

APPENDIX VI

DATES OF DISCUSSIONS WITH STATE GOVERNMENTS

<i>Government</i>	<i>Dates</i>
Madhya Pradesh	7th to 10th April 1952
West Bengal	17th to 31st April 1952
Orissa	23rd to 25th April 1952
Assam	3rd to 7th May 1952
Madhya Bharat	27th to 30th May 1952
Bombay	2nd to 5th June 1952
Travancore-Cochin	10th to 12th June 1952
Mysore	2nd to 5th July 1952
Madras	9th to 12th July 1952
Hyderabad	16th to 18th July 1952
Saurashtra	1st to 3rd August 1952
Punjab	9th to 13th August 1952
Patiala and East Punjab States Union	16th to 18th August 1952
Rajasthan	22nd to 25th August 1952
Uttar Pradesh	27th to 30th August 1952
Bihar	6th to 8th September 1952 and 22nd September 1952.

APPENDIX VII

LETTER FROM THE CHIEF MINISTER OF SAURASHTRA DATED THE 1ST AUGUST, 1952, TO THE CHAIRMAN, FINANCE COMMISSION

This morning we discussed the question about the powers of the Finance Commission *vis-a-vis* clause (I) of the Federal Financial Agreement entered into between the Government of India and the Government of Saurashtra. As we had anticipated the provisions of Article 280 will not cover an inquiry under clause (I) of the said Agreement. We appreciate the difficulty of the Finance Commission. The Constitution gives them certain powers and it is just and proper that the investigations by the Finance Commission should be confined to the provisions and the terms of the Constitution. On our side, however, you will appreciate the difficulty that for the period for which the Commission is to report there is also another body contemplated by the provisions of the F.F.I. Agreement to report practically on the same matter, although the background and the approach will be different.

2. We have carefully considered whether we should proceed further with an inquiry under Article 280 or should insist upon an inquiry under the provisions of the F.F.I. Agreement. After careful consideration, we have come to the conclusion that in the light of what has happened it would be against the interests of the State to enter into a discussion of the question unless the discussion covers an inquiry contemplated by the aforesaid Agreement.

3. Apart from the question that we feel that an inquiry limited to the terms of Article 280 will prejudice an inquiry under clause (I) of the Agreement, we feel that two Inquiry Bodies inquiring into the needs of Saurashtra for the same period will lead to all sorts of complications all of which cannot be appreciated at the present moment. At least there will be much over-lapping and duplication.

4. Under the circumstances, we have decided to move the Government of India to institute an inquiry under clause (I) of F.F.I. Agreement. I may explain that this is not in a spirit of huff or non-co-operation. We will be glad if this Commission itself is vested with the power to undertake an inquiry suggested above.