

12.05 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

REPORT OF THE TEAM OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT ON NAGALAND

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Dinesh Singh): Sir, on behalf of Shri Swaran Singh, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of Report of the team of Members of Parliament who visited Nagaland in February 1965. [*Placed in Library, see No. LT-4023/65*].

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Berpampur): Sir, on a point of order. It is in relation to this item of business. I want to know what is the status of the document that is being placed before us, on the Table of the House and also the status of the Members of the team who went to Nagaland. You will remember, Sir—you were then Deputy-Speaker in 1960,—when the Chairman of the Rajya Sabha and the Speaker of this House, your predecessor, jointly appointed a parliamentary delegation to visit the State of Assam in connection with the disturbances that took place in Assam. I was instrumental in raising a similar point of order, questioning the legal status of the report of that delegation that was sent, which report was laid on the Table of the House, and I questioned the propriety of sending such delegations to a regularly constituted State, without any invitation or any sort of asking by the State Government. The State of Nagaland is also regularly constituted.

Mr. Speaker: I have followed him.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: Let me finish, Sir. I want to know: What was this team? Who sent them? If a parliamentary delegation is sent from this House, the selection of Members is generally made by the Speaker in consultation with the leaders of different groups and although I have nothing against the Members who were sent, I would

like to know how the selection was made. I also represent a small group here recognised by you and as far as I know neither my leader nor myself, the deputy leader, was consulted in the selection of this team. Who formed this team? Who sent this team? Why did it go? On what grounds? Was there any invitation from the State of Nagaland? What was the purpose?

Mr. Speaker: Let me hear the Government side.

Shri Dinesh Singh: Sir, I do not know what particular point the hon. Member had in mind when he raised the question of status. These are Members of Parliament and their status is that of Members of Parliament. They went there, in these circumstances. As you know, Sir, Prof. Ranga had written to the Prime Minister that some Members of Parliament wished to go to Nagaland and the Prime Minister agreed with the proposal. The Department of Parliamentary Affairs invited certain number of Members from both Houses, of different parties, to go to Nagaland. I think they went on their own expenses. Arrangements were made for them to meet certain people and go round. I do not know what legal status is necessary. They came back and gave a report and that report had been placed on the Table of the House. There is no question of any legality or states involved.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: Sir, the answer of the hon. Deputy Minister makes the position worse confounded. I know that Members of Parliament have a right to ask the Government to visit any part of India and ask for facilities. These are Members of Parliament. Was this team a parliamentary delegation properly constituted according to the traditions of the House? That is what I want to know. Who sent them?

Shri Bade (Khargone): Sir, myself and four Members of this House went

to Ernakulam in Kerala. Can I submit a report to the Government or can I lay it on the Table of the House That is the question. We have also a report on Kerala. Will you allow us to put it on the Table of the House. Can any paper be laid on the Table of the House?

श्री किशन पटनायक (सम्बलपुर) :
पहली बात तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इसको संसद् सदस्यों के दल की रिपोर्ट नहीं कहना चाहिये क्योंकि उसमें सब दलों का प्रतिनिधित्व नहीं था ।

दूसरी बात अगर आप इजाजत दें तो मैं विशेषाधिकार के प्रश्न के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस समय जो बात चल रही है आप सिर्फ उसी के बारे में कह सकते हैं ।

Shri Daji (Indore): Sir, I would not like to say about the status of the delegation but if it is to be a parliamentary delegation which could present reports to this House, then it has to be chosen by the Speaker. I am not going into the other point, why some people were not selected or consulted. It can be an informal group, which asked the Government for certain facilities and it is upto the Government to allow those facilities. But the report of such a delegation cannot be considered to be a report of a parliamentary delegation of which the House should take note or which could be laid on the Table.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Sir, I was also a member of this Delegation which went to Nagaland and I may say this much that we were invited by the Parliamentary Affairs Minister, Mr. Jain was also there. We were invited directly by the Department of Parliamentary Affairs and we joined this team because we were interested in knowing the affairs in Nagaland. We visited Nagaland. The Government of Nagaland provided us

with all facilities. Possibly, the Department of Parliamentary Affairs also provided us with the necessary facilities. Then we thought, because we went there as a team of Members of Parliament, we should submit a report to the Government giving our views, and I think the report submitted by us is one of the most sensible reports that were submitted.

Shri Daji: We have no doubt about that.

Shri Hem Barua: Naturally enough, when Shri Masani made a reference to that on the floor of the House in the course of one of his speeches that day, my friend Shri Nath Pai demanded that a copy of that should be placed on the Table of the House. In response to that demand a copy has been now put on the Table of the House. There the matter ends. I think every Member of Parliament has a right to demand it that whenever any report is made to the Government and there is a reference to it on the floor of the House, a copy of it should be placed on the Table of the House.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barackpore): It is for the Speaker to decide whether it should be allowed to be placed on the Table.

Shri A. P. Jain (Tumkur): Sir, I was also a member of this delegation. Personally I never made any request to the Government to include me in the delegation. I received an invitation from the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs enquiring as to whether I would be prepared to join the delegation. I willingly did it. Our stand was that the Government had requested certain persons to visit Nagaland and to give them their impressions. We did visit Nagaland. No specific terms of reference were given to us. It was just a study team to acquaint ourselves with the conditions obtaining there. We were fortunate enough that we were members of a delegation consisting of representatives be-

[Shri A. P. Jain]

longing to different groups of political thought.....

An hon. Member: Not all.

Shri A. P. Jain: There were representatives of the Communists, PSP—SSP or both—Shri Hem Barua represented them—and the Swatantra Party. In fact, an invitation was also issued to the Jan Sangh but they could not avail of it. We were fortunate enough to work out a unanimous report. As we had gone there we felt it our duty to convey our views to the Prime Minister. We have done it. Now it is for you to decide whether that document is relevant and it should be placed on the Table of the House. Personally, I think, after Shri Masani was allowed to make a reference to it, nothing can get in the way of this report being placed on the Table of the House.

So far as the role of the Government of Nagaland is concerned, we do not know what is the position between the Central Ministry and the Government of Nagaland, but they accorded to us every facility and they were very good and kind to us for which I want to express our thanks to the Government of Nagaland.

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: I do not think we should continue the discussion for a long time. We have already taken about ten minutes.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: We would like to make our suggestions.

Mr. Speaker: Shri D. C. Sharma— I have always this complaint that he is not given adequate opportunity.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla (Mahasamund): I have also that complaint.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): I do not want to go into the merits of the delegation that went there. I do not want to say anything about the merits of the report which has been submitted. But I definitely believe that we are setting up a wrong prece-

dent in this House, and I feel that if we are going to place such reports on the Table of the House the Table of the House will be too small to hold those reports. I would submit, Sir, very respectfully, that even when a delegation is appointed by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs in consultation with you, or by you in consultation with the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, their reports are never placed on the Table of the House. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I will answer that.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Again, the Congress Party appoint so many committees for giving reports and sometimes they make use of persons who are Members of Parliament. Can I take it that you will allow all those reports to be laid on the Table of the House?

Then, my most valid point is this. When you place a report on the Table of the House, it becomes sacrosanct; it becomes a property of the Government and the Government is bound by what is said by it. I feel that no report signed by any person, however eminent he might be—whether it is Shri A. P. Jain or others—should become sacrosanct as to bind the Government to the policy contained in that report. What we are going to follow in the case of Nagaland today, tomorrow we will be forced to follow in the case of other areas. I think this should not be done.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: One point which is not clear to us is whether the Department of Parliamentary Affairs invited the members concerned of their own accord or in consultation with you or with your approval. A delegation of Members of Parliament constituted by the Department of Parliamentary Affairs cannot really be a parliamentary delegation unless it is blessed by you and it is under your authority. So, the first point that we have to decide is whether a delegation can be a par-

liamentary delegation without your seal of authority. The second point for decision is whether the Government should take the responsibility of laying the report of a delegation on the Table—however eminent the members of the delegation may be; that is not relevant—when the delegation's report is of an informal nature and when this report becomes official by the fact that the Government have laid it on the Table of the House, what effect it would have in the stand that the Government are taking in the negotiations that are going on in Nagaland. All these implications have to be considered before you take a decision on this question.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: It is quite correct that we have to make a distinction between a parliamentary delegation and a delegation of parliamentarians of various groups. If Government have set up such a delegation and a report has been submitted by that delegation to Government, there is nothing wrong in laying that study team's report or whatever you would like to call it, on the Table of the House. There is nothing sacrosanct in the reports which are placed on the Table of the House. I do not agree there with Shri D. C. Sharma, because we often criticise those reports. When it is laid on the Table of the House, it only means that it is made available to the public. Therefore, all important documents of that nature should be laid on the Table. But I would suggest that the wording in the Order Paper should be changed because it is not a parliamentary delegation. It is the report of a study team of parliamentarians who went to Nagaland to have first hand information of the situation obtaining there.

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): It has become unnecessary for me to refer to the unnecessary verbiage which an hon. professor has indulged in, about a report becoming sacrosanct or otherwise. I merely wish to

reiterate what the hon. Member, Shrimati Renu Chakravarty, has just now stated, namely, that there is a distinction between a parliamentary delegation and a delegation of parliamentarians, and a failure to appreciate this distinction has given rise to the kind of confusion which has been given expression to by many hon. Members on the floor of the House just now.

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): I just want to submit that when there has been a demand from certain hon. Members that a paper has to be laid on the Table I think it is perfectly right to lay that paper on the Table of the House. This House should not be kept in the dark on any subject. Sir, it is high time that you laid down sound procedure relating to laying of papers. As you know, the other day, there was persistent demand about the report of CBI that....

Mr. Speaker: We are not going to "the other day". We are now on "today".

Shri P. K. Deo: You disallowed the CBI report, which was quoted by Shri Surendranath Dwivedy, to be laid on the Table of the House. Even though there was persistent demand from this side at that time you took the view....

Mr. Speaker: It is not relevant. Now Shri Madhu Limaye.

श्री मधु लिम्बे (मुंगेर) : मेरा प्रश्न यह है कि अगर यह अधिकृत प्रतिनिधिमंडल है तब तो बात दूसरी है । अगर यह अनधिकृत है तो मेरा खयाल है कि इसकी रपट को टेबल पर नहीं रखा जाना चाहिये । लेकिन अगर आप रखने की इजाजत देते हैं तो फिर मेरे जैसा आदमी कह सकता है कि मैं भी एक सदस्य का प्रतिनिधिमंडल हूँ, मैं केरल गया था, वहाँ जो संविधान की और जम्हूरियत की हत्या हुई है उस पर मैं ने भी एक रपट शास्त्री जी के पास भेज दी है और यहाँ भी रख सकता हूँ । तो आप फैसला

[श्री मधू लिमये]

इस तरह दीजिये कि उससे हमको आयन्दा के लिए रोशनी मिले ।

Shri Dinesh Singh: Sir, I think, valid points have been made by hon. Members, Mr. Daji and Shrimati Renu Chakravartty that we should have differentiated between a Parliamentary Delegation and a Delegation of Members of Parliament. As I mentioned earlier, this was not a Parliamentary Delegation.....

Mr. Speaker: But the unfortunate thing is that though the heading is 'team of Members of Parliament', the whole body of the Report contains the word 'Parliamentary Delegation'.

Shri Dinesh Singh: I was coming to that. This had been invited by the Prime Minister. We made the arrangements and we paid for their expenses. The idea was not to make it a.....

Shri Priya Gupta (Katiyar): Now he says that expenses were incurred. Earlier he had said that the expenses had not been incurred.

Shri Dinesh Singh: Of course, expense was incurred. I said, we incurred the expenses. The point here is that we had no desire to lay this on the Table of the House. It was referred to by Mr. Masani and the Minister for External Affairs in reply had said that he would place it on the table of the House. In response to that, we thought that we shall place it on the table of the House. If you so direct, we could change it from the Report of the Parliamentary Delegation to the Report of the Study Group of Members of Parliament who went there.

Mr. Speaker: There ought not to be much controversy over it. There is no doubt that the Government has

a right to send any Members of Parliament wherever they like. There right is not disputed at all. But, as has been made clear, it would be a team of Members sent by the Government. It would not be a Parliamentary Delegation. If the Report is submitted to the Government, then it does not become an official document. The Minister can only place official documents on the table of the House that are in connection with the discharge of his duties and not other documents. It is a Report submitted to the Government. Government can place it....(Interruption). It may be any other thing. In so far as Mr. Masani had raised it, I do not remember that the Minister said that he would place it on the table of the House. He did not say that.

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): While he was speaking, when he referred to this, I requested him as to whether he would share his impressions with the Members of Parliament. I had also seen it. You immediately said that there was no objection.

Mr. Speaker: I had no objection. But then it ought to have been placed when he wanted it. That had finished quite independently. That was exactly what was demanded the other day by Mr. Nath Pai that the Report of the C.B.I. should be placed on the table of the House. When the discussion was going on, nobody made that claim at that time. When that claim was made by Mr. Nath Pai, I had said I would consider it because I wanted to wait and watch whether during the discussion any other reference is made and a fresh demand is made. I waited and waited but no fresh demand was made. I had replied to Mr. Nath Pai, when he took exception to that, that I would not allow it because no other Member made a reference to it and the whole debate had been concluded. This is what

I am telling now. In conformity with that, that debate had ended and, therefore, there was no need to lay it on the table of the House just at this moment. If they wanted, they could send it to the Library and the Members could see it there. But I do not want to take away powers from the Government. The Government have every legitimate right to send as many Members as they like for whatever purpose they choose. It is their own business and their own duty. But if a Parliamentary Delegation is to be called, then the Speaker must be consulted. I was never consulted in this one. Therefore, I hope that in future if a Parliamentary Delegation is to be sent, whether inside or outside the country, at least the Speaker would be taken into confidence and he would be consulted in that.

NOTIFICATION FOR MAKING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO KERALA AGRICULTURAL PESTS AND DISEASES RULES, 1959.

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri C. Subramaniam): I lay on the Table a copy of Notification No. S.R.O 256/64 published in Kerala Gazette dated the 1st September, 1964 making certain amendments to the Kerala Agricultural Pests and Diseases Rules, 1959, under section 24 of the Kerala Agricultural Pests and Diseases Act, 1958 read with clause (c) (iv) of the Proclamation dated the 10th September, 1964, issued by the President in relation to the State of Kerala.

[Placed in Library, see No. LT-4028/65].

ANNUAL REPORT OF GANGA BRAHAM-PUTRA WATER TRANSPORT BOARD FOR 1964.

The Minister of Transport (Shri Raj Bahadur): I lay on the Table a copy of Annual Report of Ganga Brahmputra Water Transport Board for the year 1964.

[Placed in Library, see No. LT-4029/65].

ANNUAL REPORT AND CONSOLIDATED STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS OF NATIONAL CO-OPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION.

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Community Development and Cooperation (Shri B. S. Murthy): On behalf of Shri S. K. Dey, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of Annual Report and Consolidated Statement of Accounts of the National Co-operative Development Corporation for the year 1963-64, under sub-section (3) of section 14 of the National Co-operative Development Corporation Act, 1962.

[Placed in Library, see No. LT-4030/65].

ANNUAL REPORTS OF INDIAN CENTRAL ARECANUT, COCONUT AND TOBACCO COMMITTEES.

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Shri D. R. Chavan): On behalf of Shri Shah-nawaz Khan, I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Reports:—

- (i) Annual Report of the Indian Central Arecanut Committee, for the year 1963-64.

[Placed in Library, see No. LT-4031/65].

- (ii) Annual Report of the Indian Central Coconut Committee, for the year 1963-64.

[Placed in Library, see No. LT-4032/65].

- (iii) Annual Report of the Indian Central Tobacco Committee, for the year 1963-64.

[Placed in Library, see No. LT-4033/65].

COPY OF AGREED CONCLUSIONS OF DISCUSSIONS HELD BETWEEN OFFICIALS OF INDIA AND CEYLON RE: IMPLEMENTATION OF INDO-CEYLON AGREEMENT.

Shri Dinesh Singh: I beg to lay on the Table a copy of agreed conclusions