

[Shri Kanugno] -

(2) Ministry of Commerce and Industry Resolution No. IS (4)-2-(161)/56, dated the 16th July, 1956.

(3) Statement under proviso to section 16(2) of the Tariff Commission Act, 1951, explaining the reason why a copy of each of the documents referred to at (1) and (2) above could not be laid within the prescribed period.

[Placed in Library. See No. S-267/56]

AMENDMENTS TO ESTATE DUTY RULES

The Minister of Revenue and Civil Expenditure (Shri M. C. Shah): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (3) of section 85 of the Estate Duty Act, 1953, a copy of the Notification No. 32/12/9/55-E.D., dated the 12th June, 1956, making certain further amendments to the Estate Duty Rules, 1953. [Placed in Library. See Idnex No. S-268/56].

AMENDMENT TO ADMINISTRATION OF EVACUEE PROPERTY (CENTRAL) RULES

The Deputy Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri J. K. Bhonsle): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (4) of section 56 of the Administration of Evacuee Property Act, 1950, a copy of the Notification No. 42-I(25)/55-Prop. I, dated the 5th June, 1956, making certain amendment to the Administration of Evacuee Property (Central) Rules, 1950. [Placed in Library. See No. S-269/56].

COMMITTEE ON ABSENCE OF MEMBERS FROM THE SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

SIXTEENTH REPORT

Shri Ahtekar (North Satara): Sir, I beg to present the Sixteenth Report of the Committee on Absence of Members from the Sitzings of the House.

also lay on the Table a list showing names of Members who were

continuously absent from the sittings of the House for 15 days or more during the twelfth Session, 1956.

PETITIONS RE STATES REORGANISATION BILL AND CONSTITUTION (NINTH AMENDMENT) BILL

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): Sir, I beg to present a petition signed by 1,175 petitioners, in respect of the States Reorganisation Bill, 1956, as reported by the Joint Committee.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): Sir, I beg to present a petition signed by 2,118 petitioners, in respect of the States Reorganisation Bill, 1956, and the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill, 1956, as reported by the Joint Committee.

STATES REORGANISATION BILL

Mr. Speaker: We will now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant on the 26th July, 1956, namely:

"That the Bill to provide for the reorganisation of the States of India and for matters connected therewith, as reported by the Joint Committee, be taken into consideration."

Before I call upon Shri Gurupadaswamy who was on his legs yesterday to resume his speech I wish to make this announcement. Hon. Members were anxious to have, including the ex-Finance Minister, extracts of the Prime Minister's speech. I have been given, along with a letter, a short extract from a note recorded by the Prime Minister dated June 8, 1956, at the request of Shri Deogrikar, explaining the main points dealt with in his speech delivered at the All India Congress Committee meeting at Bombay on June 3, 1956. The letter states: This extract may be placed on record as an authenticated version of the Prime Minister's statement referred to ;

paragraph 15 of the Report of the Joint Committee on the States Reorganisation Bill, 1956.

The extract is as follows:

"Continuance of Central Administration of Bombay.

I said that the provision in the Bill before Parliament providing for central administration of Bombay represented the Government's point of view and the Congress also agreed with it. There is nothing more to be said about it. I added, however, that, subject to the Central administration of Bombay, it was our intention to make some suitable arrangements to associate representatives of Bombay with this administration. I further added that after a certain period which might be about five years, the people of Bombay should have the opportunity to decide for themselves about their future. The method to be adopted for this purpose could be decided later in consultation with the people concerned."

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): I want a clarification.....

Mr. Speaker:... Of the extract for which I am not responsible?

Shri Kamath: No, Sir, not of the contents of the statement. Considering that it is not customary, except in totalitarian countries, to make announcements of Government policy at party meetings, will the Prime Minister clarify and say whether this was made in his capacity as the Prime Minister or merely as a party leader?

Mr. Speaker: All this was asked yesterday.

Shri Kamath: But no answer was given yesterday, Sir.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): May I know whether it will be circulated to all the Members so that we can make use of it.

Mr. Speaker: It will form part of the debates. I shall see to it that it is circulated.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): Has the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs got anything to say about the programme of work for the next week? Today is Friday.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): The House is sitting tomorrow. Whenever the House sits on Saturday, I propose to make that statement on Saturday.

STATES REORGANISATION BILL —Contd.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): Yesterday I was dealing with the question of Bombay. Most of the Members of the House feel that Bombay should belong to Maharashtra. I am sorry that the attitude of the Government, especially of the Prime Minister was strange and even unjust. The other day, the hon. Member, Shri C. D. Deshmukh made a historic statement giving us the truth behind the Bombay decision. I cannot improve upon his language but I may just draw the attention of the House to the statement of Shri Deshmukh. He said that the decision on Bombay was not the decision of Government. He also said:

"There was no consideration of the proposal in the Cabinet or even by circulation. There was no individual consultation with members of the Cabinet known to be specially interested, as for instance, myself. There is no record even of a meeting of a Committee of the Cabinet, and to this day no authoritative text of the so-called decision is available to the members of the Cabinet."

If this is a fact, I must say that the attitude of the Prime Minister is highly irresponsible. I may further say, if I am permitted to use the phraseology of H. G. Wells, that the policy of the Government in regard to the States reorganisation is a 'pitiful jumble of incoherent nonsense.'