him. There was also a vote of confidence of the Chief Minister. The Speaker had already become a controversial person and he should not have been there because that would have been in the fitness of things.

Another thing which creates creates doubt is this. The Speaker has all the powers. When unauthorised Members were sitting in the House, why did he not ask the Marshall to remove these Members from the House, since they are unauthorised persons? When they have already become strangers, how did he allow the strangers to come and take their seats in the House? Does it not create some suspicion? It creates a serious suspicion in the impartial functioning and the role of the Speaker. He allowed the voting to take place and the record shows that 30 Members voted in favour of the Vote of Confidence and 27 Members voted against that. Why did he allow that? He should have said in the very beginning itself that these people, who are no longer the members in my opinion, are not authorised to vote. But he allowed the voting also to take place and later on he gave his judgment that because these five Members are disqualified Members, I will not take that into account. So, the Governor makes it very clear in his report. In the last paragraph of his report he says:

"As per my report, one person crossed the Floor on the same occasion. 26 Members of the Opposition UMPF group and 30 Members of the ruling MUPP group in the House, including the four

[Sh. Chandra Jeet Yadav]

Members who had been earlier disqualified by the Speaker, but in respect of whom the division orders of the Speaker were stayed by the Supreme Court... after 30 Members had affixed their signatures for the motion...."

He allowed them to affix their signatures also for the motion. They were strangers, but they were allowed to affix their signatures before the eyes of the House. Is it democracy? Is it the maintenance of democratic traditions?

The Speaker announced the results saying that 26 members had voted for the motion and 26 Members had voted against the motion, having allowed them to affix their signatures.

Therefore, there was the time and he was using his own vote against the motion. This is something which is not becoming of the Speaker. I am not naming anybody; but it is not becoming of any Speaker to behave in this manner. This is against high parliamentary traditions, behaviour and also against the functioning of the parliamentary system. This was done which does not speak well. I think the Central Government should have given a very serious thought to it. The Supreme Court's verdict was to stay the membership of Members. But, the Speaker allowed them to come to the House, vote and affix their signatures. Then, he says that we should suspend them. I feel that they should have given a very serious thought to it. My information is that the Home Ministry and the Government of India were not in a hurry. "They knew that the situation was very serious. They were in a very very difficult situation as to what to do in this circumstance. They were trying to find out some kind of a solution. But unfortunately solution had not been found. That is why, this situation has come.

The alternative motion which has been moved says that this House should

recommend to the President of India that the proclamation issued by him may be revoked so that the Meghalaya Assembly itself can find out to some kind of a solution. This is the position.

This is a very serious situation and in this serious situation, the dignity of the Supreme Court jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, the jurisdiction of the State Assembly and the role of the Speaker are involved. This is a delicate political situation and we have to maintain very high traditions.

Things are not so easy. We are passing through the most challenging period of our democracy. Unless and until we maintain certain high norms and forms, unless and until we maintain certain high norms and forms, unless and until we make special efforts and foundation of certain traditions are laid down, I think, we will be playing with the future of our democracy itself. These are my requests. These are my submissions that these things have to be considered.

With these words, I support the motion for revocation.

SHRI P.C. CHACKO (Trichur): Sir, I rise to support the motion moved by the Hon. Minister of State for Home Shri M.M. Jacob:

"That this House approves the Proclamation issued by the President on the 11th October, 1991, under article 356 of the Constitution..."

In support this motion not with great happiness or not as it is the ideal thing even according to our party. What has been said in this House by all the hon. Members from various parties, it is obvious that there is a constitutional crisis which is being developed in Meghalaya. This constitutional crisis is the creation of whom? There was the trading of charges in this House by the various parties. I am not going into the details. But it is accepted that there is a constitutional crisis. None of them - who spoke from the Opposition - suggested an ideal solution. Still they want to prolong this agony. They

want to hit the Congress using the opportunity and to get a sort of vicarious satisfaction.

What happened in Meghalaya? They referred to the days of the National Front Government when the self-proclaimed messiah of principled politics, Mr. V.P. Singh was the Prime Minister. They started this toppling game in Meghalaya. The Congress Government in Meghalaya was toppled by the National Front Government.

Mr. Peter G. Marbanlang, who is involved for almost the last quarter of a century in the Meghalaya politics, spoke from the bottom of his heart. He rightly said that in Meghalaya, the only political party with roots is the Congress Party. Whether it is the recent Chief Minister's party or any other party or small fractions or groups join together merely by the lust of power and for all these disintegrating groups, pulling in different directions, power was the only binding force.

Even though it was a very sad thing that the discussion on this issue went on these lines, some very happy things were also revealed during the discussion. I am happy about it. Hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Lal K. Advani was saying what the congress should have done at that time on what happened in Meghalaya. Mr. Advani is not here. Mr. Ram Naik and other senior friends are here. I would like to inform them that Congress needs no advice from your party on what we should have done at that time. He also confessed that there was no constitutional remedy. He said that no remedy was available. Congress Party is a party of 106 year old history. We do not want any advice from the BJP on this issue.

More than that, we want to say that during the discussion, another very important subject came to the limelight, that is, about article 356. Mrs. Mallini Bhattacharaya and all the leftist leaders who spoke were saying about the assassination of democracy and about use of article 356. They are saying about the right of democracy. Congress Party ruled this country for 40 years. And all others together, individually, separately,

collectively ruled this country for 4 years. I was going into the arithmetic. How many Governments were toppled? They ruled the country on two occasions for less than four years. According to them, a friend from BJP was saying that we have dissolved two dozen assemblies. You just multiply the combined life of your Governments, that is, four into ten which comes to 40. You should have dissolved 80 or 90 Assemblies if you were in power. This is only arithmetic just to bring into your head something which had happened. Slaughter of democracy in this country was not done by anybody else, it was done by BJP-communists combination. Sir, what is happening in this House today? This Government is a minority Government. Our Prime Minister said that we want a consensus politics and we are appealing to the conscience of all the parties in this House on every basis issue and issues like that of Meghalaya. We want to discuss with them. This item was in the agenda and we could have discussed this item last Friday, Thursday or Wednesday. But we postponed the discussion, as per their suggestions also. We were waiting for the report of the Governor. And that report came. Now, they say that the ideal solution is calling the Assembly. They tried outside the House also. They speak as if they are the champions of democracy. It is obvious that in the House of 50, 29 are on one side and 30 are on the other side. And in this picture, you are criticising the Speaker. It is all right. Now, if the Speaker resigns, a new Speaker comes, then again 29 will be there on one side and 29 on the other side. Where is the solution, my dear friends? You can abuse the Congress Party. We are prepared to take it. We know how to answer it. That is a different matter.

What is the situation today? President's Proclamation came and it is the constitutional responsibility of this august body to ratify the President's Proclamation. Otherwise, we would have a solution. What is the solution in sight? There is no solution. According to are other political party in this House, it is said that this State should again be pushed back to the unfortunate development. I am

[Sh. P.C. Chacko]

not going into the constitutional details or the tussle between the Legislature and the Judiciary. How easily was that issue dealt with by Mr. Advani and others and how they were giving a final answer to it!

There is a long history about the tussle between the legislature and the Judiciary. Advaniji was very vocal today in saying that the supreme Court decision should be upheld. I was very happy for a moment. Ram Naikji, do you know hon. Advaniji said that the Supreme Court decision is final? He said that Legislature's decision is nothing and the Supreme Court decision is final. For argument's sake, I am asking you one question. Well you please agree the Supreme Court decision on Ayodhya in final? Can you go and tell Mr. Kalyan Singh to accept the decision of the Supreme Court? Where does your respect for Supreme Court and judiciary stand?...*(Interruptions)*...Is this the way to treat an issue of national importance? With a heavy heart, I am telling you that you may defeat us in the House as Communists and the BJP combine together. Somnathji and Indrajit Guptaji always abuse Congress. We are going to see a new political compaignation here. The Motion was moved jointly by Shri L.K. Advani and Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee. Not only this House, but the whole country will watch as to where you stand at the time of voting tomorrow. There are going to be many motions jointly by the Communists and the BJP in this House. You will succeed one day. You will succeed in toppling this Government and the aspirations of the people. But the Communists should understand that their party is withering away.....*(Interruptions)*....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Kindly speak about Meghalaya.

SHRI P.C.CHACKO: Sir, they are provoking me unnecessarily. I am not listening to them. As this Resolution has come before this House, I request each Member on the Opposition side to violate

the whip of their party leadership and come out with an open heart and ask their conscience as to how this country should proceed. Meghalaya is a typical case. There is only one solution not only before Congress Party but before any democratic party and Government. We cannot allow the agony of the people of Meghalaya to be prolonged. There is only one solution and that solution is that the President's Promulgation should be accepted by this House and the Meghalaya Assembly may be kept in animated suspension. Sir, some members alleged that the Congress Party is thinking of forming its Governments there and that is why we are doing all these things.

Basically, we have to see one thing. Which is the largest Party now? In such a situation, some basic things ought to be analysed. Which is the biggest party in the House? The Congress(I) alone is the party with a mass base and with maximum number of MLAs.

I once again request the hon. Members of the opposition parties to refrain from these nefarious politics and come back to the right track.

I support the Resolution moved by Shir M.M. Jacob and I thank you for allowing me to speak.

SHRI KABINDRA PURKAYASTHA (Silchar): Hon. Chairman, I rise to support the Motion brought forward by the leader of the Opposition for revocation of the President's Rule in Meghalaya. I also oppose the Statutory Resolution on Meghalaya moved by the Home Minister.

Sir, just before going into the matter, I would like to draw your attention to one factor. Meghalaya is in the North Eastern Region and everybody knows that the situation in North East is explosive. Fortunately, Arunachal Pradesh and Meghalaya are the only two States where organised insurgency is not there. But in all other States of North East, there is insurgency more or less and the situation is explosive.

Everywhere, there is the question of law and order.

Now, because of this President's Rule in Meghalaya, it is noted that some sort of instability has started there also. When there is tranquillity and when the State is peaceful to some extent, this promulgation will definitely bring some sort of trouble and that will definitely create problems in Meghalaya. In that respect, I appeal that the Government should consider the issue in this light and it should work for the removal of this problem.

There is only one way out and that is the revocation of the President's Rule in Meghalaya and allowing the Members of the Assembly to decide their fate in Meghalaya. Sir, this promulgation of President's Rule in Meghalaya, in my opinion, is very unfortunate, illogical and it is also against all the norms of democracy. The question of Article 356 comes when there is no way out. But in Meghalaya, that was not actually the situation. The Speaker could have very easily solved this problem. But very unfortunately he did not do so. On the fateful day, as per the report of the Governor, there were 30 Members in the Ruling Front and 26 in the Opposition. That should have been accepted by the Speaker. Later, also the verdict of the Supreme Court to uphold the votes of the four Members should also have been accepted by the Speaker. Then, this problem in Meghalaya Assembly would not have arisen at all....

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may continue next time because we have to take up the Half-an-Hour Discussion now.

SHRI KABINDRA PURKAYASTHA: I will continue next time Sir.

17.30 hrs.

#### HALF-AN HOUR DISCUSSION

#### Singing of National anthem and National Song

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will now take up Half-an-Hour discussion. Shri Ram Naik to speak.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM NAIK(North Bombay): Mr. Chairman, Sir, started question No. 170 regarding singing of National Anthem and National Song Jan Gan Man and Vandemataram was answered in the House on 3rd Decemberr, 1991. Since the question could not be taken up for oral answer in the House, with your permission, I am raising Half-an Hour discussion on it.

This question was raised by Shri. K. H. Muniyappa and Shri Murmtaz Ansari which was answered by the hon. Minister of Human Resource Development Shri Arujn Singh.

Naturally, no supplementary could be put on that question and therefore, I am raising discussion on it in the House.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, first of all I want to draw our attention to the importance of the outline of this question.

Parts(a) and (b) of this question were:

[English]

"(a) Wheether singing or National Anthem and National Song has been discontinued in some educational institutions in the Country;

(b) if so, the reasons therefor;"

[Translation]

The answer of these pants was as follows:

[English]

"Some reports have been received that the practice of collective singing of National Anthem every day in schools has been discontinued or limited to a few occasions in some schools. Apathy is likely to be the main reason for the discontinuance."

[Translation]

Apply has been given as the main