

[Shri Bal Raj Madhok]  
as to what is communalism. This word is bandied around by some people day in and day out.

MR. SPEAKER : Let us not begin the discussion now itself. That is all.

SHRI RANGA (Srikakulam) : I do not know whether the Mahajan Commission's Report should be discussed here. You, Sir, set the pattern earlier when there was a similar dispute between Andhra and Tamilnad and you settled it. Why not the three concerned Chief Ministers sit together and agree among themselves to implement the Mahajan Commission's Report, if necessary, with proper modifications ?

DR. KARNI SINGH (Bikaner) : During the last session, I had raised a discussion on the effective population control. Unless we have effective population control, all our plans are going to fail.

MR. SPEAKER : We are going astray now. That is all.

SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai) : What is effective population control ? Will you define it ?

MR. SPEAKER : I do not know.

12.23 Hrs.

MOTION RE : GOVERNORS OF STATES—*contd.*

MR. SPEAKER : Yesterday, in the beginning, we had allotted 2 hours for this discussion. But the House was pleased to increase the time from 2 hours to 4 hours. Now, we have already taken 3 hours and 40 minutes and only 20 minutes remain. Only one party has not spoken and the hon. Minister has also to intervene and then Mr. Nath Pai has to reply to the debate. I do not think I can accommodate any other hon. Members. It is not possible. We have to finish it and then take up the non-official business. I will not be able to extend the time further. It is not in my hands. Now, I call Mr. Ramamurti and I would request him to finish in a short time.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU (Diamond Harbour) : Can't we sit a little longer in the evening, say, till 6-30 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER : No; we sat yesterday till about 8 p.m.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madurai) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, this House has previously debated such questions regarding the Governors of various States on two occasions and every time it was found that that particular action of the Governor helped the ruling Party at the centre, namely, the Congress Party.

Now, the happenings that are there today in West Bengal clearly indicate that the Governor is not an independent entity as it is made out but is nothing more than the creature of the Central Government and the Party in power. Take this very question. Why is it necessary for the Law Ministry of the Government of India to issue an opinion as to what can be done and what cannot be done under certain circumstances ? After all, there is the Law Officer in the Government or West Bengal. If the Governor had any doubt with regard to particular powers that he had, the simple thing for him was to call the Law Officer of the West Bengal Government and ask him his opinion on that. Instead of that, what happens is this. Here is the Law Ministry of the Government of India which enters into a great amount of research with regard to the powers of the Governor. The Law Ministry issues some statement or some note; the Law Ministry spokesman briefs the press. The Home Ministry then issues some directive and the Congress Parliamentary Board or the Congress Working Committee also discusses all these questions. What does it mean ? It only means that it is an indication to the Governor of West Bengal that he had to act in a particular way. This is nothing but that. After all, if the Governor of West Bengal wants any information, there is the Law Officer there.

What is the Governor doing now and what has he been doing before ? I know, as a matter of fact, the Governor of West Bengal, immediately after the new Ministry came in, as early as in March, called all the district officials, the I.G., Police and various Police officers and discussed with them as to what should be done and what should not be done. It is a matter of fact. When the matter leaked out, the Governor of West Bengal denied it and he said that it was just a tea party with those people.

I would like to know in how many States where the Congress is ruling or has been ruling before, the Governor called the district officials, the I.G., Police and various other Police officers for a tea party. It is a very strange thing that is happening in the State of West Bengal. I know how the West Bengal Governor, right from the beginning, has been in conspiracy with the Central Government in order to topple this Government.

We have had a discussion here, in this House, regarding Rajasthan and we had a discussion also on the question of Madhya Pradesh. I would like to refer to the speech made by Mr. Y. B. Chavan. I would just like to refer to certain passages of his speech when we were discussing the question of Madhya Pradesh on the 20th July, 1967. He said :

"The Governor's office is a very important office. Let us not compromise the role of the Governor because sometimes it helps a political party. Let us accept this basic position. The Governor is the constitutional head of the State. He has to act on the advice of the Chief Minister, whether he heads a Congress Government or a non-Congress Government. Let us act on that basis".

This was the categorical statement he made defending the position that the Governor of the State was perfectly in his right, when he accepted the advice of the Chief Minister of that State, to prorogue the Assembly in the midst of the Budget Session when a particular Demand was to be voted upon the next day and the Ministry was to be formed. This was a particular action he took. Mr. Chavan, a very great constitutionalist, a man who stands by constitutional propriety, said that it was a very correct thing for him to do. Very good. What was the reason for that? He also gave the reason. He said :

"I am not going into those facts. But really speaking, the Chief Minister was entitled to meet his own people to find out what is the charge against him. The charge against the Chief Minister is that he has tried to get his colleagues back. What is wrong in that? . . . If he is trying to get back into his party those with whom he has worked for years together, if he wants to talk to them for the pur-

pose and iron out the differences, what is the wrong?"

I do not say, there is anything wrong.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN) : But you found it so.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI : The question was not that; that was not the issue. I am entitled to get back my people if they have erred and gone away. But that is not the issue. The issue is, for the purpose of getting them back, was it open to the Chief Minister to give the advice to the Governor to prorogue the Assembly because in the absence of prorogation the Ministry would have been toppled? Here was the Chief Minister who gave that particular advice in order to enable him to try and make an attempt to get back those people. Mr. Chavan defended that position very well. In West Bengal such a position has not arisen. Mr. Indrajit Gupta read from the letter of Governor in which the Governor has said, that he has some doubts about the majority. The Assembly is not in session. Six months have not elapsed since the last session of the Assembly. It is also necessary for me to point out that, just before the Assembly was prorogued last time, the Congress Party attempted to topple the Ministry by a Vote of No-Confidence, but it failed miserably. Within these months, simply because a doubt has arisen, is it to be done immediately? After all, the Chief Minister did not say that he is not going to call the Assembly, or that he is not going to exercise his power of calling the Assembly only at the end of six months. Nothing of that kind. He has said that they are having it on the 18th December. This is what has happened. The charge is : Why don't you want to have it? Suppose it is said that it is open to the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh to prorogue the Assembly or suppose, for example, it is said : why do you require this time. They have given some reasons. All right, we are not concerned with it. Even assuming that there is an attempt to get back some of the people who may have erred, are we using any undue method? We are not offering Ministries as the Congress Party does. We have decided firmly that we are not going to get back anybody on the offer of a particular Ministry. To this kind of

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

immoral inducements, we have said that we will not be a party. On that we are absolutely certain. We heard in this House sometime back very great morals on the part of the Congress Party; they were vaxing eloquent over the question of defections; it was said that it was immoral, it was cutting at the social fabric of our country, the political life of our country and all that. We have heard all those things. But what has happened? I do not see some of them here. Here what has happened now? What is it that we are guilty of? All that we have said is that we believe in our people and we tell the people, who have elected these people to the Assembly on the promise that they are going to oppose the Congress Party, "Friends, this is how these people are behaving; therefore, mobilise your opinion and prevent them from betraying you". Is it wrong? Is it an undemocratic thing? Our Ministers have said that; our Party has said that, and the response was tremendous. On the 5th of this month, the biggest rally was held; every newspaper in this country has said that the biggest rally ever held in the history of Calcutta—even for Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru it was not there—was held on the 5th of this month. Therefore, we will certainly continue to mobilise public opinion. What is wrong in that? My friend, Mr. Asoke Sen, does not want that. Why? He says that it is 'mob'. For him, this is 'mob', but for us they are the people of our country and we believe in the people of our country. Therefore, what is wrong about that? It is not just a Constitutional question as people try to make it. If it is just a Constitutional question, then, as my friend pointed out, many Constitutional pandits will differ. If six Constitutional lawyers join together, I am sure seven opinions will be given on a particular question, if not more. Therefore, that is not the question.....

**SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai) :** Wonderful! Six people giving seven opinions!

**SHRI P. RAMAMURTI :** Somebody will give two opinions.

So, it is a political question. What is the political morality? That is the question with which we are concerned. The Constitutional point has been very well argued by my hon. friend, Mr. Nath Pai, and I do not want to

add anything more. I am not a big Constitutional pandit and I also do not claim to be a Constitutional pandit.

Anyway, let us now take the political question. I am glad that Mr. Asoke Sen and Mr. Dandekar spoke almost in an identical language; both of them spoke the same thing. I am glad about that. But what is the simple question? The simple question is that, when this Government came, this Government was faced with a situation which was not its own creation, but a situation which was created by the policies pursued by this Government at the Centre all these twenty years. Mr. Dandekar and the members on that side talked of gheraos. If they had some understanding with regard to the people and their sufferings, they would also have talked something about the large number of retrenchments that have taken place during this very period. Over one lakh of people have been retrenched in one month alone. What is the position? Here is a State Government which is not empowered to tackle that problem. It is a problem created by the policies of the Central Government. The State Government cannot tackle it. It cannot take over those industries. It has neither the resources nor the power to do it. But the employer is at liberty to dismiss thousands and thousands of people and here is the Central Government which is not alive to its responsibility. Even human problems do not move them. What about these more than one lakh people today? They do not think even in terms of unemployment doles for these people. And here is the State Government which has got to deal with that problem. It is a human problem, the problem of unemployment. When this comes, there are two lines of action. One line of action is this: profits to the industrialists is the most important thing; people do not come if people oppose the industrialists, then the profits of the industry will suffer, and the profits will have to be maintained even by the use of the Police force of the State; the State machinery is there intended for the purpose of coercing the workers to submit to any attack that the employers might make. There is another line of action: that is, we will not allow the employers and the Central Government to make the workers, the common people, bear the burden which they themselves created; who is to bear the bur-

den of rising prices? That is a primary problem. Are the employers to bear it or is the Government of India to bear it or are the workers or the common people to bear it? This is a simple issue. Our Government says that they are not going to allow this policy of throwing the burden of this crisis on the working class who were not responsible for its creation; it has been created by the others; and they are going to use the State machinery for protecting the workers. Therefore, these two lines of action have certainly been contending and I am absolutely certain that the Government of India does not want the second line of action to be followed. If the West Bengal Government is allowed to help the working class within the limitations of its powers, which are already crippled, if within those limited powers the West Bengal Government is allowed to use the State machinery for the purpose of helping the downtrodden people, then it will be an epidemic; the democratic movement in the country will develop; the people in the other States will say, "Why not we do the same thing?" That is why, I say that the spokesmen of the Congress Party and the Swatantra Party say the same thing; in the ultimate analysis, both of them represent the same interests, the interests of Tatas and Birlas of this country, and in order to be able to do that, they will have to drown the people of West Bengal. I know, they are prepared for that. Sometime back, they were prepared for that, and once again, if they want to prepare themselves for that, all right. That is a different question. But all that I want to point out is that, by this, they will only be proving the thesis that we have stated in our Party Programme and which we have claimed from house-tops that the ruling class of this country, when they find that the downtrodden people, the common people, will utilise, the facilities afforded by the Parliamentary system, in order to assert their rights, will not hesitate to use the Police and the Military in order to subvert democracy itself, in order to subvert the Parliamentary democracy itself. Let the people learn from experience let them experience it and they will learn it; they will find some other way of fighting. I would, therefore, warn this Government here that if they want to do it, that is not going to help them in the ultimate analysis. There are these talks of China; we have heard them hundred times. They said the same thing

with regard to the elections in Kerala. My hon. friend's predecessor said the same thing with regard to the elections in Kerala in 1965, and he had said the same thing in regard to West Bengal also. Ultimately, it is the people who are to decide. We are prepared to be judged by the people of this country, not by the Congress Party. It is ultimately the people of our country that are to judge. Even in West Bengal, we are prepared to be judged by the people of West Bengal. That was why four months ago we started the slogan 'Go back to the electorate'. Even now, we are prepared to go back to the electorate and let the people of Bengal give a verdict. I am sure the Congress Party will not be prepared to go back to the people because they know what the verdict of the people will be.

12.41 Hrs.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION UNDER  
RULE 357

(Shri B. P. Mandal)

MR. SPEAKER : Now, Shri B. P. Mandal. He said that he wanted to make some personal explanation. There should be no speech-making, but only a personal explanation. Let him be clear about that.

श्री बि० प्र० मंडल (माधोपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जब मैं कल इस सदन में आया तो मैंने माननीय सदस्य श्री नाथ पाई का एक प्रस्ताव देखा जिस से मैं सहमत नहीं हूँ। अध्यक्ष महोदय, उस प्रस्ताव के द्वारा यह कहा गया है कि बिहार का गवर्नर . . . . .

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : This is no personal explanation.

SHRI B. P. MANDAL : You have called me to give a personal explanation. I shall make the personal explanation, but I also want to speak.

MR. SPEAKER : No, I called him only for personal explanation, not for making a speech now.

SHRI B. P. MANDAL : I am making my personal explanation.

अध्यक्ष महोदय, कल माननीय सदस्य श्री मधु लिमये ने कहा बिहार के सम्बन्ध