

1. DIRECT ELECTION OF THE GOVERNOR IS INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE PARLIAMENTARY SYSTEM ESTABLISHED AT THE STATES. DISCUSS.

In India, the same parliamentary structure is adopted in the states. The Governor acts as the head of the state. He is the de jure or ceremonial head as he is required to go by the advice tendered by the council of ministers in the state.

Considering his constitutional position, it was decided by the makers of the Constitution to avoid an idea of direct election for the office of the Governor and replaced it with the method of appointment by the President.

Denying direct election would save the country from the evil consequences of election.

If the Governor were to be directly elected, then he might consider himself to be superior to the Chief Minister, who merely represents a single constituency. It would have created conflict between the two offices.

The election of the Governor would be entirely on personal issues. Hence, it is against national interest to involve large number of people and spend huge amount of money in such an election.

Elected Governor would naturally belong to a political party and would not remain neutral and impartial head.

The direct election of governor would create leadership crisis at the state level.

The chief minister would like his nominee to contest for governorship and hence, a leader of less political clout than him would get elected.

Hence, a directly elected governor on American model was dropped and an appointed Governor in line with the Canadian model was adopted by the Constituent Assembly