

Appropriation Accounts (Civil), 1963-64; Audit Report (Civil), 1965 and Audit Report (Commercial), 1965 relating to the Ministries of External Affairs, Health, Home Affairs, Information and Broadcasting and Labour and Employment.

13.07 hrs.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION BY
MEMBER

Shri G. N. Dixit (Etawah): Sir, on Friday, the 3rd December 1965, Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath's Private Members' Constitution (Amendment) Bill came up for consideration before the Lok Sabha for the purpose of changing the name of the Union Territory of Andaman and Nicobar Islands.

13.04 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC UNDERTAKINGS

THIRTEENTH REPORT

Shri P. G. Menon (Mukundapuram): I beg to present the Thirteenth Report of the Committee on Public Undertakings on the Management and Administration of Public Undertakings (Planning of Projects).

Mr. Speaker: The Food Minister would be making a statement on PL 480 imports at 2.30 P.M. today.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Barrackpore): He is doing nothing but making statements on PL 480!

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): What about the Prime Minister's statement?

Mr. Speaker: That will be made at 4.00 P.M.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Regarding PL 480, is he making a statement on the news which appeared this morning about President Johnson? I want to know that because we have tabled a calling attention notice on that.

Mr. Speaker: How can I say what statement he is going to make?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: If I heard you aright, the Food Minister will be making a statement at 2.30 and the Prime Minister will be making a statement at 4 P.M. May I ask whether this will not result in an unusual erosion of private members' time, if two statements are to be made during that period? (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Dixit.

I raised a point of order that the Bill could neither be introduced nor considered as under Article 3 of the Constitution a Bill for the purpose of altering the name of any State cannot be initiated except on the recommendation of the President. The point of order was resisted on the ground that the bar applied to the States and not to Union Territories. There being no definition of 'State' in Part I of the Constitution, I relied on Article 1 which says: "India, that is Bharat, shall be a Union of States". At the time I raised the point of order, the General Clauses Act was not with me. Later, I looked into it and I find that there was positive and categorical support to the correctness of my point of order. Article 367(1) makes the General Clauses Act applicable for the interpretation of the Constitution and the said Act—the General Clauses Act—gives the definition of the word State as under in section 3(58):—

"State"

(b) as respect any period after such commencement [commencement of the Constitution (Seventh amendment) Act, 1956] shall mean a State specified in the First Schedule to the Constitution and shall include a Union Territory."

While I was making my argument, and which argument was quite arguable even under Article 1, the hon. Member, Shri Nath Pai made an observation saying: "He says Union ter-