[श्री लखनलाल कपूर]

लिए इन बातों पर जोरदार विरोध करते हुए मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि इस तरह का बिल आपको नहीं लाना चाहिए और अगर लाना चाहते हैं तो उसमें सुधार करके लाना चाहिए। जो ला कमीशन की रिपोर्ट आई है, उसकी जो रिकमेन्डेशन हैं कम से कम अगर उनको ही आप मानकर चलें तो थोड़ी सी राहत मिल सकती है। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि इस तरह के बिल से हिन्दुस्तान में न तो अच्छा वातावरण बना है और न बनेगा ही। आप जरा हिम्मत करके समाजवादी ढंग पर इस बिल को बनाइये जोकि जनहित के लिए अच्छा साबित हो।

SHRI DATTATRAYA KUNTE (Kolaba) : This reminds me of the first Bill that we discussed in the 1967 session of this House. It was just a Bill. We do not have any support for this Bill except from the Minister concerned. But if you look to the statute book, it is already there on the statute book squarely. This is a Bill with a very sinister motive. It is a four-clause Bill. One clause is the name of the Bill and the rest of the three clauses have a very sinister motive. Clause 1 refers to deletion of a particular sub-clause of section 1 meaning thereby that this becomes a permanent statute on the statute book instead of a statute which ought to expired by the end of the March 1970. Has the Minister given any reasons why he wants to do il ?

16 hrs.

SHRI B. S. MURTHY : Yes, Yes.

SHRI DATTATRAYA KUNTE : And if he has given and reasons, are they convincing ?

SHRI B. S. MURTHY : It is for you to be convinced.

SHRI DATTATRAYA KUNTE : That is exactely what I am trying to do. If the Minister feels that he has convinced the House, he does not know the mind of the House because the speeches that followed him have been against the Bill. One point is that he wants this Bill permanently on the statute book. How does the statute arise ? It was pointed out by Mr. Mahida that the Government of India passed a two-section Defence of India Act under which 500 and odd rules were passed, lot of persons were put in jail and properties requisitioned. Under these circumstances, to take defence under something that was done in a war long time back, is not correct. I do not know what the Minister wants to do. In the year 1962 an Act was passed, it was a temporary measure, far a temporary purpose than in 1962 because an amergency was declared.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You have been given two minutes.

SHRI DATTATRAYA KUNTE : I will continue tomorrow.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You can continue ; but you have been given only two minutes. You can continue tomorrow.

16.02 hrs.

Discussion re Rule of Governors, in the Recent Ministry—Making in U. P. and Bihar

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The House will now take up Discussion on the role of Govenors, in the recent Ministry-making in U.P. and Bihar. Altogehther an hour and a half have been alotted for this discussion.

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI (Mandsaur) : I require 25 minutes at least. I am the mover; I have to present my case.

SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU (Chittoor) : You have to have full discussion. Do you want a half or quarter discussion, Sir ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The time alloted is one hour and a half.

Shri Kothari may finish in ten minutes.

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI : I will take at least 25 minutes.

Sir, it is a sad commentary on the functioning of governers and democracy in this country that time and again we in this House have to concern overselves to discuss

their role, particularly with regard to ministry-making. The institution of Governors as envisaged in the Constitution is, or should be, a highly-respectable and an honoured one, but the Governors of various States by their own deeds and misdeeds and their conduct, have brought the institution of Governors into, contempt, in this country. The people in this country are gradually losing their faith in Governors. What we have been seeing is this : The Governors gradually are being reduced to the role of instruments of the ruling party at the Centre. Some of them have sunk so low that they have almost become puppets of the Home Ministry or the Home Minister. The role of governors in U.P. and Bihar is not an isolated incident. It is only a link in the long chain of events that have occurred in the States where Governors hove acted, not according to constitutional provisions, as they should have, but according to the behests and dictates of the ruling party, their leaders here. We have seen this in Rajasthan, Haryana, punjab, Madhy Pradesh and West Bengal. I would like to emphasise that the common feature of their manoeuvring has been to frustrate the attempts of the coalition parties which are opposed to the ruling party at the Centre to form Governments ; but to facilitate the attempts of the ruling Congress to form Governments in coaliation with other parties. Both in U. P. and Bihar and in the other places the practice adopted is this. When the opposition parties who contitute a viable majority, approach the Governor to form a Government, then, the Governor dilly-dallies ; he does not take action. He gives time to the ruling party to muster support by means, some of which are, shady. Defections are encouraged by all kinds of instruments, money probably being one of them. I do not know who does this exercise, where the money comes from, how it is offered and what is done. It is all hush-hush, under the table. But the fact is that defections are encouraged and the majority of the party which had approached the Governor to form the Ministry is gradually whittled down. After that has been done successfully, the ruling Congress nominates somebody, who may either have defected and comes forward or is put up as a candidate, and he forms the Ministry. This is the *modus operandi* of all this manoeuvring.

Coming to the specific instances of U.P. and Bihar, we have seen in the papers that it was probably on the 10th February that C. B. Gupta approached the Governor and said that he would resign in favour of Shri Charan Singh with whom an alliance had been effected for the formation of a coalition Ministry. The Governor of U. P., Dr. Gopala Raddi, who is an honourable man did not take any action. He dilly-dallied. Meanwhile, we are told he received an urgent summons from the Prime Minister to discuss the political situation in the State. What was the necessity for this urgent summons ? What business had he to come here and have confabulations with the Prime Minister and the Home Minister ? What was the nature of these confabulations ? A mystery surrounds these meetings. We are not informed as to what transpised what advice was tendered.....

SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU : Another extension offered.

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI : In consequence of that, the Governor went back to U.P., probably having all the mist cleared away from his mind, his eyes clear and glistening. Then he found that the Congress (R) had in what I would call a deed of surrender told Shri Charan Singh that he could go ahead and form a solo BKD Ministry and the Congress (R) would support it.

With regard to Shri Charan Singh's role in this nefarious affair, I shall deal with it latter. But the Governor then suddenly found that Shri Charan Singh, who previously did not enjoy a majority, according to him, had the majority, and he was called and sworn in as Chief Minister. Even the swearing in took place in circumstances which were surreptitious. The other opposition parties were not even invited. They received the invitation late, after the ceremony was over. What was so mysterious about the swearing in ceremony ? Why should others not have been invited when it was taking place ? Why his indecent haste ? Why this hush-hush ? But that was probably also a part of his game.

With regard to Shri Charan Singh, what shall I say ? Words fail me. His name has probably become a word in the distionary, to describe a defector who has defected many times. He is, shall we call

[Shri S. S. Kothari]

him the king of defectors or Chair Singh. All these epithets are apt.

The fact is that when he was almost on the point of an alliance with the ruling Congress, he deserted them and came over to Shri C. B. Gupta, and promised him support. Then Shri Gupta, in conjunction with other parties for the purpose of forming a coalition government, resigned in favour of Shri Charan Singh. Having achieved this, Shri Charan Singh virtually stabed Shri Gupta in the back and decided to join the ruling Congress. It was crossing and double-crossing, and probably he will go down in history with an honoured place there, as the king of defectors, but Mr. Charan Singh and his class or tribe have brought a stigma on democracy. They have weakened the fibre of democracy, and it is up to the leaders of all the parties here to see that this game of defection is stopped if democracy is to survive in this country. The strictest possible penalties, political penalties, should be levied on those who indulge in this nefarious game of defection.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Kindly conclude in two or three minutes.

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI : I will try to expedite.

I now come to Bihar which is another sordid affair as far as the role of the Governor is concerned. I am reminded of a recent cartoon in a leading paper in which Shri Kanungo, the Governor, says on the phone, "Hello, Indiraji, what have I decided today ?" What better commentary can there be on the role of the Governors ?

The Governors take instructions from the Prime Minister or the Home Minister. The Prime Minister or the Home Minister thinks for them and like, an automatic electronic robots the Governors just carry out the instructions which have been filled in their head by the Central Ministers here. During the British regime we used to hear that decisions were taken at White Hall and implemented in Delhi. We now find that decisions are taken at Delhi and implemented in Lucknow, Patna and other State Capitals.

I now come to Bihar in particular. Mr. Harihar Singh, before the Congress split into two, had a clear majority for a considerable time. He immediately approached the Governor to be permitted to form a Ministry, but the Governor could not see any logic, or he was not convinced that he had a majority, and the did not permit him to form a Ministry. But when Mr. Daroga Rai went and claimed before the Governor that he had a majority, even though the fact probably is that in a Hause of 319 he has only 140—that would be apparent when the Assembly meets, it would be tested on the floor of the House—the Governor in his wisdom decided to call Shri Daroga Rai and ask him to form a Ministry. At that time Mr. Upendranath Verma on behalf of the S. V. D. also claimed a majority. But the Governor ignored him. There again in indecent haste he called upon Shri Daroga Rai to form the Ministry.

I have here two reports. These reports were placed on the Table of the House not at 11 O' Clock in the morning because then I would have studied them probably, but at 3.45. 15 minutes before I was to speak. Anyway, that does not matter. On the 11th February the hon. Governor, Mr. Nityanand Kanungo, writes to the President :

> "In my opinion no Government with any reasonable prospect of stability can be formed now. Therefore, the President's Proclamation should be extended for another term of six months."

That was on the 11th February. I am coming to a very important point. I am the Mover of the motion and I shall take another five minutes.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : No, no; you have already exceeded your time.

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI : Just a few days later, on 14th February. the Governor suddenly found : "this is a good enough combination on which the Ministry can formed". Are not we to suspect the malafides of the Governor ? Or, what had he in hin his mind ?

In our Constitution, there is a lacuna. Governors are not answerable to anybody in the State or in the Centre. The Presi-

dent can be impeached, but not the Governor. Therefore, the Home Ministry has to accept responsibility for this. It has acted arbitrarily and it can get away with anything. The Governor has become the puppet and the Home Ministry used that puppet as an instrument to carry out its purpose and in the interest of its own party.

Governors' Conference was held in Delhi sometime back. Mr. Chavan also attended it. It was stated there that some code of conduct and guidelines should be laid down for the conduct of Governors. Mr. Chavan is reported to have said that no guidelines could be laid down as the situation differs from State to State. That is a situation that ideally suits the ruling party. The Centre it appears wants to keep the powers to itself so that it can manouevre. It does not want to lay down guidelines and to that extent I would say that it is also acting in a manner which can only be described as I am sorry to use the word—malafide...(*Interruptions*.) It means that healthy democratic conventions and constitutional processes have been subverted and people are becoming cynical and disillusioned which would lead to a weekening of the democratic fabric in this country.

Finally, the present Governors of U. P. and Bihar have acted in a manner which is against constitutional propriety and I demand that they be dismissed immediately.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI (Gonda) : The manner in which the Governors of U. P. and Bihar have acted recently has shocked the whole of the country. By thus acting, they have disregarded the principle of democratic functioning and have brought into contempt our democratic constitution. Recently we have had increasing indication of those who are in power holding the Constitution in contempt and throwing it overboard, as also the normal conventions and rules that go to the working of the Constitution. For example, recently when the Act on natinalisation of banks was struck down by the Supreme Court Judges, the remarks of the Prime Minister and her able lieutenant, Mr. Khadilkar are something over which we should ponder. Democracy means respect of law and respect of the Constitution and the supremacy of the law. Law and Constitution are being twisted to suit the convenience of those in power and to implement the will of the individual. These are signs of dictatorship, may be of any kind, of the communist kind or of the other kind. These are things which we should take note of, the Governors, I am afraid, did not act according to their conscience. By conscience, I do not mean the new "conscience", but the old conscience as we understand it. They did not act according to their conscience; or according to the Constitution. They were directed to act in a certain manner and they acted as agents of those who are in power here. They were helpless, I am sorry to say that they acted just like Government servants. Because they had to depend for their bread and butter, on them therefore, they had to do what they were directed to do.

Take Bihar and Uttar Pradesh. The whole thing is the result of unprincipled, sordid, political manoeuvrings by the hon. Prime Minister's group in flagrant violation and contradiction of the norms that should guide the working of our democracy. I say this with a great deal of responsiblility. When did the trouble in Utter Pradesh start first ? The trouble started, as you all know, with the election of the President, Mr. Giri. During that time Guptaji had the temerity not to act "according to the P.M's conscience" and vote against Dr. Sanjiva Reddy. From that time on persecution was launched agaist him. But side by side, the Prime Minister also made overtures to win him over. She gave indirect assurances and said, "If you come with me, your are safe and your Ministry will continue." Guptaji as the chip of the old bloc, said, "I have given my word ; I have pledged that I will stand by the organisation ; and I shall stand by the organisation." Then we saw in the papers loud protestations that his Ministry will be overthrown. The Prime Minister hurried not once, twice, but thrice ; she toured round the entire, big State of U.P.; she had a hectic tour programme going from district to district meeting the MLAs, speaking to the people on the streets and giving promises, all kinds of inducements, about which my hon. friend has already mentioned, and which I do not wish to repeat. She gave not only inducements but threats. I

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

have myself spoken to an MLA who was a supporter of Guptaji. He said, "wha can I do ? I am being persecuted by the income-tax people." So, various methords were adopted and they put forth their utmost efforts to wean away the people from Gupta's side. He also heard the hon; Prime Minister to say that "I can throw away Gupta's Ministry in a trice." Similar activities were carried on in Gujarat. After this came the situation that we saw recently in Uttar Pradesh.

In U.P. Gupta was being supported by the Swatantra, Jan Sangh, SSP, Hindu Mahasabha, KMP, and a number of independents. Gupta wanted a stable Ministry. He also wanted to avoid prevent another mid-term election. Therefore he said, "Let us offer the Chief Ministership to Charan Singh." Our leader, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh himself went to Lucknow and they had talks with Charan Singh. It was arranged that we would elect Charan Singh as the leader, and all the other parties would like-wise elect Charan Sigh as their leader, with the condition that the progressive measures that Gupta had adopted, measures which are aimed at bringing about great social justice, measures which would give rights to the most depressed of the people in this country, for whom our madam Prime Minister and her group shed tears will continue to be taken. Charan Singh agreed. The agreement was that Guptaji resign, nominating Charan Singh as his successor, and Charan Singh, in response, would issue a suitable statement. That letter and the statement were sent to the other group. A draft of the letter was sent to Charan Singh and approved, and his draft statement was seen and approved by us. Another part of this agreement was the clarification made by Kumbha Ram Arya regarding the programme. Then, in consonance with this agreement, on the 10th February, a letter was sent to the Governor and Charan Singh on his part issued a suitable statement in the press.

While all this was going on, the hon. D. P. Mishra, the ex-Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh, a very important political operator belonging to the hon. Prime Minister's party, was staying in Lucknow. He was camping in Charan Singh's room or verandah, I do not exactly know. Charan Singh told him, "You have missed the bus; I cannot do anything more." Mr. Jagjiwan Ram also went there. Charan Singh said, "I am sorry I cannot meet you now. I have already finalised the matter." Therefore, that was the end.

SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM *rose—*

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI : He did not meet you. Did he meet you ? I am only saying that he did not meet you.

THE MINISTER OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (SHRI JAGJIWAN RAM) : He wrote a letter that he was going to move a no-confidence motion against the Gupta Ministry.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI : Whatever he may have written is not a fact that, he told you "I will not meet you." I am only saying that he refused to meet you. His comment on Mr. Jagjiwan Ram's statement was "The cat is now out of the bag", *i.e*, they want a mid-term poll. Mr. Jagjiwan Ram's party was very angry with him. Next morning, Mr. Kamlapati said, "I am going to claim Chief Ministership because I am the leader of the largest party." Mr. Charan Singh again issued a statement on 11th February that he will not flinch to take up the responsibility of Chief Ministership if he was called upon to do so. Mr. Bahuguna, another eminent man in the Prime Minister's party, described the BKD alliance with Mr. Gupta's group as "an unholy alliance." The CPI, the comrades of the Prime Minister's party, said, this alliance between Mr. Charan Singh and the Syndicate was for loves and fishes of office. But we had not counted the clever political operator, Mr. D. P. Misra. He now began frantic negotiations with Mr. Charan Singh. Next day, *i.e.* 12th February, ominous signs appeared. Mr. Kamlapati still disclaimed that Mr. Charan Singh had a majority. But we found a very interesting report in the *National Herald*, the Prime Minister's own special paper. Please remember Mr. Charan Singh had not yet been called by the Governor. The comment of *National Herald* was :

> "It is too early to call Mr. Charan Singh. Mr. Kamlapati's group should have been in readiness to make necessary adjustments and sacrifice, specially with

the knowledge of Mr. Charan Singh's charming chameleon-like changeability."

It is not our paper, but the Prime Minister's paper.

AN HON. MEMBER : What is your paper ?

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI : We have no paper; we are the have-nots.

At this time, the Governor left for Delhi ; whether he left on his own initiative or whether he was summoned by the masters from here is shrouded in mystery. From here another clever gentleman, Mr. Bhagat, went to win over Charan Singh while here in Delhi Mr. Kumbha Ram Arya, escorted by Bahuguna, called on the Prime Minister. Both at Lucknow and here, reverse gear action started with great vigour. We also saw reports in the papers that the Congress high sources had indicated that the party was now willing to offer Chief Mimistership to Mr. Charan Singh. As everybody knows, Mr. Charan Singh is mad after Chief Ministership. When we had offered Chief Ministership to him and Mr. Jagjiwan Ram's Congress was dragging its feet ; they were not willing to offer it to him, because they had to reward Mr. Kamlapati also. But now they thought, let us throw overboard Mr. Kamlapati. We understand that Mr. D. P. Misra, Mr. K. D. Malviya and a few others were camping in Lucknow who carried on frantic negotiations with Mr. Charan Singh. There were mid-night exchanges of messages and letters between Mr. Charan Singh and Mr. Misra. The Prime Minister had to bend backwards. She had to bend on her knees to placate Mr. Charan Singh. She said, "You form your ministry. We do not ask for any price. You be a minority party. We will give you support from outside." All this was managed by the clever political operator, Mr. D. P. Misra.

In the meanwhile, the Governor had returned to Lucknow. He said, "I am in no hurry." Not only that ; he gave the impression that he was not only in a hurry but would assess properly the situation. We thought, perhaps it would be all right. But Mr. Charan Singh's attitude started changing. When his attitude started changing, Mr. Gupta wrote to the Governor on the 14th Febuary, "We have withdrawn our support to Mr. Charan Singh. We will now support Mr. Girdhari Lal, who is an eminent Harijan leader of thies State (*Interruptions*). I hope you will not say that he is not your leader.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I would request her to conclude her speech.

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI : These negotiations went on. The two leaders had meeting with the Governor on the 15th. On the 17th the Governor had given them time to come again. He said, "I would like to assess the majority." He also said : I do not want to count hands, I do not want the parading of members but I want the break-up of the members party-wise. He called Mr. Charan Singh in the morning of the 17th. Then Shri Girdharilal was called to see the Governor with the leaders of all those parties plus some members of the BKD who had defected and some members of Shri Kamalapathi Tripathi who also had come over to us ; only a few had gone only two or three. The full members would have gone if the Governor wanted them to do so. But when Shri Girdharilal went, he was very unhappy. Along with the leaders of the supporting parties and other independents, the Governor's remark was 'why have you all come "I am unhappy." Why was he unhappy ? Because the strength of Shri Girdharilal was embarrassing to him.

We thought that after the meeting these leaders of the parties, the Governor will exercise some judicious thinking and come to certain correct conclusions. But we learnt later that even before he said Girdharilal and his supporters, the BKD office knew in the morning itself, that the swearing in ceremony will be at 2.30 P.M. That is why they were organising a procession. We came to know about it only later. Why was there such a hurry for the swearing the ceremony ? Because, Shri Charan Singh is a great believer in astrology. He was told by some astrologer that according to his stars he has to be sworn in by the 17th. That is why he was in a hurry. Nowadays, astrology has become the guiding factor of those who are sitting there in the opposite

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

benches. They need the services of Sadhus, tantrik sadhus etc.

For want of time I cannot go into the details. I will only say that the relative strength of the various political par ies was not assessed properly before a decision was taken by the Governor. He acted more as an agent of the Central Government and carried out their orders.

So far as Bihar is concerned, there could be nothing more dirty or sordid than what took place there. Shri Harihar Singh had a majority in the middle of July. He had 183 out of a House of 316. Out of 318 two were dead. During the Presidential election Shri Harihar Singh sided with us and this incurred the PM's wrath. But even after that he had the support of 184 members. So, he requested the Governor to invite him to form a Government. But he was not called. All of a sudden, this report was sent by the Governor. This document is not worth the paper on which it is written. The first report of the 11th says : nobody has a clear majority he cannot be sure of a stable government and, therefore, he cannot make up his mind ; so, President's rule should be continued for another six months. He also says that the names of 17 members are found in both the lists hence their loyality is dubious. If the names of 17 members were found in both the lists, how did he in his next report come to the conclusion that they belonged to, or took the side of, Shri Daroga Rai, and on that ground accepted the majority claim of Shri Daroga Rai.

May be, because of another interesting thing, this has happened. According to *Navbharat Times*, the term of this Governor is going to be extended by another year. Thus either a Damocle's Sword was hung over the Governor's head or a carrot was being held out before him for taking the action which he did.

Finally, I would say that a person in high office should function with a sense of responsibility. He must maintain the dignity of his high office instead of bringing it into contempt and disgrace. I would say that the post of Governor should be abolished, if this post is going to be misused in this manner. The Chief Justice of the State can carry on the formal duties of the Governor. He will bring to bear a more judicious mind on his work.

श्री द्वा० ना० तिवारी (गोपालगंज) : उपाध्यक्ष जी, हिन्दी में एक कहावत है कि तिल का ताड़ बनाना और आज यही हो रहा है। दो प्रान्तों की बात है, एक यू. पी. और एक बिहार की। मैं यू.पी. के बारे में अधिक नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ। वहां के सदस्य कहेंगे। लेकिन उस सम्बन्ध में एक बात मैं जरूर कहना चाहता हूं कि चरणसिंह को फुसलाकर ये लोग ले गए तो चरणसिंह बहुत अच्छे थे और फिर हम अपनी तरफ ले आए तो वह खराब हो गए। यही स्टैंडर्ड इन लोगों का है तो भगवान बचाए।

अब बिहार के बारे में मैं कुछ कहना चाहता हूं। 1967 के चुनाव के बाद बिहार में कोई स्थिर गवर्नमेंट बन नहीं सकी। किस वजह से नहीं बन सकी ? राजा रामगढ़ की वजह से, और कुछ शोषित दल के भाइयों की वजह से, दो ही दल थे जिनकी वजह से वहां कोई स्थिर गवर्नमेंट नहीं बन सकी। यही राजा रामगढ़ इधर से उधर जाकर गवर्नमेंट को हराते रहे हैं। तो उन पर कैसे विश्वास करें यह समझ में नहीं आता। जब कांग्रेस के दोनों दल एक थे और गवर्नमेंट गिर गयी थी, और उसके बाद कोई गवर्नमेंट नहीं बनी थी तो यहीं इसी हाउस में अपोजीशन के सदस्यों ने कहा था कि हरिहर सिंह को लालच दिया गया है कि तुम 175 वोट प्रेसीडेंट के चुनाव में दिलाओ तो तुम्हारी गवर्नमेंट बनने की इजाजत हम देंगे।

16.37 hrs.

[Shri K. N. Tiwary in the Chair]

इसके मानी यह थे कि उस समय उनके पास इतने वोट नहीं थे। जब प्रेसीडेंट का चुनाव हुआ तो मालूम हुआ कि वे माइनारिटी में हैं और कांग्रेस पार्टी में भी उस समय माइनारिटी में थे। जब हम लोग अलग हुए तो उस वक्त हरिहर सिंह जी 86 क्लेम कर रहे थे।

हम लोगों के 82 आदमी अलग थे। 82 आदमियों ने तो लिख कर दे दिया था कि हमारा विश्वास हरिहरसिंह में नहीं है और आज भी वह दस्तखत गवर्नर के पास मौजूद हैं। उनके पास केवल 25 आदमी हैं। 25 से 27 नहीं होंगे और हमारे पास 82 आदमी कांग्रेस पार्टी के हैं। गवर्नर ने किया क्या ? उन्होंने यही कहा कि तुम 160 कम से कम दिखला दो। हरिहर सिंह ने कांग्रेस मेम्बर्स को लेकर 186 की तादाद दी और कहा कांग्रेस (आर) उनके पास केवल 35-40 आदमी हैं जबकि हम लोग 82 आदमी हैं तो बाकी रह कितना जाता है ? दूसरी बात यह है कि पी. एस. पी. और कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की सपोर्ट पर गवर्नमेंट बन सकती है। तो कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी और पी. एस. पी. यह डिसाइड कर चुकी थी कि हम कांगो के साथ नहीं जाएंगे...(**व्यवधान**)...यह कांगो इनके लिए अखबारों में निकलता है—सी० ओ० एन० जी (ओ), हम अपनी तरफ से नहीं कह रहे हैं। वे लोग चाहते थे कि वे कांग्रेसी (राइट) के साथ रहेंगे। कांग्रेस (राइट) हमारे लिए लिखा जाता है और वे हैं कांग्रेस (ओ)। उस बीच में एस० एस०पी०वाले कूद पड़े।...(**व्यवधान**)...बराबर हमारा और लोगों का यह मत रहा है कि जो भी सब से बड़ी पार्टी हो उसको गवर्नर काल करे, उसकी मेजारिटी हो या न हो। कांग्रेस वालों ने, याने हम लोगों ने दिखला दिया था कि 84 सदस्य हमारे पास हैं जो सबसे बड़ी पार्टी है। सब ने दस्तखत करके दे दिया था, लेकिन उस पर भी गवर्नर ने नहीं माना और कहा कि तुम 160 सदस्य दिखलाओ। उस वक्त तक पी० एस० पी० की कांफ्रेंस बड़ौदा में नहीं हुई थी, इंफार्मली हम लोगों को सपोर्ट के लिए कहा था, फार्मली नहीं कह सकते थे जब तक उनकी कान्फ्रेंस पास न कर दे। उसी की राह कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी भी देख रही थी। एस० एस० पी० चाहती थी कि कम्युनिस्ट, एस० एस०पी०, पी० एस० पी० और लोकतान्त्रिक दल का ब्लाक बने, लेकिन वह बन नहीं सका। श्री रामानन्द तिवारी लीडर बने, लेकिन उन्होंने डिनाउन्स कर दिया कि हम लीडर नहीं हैं। ये लोग कहते हैं कि तुम लीडर हो, लेकिन वह कहते हैं कि हम लीडर नहीं हैं—अब ऐसी स्थिति में गवर्नर क्या करे।...(**व्यवधान**)...

मैं आपके सामने फैक्ट्स रख देना चाहता हूं, लीगल बात मैं नहीं जानता, लीगल बात तो हमारे अशोक सैन साहब कहेंगे कि गवर्नर को पावर थी या नहीं थी। लेकिन वे बेचारे जो एस०वी०डी० के लीडर चुने गये उनके खिलाफ़ डिस्पिलनरी एक्शन चल रहा है—ऐसी हालत में वे लीडर कैसे रहें। एस०एस०पी० के लीडर कैसे रहे जबकि उनके खिलाफ़ पार्टी डिस्पिलनरी एक्शन ले रही है, उनको निकाला जा रहा है। वहां एस०एस०पी० वालों के दो दल हो गये हैं। एस०एस०पी० वाले चाहते हैं कि मिनिस्ट्री मिले या न मिले, लेकिन हमारा दल ठीक रहे और उसी को सम्भालने में वे लोग मर रहे हैं।

जब बड़ौदा कान्फ्रेंस हो गई और पी०एस० पी० वालों ने बड़ोदा से वायर किया कि वे दरोगा राय की गवर्नमेन्ट को सपोर्ट करते हैं, तो भी गवर्नर ने नहीं माना और कहा कि जब तक लिखकर नहीं देते हैं हम इसको नहीं मानते। हालांकि हम लोगों की मैजोरिटी वहाँ पर तब भी थी, लेकिन गवर्नर ने नहीं माना और यहाँ पर रिपोर्ट भेज दी कि यहां पर स्थिर गवर्नमेन्ट बनने की उम्मीद नहीं है। जब पी० एस० पी० वाले बड़ौदा से आये और उन्होंने फार्मली लिखकर दिया कि वे दरोगा राय को रिपोर्ट करते हैं.....

श्री सु० कु० तापड़िया (पाली) : इसी वजह से गवर्नर की टर्म एक्सटेण्ड की गई है।

श्री द्वा० ना० तिवारी : बिहार में ही नहीं हुई है और जगहों में भी हुई है, औरों को किस बात का इनाम मिल रहा है।

मैं कह रहा था कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के 26

[श्री द्वा० ना० तिवारी]

आदमी और पी० एस० पी० वालों के 17 आदमियों ने जब गवर्नर को लिखकर दिया कि हम दरोगा राय की लीडरशिप को मानते हैं। इसके पहले उन्होंने एस० एस० पी० वालों से पूछा कि तुम स० दल बनाना चाहते हो या नहीं। उन्होंने कहा कि हमारा तो घर ही बिगड़ा हुआ है, हम कैसे बनयें। उन्होंने यानि पी. एस. पी. और सी० पी० आई० ने दरोगा राय को सपोर्ट करने के लिये क्यों लिखा ? इस लिये लिखा कि लोग चाहते थे कि वहाँ पर पौपुलर गवर्नमेन्ट बने, इस लिये कि नहीं दरोगा राय चीफ़ मिनिस्टर बनें, बल्कि वहाँ पर पौपुलर गवर्नमेन्ट बने, एस० एस० पी० वाले डिसाइड नहीं कर सकते थे। गवर्नर ने फिर सरदार हरिहर सिंह से कहा कि तुम सबूत दो कि तुम्हारे साथ 186 आदमी हैं। वे ज़बानी तो कहते थे, लेकिन लिख कर कुछ नहीं दिया। उसके बाद हम लोगों ने क्या किया—84 हमारे अपने आदमी थे, 10 झारखण्ड पार्टी के थे, 6 शोषित दल के थे, 7 हुल झारखण्ड के थे और 15 इण्डीपेन्डेन्ट थे, इनके अलावा पी० एस० पी० और कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी वालों ने जब लिख कर दिया और गवर्नर को विश्वास हो गया—यह विश्वास चाहे दो घन्टे में हो या दो दिन में हो या दो महिने में हो, मैं उसमें नहीं जाना चाहता, लेकिन जब गवर्नर को विश्वास हो गया कि वहाँ पर गवर्नमेन्ट टिक सकती है, उन्होने रिकमेण्ड किया कि वहाँ सरकार बन सकती है।

यू० पी० में गुप्ता जी ने तीन महीने तक असेम्बली नहीं बुलाई, इस लिये नहीं बुलाई थी कि उनकी जल्दी मौत हो जायेगी, लेकिन बिहार में जैसे ही मिनिस्ट्री फौर्म हुई, दरोगा राय ने तुरन्त 16 मार्च को असेम्बली बुला ली और वहाँ पर अपनी स्ट्रेन्थ को मेज़र किया जा सकता है। अगर आपकी ताकत ज़्यादा होगी तो हम हट जायेंगे, लेकिन ज़्यादा होने की बात नहीं है, दिन-ब-दिन इनकी शक्ति क्षीण होती जायेगी और हम लोगों की शक्ति बढ़ती जायेगी।

स्थिति यही है, आप इसको मानें या न मानें।

SHRI RANGA (Srikakulam) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is indeed a very unpleasant task to have to take part in this debate. Where are our standards ? Where are our morals ? Where are our rules of game ? Where are our guidelines ? If cricket were to be played in the manner in which these political games in Bihar and UP are being played, do you think the rest of the world will care to play with our players here and take part in the game of cricket with us ? Everybody is clear about one thing. When they want to pay any compliment to an hon. man, they say, 'You play cricket'. Is that the manner in which this Government, this Party and ourselves are behaving in public life ? These are the States of Rajan Babu and Purshottam Das Tandanji. Purshottam Das Tandanji was the President of the Congress. I was also a Member of that Working Committee. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru refused to co-operate with him. Tandanji had majority. This very same Misra, this many-sided coloured Misra, advised Tandanji to defy Jawaharlal Nehru but Tandanji said, 'Presidentship is not more important than the prestige of the Congress' and he finally resigned. That was the standard and from that we have come down to the standards of this Ministry of Indiraji. (*Interruptions*) Although, I pity the present Home Minister, I like him personally and that is why I am so unhappy. As I claim him as one of my fellow kisans. I felt happy when he was brought from Bombay to this place because a kisan was coming here and was going to be in charge of the Defence Ministry because kisans have always taken the pride for defending this country. And this kisan came over here and he has been transferred to this Ministry and from that time onwards his fall has begun. And who has conspired in his fall ? It is the Prime Minister and it is this Prime Minister, a master of this show that is going on in this country. And against whom ? Who are their enemies ? We said that those who owe their allegiance to parties outside, to powers

outside, to politices outside might possibly become the enemies of our country. Then later on we said there are those people who are supporting China which aggressed on us. Therefore, we asked the Home Minister and others also to ban them. They were not prepared to do it. They were not satisfied with it. They have now gone on hobnobbing with these people and they are dependent upon them to-day. They are not the enemies of this country according to my friends. But these of my right are their recent enemies. They are the latest erstwhile colleagues of theirs because I was also one of their erstwhile colleagues. These are their worst possible enemise now. What is it they are traying to do? To destroy the Governments which in those days we were very proud to instal and even recently they were claiming them to be their own.

They are getting Mr. Daroga Rai who is supposed to be a Congressman and what sort of Congress Ministry is it? Is it given any name? That gentleman said in answer to a journalist who put question, 'How many Ministers are you going to have?', 'How can I say? It is a continuing process.' (*Interruptions*) This is the Ministry that has been installed, in Bihar.

Here, in the Uttar Pradesh they had their own gentleman, Mr. C.B. Gupta. I do not agree with his politics. My hon. friend, Smt. Sucheta Kripalani, in spite of the fact that she is in the excellent company of my Dada, found it possible to carry on with the Ministry under standings of that gentleman. But I never developed that much of admiration for him although I have affections for him. He has been known for very bad politics. Now he is reaping the benefit of it all. Will not those gentlemen come to reap the benefits of these immoral politics that they are indulging in? They are taking pride in that; they are not ashamed of that. By the time 1972 comes by what yardsticks are they going to decide who should be in power? Sir, I have been telling them for years, after having had experience of the failure of the British and the American systems of ruling by mere majority that this a is very bad way of doing things and denigrating democracy in this country. (*Inerruptions*) Some of my hon. friends will prostrate for the sake of a small pittance of a job. There were several of us, including Dadaji, who never bothered for a ministership when ministership counted ten times more than what it is today. And, therefore, Sir, is this the play of politics which they should indulge in? Would it not have been better to do it otherwise? What are those yardsticks by which you decide who should rule? You say, majority. Are you going by that now? No. When Mr. Ajoy Mukerjee, the present West Bengal Chief Minister was having his talks with Mr. Mahamaya Prasad Sinha of the B. K. D. my hon. friend Mr. Chavan asked the Governor to dismiss him. He was dismissed. At that time they did not find fault with that. We wanted them to ban all the communist parties and then dismiss that Ministry. They did not do it. But when it suited their purposes, they did it, but in a wrong way. In this manner, in a wrong way, they are going on. Shri C.B, Gupta was supposed to be having majority. Is Mr. Charan Singh having majority today? Nobody knows. Is Daroga Parsad Rai having his majority? Nobody knows. Who is supposed to know? The Governor. Somebody said, he has left his mind here. He came to Delhi. Whatever judgment the Prime Minister makes, that is the judgment of the Governor. It is that Governor who has to decide who is having majority and who is not having majority. Is this right? Is it the right yardstick? Is this the manner in which democracy is to be carried on? My hon. friend sometime ago mentioned of the goings-on in other States, of the *Aya-Ram* and *Gaya-Ram* practice. Who is the *Gaya-Ram*? Who is the *Aya-Ram*? These are the two facts of the Prime Mister. These are the two facts of the Home Minister. These are the two facts of those people who wanted the role of Governors to be carried on in this unethical, unsuitable, un-Indian fashion. There is no such thing as majority therein these places; it is all a make-belief. Then, my hon. friend Shrimati Suchetaji said that some people have defected to them. My hon. friend here, the Home Minister, says that some people have defected to his side. And, in between, who are the go-betweens? Here is another friend of mine, Shri Jagiwan Ram, a friend of 40 years. And, what a fall? There is another, Mr, Mishra and so many others. Is this country to be

[Shri Ranga]

governed and to be administered by such people as these, with this lack of standards, lack of principles, lack of guidelines, lack of rules, etc ? It is high time they turn a new phase, they turn a new leaf, in their public conduct in this age of Mahatma Gandhi it is still the age of Mahatma Gandhi, in spite of these people and their conduct. In this age, I should think, they should have decided to turn a new leaf and then invite into dishonourable partnership, but an honourable, democratic, decent, patriotic partnership of all elements, people and groups who would be loyal to democracy and to fundamental rights.

What does that mean ? It means, first of all, that these two groups must live down their hatred of each other. We must also be prepared to expect them to come together and by the help of all others we must come together so that in this country we can have a good government, a national government, a healthy, wholesome, morally sustainable democratic government of the common people, not of anybody else.

SHRI A. K. SEN (Calcutta North-West) : It is not difficult to agree with many of the things said in support of the Motion, namely, that the Governor must act according to his own individual judgment and must bear an impartial mind on the problems before him in choosing who should form the Ministry. If there were an iota of truth and evidence in the allegation that he has departed from these standards, it would have been possible for many of us to support the Motion.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) : I should like to live to see that day.

SHRI A. K. SEN : But unfortunately, apart from saying that the Governor has not done this, no evidence has been forthcoming, and there has been an attempt to forget the realities of the situation. Let us not throw the blame which possibly sticks to almost every political party in the matter on to the Governor. The Governors have a very difficult time in these two states.

Two irreconcilable characters who have fought for years over the leadership of the Government there, Shri C. B. Gupta and Shri Charan Singh, suddenly found amity between themselves, and declared that they have now come together. Shri C. B. Gupta who was the then Chief Minister, had advised the Governor to accept his resignation and to call upon Shri Charan Singh to form the Ministry.

Dr. Gopala Reddi had behaved with the utmost rectitude throughout. Even when accusations of partiality were made against him, he had said that so long as the Chief Minister had not demonstrated to have lost his majority, he would be guided by his advice. That Chief Minister gave him advice to call on Shri Charan Singh to form the Government.

SHRI SHEO NARAYAN (Basti) : Why did he not call on him immediately to form the Government ? As an eminent lawyer, I hope the hon. member will clear the position.

SHRI A. K. SEN : Dr. Gopala Reddi, being Governor, is expected to act with deliberation and mature thought. It would be very difficult to imagine Governors acting on the spur of the moment. He has to deliberate on the matter when he is advised he has to find out, according to paramount constitutional requirements, whether the man proposed can command majority in the legislature and there is a chance of his forming a stable government. When it was made amply clear that all the parties went to garland him—each party wanted to have him as the Chief Minister, both wings of the Congress and possibly everybody else—then is it possible for the Governor to refuse to call upon him to form the Government ? In this Svayamvara ceremony those who garlanded Charan Singh ought to share the blame, not the Governor. This is a new Svayamvara ceremony where from a lot of garlands one has to choose one garland only. Therefore, Charan Singh had to choose one garland and reject the others.

17 hrs.

SHRI PILLOO MODY : Remarkably poor taste.

SHRI A. K. SEN : I can appreciate and understand the depth of feeling and disappointment of those whose garlands have

been rejected by Charan Singh. But that is no justification to put the blame on the Governor or show their wrath at the Governor. Is it expected that the Governor would be a participant in the maligning of the man who has rejected the garland so affectionately offered to him? He has done his job.

SHRI PILOO MODY : I am surprised that the Governor himself did not garland him.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai) : I do not know whether Shri Sen is so sure that he has not got the divorce writ yet in his pocket.

SHRI A. K. SEN : If he has, the Governor will again be called upon to exercise his discretion.

The question is whether in the circumstances he has not acted to the best of his judgment. Those who have brought this motion have miserably failed, if I may say so with respect, to put one evidence before the House which would colour our judgment against the Governor.

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI : The two reports are there, please read them.

SHRI A. K. SEN : I have got the reports in front of me and they are clear. When the hon. Member was speaking, I listened to him respectfully.

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI : I am listening to you with equal respect.

SHRI A. K. SEN : I am very happy at the assurance.

The question is what has the Governor, Dr. Gopala Reddi, done to merit this sudden condemnation. Nothing whatsover. His only duty is to find a constitutional Government and to choose the man who will make that constitutional Government possible. The future will show whether his judgment is correct or not. Most patently when Mr. Charan Singh has been selected in the circumstances as representing the majority in the U. P. Assembly it is not for this House to say that the judgment is wrong in the absence of any evidence whatsoever.

Going to Bihar, I have the first report of Mr. Kanungo. It is an excellent and an impartial report. If anybody felt aggrieved it was Mr. Daroga Rai because, though he had 84 Members behind him solidly and two or three parties had expressed their support in his favour. Mr. Kanungo wanted the written support of the P.S.P. and of the Communist Party of India. One would imagine that normally, taking the precedents of other countries where coalition Governments are the order of the day, as it is going to be in most of the States in India, the leader of the largest party is called upon to form the Government. It is only when he declines that the Head of the State calls upon others to form the Government. In this case, the grievance, if any, was on the side of Mr. Daroga Rai because he represented the largest possible majority in the Assembly and yet, because two or three other parties who had proclaimed their support had not given it in writing because they were meeting in open session in their own party forums, Mr. Kanungo refused to call him. But then what happened? On the 14th February he says, this is the report I am reading, "Today at 9 P.M. those two parties had given the written assurance." Therefore, the ground on which Mr. Rai was not called earlier had disappeared. The two parties had given written assurance, and when that written assurance came it showed clearly that he had about 173 Members to support him. That was a clear majority in the House. Is it then still for the Governor to say that because there would be some people who would question his judgment, he will refuse to call the man who has the undoubted support of a vast majority of the Members of the House, thereby stalling it and continuing the President's rule. I think he acted admirably in trying to bring to an end the President's rule because in the future political set-up of India there will be coalition Government in many places and it will be wrong for the Governor to continue President's rule if he could explore successfully the possibility of setting up a constitutional Government. That is exactly what his duty is under the Constitution : to try his utmost to see that a Constitutional Government is set up..... (*Interruptions.*)

The opposite group which was formed a few days earlier and which had elected Mr.

[Shri A. K. Sen]

Ramanand Tiwari as the leader fell into disarray over some matter over which we need not go, as a result of which Mr. Tiwari himself disclaimed that he was leading his group; he said : I have nothing to do with this. Many important leaders of the political parties disclaimed this coalition and openly said that they would be opposing this coalition. In those circumstances, it was the fittest duty of the Government, having regard to the pledge he had taken to uphold the Constitution, to call the man who in his judgment represented the majority of the legislature and was, according to his judgment again, capable of forming a stable Government. Let us not bring in the quarrels among ourselves. In this game of politics during the last few months, it is futile to call in the code of chivalry to justify the conduct of either the one or the other because if there has been any victim in this fight on both sides, it is the code of chivalry. That is also evident from the speeches made on the floor of the House taday. Therefore, if we have been guilty of lapses on our part in upholding the best standards, let us say so. We all agree with the appeal of the leader of the Swatantra party and I think it found an echo in the hearts of many of us. After all it is still for us to uphold the best standards in public life and if we fail to do it the blame is not on the Governor just as if we fail to uphold the best standards the blame is not on the judges who must uphold the constitution and judge, people according to their conduct to the best of their judgment. Therefore, if we have to uplift ourselves, let us uplift ourselves and not call others liars or wretched men or say that they were acting at the behest of others; it will be most unfair to do so.

SHRI SEZHIYAN (Kumbakonam): The role of the Governors has come for discussion on many occasions and had been questioned also. There is broad agreement on both sides of the House that not only the constitutional standards but the moral standards also should be upheld, and that the Governors should act justly and appear also to act justly. The role of Governors had been questioned from its very inception. In the year 1952 when the Constitution was enforced and elections to the legislatures in different States were held, the action of the Governor in the then State and Madras in calling a party which did not command the majority in the House was questioned. After the 1967 elections different parties are occupying seats of power in different states. The role of the Governor was called into question in Rajasthan; in Haryana his role was questioned when he dismissed the Ministry; in Punjab, when he prorogued the Assembly; in Bengal, when he acted unilaterally and dismissed one Ministry and installed another Ministry.

In West Bengal, at that time, the only difference that arose between the Chief Minister, Mr. Ajoy Mukherjee and the Governor was this. There was a crisis in November, 1967, when some of their colleagues in the United Front Ministry resigned, and it was felt that Ajoy Mukherjee's Ministry did not command the majority in the House. Though it was not registered on the floor of the House, still, the Governor asked the Chief Minister to convene the Assembly early and the Chief Minister said he would be able to convene the Assembly on December 18, 1967. On November 21, without giving much time, that Ministry was dismissed. At that time also, there was a heated debate in this House. Today, when the hon. Member from the Congress Opposition spoke in very passionate terms against the act of the Governor in Uttar Pradesh and Bihar, I listened to her very carefully, and appreciated the sentiments expressed by her. She made a scathing attack against the Governor acting against the Constitutional propriety. She also said the Governor acted as an agent of the Centre. She said that the Governor had acted against his conscience, the old conscience ! She said it was an act of perfidy; she said it was in flagrant contradiction to the framework of the Constitution. I agree totally with all the sentiments expressed by her. In 1967, in this very House, when the discussion about the West Bengal situation was held, the hon. Lady Member was there on the Congress side defending the role of the Governor there.

AN HON. MEMBER : She is not the Government.

SHRI SEZHIYAN : Even now, she is not the Government. At that time, she said :

"Let us take up the question of the Governor's powers. It is clear and basic in the scheme of our Constitution that the Governor is a constitutional head. He has to discharge his functions on the advice of the Council of Ministers, except when he is required by the provisions of the Constitution to use his discretion..... For instance, a person cannot be appointed as Chief Minister by the Governor unless he is satisfied that he enjoys the confidence of the House. But as to who has to decide whether the Governor is to use his discretion, the final authority is the Governor himself, as has already been quoted by many Members; under article 163 (2), he alone is to decide. This matter is not justiciable. Therefore, at what time and on what occasion, the Governor has to use his discretion is left to him."

SHRIMATI SUCHETA KRIPALANI : What I said now is, the Governor did not properly go into the question as to who has the majority. That is my point. I stand by what I had said then.

SHRI SEZHIYAN : I have quoted her very words. Let her read it again to refresh her memory. I am not quoting this just to say that there is a contradiction or anything like that. I am only quoting it to show the line of thinking on her part now.

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI : Are you supporting or oppoing the motion.

SHRI SEZHIYAN : I opposed her views then and I support her view on the basic question of Governorship. I am just saying that this is a new line of thinking on her part, which we must appreciate. Now the basic question is, about the place and role of Governor in our democracy.

It has been found that there are certain lacunae in the Constitution. I feel that a review of the Constitution is necessary and urgent. A reappraisal of the Governor's role is urgently necessary, defining the power and the guide-lines by which the Governor should act, because at the present, under the Constitution, if the Governor appoints somebody as the Chief Minister, there is no fixed time by which he should constitute the Ministry, and there is no fixed interval by which he should convene the Assembly. The only thing that the Constitution says is that between the termination of one session and the beginning of another session, there cannot be an interval of more than six months.

In 1967, the Chief Minister, Shri Ajoy Mukherjee, pointed it out to the Governor. This was not conceded by the Governor. Therefore, I say that the Governors are acting in different States in different ways using different kinds of discretion. I am not blaming them, but we should define the procedure in the Constitution, and to the extent possible, we should be able to decide, that the majority in the Ministry is not to be decided by the signatures, not by the Governor, but it should be decided on the floor of the legislature. It is to be decided not even by the legislators, but by the legislature. The legislature's verdict should be final. Therefore, an early opportunity should be given to the respective legislatures to decide whether a certain person selected by the Governor as Chief Minister really commands the majority.

I congratulate Mrs. Kripalani on her forthright statement, which is an improvement on what she said earlier.

SHRI S. A. DANGE (Bombay Central South) : Sir, from the first one or two speeches made on this subject, it was not very clear whether we were discussing the diary of visits of Mr. Bahuguna, Mr. Misra and such other people or we were discussing the fundamentals of certain democratic principles, about which so much was said. If it is a question of democratic principles, I think the institution of Governors is highly undemocratic and ought to have been abolished. But I wonder whether those who criticise that institution would be able to support a constitutional amendment to that effect. If that were so, my party is perfectly prepared to move for the abolition of the institution of Governors. It is no use discussing the behaviour of one Governor as against another, because it is an arbitrary institution. Secondly, the Governor is there at the will

[Shri S. A. Dange]

of the ruling party at the centre. If he falls a victim to human weakness and acts according to the suggestions of the ruling party, there is nothing wrong with it. There is nothing unconstitutional and arbitrary about it, because the institution itself is a hotchpotch of confusions. So, we must apply some other standards.

I do not want to go into the diaries of visits. I want to know what has happened which irritates these gentlemen so much. What is the net outcome of all these manouvres which has displaced them to such an extent that they wanted to move an adjournment motion ? The net outcome is, their group has not come into power, but the other group has succeeded in coming into power. Can we judge it only by that question ? No. We must ask whether the group which has come into power deserves to come into power or not. It is only votes ? Of course, votes is a necessity but there is such a thing as politics, democratic behaviour, morals, corruption, etc. The group which is opposed to the politics and behaviour of the Swatantra, Jan Sangh and Syndicate combine has come into power. This triple alliance has lost in Bihar and in U.P. Is this loss of the triple alliance healthy for democracy and good for the country or not ? As a common man, I would only ask that question. And, my answer would be, it is good for the country that this triple alliance has not succeeded in misleading the Governor and coming into power. The reason is, this group is full of corruption, condemned by two enquiry commissions headed by Supreme Court Judges. One was the Aiyar Commission and the other was the Mudholkar Commission. These commissions have held that the Syndicate group was full of corruption which could be proved and prosecuted.

For example, there is a very venerable gentleman, with whom my friends would have no quarrel, because he belongs to their group—Mr. S. P. Jain. On 10th February, his Tuiem of India says :

> "The Leader of the Old Congress in the Lok Sabha, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh."

—I hope he is the same Dr. Ram Subhag Singh here—

> "has had the gumption to suggest in so many words that the finding of the Aiyar Commission would in no way affect his party's organisation in Bihar."

This is a man of courage. Even if five out of six Ministers are proved to be absolutely corrupt, yet, he has the courage to say that they must rule again so that they can have more and more of corruption. Therefore, if he has failed in his attempts, he has every right to be angry.

Five out of six formers Ministers who have been held guilty of serious charges of corruption, graft or misuse of authority belonged to the Old Congress.

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH (Buxar) : What about the sixth ?

SHRI S.A. DANGE : The sixth should be expelled by them from their party. First, will you explain your conduct, you having the majority of five out of six ? Observe democracy and expel your majority of five! then, if they do not expel the sixth man, you can blame them.

Therefore, whatever has happened is absolutely correct. Otherwise, what kind of people were going to form the government. There is the Raja of Ramgarh who in a real democracy ought to have been shot at sight. He is a man who steals mines, forests and other mineral wealth and draws money from the State for going abroad but pockets that money by not going abroad. This was the gentleman with whom they wanted coalition.

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH : But your party was also with him in the Ministry.

SHRI S.A. DANGE : One of them went so far as to accept bribe of Rs. 1,75,000 from a private firm for favours rendered. The former Chief Minister, Shri K.B. Sahai was in their company. I do not want to go into details. The report is there for everyone to see.

My point is this. When these people were condemned by two commissions, in all humility they should have respected democracy and themselves surrendered their right

to form the government. Instead of doing that, now they are challenging the Governor because he did not accept their *bona fides* did not accept their democratic pleadings and installed somebody who is not a member of this gang of corrupters, mentioned by both Justice Mudholkar and Justice Aiyar. What right have they to talk of democratic decencies and standards ? I do not want to read extracts from those reports.

I would say that the Governor did well. If he was arbitrary, he was correctly arbitrary because by his arbitrary action he has succeeded in shutting out from coming to power the corrupt gang of the Old Congress organisation. If the Congress is split, well and good. If the new Congress shows some better outlook, we should all welcome that. The new Congress should also remember that one of the six still belongs to them. They should expel him if they want to be on firmer grounds for criticising the Old Congress. I am not advising like a patriarch but I am simply mentioning what people expect them to do. Ask the Daroga Rai Government to put handcuffs on the Raja of Ramgarh so that he will not play any more mischief, Bihar is a State which is full of mineral wealth and it has a fine working class and peasantry. As long as this gentleman was in power they could never carry out any land reforms. We hope that Daroga Rai government will carry out these land reforms.

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH : Your representative was the Revenue Minister in that Ministry. What did he do ?

SHRI S.A. DANGE : It is on record of the Mudholkar Commission report that our representative in the United Front Government was well-behaved and that he was perfectly innocent.

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH : That is all wrong.

SHRI S.A. DANGE : We are proud of our Ministers. I will now conclude without taking much of your time.

I would say that this method of calling legislators behind the screen and judging the majority or the minority there is a wrong method. If a Chief Minister resigns, the Legislature should be called and the majority of the claimants should be decided on the floor of the House and neither by roll calls nor by signatures nor by phone calls nor by anything else. If no majority for a single person is found, the largest single party should be asked to form the Government and they should call the Assembly and test their majority or minority there. If we wish to follow real to democratic policies, democracy must be shown on the floor of the House and not behind the curtain either with the Governor or with anybody else. That is our submission.

I am not concerned here with the honesty of Shri Charan Singh, Shri C.B. Gupta and so on. Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani has a right to grumble because she herself was once ditched by Shri C.B. Gupta himself when she was the Chief Minister there. She knows the intricacies there and she can explain them in a novel better than we can. Shri Charan Singh was askec to be called. He was called and, as Shri Asoke Sen said, if he preferred one garland to another, what can we do ? That is the opportunism of great men and we cannot help it.

My test is whether he or these two governments would carry out a programme or not of land reforms, of taking over sugar mills and of giving relief to the peasantry and the poor people. If they carry it out, we are prepared to support them; if they are not prepared to carry it out, we are going to dethrone them. Our vote is given only on that condition and no more.

SHRI B.P. MANDAL (Madhepura) : Sir, I want to know whether unattached Members are fullfledged Members of this House or not. You have not called any unattached Member so far. They are not attached to either side; therefore, they are not fullfledged Members.

सभापति महोदय : अनएटैच्ड मेम्बर को भी बुलाया जायेगा, लेकिन मुश्किल यह है कि इतने सदस्य बोलना चाहते हैं कि इस डिसक्शन के लिए जो डेढ़ घंटे का टाईम एलाट किया गया है, उसमें वे सब नहीं बोल पाएंगे। इस

[सभापति महोदय]
लिए गवर्नमेंट बैंचिज से माननीय सदस्य को बुलाने के बाद एक आपोजिशन के सदस्य को और एक अनएटैच्ड मेम्बर को बुला कर मैं मिनिस्टर साहब को बुलाऊंगा।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) : सभापति महोदय, आपके इस कथन से मालूम होता है कि आप हमारी पार्टी से किसी को नहीं बुला रहे हैं। हमारे ऊपर सीधा आक्रमण हो रहा है और आप हमें उत्तर का अवसर न दें, इस तरह कैसे होगा ?

श्री मु० अ० खां (कासगंज) : चेयरमैन साहब, जब हम पिछले फ्राईडे को यहां मिले, तो यू०पी० और बिहार के बारे में एजानमेंट मोशन पर इतना शोर हुआ कि मालूम होता था कि जाने कैसा तूफ़ान आ गया है। लेकिन डिसक्शन में यह महसूस हुआ कि यह तो सियासत की बिसात पर हारे हुए लोगों का फ्रस्ट्रेशन और डिफीटिड पालिटीशन्ज यू० पी० और बिहार के अखाड़ों में हारने के बाद यहां अपना गुस्सा उतारने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। इस डिसक्शन के दौरान किसी भी तरफ से ऐसा कोई आर्ग्युमेंट नहीं किया गया, जिससे यू० पी० और बिहार के गवर्नज़ के रोल पर किसी किस्म का धब्बा आता हो। सही बात यह है कि यू० पी० में तो सरकार उसी रोज़ माइनारिटी में हो गई थी, जिस रोज़ श्री त्रिपाठी ने डिक्लेयर किया कि वह और उनका ग्रुप उस सरकार को सपोर्ट नहीं कर रहे हैं। श्री त्रिपाटी ने गवर्नर साहब को लिखा कि अब उस सरकार को मैजारिटी हासिल नहीं है, इसलिए एसेम्बली की मीटिंग जल्दी बुला कर वहां पर इस बारे में फैसला होने दिया जाये। मगर गवर्नर साहब ने कई महीनों तक उस माइनारिटी सरकार को चलने की इजाजत दी और चीफ मिनिस्टर साहब की एडवाइस पर, जिनको मैजारिटी हासिल नहीं थी, एसेम्बली को बुलाने की तारीख 11 फरवरी मुकर्रर की। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या गवर्नर साहब का वह एक्शन कांस्टीट्यूशनल था या नहीं।

अभी माननीय श्री कोठारी ने कहा कि गवर्नर को यहां से सम्मन किया गया, बुलाया गया। यह बिल्कुल गलत बात है, जिसकी तरदीद की जा चुकी है। मैं शुक्रगुजार हूं अपनी एक्स-चीफ मिनिस्टर साहिबा का, कि जिन्होंने इसका कोई तजकिरा नहीं किया, क्योंकि वह जानती हैं कि सही बात यह है कि गवर्नर साहब को यहां से नहीं बुलाया गया था।

मुझे हैरानी हुई, जब कि श्री कोठारी ने चौधरी चरण सिंह को किंग आफ डिफेक्टर्ज कहा। मैं उनसे पूछना चाहूंगा कि जब 1967 में चौधरी चरण सिंह ने अपने 17 सदस्यों के साथ कांग्रेस पार्टी से डिफेक्ट किया था और श्री कोठारी की पार्टी के लोगों ने सबसे पहले उनकी गर्दन में हार डाले थे, क्या उस वक्त वह किंग आफ डिफेक्टज़ नहीं थे। श्री कोठारी जिस बात को अपने लिए बेहतर समझते हैं, उसी को लेकर वह दूसरों पर आरोप लगाते हैं।

सभापति महोदय : यह साढ़े पाँच बजे खत्म होना था और हाफ ऐन अवर डिस्कशन इसके बाद लेना था मिस्टर ज्योतिमय वसु का। लेकिन इसे हम आज खत्म करना चाहते हैं और अभी स्पीकर कई एक हैं और मिनिस्टर साहब को भी इसको जवाब देना है। इसलिए हाफ ऐन अवर इसके ऊपर हम आज ही बढ़ा देते हैं और हाफ ऐन अवर डिस्कशन अब दूसरे दिन होगा। मैं समझता हूं इसमें गवर्नमेंट को और किसी को भी एतराज नहीं है। तो यह हाफ ऐन अवर बढ़ाया जाता है और वह हाफ ऐन अवर डिस्कशन बुधवार को लिया जाएगा। इसको आज ही खत्म किया जाएगा।

श्री मु० अ० खां : तो मैं यह अर्ज कर रहा था कि जो चीजें आप अपने लिए मुनासिब समझते हैं उन्हें हमारे खिलाफ आरोप लगाते हैं। यहां जिक्र किया गया डी. पी. मिश्रा का, यहां जिक्र किया गया कि जगजीवन रामजी गए और और नेता यहां से गए, मेरा खयाल यह है कि

उधर से भी वीरेन्द्र सिंह जी गए और हमारी एक्स-चीफ मिनिस्टर सुचेता जी गई और अपना पूरा जोर डालने के लिए जो वहां चीफ मिनिस्टर रह चुकी हैं तो अखाड़े में दो जोर हुए उस में आप हार गए तो आप चिल्लाते क्यों हैं ? ख्वामख्वाह हम पर इल्जाम क्यों लगाते हैं ? सही बात यह है कि गुप्ता जी माइनारिटी में हैं यह उसी दिन डिसाइड हो गया था जिस दिन त्रिपाठी जी ने यह एनाउन्स किया था कि हम मेजारिटी में हैं। उसी दिन उन्होंने अपनी माइनारिटी महसूस कर ली थी और इसलिए क्योंकि वह जानते थे कि अपनी मेजारिटी वह साबित नहीं कर सकेंगे, इसलिए उन्होंने 10 तारीख को इस्तीफा दिया। यह इस बात का सबूत है कि उनके पास मेजारिटी नहीं रह गई थी।.....(व्यवधान)..... अभी-अभी जितने स्टेटमेंट यहां हुए किसी ने यह साबित नहीं किया कि हमारी सपोर्ट के बाद चौधरी चरण सिंह की गवर्नमेंट माइनारिटी में है और यह तो 26 तारीख को असेम्बली मिल रही है उसमें आन दि फ्लौर आफ दि हाउस मालूम हो जायगा कि गवर्नर का फैसला सही था या गलत। अब मुझे आप बोलने नहीं देंगे लिहाजा मैं बैठ जाऊंगा तो अच्छा रहेगा।

श्री प्रकाश वीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) : सभापति जो कुछ भी कहने से पहले मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि आज की चर्चा का विषय जो था जिसके ऊपर श्री कोठारी साहब ने चर्चा दी थी वह यह था कि उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार के राज्यपालों का आचरण उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार में सरकार बनाने के सम्बन्ध में सही नहीं रहा, उसके ऊपर विचार किया जाय। मुझे खुशी होती अगर चर्चा यहीं तक सीमित रहती। लेकिन दुर्भाग्य यह है कि वह चर्चा राज्यपालों के आचरण से हट कर मुख्य मंत्रियों और उन के समर्थकों के आचरणों तक पहुँच गई। लेकिन मैं अपने मित्रों को याद दिलाना चाहता हूं कि आज जब राज्यपालों के आचरण पर उनको कष्ट हो रहा है और दुःख हो रहा है कि उन्होंने उत्तर प्रदेश में श्री चरण सिंह की सरकार बनाने के लिए उनको क्यों आमन्त्रित किया या बिहार में श्री दरोगा राय की सरकार बनाने के लिए उन्हें वहां क्यों आमंत्रित किया ? मैं खुश होता अगर अब से ढ़ाई महीने पहले जब उत्तर प्रदेश के राज्यपाल श्री गोपाल अल्पमत की सरकार को ढ़ाई महीने तक चलने दिया और यह कहा कि उत्तर प्रदेश की विधान सभा की बैठक 11 फरवरी से पहले नहीं बुलाई जाएगी। अगर यही लोग उस समय भी यह कहते कि राज्यपाल का यह आचरण सही नहीं है और विधान सभा बुला कर शक्ति परीक्षण किया जाय और देखा जाय कि गुप्ता जी के साथ बहुमत है या नहीं है। उस समय उनका मौन रहना और आज चूंकि गुप्ता जी की सरकार गिर गई और चरण सिंह जी की सरकार बन गई उस समय इनका मुखर हो जाना इनकी नीयत का साफ परिचय देता है।

दूसरी बात यह है कि मुख्य शिकायत इन की क्या है ? जैसा मैं ने भाषणों से सुना, मुख्य शिकायत यह है कि जब श्री चरण सिंह जी को गुप्ता जी ने मुख्य मंत्री बनाने की बात कही तो राज्यपाल ने चरण सिंह जी को शपथ दिलाने के लिए क्यों नहीं बुलाया ? दूसरी शिकायत यह है कि जब कमलापति त्रिपाठी जी ने अपना समर्थन उनको देने की बात कही तब राज्यपाल ने श्री चरण सिंह जी को मुख्य मंत्री की शपथ देने के लिए क्यों बुलाया ? यह उनकी मुख्य शिकायत है। अब मैं एक बात पूछना चाहता हूं कि इसमें राज्यपाल का क्या अपराध है ? राज्यपाल का इसमें अपराध है या राज्यपाल की इसमें सराहना की जानी चाहिए कि राज्यपाल ने एक ऐसे व्यक्ति को मुख्य मंत्री की शपथ देने के लिए बुलाया कि जिसको गुप्ता जी भी कहते थे कि मुख्य मंत्री

[श्री प्रकाश शास्त्री]

बनाया जाय और जिसके लिए त्रिपाठी जी भी कहते थे कि मुख्य मंत्री बनाया जाय। इतिहास के अन्दर कोई भी इस प्रकार का व्यक्ति आप को मिलेगा कि जिसका एक विधान सभा के अन्दर दो पार्टियां हैं और दोनों पार्टियां उसके नाम कर रही हैं। गुप्ता जी भी यह कहते हैं कि हमारी अपनी इच्छा यह है कि चरण सिंह जी मुख्य मन्त्री बनने लायक हैं और त्रिपाठी जी भी यह कहते हैं कि हम भी इससे सहमत हैं कि चरण सिंह मुख्य मन्त्री बनने लायक हैं। दोनों ने जब उन के सम्बन्ध में सहमति दी तो राज्यपाल ने उन को मुख्यमंत्री की शपथ दिलाई इस में राज्यपाल का क्या अपराध है? राज्यपाल ने तो जिस व्यक्ति के प्रश्न पर उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के दोनों पक्ष एक मत थे उसको मुख्य मंत्री बनाया। इसके लिए राज्यपाल की निन्दा की जानी चाहिए या राज्यपाल की सराहना की जानी चाहिए? यह मैं आपके ऊपर छोड़ता हूँ।

असल में जो बात है वह यह है कि जब गुप्ता जी के कहने पर राज्यपाल ने शीघ्रता न की और त्रिपाठी जी के कहने पर चरण सिंह जी को शपथ लेने के लिए बुलाया तो सबसे बड़ी तकलीफ इनको यह है कि थोड़ा वक्त और मिलना चाहिए था जिससे कुछ खरीद फ़रोख्त कर लेते। राज्यपाल ने इतना वक्त क्यों नहीं दिया जिसमें यह काम यह लोग पूरा कर लेते हैं? जिस समय कोई आदमी सहसा दुनियां छोड़ कर जाता है तो घर वालों को यह तकलीफ होती है कि भलेही चला तो यह जाता लेकिन डाक्टर बुला कर इलाज करवा लेते तो मन के हौसले निकाल लेते इन्हें तकलीफ सिर्फ इसी बात की है कि यह जो खरीद का काम हो सकता था, इस के लिए राज्यपाल ने अवसर क्यों नहीं दिया।

दूसरी सबसे बड़ी बात यह है कि अच्छा होता अगर किसी भी सदस्य ने जिसने राज्यपाल के आचरण की निन्दा करनी चाही, यह संख्या भी गिनाई होती कि श्री चरणसिंह जी के साथ बहुमत नहीं था और श्री गिरधारी लाल के साथ बहुमत था अगर किसी ने यह आंकड़े दिए होते तो मैं शायद उनके आंकड़ों को चुनौती देता लेकिन दुर्भाग्य इनका यह है कि इनके पास ऐसे कोई आंकड़े ही नहीं हैं कि जो यह सिद्ध कर सकें कि गिरधारी लाल का बहुमत था सीधी बात है जिसका बहुमत था उसको उन्होंने बुलाया, राज्य पाल उसके लिए विवश थे। और अगर अभी भी आप को यह शक हो कि नहीं, चरणसिंह जी के पास बहुमत नहीं था, गिरधारी लाल जी के पास बहुमत था तो जैसे नाई से बाल कटवाते समय किसी ने पूछा कि मेरे सिर पर कितने बाल हैं, उसने कहा कि यजमान, दो मिनट में सामने आ रहे हैं, अभी गिन लेना। परसों उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा की बैठक होने जा रही है। अगर आपको अभिमान हो कि बहुमत आप के है तो अरमान परसों निकाल लेना, पता लग जायगा कि बहुमत आपके पास है या चरणसिंह जी के साथ है। दो दिन बीच में हैं। कोई बहुत बड़ी बात नहीं हुई है।

लेकिन जो बात मैं अपने वक्तव्य को समाप्ति की ओर ले जाते हुए विशेष रूप से कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह कि चरणसिंह जी ने गुप्ता जी के साथ मुख्य मंत्री बनना क्यों नहीं स्वीकार किया और चरणसिंह ने दूसरे पक्ष के आमंत्रण को क्यों स्वीकार किया? इस में एक बात यह थी कि चरणसिंह जी उत्तर प्रदेश के मुख्यमंत्री बंगाल के मुख्य मंत्री अजय मुखर्जी की तरह से नहीं बनना चाहते थे मुख्यमंत्री बन कर बैठू मैं और सुपर मुख्य मंत्री रहें सी० वी० गुप्ता को आर्डिनेशन कनेटी के चेयरमैन के रूप यह चीज उन को स्वीकार नही थी। चरणसिंह जी का कहना यह था कि अगर मैं मुख्य मंत्री बनूंगा तो मेरी नीति चलेगी ज्योति बसु की नीति नहीं चलेगी। यह चरणसिंह जी का

अपना विश्वास था आज उसका सबसे बड़ा प्रमाण यह है कि चरणसिंह जी ने मुख्य मंत्री बनते ही उत्तर प्रदेश की जनता के सामने चार घोषणायें की हैं, जिन को डॉ० राम सुभाग सिंह जी और उनके साथियों ने भी सुना होगा। चरणसिंह जी ने मुख्य मंत्री बनते ही सबसे पहली घोषणा यह की कि किसानों के लिए खाद पर जो टैक्स लगाया था, मेरी सरकार उसको वापस लेती है। अब किसानों को खाद पर कोई टैक्स नहीं लगेगा। उत्तर प्रदेश का किसान गुड़ पैदा करता था पर उसके पल्ले कुछ नहीं पड़ता था। प्रान्त के बाहर उस का लदान बन्द हो जाता था, निर्यात बन्द हो जाता था। उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार ने घोषणा की है कि गुड़ के लदान पर किसी तरह का प्रतिबन्ध उत्तर प्रदेश में नहीं रहेगा ताकि किसानों, गन्ना पैदा करने वालों की जेब में भी चार पैसे जा सकें। उन्होंने यह घोषणा भी की है कि मैं तीन आदमियों की एक कमेटी बनाता हूँ। जो किसान गन्ना पैदा करता था, जाड़ों में घुटने-घुटने पानी में खड़ा हो कर वह जब अपना गन्ना ले कर चीनी मिलों के दरवाजे पर जाता था तो ठगा-सा रह जाता था। उत्तर प्रदेश में सूखी लकड़ी की कीमत साढ़े पाँच रुपये मन, लेकिन गन्ने का भाव पौने दो रुपये मन। उन्होंने कहा कि मेरी सरकार इस चीज को नहीं चलने देगी। यदि चीनी मिलों का रवैया ऐसा ही रहा तो उन्होंने कहा कि मैं चीनी मिलों का राष्ट्रीयकरण तो नहीं करुंगा लेकिन मैं चीनी मिलों का किसानीकरण करना चाहता हूँ। जो गन्ने को उत्पन्न करने वाले हैं, उसके हाथ में गन्ने का मूल्य-निर्धारण का काम रहेगा, मिल मालिकों के हाथ में गन्ने का मूल्य नहीं रहेगा।

चौथी घोषणा उन्होंने यह की है कि उत्तर प्रदेश में जो किसान तहसीलदारों और मैजिस्ट्रेटों के दरवाजों पर खड़े सूखते रहते थे और उनको सही न्याय नहीं मिल पाता था, उनको सही न्याय कैसे दिया जा सकता है, और जल्दी कैसे दिया जा सकता है, इसके लिए उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार निर्णय लेना चाहती है। एक बात मैं अपने इन मित्रों से भी कहना चाहता हूँ जो सत्तारूढ़ पक्ष में इधर बैठे हुए हैं। वी० के० डी० की सरकार की ओर से कहना चाहता हूँ श्री चरणसिंह जी को श्री कमलापती त्रिपाठी जी ने जो सहयोग दिया है और आगे भी वह सहयोग देंगे ; एक बात आप लोग कान खोल कर सुन लें—चरण सिंह जी अपने दिमाग को किसी को गिरवी रख कर हुकूमत नहीं चलाना चाहते है। उनका एक ही लक्ष्य है कि उत्तर प्रदेश का गरीब किसान; उत्तर प्रदेश के मजदूर, उत्तर प्रदेश के हरिजन, उत्तर प्रदेश के 9 करोड़ निवासियों का हित जिसमें होगा, वही काम वह करेंगे, किसी व्यक्ति को प्रसन्न करने के लिए वह कोई काम नहीं करेंगे।

श्री बी० प्र० मंडल (मधेपुरा) : सभापति जी, मैं एक अनएटेच्ड मेम्बर के नाते उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार के सम्बन्ध में अपना अन-प्रजुडिस्ड और अनएटेच्ड विय्रू रखना चाहता हूँ। मैंने दोनों पक्षों को सुना। यहाँ पर कहा गया कि उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार के गवर्नर ने चरण सिंह और दरोगा राय को मुख्य मंत्री बनाकर कोई उचित कार्य नहीं किया। लेकिन जहां तक वस्तुस्थिति का प्रश्न है—उत्तर प्रदेश में तो चरणसिंह जी के चरण पर आपने अपना मस्तक रख दिया, लेकिन आपसे भी आगे आ कर जब कमलापती त्रिपाठी जी ने अपना मस्तक रखा तो चरणसिंह जी ने उन के मस्तक को उठा लिया और चूम लिया; तो इस में गवर्नर का दोष क्या है ?

दुनियाँ इस बात को जानती है कि बिहार में जब तक श्री रामानन्द तिवारी संविद के नेता के रूप में पिक्चर में थे, तब तक गवर्नर ने कोई फैसला नहीं दिया, लेकिन जब खुद

[श्री बि० प्र० मंडल]

आपके नेता श्री रामानन्द तिवारी रन छोड़ कर भाग गये तो गवर्नर किस को मुख्य मंत्री बनाता—ज़रा इस का जवाब दीजिये—और ऐसा भागे कि अभी तक नहीं लौट पाये। उन्होंने न सिर्फ अपनी पार्टी की बेइज्जती. बल्कि संविद के जितने घटक थे—जनसंघ, सिण्डीकेट वगैरह, सब की बेइज्जती की, सब की मिट्टी-पलीद कर दी। ऐसी स्थिति में गवर्नर श्री रामानन्द तिवारी को किस तरह मुख्य मंत्री बनने के लिए बुलाता—मेरी समझ में यह बात नहीं आती है।

सभापती जी, इस लिये मैं समझता हूँ कि बिहार में गवर्नर को दोष देना कि उसने दरोगा प्रसाद राय को मिनिस्ट्री बनाने के लिए बुला लिया, कोई युक्तिसंगत बात नहीं है। पहले सरदार हरहिर सिंह के 115 सदस्य थे, उसको गवर्नर ने नहीं बुलाया और दरोगा प्रसाद राय के 82 थे, उनको बुला लिया, मैं उन बातों में नहीं जाना चाहता, लेकिन मौजूदा स्थिति यह है कि आपके नेता खुद भाग गये और ऐसा भागे कि अब तक आपका कोई ठिकाना नहीं हैं..... (व्यवधान).....

हमारी कम्युनिष्ट पार्टी के नेता डांगे साहब ने मुधोलकर कमीशन और अयर कमीशन की बातों का जिक्र किया। मुझे ऐसा मालूम होता है कि डांगे साहब ने कम से कम मुधोलकर कमीशन की रिर्पोट को पूरा पूरा पढ़ने का कष्ट नहीं किया है। मुधोलकर कमीशन में 14 मंत्रियों पर चार्ज आया था, जिसमें कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के भी तीन मंत्री थे—इन्द्रदीप सिंह, चन्द्र शेखर सिंह और तेजनारायण सिंह पर भी चार्ज था। मुधोलकर कमिशन ने तेजनारायण सिंह को बरी किया है, लेकिन इन्द्रदीपसिंह और चन्द्रशेखर सिंह पर चार्ज है, आप ज़रा उसको पढ़िये.....

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा (बेगूसराय) : उन के खिलाफ यही चार्ज है कि उन्होने 31 सूत्री कार्यक्रम के अन्तर्गत बन्दियों को मुक्त करने का जो कार्यक्रम था, उसका पालन किया उस के लिये हम को अभिमान है, शोक नहीं है।

श्री बि० प्र० मंडल : लेकिन मुधोलकर कमीशन ने उस को गलत माना। वह कहते हैं कि आप फलां को निकालिये, ज़रा मुधोलकर कमीशन की रिर्पोट को पढ़िये, इन्द्रदीप सिंह और चन्द्र शेखर सिंह और अपनी पार्टी के अन्य सदस्यों के साथ आप भी तो ज़रा कड़ाई से पेश आइये। सभापतिजी, पब्लिक लाइफ में इन कम्युनिस्टों का हाथ भी जहाँ रहा है चाहे बिहार में ही क्यों न हो, ये लोग भी बदनाम हो चुके हैं।

श्री राम सेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) : सभापति जी, उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार के राज्यपालों ने सरकार के गठन के सिलसिले में जो काम किया, आज उस पर यहां चर्चा हो रही लेकिन उस चर्चा के सन्दर्भ में दलों की चर्चा भी उठाई गई है। मैं इतना ही कहूँगा कि दलों की मेड़ें टूट चुकी हैं, कस कर टूट चुकी हैं और जो लोग इस पर खुशी मना रहे हैं कि दूसरों की मेड़ें टूट गई हैं, उनके यहां भी मेड़ें ही नहीं टूटी, बल्कि बांध ही टूट गया है। इस लिये अच्छा होगा कि वे इस पर विचार करें और इसके कारणों पर जायं।

सभापति महोदय, मुझे ताज्जुब होता है कि जब सदन में सरकार की ओर से दल-बदल को रोकने की कोशिश हो, वही सरकार जब दय-बदल करवाने का प्रयास करे, तो फिर उसकी नेकनीयती पर शुब्हा करने का लोगों को मौका मिलता है—इस पर भी ध्यान जाना चाहिये।

में कहना चाहता हूं कि बिहार में राज्यपाल का जो काम था, उस में उन्होंने स्वविवेक का इस्तेमाल किया—वह ठीक किया या नहीं किया—यह प्रश्न है। जब यह प्रश्न उठा तो सबसे पहले ध्यान जाना चाहिये मणिपुर की

ओर, क्योंकि राज्यपाल सीधे केन्द्र के इशारे पर, केन्द्र की राय पर चलता है। मणिपुर में, सभापति महोदय, आप जानते हैं कि विरोध पक्ष के 21 सदस्य हो गये थे और कांग्रेस के केवल 10 या 11 सदस्य रह गये थे। लेकिन वहां के कमिश्नर ने किस तरह से, किस माप दंड से और कौन से जनतांत्रिक तरीके से 21 आदमियों को सरकार गठन करने के लिए नहीं बुलाया और वहां पर राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू हो गया, क्यों? इसलिये कि प्रधान मंत्री चाहती हैं कि या तो उनके मन के लोग हों और अगर उनके मन के लोग न हों तो दिल्ली राज्य करे। दोनों का मतलब एक ही होता है कि दिल्ली की हकूमत हो। तो उस सन्दर्भ में बिहार को भी देखें। अभी प्रश्न उठा था कि हरिहर सिंह 115 थे तब उनको मौका नहीं मिला। फिर भोला पासवान की जब सरकार गिरी थी तब भी उन्होंने मौका मांगा था लेकिन आपके अन्दर कि दलबन्दी के कारण हरिहर सिंह को मौका नहीं मिला। उस समय तक आप टूटे नहीं थे। .....(**व्यवधान**)....

श्री द्वा. ना. तिवारी : उस समय निजलिंगप्पा साहब ने कहा था कि अभी हम नहीं बनने देंगे।

श्री राम सेवक यादव : तब तक ये पूरी तौर से टूटे नहीं थे, शायद प्रक्रिया भी शुरू नहीं हुई थी। लेकिन अन्दरूनी दलबन्दी के कारण कि कौन नेता बने, कौन मुख्य मंत्री बने, उस झंझट की बिना पर मामला पड़ा रहा और राज्यपाल इन्तजार करते रहे। फिर उसमें एक जबर्दस्त कड़ी और है। जिन सदस्यों को राज्यपाल महोदय कहते थे कि ये 27 ऐसे लोग हैं दलबदलू जिनपर भरोसा नहीं किया जा सकता है लेकिन आप इस सूची को देखें जो राज्यपाल महोदय ने भेजी है कि उसमें के लोग इसमें शामिल हैं या नहीं? तो यह किस तरह से उनका माप दंड बदल गया फौरन, यह जी देख ने की चीज है? अगर उसमें इनके नाम शामिल हैं तो उससे साफ जाहिर होता है कि कहीं न कहीं, कोई न कोई राय ऊपर से हुई और उसका उनपर असर पड़ा। तब फिर उस के साथ यह बात रेलिवेन्ट हो जाती है। 1 को वे यह राय देते हैं कि इसको सस्पेन्ड रखा जाये और फिर 14 को ही सरकार बन जाती है क्योंकि ऊपर से उनके ऊपर दबाव पड़ता है। मैं गृह मंत्री जी से चाहूंगा कि इस बात की सफाई हो जाये कि क्या जो वहां के राज्यपाल महोदय हैं उनका कार्यकाल बढ़ाया गया था? अगर उनका कार्यकाल बढ़ा है तो उसको भी इसी के साथ पढ़ लेना, तभी फिर पता चलेगा कि वह उचित है या नहीं।

अब मैं थोड़ा सा उत्तर प्रदेश के बारे में भी कहूंगा। कौन कैसा है उसमें मैं नहीं जाऊंगा। क्योंकि श्री गुप्त के ऊपर दोषारोपण हुए हम लोगों ने भी किये। ···(**व्यवधान**)··· 6 महिने पहिले यही लोग आरती उतारते थे ···(**व्यवधान**)··· हमारे लिये तो जैसे थे वैसे थे, हम लोग तो कार्यक्रम को ही महत्व देते हैं। ···(**व्यवधान**)··· उत्तर प्रदेश में क्या होता है, उसी को मैं सामने रखना चाहता हूं। 10 तारीख को जब मुख्य मंत्री ने राज्यपाल को जब चिट्ठी लिखी की जिन-जिन कार्यक्रमों के आधार पर इन दलों ने हमें समर्थन दिया था, हम को विश्वास है कि चरण सिंह को भी समर्थन मिलेगा, वह पत्र चौधरी चरण सिंह को दिखाया गया था, उन्होंने उसको पढ़ा और वह राज्यपाल को गया। फिर रात में चौधरी चरण सिंह गुप्त जी से मिलने भी आये। इस सारे मामले में आपने विरोधी दल के नेता, डा० राम सुभग सिंह और श्री कुम्भाराम आर्य भी शामिल थे। लेकिन होता क्या है? परेशानी बढ़ गई हमारे श्री जगजीवन राम की, परेशानी बढ़ गई श्री डी० पी० मिश्र की और परेशानी उनकी बढ़ गई जो कि आज दिल्ली की गद्दी पर बैठी हैं, श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी

[श्री राम सेवक यादव]

जब इन लोगों की परेशानी बढ़ गई तब भाग दौड़ मची। श्री बहुगुणा का यह बयान आ गया कि श्री चरणसिंह तो बे-एतबार आदमी हैं बाबू जगजीवन राम कुछ संयत रहे लेकिन फिर भी परेशानी तो निकल ही आई। उन्होंने कहा आगे आगे देखिए क्या होता है, जो एक बार दल बदल सकता है। वह फिर दूसरी बार भी बदल सकता है यानी अभी मरीज मरा नहीं है, उसकी नब्ज बाकी है। ये सारी चीजें चलती रहीं। लेकिन यहीं पर राज्यपाल महोदय की बात आती है कि जब दस तारीख का पत्र था तो उन्होंने 11 को क्यों नहीं बुलाया अगर श्री गुप्त के कहने पर ही उन्होने अमल किया तो फिर उन्होंने 11 को क्यों नहीं बुलाया ? 12 को क्यों नहीं बुलाय 13 को क्यों नहीं बुलाया या 14 को क्यों नहीं बुलाया ! यह खरीद-फरोख्त क्यों होनी चाहिये ? यह सौदेबाजी क्यों होनी चाहिये ! यह मामला क्यों चलता रहा, इसकी जांच होनी चाहिए। राज्यपाल महोदय दिल्ली आए थे। लोगों को शुबहा हुआ कि बुलाए गये लेकिन वे कुछ नहीं बोले। लेकिन जब उनको आत्मा के खिलाफ काम करने की आवश्यकता पड़ गई तो झट से अखबारों में सफाई भी छप गई कि हमको दिल्ली बुलाया नहीं गया, हम खुद गए थे। आखिर क्या जरूरत थी ? फिर जिस दिन शपथ समारोह हुआ वह ऐसा हुआ जैसे कोई काम चोरी से हो रहा हो। विरोधी दल के नेता को नहीं बुलाया गया, दूसरे दलों के नेताओं को सूचना नहीं मिली। पहले से ही पंडित से साइंत पूछ करके सारा काम हो जाता है और फिर अखबारों में राज्यपाल की सफाई आती है कि लोगों को बुलाने के लिए समय नहीं था। अगर 17 को तय कर लिया था तो 18 को भी शपथ समारोह हो सकता था। सबसे बड़ी चीज यह है कि जब दोनों दलों को बहुमत का समर्थन प्राप्त था तो राज्यपाल महोदय को उसे देखना चाहिए था। राज्यपाल महोदय ने कह दिया कि हम केवल सदन में बहुमत और अल्पमत का निर्णय करेंगे, बाहर सिर नहीं गिनेंगे। चौधरी गिरधारी लाल ने जो सूची दी वह बहुमत की थी उसमें 15 बी. के. डी. के थे और इसी प्रकार से इंडीकेट की सूची थी जिसमें से दो दो आदमी बी० के० डी० के और इंडीकेट के पेश भी किये गए और यह भी कहा गया कि अगर आप चाहें तो हम औरों को पेश भी कर सकते हैं। लेकिन उसके बाद भी राज्यपाल महोदय ने उस पर कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया और माइनारिटी की गवर्नमेन्ट बना दी। .....(व्यवधान).....हम तो कार्यक्रम के आधार पर ही समझौता करते हैं। दस सूत्री कार्यक्रम की चर्चा चलती है तो प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा कि सवा 6 एकड़ तक लगान माफी वे भी चाहती हैं, बहुगुणा जी ने कहा कि हम भी चाहते हैं लेकिन आज चौधरी चरण सिंह जिनको वे समर्थन देने के लिए कह रहे हैं, उन्होंने साफ कहा है कि हम सवा 6 एकड़ की लगान माफ़ी नहीं करेंगे। क्योंकि जो छोटे किसान हैं उनके वे दुश्मन हैं और बड़े किसानों के हमदर्द हैं। लेकिन उनकी कोई शर्त नहीं है, शर्त यही है कि उनको मुख्य मंत्री बनाओ। प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री जी ने यहां पर साफ कह दिया कि चौधरी चरण सिंह की कोई शर्त नहीं, उनकी एक शर्त है कि हमको ताज पहनाओ...

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : मैंने कहा कि उन की एक ही शर्त है कि उत्तर प्रदेश के 9 करोड़ किसानों का जिसमें भला होगा वही काम किया जायेगा—सोशलिस्ट पार्टी जो कहेगी वह काम बिल्कुल नहीं किया जायेगा।

श्री राम सेवक यादव : मैं तो बधाई देता हूं उनको। चौधरी चरण सिंह का एक सूत्रीय प्रोग्राम है और वह है कुर्सी। इसके अलावा यह कि उनका सारा दल केवल एक आदमी के हाथ में सुरक्षित है·· (**व्यवधान**)·····अब दोनों दलों के विलीनीकरण की भी चर्चा चल रही है। अगर इनका विलीनीकरण नही होता है तो वहां पर राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू हो सकता है—इसकी

योजना भी बन गई है। नही तो श्री कमलापति त्रिपाठी ने कौन से कार्य-क्रम के ऊपर समर्थन देने का फैसला किया है। जो चिट्ठी-पत्री श्री द्वारिका प्रसाद मिश्र और चौधरी चरण सिंह की है उसमें उन्होंने इस तरह से दुतकारा है जिसकी आप कल्पना भी नहीं कर सकते हैं। इसलिए वह कौन सा कार्य-क्रम है, यह हम जानना चाहते हैं।···(**व्यवधान**)·····

अन्त में इन सब दृष्टियों को ध्यान में रख कर अगर आप सोचेंगे तो पता चलेगा जैसा कि शास्त्री जी ने कहा कि वे ज्योति बसु के इशारे पर नहीं चलेंगे तो मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि उत्तर प्रदेश में कौन ज्योति बसु हैं? साफ बात है वह ज्योति बसु हैं श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी जिनके दल के इशारे पर नहीं चलना चाहते हैं? ...(**व्यवधान**).....

18.00 hrs.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madurai) : Sir, my friend, Prof. Ranga, who was one of the important participants in this debate, said that we are not playing the rules of the game. He compared this whole game to the game of cricket, and to my mind, that succinctly expresses what we are really doing, and what kind of parliamentary democracy we are practising. To my mind the whole thing is like a game of chess where, in the moving of the coins, somebody else is moving the coin in a better way. Therefore, my hon. friend is extremely unhappy. I am glad he brought in this analogy. After all, when this question of Governors' powers and when this question of the behaviour of the Governors arises, it has been debated during the last so many years here. We have always found that the Governor has acted in the interests of the ruling party or the ruling class.

My friend referred to the behaviour of the Governor in the then composite State of Madras in 1952. 152 members became larger than 176 members. The United Front had 176 members; Rajagopalachari's Congress party had 152 members. But 152 became larger than 176, and yet, it was tolerated. (*Interruption*)—Of course, it was a curious piece of arithmetic, but that arithmetic was tolerated. My friend Mr. Ranga at that time is not known to me to have raised a little finger of protest against it. Later on, so many things happened.

Mrs. Sucheta Kripalani told us that she stands by every word that she had uttered with regard to what has happened in West Bengal in 1967. But in West Bengal, the Governor at that time said that since 17 people had left the United Front, the majority was in doubt and therefore, he asked the Chief Minister to summon the Assembly on a certain date. The West Bengal Chief Minister said that he would summon the Assembly on the 18th December. It was a difference of hardly about three weeks. The Governor did not listen to it and he immediately dismissed the Ministry. But why did not the hon. Member adopt the same yardstick with regard to UttarPradesh where C. B. Gupta's ministry at that time did not have a huge majority? It had just about 220 out of about 425 members, and about 80 people had left the Congress party. Still, Mr. Gupta would not convene the Assembly for full two months and a half. Why did she not get up and say that "this is against the norms of democracy, and you must immediately convene the Assembly?" She did not say any such thing. Therefore, we have been saying the same thing previously also.

Take Kerala for instance. It was known that the Kerala Governor appointed somebody Mr. Achutha Menon—as the Chief Minister and called him to form the Ministry, even knowing at that time ..

SHRI A. SREEDHARAN (Badagara) : Sir, on a point of order. This discussion which is the subject-matter of the House pertains to Bihar and Uttar Pradesh. The scope of the discussion is limited to that. If the hon. Member makes a general reference to Kerala, I can understand, but he is citing instances and referring to extraneous matters in this discussion, which is improper, irregular and is out of the scope of the discussion.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI : I would have appreciated the hon. Member if he had objected to my referring to Bihar and

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

Madras in 1952, to the behaviour of the U.P. Governor or the behaviour of the West Bengal Governor. But just when I referred to the behaviour of the Kerala Governor, why should he be the spokesman for the Kerala Governor ? I am not bothered about it. What I am pointing out is this (*Interruption*).

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS *rose*—

SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA : The behaviour of the Governor of Kerala has been proved to be justified. Kerala Assembly has given its verdict in support of the judgement of the Governor (*Interruption*)

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI : At that time, he gave them plenty of opportunities. Nearly two months' time was given and the Assembly was not called immediately. (*Interruption*). So this question has always been like this. Our hands have always been clean.

As far as U.P. and Bihar are concerned, it is very difficult to judge. One gentleman says, "I am going to topple this Government will-nilly when the Assembly meets." Immediately, the Chief Minister resigns and says, "Call the other gentleman". Overnight it is stated that he has joined the other group. Two days later, he says, "No, I have discarded you." What can any Governor do in such circumstances ? In Bihar, an SVD was formed and they claimed majority. But the leader of the SVD said, "I am not the leader. resign from this." What can anybody do in such circumstances?

Therefore, rather than blaming Governor, I would say, this country has come to such a level where the ruling classes are in a disarry because of the blows on them by the rising masses of this country. Mr. Ranga would like to meet that challenge by banning the CPM. That is his answer. That is his democracy. He cannot go to the people and ask them to vote for them. At the time of the presidential election, those gentlemen denied vehmently that they had nothing to do either with the Swatantra or the Jan Sangh. Today it is absolutely clear that even then they had this combine. Today that combine stands nakedly before the people and they cannot deny it. It is a good thing that combine has been defeated both in U.P. and Bihar.

श्री लखन लाल कपूर (किशनगंज) : सभापति महोदय, आज वाद-विवाद का मुख्य विषय यह है कि उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार में जो सरकारें बनी उनके सम्बन्ध में राज्य पालों के ऊपर दोषारोपण किया गया है । आज की बहस सुनने के बाद, जिसमें यह आरोप लगाया गया कि सरकारें गलत ढ़ंग से बनाई गई हैं, पक्षपातपूर्ण ढंग से बनाई गई हैं, ऐसा लगता कि बहुत शोर सुनते थे हाथी दुम का, लेकिन एक गज भर की रस्सी पड़ी थी । इस आरोप के पीछे कोई राजनीति नहीं, कोई तर्क नहीं । इसके पीछे सिर्फ यह है, वैसा मैं समझता हूं कि पावर बैंटल की एक रैस चल रही है, कौन मुख्य मंत्री बने, किसकी पार्टी गद्दी सम्भाले, मुख्य विषय यही है । मैं समझता हूं कि यह स्थिति आज देश में वर्तमान है । हम अपनी किस्मत को रो रहे हैं ।

ऐसी हालत में में समझता हूं कि प्रश्न बिहार या उत्तर प्रदेश का नहीं है, मुख्य मंत्री चरण सिंह बन रहे हैं या दरोगा राय बन रहे हैं यह महत्व नहीं रखता । हमारे लिये महत्व इस बात का है कि इस पावर बैंटल के लिए, जो पूरे देश के जन-जीवन को दूषित कर रही है, उसके लिए कौन जवाबदेह है ? इन जवाबदेह लोगों को कौन खोज निकालेगा, कोन नहीं इस बात में जो हम राजनीति चलाने वाले लोग हैं या अपने हृदय पर हाथ रख कर इस बात का आत्म-चिंतन करने की कोशिश करेंगे कि जो वर्तमान स्थिति पैदा हो गई है उसको कैसे सुधारा जाय, जिसको लेकर देश के पवित्र सदन में शक्ति संचय करने के लिए हमें अपने आचरण में डिमाक्रेसी को प्रवेश करना चाहिए था मगर हम उससे उल्टे जा पड़े हैं ।

आज स्टैंडर्ड की बात कही जा रही है, मारेलटी की बात कही जा रही है, एथिक्स की बात कही जा रही है । ये सभी बातें उन लोगों के द्वारा कही जा रही हैं जिन्होंने इस चीज का सूत्रपात किया था, जिन्होंने इसकी बुनियाद

डाली थी। पिछले 22 साल तक वे देश में राजनीति, डैमोक्रेसी और लोकतन्त्र के नाम पर खेल खेलते जा रहे हैं, उसका ही यह आज परिणाम हैं कि आपको अपनी किस्मत पर रोना पड़ रहा है। आज हम एक दूसरे पर दोषारोपण कर रहे हैं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि जो दोषारोपण करने वाले हैं, जो डिफैक्टेज के खिलाफ़ बोलते हैं, जो मारेलटी की बात करते हैं, उनका केरल में जब थानु पिल्ले वहां चीफ मिनिस्टर थे, क्या रोल रहा है ? उनको डिफैक्ट करवा कर किसने गवर्नर का पद दिया था ? हमारे साथी श्री अशोक मेहता यहां बैठे हुए हैं। उनको अपनी पार्टी से हटाने की कोशिश किसने की थी.....

सभापति महोदय : बिहार और उत्तर-प्रदेश के बारे में बोलिए।

श्री लखन लाल कपूर : मैं बिहार के बारे में कहता हूं। बिहार के गवर्नर श्री कानूनगो पर आरोप लगाया जा रहा है कि उन्होंने पक्षपात किया है और संविद के बहुमत की उन्होंने उपेक्षा की है, संविद को सरकार बनाने का अवसर नहीं दिया है। लेकिन जो वस्तुस्थिति है, उसको देखें। सात तारीख को संविद के जो नेता थे उन्होंने नेमापद त्याग दिया और कहा कि कोई संविद नहीं है। उसके बाद ग्यारह तारीख को राज्यपाल ने सिफारिश दी कि राष्ट्रपति शाशन की जो अवधि है उसको बढ़ा दिया जाए। चूंकि उस वक्त कोई स्पष्ट चित्र नहीं सामने आया था इस वास्ते उन्होंने यह सिफारिश की कि वहां स्थायी सरकार बनाना संभव नहीं है। लेकिन चौदह तारीख को सुबह प्रजा सोशलिस्ट और कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी, दोनों ने ही लिखित रूप में अपना समर्थन श्री दरोगा राय को दे दिया। इससे स्थिति में एक क्वालीटेटिव चेंज आ गया। मैं समझता हूं कि गवर्नर साहब ने कोई पक्षपात नहीं किया। 27 आदमी जिन पर गवर्नर को भरोसा नहीं था और जिनके बारे में वह यह समझते थे कि जिस पार्टी में वे होंगे, उसकी सरकार स्थायी नहीं बन सकेगी, उनकी गिनती उन्होंने अब भी नहीं की। दरोगा राय ने, 172 विधायकों की लिस्ट दी और यह भी कहा कि छः विधायकों का और उनको समर्थन प्राप्त है। लेकिन कानूनगो साहब की ईमानदारी को देखें। उन्होंने कहा कि छः आदमियों को मैं नहीं मानता चूंकि उनके हस्ताक्षर प्राप्त नहीं किए गये हैं। लेकिन 172 में से ग्यारह आदमी वे थे जो 27 की लिस्ट में थे। उन्होंने कहा कि अगर हम ग्यारह आदमियों को हटा भी दिया जाय तो भी 172 में से 161 श्री दारोगा राय के साथ हैं और इस तरस से उनका बहुमत बन जाता है। ऐसी हालत में कौन सी कांस्टीट्यूशनल इम्प्रोप्राइटी गवर्नर ने की है, यह मैं समझ नहीं पाया हूं। मैं समझता हूं कि कोई पक्षपात वहां नहीं हुआ है।

प्रत्येक पार्टी यह महसूस करती है कि राष्ट्रपति शाशन से बुरा शासन कोई दूसरा नहीं हो सकता है। इस वास्ते हम जैसे लोगों ने मजबूर होकर जनता को जनता की सरकार देने की कोशिश की है। अगर सरकार अच्छा काम करेगी तो हमारा समर्थन उसको प्राप्त रहेगा। अगर 35 सूत्री कार्यक्रम खिलाफ वहां की सरकार जाएगी तो उसी दिन हम भी अपना समर्थन वापिस ले लेंगे।

श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा (हमीरपुर) : सभापति महोदय, गवर्नर के रोल पर बहस हो रही है और सभी पार्टियों के बड़े-बड़े नेताओं ने अपने अपने विचार व्यक्त किए हैं। हम संघर्ष में एक ओर प्रजातन्त्र की और दूसरी ओर राष्ट्रपति राज की बात कही गई है। दूसरी बात यह कही गई है कि सरकार कौन बनाए और बहुमत का सवाल इसके साथ पैदा होता है। तीसरी गरीबों के हित की बात कही गई है। चौथी राज्य की लड़ाई का सवाल भी आता है। जहां तक राज्य की लड़ाई का सवाल है

[श्री प्रेम चन्द्र वर्मा]

अगर मेरे दोस्त हिन्दुस्तान के इतिहास को देखें तो उनको पता चलेगा कि राज्य के लिए लड़ाइयां होती चली आई हैं और फौजें कटती चली आई हैं, किले बरबाद होते चले आए हैं, राष्ट्र बरबाद होते चले आए हैं। राज्य की लड़ाई में तबाही और बरबादी होती ही है। लेकिन मुख्य बात यह है कि राज्य की लड़ाई में हम चरित्रहीन न हों ओर यही एक महत्वपूर्ण बात है। इसी बात की ओर मैं आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूं। राज्य की लड़ाई सब कुछ जायज होता है, मुनासिब होता है। हम किसी को तोड़ें, किसी को खाक बनायें, इसमें कोई बात नहीं है, किसी फौज को खुफिया हथियार से मारें, किसी फौज को बम मारें या तलवार मारें, कोई बात नहीं हैं। लेकिन हम चरित्रहीन न हों, यह मुख्य बात है। गवर्नर के चरित्र पर बहस न हो कर उन लोगों के चरित्र पर बहस होनी चाहिए जो लोग जनता के नुमाइन्दे बन कर और चुन कर आते हैं और भेड़-बकरियों की तरह से बिकते हैं और बिक रहे हैं। भेड़ों और बैलों की तरह से जो लोग बिकते हैं, उनके चरित्र पर विचार हो और यही आज की सबसे बड़ी बीमारी है, जिसको दूर करना हमारा कर्त्तव्य है। हम दूसरों पर लांछन लांछन लगाने से पपले असने चाल चलन पर पर भी विचार करे। जब इस तरह की बात होती है तो हम जनता के साथ धोखा करते हैं। तब हम किस तरह से प्रधान मन्त्री या कांग्रेस पार्टी या किसी दूसरे को दोष दे सकते हैं। जो खेल आप खेलते हैं, उसी को अगर हम खेलते हैं तो हमें मुल्जिम कहा जाता है और अपने को पाकसाफ। आपकी लड़ाई तो ठीक और हमारी गलत। मैं समझता हूं कि इस प्रस्ताव का कोई फायदा नहीं है। प्रस्ताव अगर लाना हो तो ऐसा लाया जाना चाहिए कि हम जो चरित्रहीन हैं, उनके बारे में बात कर सकें। गवर्नर के बारे में हम क्या कह सकते हैं। वह तो एक निशानी है, वह तो एक कांस्टीट्यूशनल हैड है।

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN) : Mr. Chairman, I am very glad indeed that the hon. Member of the Jana Sangh Party raised this debate. Why I thank him is because after hearing the debate for more than two hours I find that the debate has morally gone in favour of the Governors.

It is a good thing that this House got an opportunity to go into the facts of the matter as to what happened in U.P. and Bihar. I do not want to go into the political matters as to how parties reacted among themselves and which party leader acted in what manner because that is not the scope of the debate as far as I am concerned.

What really speaking matters is whether what the Governors did was within the framework of the Constitution, both in letter and in spirit. I have no doubt that the debate has proved that both the Governors of U.P. and Bihar acted absolutely within the letter and spirit of the Constitntion.

What is it that is expected of a Governor ? The Constitution enjoins upon the Governor to see that he chooses a person to become the Chief Minister who has the support of the majority of the Legislature. When the hon. Member, Shri Ranga, spoke, I thought he was going to make some contribution to the debate but he made rather a negative contribution to the debate by saying that this idea of running a Government by majority is something unIndian and unconstitutional. This thesis coming from a member of the Swatantra Party is very surprising. What he wanted was a government run by all political parties instead of a government run with a majority. But, at the same time, he said, "Ban certain political parties." I would certainly have understood a man coming forward and saying, "Instead of having a majority party rules, let all the political parties run the country." I would have loved to see the sight of a Government being run by Shri Ramamurti and Shri Ranga working together. It would have been a very interesting scene.

SHRI PRAMAMURTI : He does not want it.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I know. He wanted to ban your party.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI : He wanted to have a government minus us.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I was rather struck by the logic of his argument. The basic concept of parliamentary democracy is that a government has to be run on the basis of majority. I think that is the real substance of all the democratic experiences all over the world except perhaps in those countries where parliamentary democracy is not accepted as an instrument of running governments. So, here, the duty of the the Governor was to see whether the person he chose was likely to get the support of the majority of the legislature. What happened in Bihar is very clear. I have laid both the letters of the Governor on the Table of the House so that Members who wanted to criticise Government may have full facts with them. What is the duty of the Governor ? Should he wish for prolongation or the Proclamation having the President's Rule or should he see that a popular Government is formed in the State ? Naturally, when he wrote the first letter, he had these two points to consider. The period of President's Rule was running out fast. The Proclamation had to be renewed before the 26th of this month. That ought to have been kept on the agenda of this honourable House in the very first week. Instead of discussing the role of the Governor today, we would have possibly been discussing the prolongation of the Proclamation if things had not changed. Naturally, he had to make certain recommendations to the Government. Therefore, at the time when he had to make the recommendations, he had to state the facts as they were at that time. The entire spirit of both the letters is that he was trying to see whether some organised political parties were in a position to support the Government.

There were certain groups and some individuals. It was very difficult for the Governor to depend on their support as a real support to the Government to carry on during the troublesome times. He indicated in the first letter that he had asked Shri Daroga Rai to say whether he was in a position to get the consent of the leaders of the C.P.I. and the P.S.P. because these are the two political parties which have got reasonable strength there on whose support, really speaking, depends the political stability of Bihar. When he wrote the first letter, such a communication was not in the hands of the Governor.

Now people ask, what happened that changed his mind after he wrote the first letter. It was a very important thing that happened. After he wrote the first letter, he got in writing from the leaders of both the parties, the C.P.I. and the P S.P. that they were prepared to support the Government of Shri Daroga Rai. I think, he would have failed in his duty if he had not changed his mind given another recommendation, if he had merely stood by a sense of consistency, saying, once he had made a recommendation that it was not possible to form a Government, he stood by it. It was the duty of the Governor to make another recommendation when he saw that there was a reasonable possibility of forming a popular Government, bringing a democratic regime to the State of Bihar, which he did. I think, it is a credit to him that he did not stand on his personal prestige saying, "Well, this is what I have said. How can I change my own word ?" He showed, I should say, a moral courage by going against his own recommendation and making a recommendation that a democratic Government could be formed.

What happend in U.P. is another story. There is only one common thing between U. P. and Bihar.....

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI : That is yourself.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN . ...and it is that the Opposition people wanted some people to be their leaders and they were consistently refusing to be the leaders. That is one thing that is common between U.P. and Bihar. In Bihar, Shri Ramanand Tiwary was expected to be the leader and everybody expected that he should become the Chief Minister. But he said, "No ; I do not want to be the Chief Minister." I do not know to whom the credit is to be given, to his party or to Shri Ramanand Tiwary.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA (Delhi Sadar) : To you, as the Home Minister.

SHRI Y. B. CHAWAN : In the case of Shri Charan Singh also, same thing happened. I am asked why is it that Shri Charan Singh was not asked to form the Government earlier ? The facts are quite different. It is a good thing that the Governor did not invite him then because on the 11th February itself, Shri Charan Singh had changed his mind. When he wrote the letter to Shri C. B. Gupta on 11th February itself, he said, "I have not consulted my colleagues yet about it. I am writing this letter at 10-30 P.M. in the night." Then, he said, "I have come to the conclusion that it is very difficult for to work with those political parties with whom I have had a sad experience." Possibly, he meant the S.S.P. and Jana Sangh. This is a compliment.

श्री राम सेवक यादव : यह 11 तारीख की चिट्ठी नहीं है। मंत्रीमहोदय फिर से पढ़ लें। उसमें तो उन्होंने सफाई दी है कि उन्हें तीन चार दिन क्यों लगे।

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : He had specifically indicated this. He said, 'I do not want to repeat the sad experience of working...' I think...

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : उसने बाद में अपना मन बदला, जबकि आप ने उससे सौदेबाजी कर ली और डी. पी. मिश्र ने उस को खरीद लिया।

श्री राम सेवक यादव : 11 तारीख की चिट्ठी में उन्होंने संसोपा और जनसंघ को धन्यवाद दिया था और कहा था कि वह अपनी जिम्मेदारी को निभायेंगे। माननीय मंत्री जिस चिट्ठी का जिक्र कर रहे हैं, वह 14 तारीख की है।

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : If at all anybody is to be given thanks for the change of mind by Mr. Charan Singh, it is possibly the Jana Sangh and the S.S.P.

श्री कंवरलाल गुप्त : यह आपकी सोदे बाजी का नतीजा है।

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : If you do not want those thanks, I do not want to give them.

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र (फूलपुर) : यह तो आप की प्रेरणा है। राष्ट्रपति के चुनाव में आप ने भी तो अपनी राय दो तीन बार बदली थी।

श्री यशवन्तराव चह्वाण : मैं ने अपनी राय नहीं बदली है। राष्ट्रपति के चुनाव के बारे में मेरी जो राय थी, वह मैं ने होल्ड की।

श्री कंवरलाल गुप्त : हम होम मिनिस्टर और प्राइम मिनिस्टर को बधाई देना चाहते हैं कि वे मंडी में बहुत अच्छा सौदा खरीद सकते हैं।

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : So, Sir, the point is that as far as U.P. is concerned, it was very true that, what happened after the split in the Congress party, was that it become very clear that only Mr. Charan Singh could lead the Government in U.P. it was wisdom on the part of Guptaji that he saw that thing. This credit should be given to Guptaji that when he was convinced that he had lost the majority he gracefully resign. He also saw the truth that the only person who can become the Chief Minister of U.P. was Mr. Charan Singh. Therefore, he made a recommendation. Ultimately that thing came true. Why do you blame the poor Governor for it ? (*Intrruptions*) I must say that in the whole history of the last two or three years, political parties have erred, calculated and miscalculated but the Governors' calculation in all the States have come true—even in the case of Kerala I must say. Ultimately what the Governor did was practically supported for all purposes by the Legislative Assembly of Kerala. I think there he was correct in choosing the right person who got ultimately the majority in the Kerala Assembly. What happened in Kerala, what happened in Bihar, what happened in west Bengal and what happend in U P. have all vindicated the role of the Governors.

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI : Why did you call him here ? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : A part from this political manoeuvring involved in this matter, ultimately the basic point that this House should consider is : what exactly is the Governor supposed to do in a changing

situation ? Whether it is 'A' Party or 'B' Party or 'C' Party which rules is a different matter. Whether Mr. Dange likes it or not, the Constitution is going to remain there and the insstitution of Governor is going to continue.

SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA : Why can't you change it ?

AN HON. MEMBER : Can you give a guarantee ?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I can say many things. It is not mere wishfull thinking. As far as giving a guarantee is concerned, in democratic conditions who can give a guarantee ?

So the point is that as long as the institution of Governor has the sanction of the Constitution, we have to see that the Governor accepts certain objective criteria while using his discretion at the time of inviting anybody to become the Chief Minister. There is no doubt that the only consideration is that he has to satisfy himself that the person chosen is likely to command the majority in the House. I have no doubt that in these two specific cases, the Governors were clearly guided by this principle. Now, whether their judgment is right or wrong is ultimately to be observed on the floor of the House of the Bihar Assembly and the U. P. Assembly. What Shri Prakash Vir Shastri said is very right. Within three days it is to be tested there.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : New friends.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : 'Majority' is a continuing process.

SHRI Y. B CHAVAN : Unless your Party changes its mind. I do not know. I wish it does not happen. What this House should really appreciate is that the people of U-P. and Bihar need a fair deal to be given to them. It should be our effort, and our desire, that the people of U.P. and Bihar get stable Governments and I wish that the two new leaderships that have come into being in U.P. and Bihar get the support of the people, get the support of their Houses, and they ultimately give a fair deal to the people of U.P. and Bihar.

18.31–1/2 hrs.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE FORTY-FOURTH REPORT

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI RAGHU RAMAIAH): Sir, I beg to present the Forty Fourth Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The House now stands adjourned to meet at 11 A.M. tomorrow.

18.32 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, February 24, 1970/Phalguna, 5, 1891 (Saka)