

16.50 hrs.

CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL

(Amendment of articles 74 and 163
by Shri C. K. Chandrappan)

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN
(Taluaherry) Sir I beg to move

'That the Bill further to amend
the Constitution of India be taken
into consideration

This Bill seeks to provide a ceiling on the number in the council of ministers in Parliament as well as in State assemblies. I think the whole House will agree that there is need for such a ceiling on the number of the council of ministers. On 8 December 1967 a resolution was unanimously passed in this House. This House is of opinion that a high level committee consisting of representatives of political parties, constitutional experts be set up immediately by the government to consider the problem of legislators changing their allegiance from one party to another and their frequent crossing of the floor in all its aspects and make recommendations in this regard." After that a committee was appointed and it included eminent constitutionalists, representatives of various political parties and other public men. There was a lawyers group. The Committee of Defection produced a report and that report has been placed before us. In that report several important aspects of our political life are discussed, aspects which polluted the atmosphere and created a situation by which democratic institutions could be weakened. The question of defection was one of the very important aspects that the committee discussed. They recommended that there should be a ceiling on the size of the council of ministers.

It is not only because the country could not afford to pay unnecessarily when cabinets are expanded but also because cabinet expansions were used as instruments for defection. Cabinet expansion in many cases had been used as an exercise in political corruption. So, if we want to weed out that kind of corrupt political atmosphere from our country and create healthy traditions to strengthen the democratic institutions various actions have to be taken. A ceiling on the number of ministers at the Centre and the States is one of the steps required.

Some time ago I had an opportunity to move another Bill regarding the right to recall but unfortunately the government was not ready to accept that. Coming to the magnitude of the problem we are facing today, in the introduction to this report it is said

Out of the 742 defections which took place from the first to the fourth general elections 116 defectors were accommodated in the Cabinets of various States.

That means nearly one-fourth of the total defectors were lured to the Cabinet. That is a case of political corruption. You tell them "Please come to this side. We will give you a seat in the Cabinet." There are people ready to cross the floor. That happened in our country in a big way. That is one of the reasons which prompted me to move this Bill. This kind of floor-crossing, defecting from one party to another and multiple defections are another symptom of political instability. Some persons defect from one party to another today. The next day they defect from that party to a third party. The third day they come back to the original party and so on. Haryana is notorious for that, which provoked Mr. Chavan to say, "Gaya Rams and Aya Rams." This does not do credit to any country. That does not show the growing maturity of democracy.

in our country. This kind of tendency finds expression when there is political instability in any State.

This committee says:

"That lure of office played a dominant part in the decision of legislators to defect was obvious from the fact that out of 210 defecting legislators of the States of Bihar, Haryana, M.P., Punjab, Rajasthan, U.P. and West Bengal 116 were included in the council of ministers...."

So, my earlier figure was wrong. Out of 210 defectors, 116 found a berth in the council of ministers!

17 hrs.

It is very difficult to study what happened in all States, but I made a sample study of four States. In Bihar, there were ministries which had only 3 members. They could manage. But there were Ministries with 37 members. What was the rationale behind it? Whenever there was political instability in a State, when the Chief Minister thought that his chair was not very safe, he tried to attract members from the opposition and offered them seats in the Council of Ministers. For example, when Shri B. P. Mandal of the Soshit Dal was the Chief Minister, he had a cabinet of 34 members. He was out-done by Shri Kedar Pandey, who had a Cabinet of 35 members, which was later raised to 37. Shri Ghafoor of the Congress Party had a Cabinet of 46 members. How can this be justified? The object should be to have a compact small Cabinet to run the administration efficiently. I am sure, Comrade Ramavatar Shastri will refer to all the tricks played by the Chief Ministers. In fact, there were occasions when in some parties there were no followers because all were Ministers. This happened in Bihar.

Then, take a small State like Manipur. They also indulged in this very brilliant trick of Cabinet-making. The smallest Ministry in that State had only three members. I have tried to study the position there from 1961 to 1975. When Shri Raj Kumar Dorendra Singh was the leader of the Democratic Legislative Party, his Council of Ministers consisted of 19 members. If he had added a few more members, 50 per cent of the Assembly Members would have been in the Council of Ministers. How could this be justified? In the case of a poor and small State like Manipur, whose requirement is very small, the strength of the Council of Ministers had gone to this fantastic figure of 19.

It is the same story in the case of UP when the SVD Ministry was in power. They did the same exercise.

In Punjab this was done by Shri Prakash Singh Badal, who belonged to the Akalis, when he was the Chief Minister. His Ministry had 26 members, and the smallest Ministry in that State had only two members. These are some of the exercises done by Chief Ministers for remaining in office.

17.05 hrs.

[SHRI VASANT SATHE in the Chair]

Now, the question is how we can overcome this situation. If we have to overcome this situation, then, first of all, there should be a great political awareness created among the people. Giving them the right of recalling the Members who are defecting is the only answer. If a Member defects, those who elected him must have the right to recall him. This is an enabling provision by which we can see that at least some political morality is imposed on the Chief Ministers because they cannot go beyond a certain limit because of the constitutional limitation binding their hands from indulging

Shri C. K. Chandrapan] in the exercise of political corruption.

The Committee on Defections, after discussions, reached a consensus which was more or less expressed in their Report thus:

"The formula before the Committee was that the size of the Council of Ministers should not exceed ten per cent of the strength of the Lower House in the case of unicameral and 11 per cent of the strength of the Lower House in the case of a bicameral Legislature. In regard to the States and Union Territories where the strength of the Legislatures was below 100, the size of the Council should be fixed so as not to exceed 15 per cent of the strength of the Lower House."

Various parties expressed their positions very clearly in regard to this problem. For example, our party, the Communist Party, took the position as under:

"The size of the Council of Ministers shall be restricted to ten per cent of the total membership of the Lower House or 30, whichever is less."

Shri Jaiprakash Narain said that in regard to the numerical strength, the consensus would be that 50 should be the maximum to which a State can go in making the Council of Ministers. But the unfortunate thing is that many years have passed and the Government has not come forward with any legislation to create a healthy atmosphere in strengthening our democracy. That is the reason why I thought this kind of a Bill should be introduced in this House.

My request would be that the Government should accept that there is need to create an atmosphere by which the democratic institutions will be strengthened, the politics of our country will be cleaned and all those factors which are leading to political corruption will be fully eliminated.

For that there is bold and decisive action required from the Government, but I am sorry to say that the Government is not forthcoming with any suggestions. Their actions are still more disappointing.

Only today we read in papers that the Congress party has adopted six Members from this side to that side of the House, three Members from this House and three Members from the other House. Mr. Stephen will say that at the time of Gujarat discussion, we discussed the same point. He said that the people might change genuinely and, when they change genuinely, they may take a new political position and that new political position might find itself in the expression of their joining a new party. I am not against it. If you ask me, whether it is a good thing, I would say, if a person with a reactionary idea changes to a progressive idea, to a better idea, it is a good thing. But there is a problem. In a parliamentary democracy, in terms of membership of the Legislature or the Parliament, if you exercise this practice, it becomes very difficult.

I do not mind a political party canvassing for its politics, projecting its philosophy, projecting its programme, before the people and attracting the people towards it. It is a good thing. But here the Members of the Legislative Assembly, the Members of Parliament, are the elected people. They are not just individuals. The Members of Parliament are elected by nearly a million people. We are responsible to them. They vote for me; they vote for Mr. Stephen or for Mr. Mavalankar, not just as individuals. You symbolise a certain programme, a certain political party, a certain political ideology. You symbolise certain goals which the people cherish and vote for you. In the House, you are representing a certain philosophy, a certain programme, a certain ideology, certain goals which your voters cherish and vote for you.

I have no business, after coming to this place, to betray my voters and pass on to this side or that side of the House. I can do it in my individual capacity but not as a Member of Parliament, not as a legislator. That is an immoral political action. It is a corrupt political practice. This is being done on a large scale.

Now, if I am not to be misunderstood, I may tell you, in all seriousness that a Jana Sangh Member overnight joined the party on that side under the shadow of Emergency, under the shadow of MISA. It does not strengthen the content of the Congress party. Of course, I am nobody to advise the Congress party. But I am more concerned about the future of democracy in this country. If the reactionary forces are to be fought and defeated, then you have to fight against them, against their ideology and politics not merely by putting them under MISA for 10 days, black-mailing them and taking them to your party. That will lead to a position where you will create political instability in your own ranks. Then, the game of disruption, de-stabilisation, in your party which was done from outside will be played from within. That will be the danger. The disruption will be from within.

That is not going to strengthen the democratic elements in our country. That will weaken the democratic institution in our country. That will create cynicism in the minds of the people, that will create despair; that will create frustration in the minds of the people. Those parties and those individuals who plead or who believe seriously that this country should go on the path of democracy, that this country should attain its goal, that the democratic institution gets strengthened, let us resolve that we will do everything possible to make the democratic institution strong by honestly working for it and sincerely working for it. In that case, I am not saying this is an end in itself—this Bill

or this thing. There are series of remedial measures suggested. A right to recall means that you are accepting the right of the people as the masters and here you are enabling and you are restricting the Chief Ministers as also the Prime Minister in regard to indulging in politically corrupt practices....

SHRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY (Nizamabad): *Om Shanti.*

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: I am only saying that in that spirit the Minister should approach this matter and I also request my friend that no bitterness is meant. It is all an effort to come to a good result and a right conclusion which will strengthen the democracy.

I am commending this Bill for the approval of the House.

SHRI B. V. NAIK (Kanara): As far as the marshalling of facts and figures is concerned, the contemporary and the recent past history of India is concerned and that of the various States, various Ministries irrespective of the parties which were in power, I could not add anything more to what the hon. and learned friend and the mover of this Bill, Shri C. K. Chandrappan has said.

But, while his diagnosis of the malaise or the malady of the body-politic of this country is understandable, while he has gone with a perfectly analytical mind which is evidenced by the facts and figures he has adduced, I wonder whether the solution that he has put forward or he has offered, that the total number or the size of the Council of Ministers should not exceed 10 per cent of the total strength of the Lok Sabha or the competent legislature to which the respective Council of Ministers is accountable—whether this solution or this remedy is the remedy is the thing which this august House should apply its mind to.

[Shri B. V. Naik]

It has been said and it is well-known in the field and in the arena of human management and governmental administration that thinking as an individual is invariably less effective. In the agonies of a genius and the ecstasy of the fulfilment of his work, it is true that acts of genius have never been done by groups of people but, in the governance of the affairs of men, it has always been held that group activity has always been found superior to individual activity. That is the reason why among most of the competent leaders in the world in whom the decision-making is concentrated, not an individual has ever succeeded over a long period of time. It is the group which has always been considered superior to the individual, however talented or capable the individual may be. Similarly, the group when it tends to increase in size, goes to the stage of becoming a mob. That has been calculated by sociologists to range anywhere between 30 and 50. Anything which transcends this limit for our species of human beings, above 50.... The decision-making naturally degenerates because it becomes a decision of the mob. Under the circumstances, it can be a sort of group activity like sports, like games, cricket or hockey or football, or like the activities of many earlier political groups, the earliest Christian cells after Jesus, even the size of a communist cell, and now, for example, in contemporary times, the size of the *shaka* of the RSS. All these groups have been well-defined. Take the size of the platoon or that of a rank of 11 people in the army, the way in which they are organised and so on. Under the circumstances, the group has to be homogeneous. The group should be like-minded. The group should be of reasonable size. But no group will be in a position to deliver the goods particularly in the extremely sophisticated field in which everybody thinks he has the skills of governing a people, but which he really does not have. This is one field where anybody thinks he is

qualified, but most of the people are disqualified. And therefore, even a group does not become effective until and unless it has that catalytic agent. Some like-minded groups have failed because they lacked one thing—the catalytic agent—in the form of the group leadership or a single person to make the whole circle complete. I would therefore suggest that there should be discretion. The mere fact that there will be a cabinet upto ten per cent will make it like some of the bureaucratic and systematic order where people would keep on hanging at the doors of the leader of the ruling party or whoever it is or the Chief Minister or the Prime Minister saying that there are still three more vacancies, kindly fill them up, although there might be no need for it at all.

Under the circumstances, quantifying a basic political problem would be a solution which would be much worse than the problem that we have on hand. Therefore, while I welcome the spirit of the Bill which the hon. Member Shri Chandrapan has brought forward, I would like to say that the form in which it has been presented may present obstacles in the matter of actual governance of the people. Therefore, while supporting the spirit of the Bill, I have to raise my voice of objection to the form of it.

SHRI S. P. BHATTACHARYYA (Uluberia): I support the proposals. As the present system is going on for some years in this country, this is one of the steps to check the Parliament or State Assemblies from becoming playgrounds of political manoeuvring and getting into the position of ministers not for the solution of people's problems but for their own individual interests. If the cabinet is fixed, then, the party in power or newly elected powerful party will fix the cabinet according to their best personality and the other parties will not be able to make power politics to enter into the cabinet for their personal interests and thus create instability.

This is one of the solutions for having a good Government in our country. And this is part of it. But, the problems are too many in our country. In our country, from the very beginning, elections were manoeuvred by the vested interests; they squeeze the voters to support their own and interested persons and to have their own persons represented.

There is illiteracy in our country where the innocent—ordinary—people can be fooled and these self-interested people by taking advantage of this might fulfil their personal interests by cheating the people. These things are going on in our country. I do not know how long it will go on. If you want our country to have the democratic system as an ideal thing, being a non-aligned country surrounded by the socialist countries, we have to try to have this democratic system. By this system, we shall be able to solve the problems of the people. We are all here to make a good democratic system functioning in this country. For that purpose, we will have to have a stable democracy. For that, playing of football in Parliament or in Assemblies must first of all be stopped. A serious, sincere, political struggle may be there. Unless the full problems are solved, no individual's satisfaction should be allowed to come in the way of the nation's interest. If, for one's own interest, one supports one party or the other which can fulfil the interests of that individual, and for that purpose, pressure is exerted within Parliament or in the States that corrupts the whole system.

So, to check that, this is one of the steps suggested by my hon. friend, Shri Chandrappan by his amendment.

I support his amendment without going into the merits of it.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, at the outset, by the very nature of the Bill brought by Shri Chandrappan, though there is a certain justification for it, this is an infructuous thing.

SHRI M. C. DAGA: How can these two things go together in one sentence?

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: Because of this one reason that we cannot take advantage of this Bill and castigate or cast any aspersion on the present Government.

The reason is that our Government has brought about a certain revolutionary change by the constitutional amendments. I think Mr. Daga and also all the other Members of the party are also represented. It is not the problem of the present Government or the previous Government. The Parliamentary Democracy in India is undergoing a change; many experiments have been tried in this country. I hope that in your State a lot of experiment has been taking place. I think we have seen many of the Governments operating in our country. I think the Governments of all character, Governments with all ideologies and Governments of all political philosophies are there. They could not bring about the changes needed in the country which Mr. Chandrappan is dreaming, namely, to change the character of the Government.

In all humility I say that we have to function under a Parliamentary Democracy. In doing so we must also see that India is a big country where many experiments have been taking place and many developments; also have been taking place and many political operations and manipulations are there. Even if such a system is being sustained for a long time, you know there is some one to scuttle the entire system of our Parliamentary Democracy in each State in this country. And so, our Government Leader has taken care to see that Parliamentary Democracy is strengthened and it functions well. We must therefore see that democracy in the real sense of the term is defended. I hope that you will all agree with me on this.

[Shri K Lakkappa]

There are in India many big States, medium States and small States. Parliamentary democracy means stability of government. I do not say the size of the Ministry should be abnormal that all sorts of people should be there in the Ministry, people without any character and so on. But we should also see that the Ministry must be a good one and there is stability. But the Mover is questioning the very basis of democracy. It is the prerogative of the Minister/Chief Minister to choose Ministers ensure stability, to decide what should be the size of the Ministry. That does not mean that there should not be homogeneity cohesiveness or collective responsibility or stability. There have been many governments in various States. For the last so many years before the emergency this was the position in Kerala or elsewhere. That is why all prudence and intelligence has been used by this Government. We have taken stock of the situation and developments. Certain measures have been taken which are of far-reaching importance. There is a Joint Committee which is going into the question of defections and trying to suggest suitable changes. I have seen all experts, constitutional thinkers, jurists, lawyers, people of all shades of opinion, representatives of all political parties giving evidence.

SHRI C K CHANDRAPPA: Is it coming?

SHRI K LAKKAPPA: Discussions are going on. Even day before yesterday, I attended a meeting.

SHRI C K CHANDRAPPA: What are we discussing for five years?

SHRI K LAKKAPPA: You cannot immediately jump to a conclusion and say that everything is wrong. I have seen that even your party leaders could not offer the correct or best solution. It is not

enough for you to say 'cut the size of the Ministry'. It is not enough to talk merely of stability. These are not the only elements in a constructive democracy. Parliamentary democracy presupposes so many other things. You must create an atmosphere; you must have economic freedom; you must have all-round development.

The Mover could have brought forward a comprehensive Bill or he could have waited till the completion of the deliberations of the Committee which is looking into the matter and their Report is before the House. I think he has been hasty. I do not know what has happened. Generally he is very progressive and pragmatic.

Therefore I do not think any useful purpose has been served except for passing certain remarks. It may have served an educative purpose. Though I appreciate that Shri Chandrappan always puts forward progressive and pragmatic ideas, this is one instance where he has brought forward something which is really infructuous and very perverse. The way it has been drafted is also not very.

SHRI M C DAGA: Why do you say perverse?

SHRI K LAKKAPPA: Because he was making a scathing attack against my party. Defections have taken place in almost all the parties. In a small party like the CPI, the size of the defection is small; the CPI(M) is a small party, therefore the defection is small. In the States there are small parties, therefore, the defections have been small.

SHRI C K CHANDRAPPA: The bigger the party, the bigger the defection.

SHRI K LAKKAPPA: In that way we are all having an experiment. Therefore, let us all sit together and

think together. What best we can do, we must do; we must have a collective idea how to strengthen parliamentary democracy. Therefore, I hope and trust that Shri Chandrappan will withdraw his Bill.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Muvathu puzha): Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted to say what I actually feel about the Bill, my honest reaction is that this is a purposeless Bill. I feel interested more in the reason spelt out by the Move, rather than the Bill itself. I am unable to discover any connection between the two. By this Bill he seeks a remedy to what he considers to be the basic defect in the body-politic of this country. I do not see how this Bill could remedy that. I have before me the report on which he has placed so much reliance. That report contains a dissenting note by his leader, Shri Bhupesh Gupta and his comment is that those recommendations do not even touch the fringe of the problem and so it is like running after mirage. The point is this. Why exactly are defections taking place? Are defections really as bad as they are sought to be made? Or is it a symptom of certain developments in the body-politic? I am not one who magnifies what is known as defection. Our Constitution is not a party based constitution. In our Constitution there is no mention of political parties at all. There is no constitutional recognition of political party by our Constitution. It is only the Representation of the Peoples Act that acknowledges the party concept. We reckon only the people in our Constitution. A person contests, may be on his own strength or on the strength of a platform or on the backing of a political party or a combination of political parties. People make their choice and send the person to Parliament and Parliament is supposed to reflect the totality of the changes in the body-politic and that change would reflect on different political

parties. A party may cease to represent the sense of the people; a party may start disintegrating and the members of that party may feel that their party is disintegrating and people have withdrawn their mandate; the members of a party may feel that their party has committed a breach of faith with the people with respect to the platform on which the election was contested. When developments take place like this, a member may feel that the party's fidelity to the electorate had been broken and therefore he should not continue in that political party any longer. Then would it be proper to insist that he should not leave that party? That is the main question. Party whips are there to a certain extent. In the British and American political systems the party whips do not operate to that extent; members of the party have certain freedom in the matter of taking up positions; they can even go and vote against a Bill in Parliament, against their own party. There is the dignity of the individual, and all that is conceded. A person is selected by a party, that person is projected by the party before the electorate as a perfectly acceptable person and people accept that person. All proceed from the basis that that particular candidate as an individual is a fairly acceptable person. The question is, on political issues coming up before the Parliament or legislatures, whether or not he should have a certain measure of freedom to take up a position. There is an interesting passage in the minute of dissent of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta which I quote:

"Defection in the sense of the crossing of the floor of the House is no new occurrence in bourgeois parliamentary democracy, especially under a multi-party system. This essentially reflects the fluidity of a country's political life and often the polarisation of its political forces. More fundamental contradictions and conflicts in

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

society including those within the ruling class itself lie at the root of political fluctuations at parliamentary level. The process is liable to become all the more pronounced when the ruling class and the parties variously representing it are in crisis and disintegrating. We are passing precisely through such a phase of crisis of bourgeois rule as well as of the rapid disintegration of its principal party—the Indian National Congress."

This is his assessment. The Indian National Congress is in a very disintegrated situation today. That is a different matter altogether. One truth is spelt out, namely, this will happen when destabilisation of the entire political structure takes place and persons re-assess their positions as to where they should be. To castigate this as a basic curse, I don't think is a correct approach. Our Constitution is not based on this at all. Therefore, any restriction which is placed on the freedom of operation will not be conducive to the stability of the parliamentary democratic system.

Look at the Central Ministry. Out of the 770 members of Parliament in both Houses, even without Mr. Chandrapan's amendment to the Constitution, the number in the Council of Ministers, including Deputy Ministers, is only around 60. Some members have come over to our party, but is for induction into the ministry? Why should you presume that something dishonest is behind their coming over to our party? Why can't you concede to him the contention that persons who are still sticking to a certain political party in spite of the manifest position that the people are not in line with that party, are either moral cowards or insincere people? Why should you assume that people who have jumped from a sinking boat are dishonest? Let there be no assumptions that way. We are here as individuals. We may move this side or

that side, but the moment you move, it does not mean you are a dishonest person. If a person sincerely feels that his party had committed a breach of faith with the people, should be only alternatives open to him be either to sink, be an accomplice in the commission of breach of faith or quit Parliament, undergo the anguish of another exercise of going through an election and be in the wilderness? Should these be the only alternatives before him? If Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's dictum is accepted, that is to say, changes and fluctuations are taking place in accordance with the changes in what he calls the bourgeois parliamentary system, should not our laws be framed in such a manner as to make it possible for those fluctuations to be taking place? To make it rigid in structure would have the effect of breaking the entire system and it would not facilitate the democratic process, or revolutionary process through democratic functioning.

With respect to defection, although a magnificent committee was set up and although all the great men and all the big men were placed in it, the only solitary recommendation which they could make was to restrict the size of the Cabinet to 10 per cent. Even with respect to the limit, the question was whether it should be 10 per cent or 12 per cent. This shows how limited, short-sighted, circumscribed and fettered were these great men in their approach to a basic problem.

I must agree with Shri Bhupesh Gupta that they failed to understand the modalities and the dynamism and the irresistible logic of certain political changes and political fluctuations that are inevitable in a changing society. If this is to be reflected in an elected representative, then he must have a certain freedom to move this way or that way.

You will not find a person getting away from the Congress today. Why? Because, contrary to your anticipa-

tions, the Congress is not a disintegrating party. It represents the will of the people. Therefore, the persons who are in it are the representatives of the people. Thinking is taking place for a change in other parties, because they feel that their boat is sinking and that they are not reflecting the will of the people. This is the way that you have to approach this problem.

Coming to the limit of 10 per cent, I would say that it is absolutely artificial. Why do you not concede that a person who is elected to be the leader of a State, or the country, by the elected Sovereign Parliament, or the Legislature which is sovereign in its own sphere, has got a certain sense of responsibility? If you do not concede that, then democracy comes to an end. If you concede that, then there is no relevance for putting any artificial limit, saying that it should be either 10 per cent or 12 per cent. Now you start with the assumption that a man who comes here is not a perfect man, he does not have a sense of responsibility, he is corruptible, susceptible to corruption and other things. The moment you proceed on this assumption, then you proceed to the further assumption that the men who elected him are also imperfect. If you proceed to that assumption, then you are digging at the very root of democracy. Why do you not accept the political wisdom of the man who is elected, why do you not concede that he is a person with a sufficient sense of responsibility? If you do not concede that, then democracy collapses. If you concede that, then this rigidity will have no place because this artificiality will mean the destruction of the democratic structure.

Therefore, the very approach is wrong, because it is born out of a wrong conception of the society because it is born out of a wrong appreciation of the solution. The solution is more dangerous than the disease. As the solution is indicative

of a lack of faith in democracy, this Bill is undemocratic. So, I oppose this Bill.

श्री रामावतार शारदा (बटना) :

समापति जी, मैं इस विधेयक का जोरदार समर्थन करने के लिए बड़ा हुआ हूँ। श्री स्टीफेन ने जितने जोरदार तरीके से इसका विरोध किया और उसे गैर-जनतांत्रिक बताया, उसी लहजे और उसी जोर के साथ मैं विधेयक को व्यावहारिक और समय की पुकार के अनुकूल मानता हूँ। जब तक कांग्रेस देश में शक्तिशाली रही, शासन तंत्र पर इसकी इजारेदारी रही, इसका एकाधिकार रहा तब तक आप देखें तो पता चलेगा कि मंत्रिमंडलों की संख्या बढ़ाने की आवश्यकता नहीं पड़ी। भग्याराम और गयाराम की बीमारी 1967 में शुरू हुई, उस चुनाव के बाद शुरू हुई। उस चुनाव में कांग्रेस नौ राज्यों में पराजित हो गई थी और वहाँ कांग्रेस का शासन, उसका एकाधिकार समाप्त हो गया था। उस समय संयुक्त मोर्चा की सरकार आई, उसकी दोर प्रारम्भ हुई, क्योंकि वे सरकारें इस ग्यारह महीने तक ही चल सकी क्योंकि उनके घनद्वार आन्तरिक अन्तर्विरोध था। उन बातों में मैं इस वक्त जाना नहीं चाहता। जब शासन पर से कांग्रेस का इजारेदारी समाप्त हुई, उसके बाद कांग्रेस ने देखा कि दूसरे दलों के लोग सरकारें नहीं चला सके तो उसने तोड़फोड़ की नीति अपनाई, उन लोगों को तरह तरह के प्रयोजन दिए जाने लगे। इसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि एक के बाद एक मंत्रिमंडल धराशायी होने लगे। कहीं-कहीं पर तो कांग्रेस पावर में आ गई और जहाँ यह सम्भव नहीं हो सका तो उसने अपने निष्ठाधियों को बड़ा किया।

सभापति महोदय : मैं बिहार की बात आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ। 1967 में श्री महामाया प्रसाद सिन्हा के नेतृत्व में संयुक्त मंत्रिमंडल बना जिस में कांग्रेस को छोड़ कर करीब-करीब सभी दलों से लोगों को लिया गया। उसको गिराने के लिए शोषित दल को इसने खड़ा किया। श्री बी पी मंडल जो इस सदन के माननीय सदस्य रह चुके हैं, जो 1971 में चुनाव हार गए, उन्हें खड़ा किया गया। उनको लाने के पहले उनके ही दल के एक श्री सतीश प्रसाद को तीन दिन के लिए मुख्य मंत्री बनाया गया। श्री सतीश प्रसाद आजकल सिनेमा के एक्टर हैं। वह अब राजनीति में नहीं हैं। एक कालेज उन्होंने चलाया। उस में उन्होंने लाखों पाए का गोलमाल किया। उसके बाद आज वह सिनेमा के एक्टर हैं। उन्हें तीन दिन के लिए मुख्य मंत्री बनाया गया। उसके बाद श्री बी पी मंडल को काउंसिल का सदस्य बना करके मुख्य मंत्री बनाया गया और जितने शोषित दल के सदस्य थे उन सभी को 34 के 34 को मंत्रिमंडल में ले लिया गया ताकि वे भागने न पाएं। बाद में 37 को लिया गया।

श्री मूल चन्द्र डाणा : आप पुरानी बातें कर रहे हैं।

सभापति महोदय : ये तो रामायण तक में चले जाएंगे।

श्री रामचंद्र आस्थो : आठ साल पहले की बात कह रहा हूँ। एक दशक अभी पूरा नहीं हुआ है।

उनके दल में जितने लोग थे सब को मंत्रिमंडल में ले लिया गया। पहले उनकी संख्या 34 थी बाद में 37 हो गई। जिस को दस्तखत करने भी नहीं आते थे उनको भी मंत्री बना दिया गया। जिन को नोट का धर्य तक मालूम नहीं, यह पता नहीं था

कि सरकारी भाषा में नोट किस को कहते हैं, जो दूसरे नोट को ही जानते थे, बस लेते थे उनको मंत्रिमंडल में ले लिया गया। 1967 से 1975 तक 11 मंत्रिमंडल बने और 27 बार रिशफलिग मंत्रिमंडलों की हुई। गफूर मंत्रिमंडल में 46 सदस्य थे। शोषित दल के मंत्रिमंडल में 37 थे। संगठन कांग्रेस के नेता सरदार हरिहर सिंह के मंत्रिमंडल में 33 थे। संगठन कांग्रेस के भाई यहाँ नहीं हैं। वे भी बड़ी लम्बीलम्बी बातें किया करते हैं। उन्होंने भी 33 का मंत्रिमंडल बनाया। लोगों को डिफेक्ट करने के लिए हर तरह से प्रोत्साहन दिया गया, आचार्य राम गयाराम की बीमारी को बढ़ावा दिया गया। यह नहीं सोचा गया कि राज्य के धन का कितना अपव्यय इस तरह से होता है। मंत्रियों को तनक्वाह मिलती है। उनको गाड़ियां मिलती हैं। चुन-चुन कर गाड़ियां ले लेते हैं। कहते हैं यह नहीं लगे यह लगे। बैस्ट गाड़ियां उनको चाहिए। तनक्वाह चाहिए। दोरे पर जाएंगे तो भत्ता, टी ए, डी ए आदि चाहिए। इस तरह से लाखों लाख रुपया राज्य का बरबाद होता है। हमारा राज्य धन धान्य से पूर्ण है। लेकिन उस राज्य की कौसी दुर्गति हो रही है इसको आप देख लें। कभी वहाँ बाढ़ आती है और कभी सुखाड़ होता है। इस साल वहाँ पर सुखाड़ की समस्या कहीं-कहीं नजर आ रही है। मैं आर्थिक दृष्टिकोण से बोल रहा हूँ। जितना छोटा मंत्रिमंडल होगा उतनी ही उस में कर्मकटनेस रहेगी, उतनी ही जल्दी से लोग फैसले ले सकेंगे और उनको कार्यान्वित कर सकेंगे। काम समय पर होगा और राज्य के धन का अपव्यय कम होगा। लेकिन ऐसा नहीं होता है। मंत्रिमंडलों में मंत्रियों की संख्या बढ़ाते जाते हैं क्योंकि सब गुटों को सन्तुष्ट करना होता है। हमारे यहाँ तो जात की बात भी बहुत चलती है। हर जात का मंत्री होना चाहिए। जात के

नाम पर अगर मंत्रिमंडल में मंत्री नहीं होंगे तो मंत्रिमंडल टिकाऊ नहीं बन सकेगा। उस स्थिति में जाति विशेष के लोग इसका विरोध करेंगे। आज भी यह हो रहा है। आज वहाँ पर मंत्रिमंडल के सदस्यों की संख्या कम है, 16 है। डा० जगन्नाथ मिश्र ने दूसरा तरीका निकाला है—लोगों को फंसा कर अपने साथ रखने का ताकि उनके अन्दर विरोधी पैदा न हों। उसके बावजूद विरोधी पैदा हो रहे हैं। आपस में वे लोग लड़ते हैं। जब ऐसा होता है तो राज्य का हित पीछे पड़ जाता है, व्यक्तिगत हित आगे आ जाता है। उस अवस्था में जनता की जो दिक्कतें हैं वे कैसे दूर हो सकती हैं। आपस में लड़ते हैं कि इस जाति का सदस्य मंत्रिमंडल में होना चाहिए, इसका नहीं होना चाहिए। मैं कहूँगा कि आप एक सिद्धान्त बना लें कि दस प्रतिशत में ज्यादा लोग मंत्रिमंडल में नहीं रखे जायेंगे। इसका फ़ैसला करके आप बैस्ट टेलेट को मंत्रिमंडल में लें, जो योग्य और अच्छे लोग हों, जो मंत्रिमंडल में आने लायक हों उनको आप लें। अभी जो तरीका है उसमें टेनेंटिड लोग नहीं लिये जाते हैं। गुट के आधार पर लोगों को जिया जाता है। अष्ट लोगों को भी ले लिया जाता है। आप चाहें तो मैं नाम बता सकता हूँ। बिहार में ऐसे लोगों को रखा गया जो 30-30 लाख रुपये रायल्टी के खा गये। तब कोयला खानों का राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं हुआ था। वे उस समय इन खानों के मालिक थे। 30-30 लाख तब वे खा गये। फिर भी मंत्रिमंडल में आये। आज वे मंत्रिमंडल में नहीं हैं। उनको लेने की कोशिश बहुत हुई। लेकिन मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि यहां केन्द्र में आप डट गये और कहा कि ऐसे लोगों को नहीं लिया जा सकता है। कहने का मतलब यह है कि आप एक सिद्धान्त निर्धारित करें ताकि मंत्रिमंडल भी ठीक हो और देश का भी हित हो। अगर

अच्छे लोगों को नहीं लेंगे, हर ऐसे गैरे तत्पू खरे को लेंगे तो आचाराम गयाराम की बीमारी दूर नहीं होगी। अपने सूबे की बात मैं आपको बता रहा था। हमारे सूबे में बहुत सी कारपोरेशंस और कमेटीज बना दी गई हैं। वहाँ पर सोलह का तो मंत्रिमंडल है जिसमें 15 मंत्री हैं कबिनेट रैंक के और एक डिप्टी मिनिस्टर हैं और 35 से 40 कारपोरेशंस हैं, कमेटीज हैं। शायद इससे भी अधिक उनकी संख्या होगी। एम० एल० एज० को उनका मेम्बर और चेयरमैन बना दिया गया है। जो विरोध करता है उसको चेयरमैन बना दिया जाता है। वहाँ कुछ खाने पीने का इंतजाम हो गया। और अभी आप ने दो चेयरमैन का हाल सुना, श्री नवल किशोर सिंह, एम० एल० ए०, चेयरमैन प्रबन कोआपरेटिव बैंक

संसदीय कार्य विभाग में उपमन्त्री (श्री बी० शंकरानन्द) : आप को नाम नहीं लेना चाहिए।

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री : ठीक है, मैं नाम नहीं लूँगा। आप ने देखा कि उन्होंने क्या गोलमाल किया। 13 लाख ० उस बैंक का खा गया। पटना स्टेशन के नम्बर 1 प्लेटफार्म को गिरवा रख दिया। वह भागा-भागा फिर रहा है। कई लोग गिरफ्तार हुए।

सभापति महोदय : अब आप अगले दिन बोलियेगा।

Now the House stands adjourned to meet on Monday, the 30th August, 1976 at 11 hrs.

18 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, August 30, 1976/Bhadra 5, 1898 (Saka).