

Lastly, with your permission, I would like to say that the question of resettlement on new colonised land is an important matter. But we cannot repeat what the Britishers did 70 or 80 years back because the pressure on land was not so great at that time. All these factors should be kept in mind before any concrete suggestions are made.

SHORT NOTICE QUESTION

With-holding of Telegrams sent by School Teachers in U. P.

+

SNQ. 14. SHRI S. KUNDU:
SHRI S. S. KOTHARI:
SHRI RABI RAY:
SHRI N. K. SOMANI:

Will the Minister of COMMUNICATIONS be pleased to state:

(a) whether the telegrams sent by the school teachers through Lucknow Telegraph Office were with-held by the Post and Telegraph authorities in U.P.;

(b) if so, how many such telegrams were with-held; and

(c) the reasons for with-holding the same?

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN-
TARY AFFAIRS AND COMMUNICA-
TIONS (DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH):

(a) Yes, Sir. Fifty identical telegrams booked by the Action Committee of the Secondary Teachers' Association were not transmitted to destination.

(b) It is not a fact that the telegraph office refused to book the telegrams; after booking they were found to be objectionable and hence with-held.

श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डीस : यह कहाँ की हुकमशाही चला रहे हो? शर्म भी नहीं लगती है. . . (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. Will you kindly sit down?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: What is objectionable? (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. You want to know what is objectionable. It is so simple a thing. The names of four Members are here. Mr. Kundu's name is on the top. He can ask that. It is a simple thing. The Minister says, it is objectionable, and you do not agree with him. (Interruptions)

श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डीस : हद् हो गई । यह इन लोगों की निजि जायदाद है क्या ?

MR. SPEAKER: It is out of the question now. I will have to expunge everything. Order, order. It is such a simple thing. He says, it is objectionable and you do not agree with it. There are four names here. Mr. Kundu can get up and ask how it is objectionable. It is so simple a thing. But so many of you begin to shout. Mr. Kundu will get a chance immediately and he can ask about it.

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH: (c) All these telegrams being of an objectionable nature were with-held under section 5 (1) (b) of Indian Telegraph Act on the advice of the competent authority.

SHRI S. KUNDU: Sir, it is a matter of great shame and also tragedy, as we live in a democracy, thousands of U. P. school teachers when wanted to communicate with the authorities here, they were not allowed because the hon. Minister says, the telegram they sent was objectionable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame, shame!

SHRI S. KUNDU: This is just what a dictator would fear not to do, what to speak of this hon. Minister. Thousands of teachers are behind the bars. Everyday, they are requesting us to speak to the Government. But they are not allowed the access to the Education Minister. My first question is, what is objectionable in the telegram, and let him place it on the Table of the House.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Read the text of the telegram. (Interruptions) पढ़िये ।

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH: The hon. Member, Mr. Kundu, has used so many

adjectives. I welcome all those adjectives. I pity his intelligence that he did not care to get that rule changed. Had he been not having a mind of a dictator, he would have cared to get that rule change democratically. He is teaching us a lesson that we are living in a democracy. But neither Mr. George Fernandes nor Mr. Kundu has cared to get that rule changed. (*Interruptions*). You are only having a drama here. Your action is shameful that you are dramatising the whole affair. . . (*Interruptions*)

श्री जार्ज करनेडीज* : यह अंग्रेज की झोलाद है. . . (ब्यवधान) . . .

श्री सीताराम केसरी : विदडा इट । . . . (ब्यवधान) . . .

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: The other part of the question has not been answered. What was the telegram? What were the contents of the telegram? Will he place it on the Table of the House?

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH: I will place the contents of the telegram on the Table of the House.

SHRI UMANATH: What was the telegram? Why was it objectionable? He has not answered that. . . (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. I am on my legs.

श्री शिव नारायण : सर, यह कहते हैं कि अंग्रेज की झोलाद है. . .

MR. SPEAKER: You were very silent till now.

श्री शिव नारायण : यह अंग्रेज की झोलाद कहेगे ? गुंडागिरी नहीं चलेगी यहां ।

MR. SPEAKER: What was the telegram? They want it to be read out.

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH: They have also got it. Mr. Somani has got.

MR. SPEAKER: Some of them do not have it.

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH: It is this:

"CONGRATULATIONS. STRIKE COMPLETE. GO AHEAD PEACEFULLY." . . (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Now I will not allow any one. . .

SHRI UMANATH: What is objectionable in that?

MR. SPEAKER: I have not called Mr. Umanath. Mr. Kundu may put his second question.

SHRI S. KUNDU: The Indian Telegraph Act was enacted by the Britishers in 1885. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh said . . . (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. Even assuming that someone is mad, all of us need not be mad. The hon. Member should sit down. I have called Mr. Kundu. Mr. Kundu may continue.

SHRI S. KUNDU: Most respectfully I would like to submit this. The hon. Minister said that by a government order these telegrams were withheld. Section 5 of the Indian Telegraph Act which was enacted by the British people says that on the occurrence of a public emergency, government officers take the necessary steps to withhold, and for doing that, they must get an order from the particular authority and a certificate to that effect from the Central, or as the case may be, the State Government. Was there a public emergency in U.P.? What was the matter in the telegram? It was a message congratulating that the strike was successful. Was there a public emergency? The British people did not use this provision capriciously but this Government, after 21 years, are using this as they like. I would like to say that they have misused and abused section 5 of the Indian Telegraph Act.

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH: It was done at the instance of the State Government. It was at the instance of the Home Ministry of the UP Government that it was done.

श्री विजुति मिश्र : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अध्यक्ष महोदय, उधर से जो यह कहा गया है

*These words were later withdrawn by Shri George Fernandes. *Vide* Col. No. 241-43

कि वह भंप्रेजों की श्रीलाद हैं उसको सदन की कार्यवाही में से निकाल दीजिए ।

श्री गुणानन्द ठाकुर : जो भी व्यवस्था उन्हें उठानी हो वह शोक से उठा सकते हैं हम लोग उसका जवाब देने के लिए तैयार हैं ।

श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा : अब अगर हमारे लिए वह भंप्रेजों की श्रीलाद वाली बात कहते हैं तो क्या हम यह नहीं कह सकते हैं कि वह रूस वालों के हैं ?

श्री रणधीर सिंह : भंप्रेजों की श्रीलाद वाली बात कहना अनुचित थी । अध्यक्ष महोदय, हम तो हिन्दुस्तानियों की श्रीलाद हैं भंप्रेजों की कहां हैं ?

श्री शिव नारायण : तुम लोग भंप्रेजों की श्रीलाद हो, इससे बढ़कर गाली और कोई क्या देगा ? श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज कहते हैं कि यह भंप्रेजों की श्रीलाद हैं इससे बढ़कर गाली और क्या देंगे ?

MR. SPEAKER: Will you kindly sit down please? I will see what has been said. If there is anything objectionable I will expunge it. I will read the record. If something is wrong it will be expunged. It won't be published also *

Now, may I appeal to both sides to keep on peace?

श्री मोल्लू प्रसाद : क्रायदे कानून भी तो निकलवाइए भंप्रेजों के . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member should not get up like this. I cannot answer his question. I am not a Minister. My only point is, you have got ample opportunity to shout outside from the 21st onwards. Why do you do it here?

SHRI UMANATH: Opportunity here is coming to an end. That is why we are shouting.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri S. S. Kothari.

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI: Some over-enthusiastic officer there wanted to show his authority and he acted in a hurry. I would like to say, Sir, that this code is somewhat outdated. Will the Minister and the Government give attention to this matter, to have the code revised and come before the House for necessary revision, to set right any lacunae that may be found in this code? Also, I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether he would try to fix certain specific criteria for determining the ground on which an officer may refuse a telegram given by the public, because, it is the basic right of a citizen, to transmit messages.

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH: We will keep this suggestion in view.

श्री रवि राय : इतनी उत्तेजना जो इस सवाल को लेकर हुई है वह बिलकुल स्वाभाविक है । मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इंडियन टेलीग्राफ ऐक्ट के चलते यह अफसरों ने कार्यवाही की और जो कि इस चीज को नहीं मानते कि सन् 1950 में संविधान के लागू होने के बाद हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों को यूनियन आदि बनाने का हक दिया गया है तो उसको मद्देनजर रखते हुए क्या इंडियन टेलीग्राफ ऐक्ट को परिवर्तन करेंगे और उसमें परिवर्तन करने के लिए वह प्रागामी बजट सेशन में कोई इसके लिए लेजिस्लेशन लायेंगे ? जिस अफसर ने इस तरह का प्रार्थन दिया है कि उसको विद्दोल्ड किया जाय उसने अपनी पावर्स का मिस् यूज किया है और क्या उस जिम्मेदार अफसर के खिलाफ कोई कार्यवाही करेंगे ?

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : श्री कोठारी के प्रश्न के उत्तर में माननीय सदस्य द्वारा उठायी गयी प्राथी बात का उत्तर मैं पहले ही दे चुका हूँ । उस अफसर ने कोई गलती नहीं की है और जैसा पहले उत्तर दिया है उसके संदर्भ में और कच्ंगा लेकिन अफसर का कोई

*Shri George Fernandes later withdrew the words used by him. (vide col. No. 241-43)

दोष नहीं है। अब जहाँ तक इंडियन टेलीग्राफ ऐक्ट में परिवर्तन के लिए आवश्यक लेजिस्लेशन लाने के बारे में माननीय सदस्य ने पूछा है तो मैं उसके बारे में ऐम्प्योरेंस इस सदन को इस समय नहीं दे सकता हूँ।

श्री शिव नारायण : ठीक है उन्हें कोई ऐम्प्योरेंस मत दीजिए।

SHRI N. K. SOMANI: It appears that the hon. Minister is standing on prestige in regard to an act of indiscretion committed by one of his officers. I would therefore like to appeal to him that in addition to Government's re-examining this whole question of codification of the grounds on which messages, whether obscene or extremely objectionable or seditious or antinational *etc.* should be banned, and in addition to clearly demarcating these areas, he should also take action against the officer concerned, so that this particular right of people to transmit messages is upheld.

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH: Actually, I had replied to this question when Shri Rabi Ray had put a similar question before. I do not contemplate any action being taken against the officer. As regards the reviewing and codification of the Act, I do not make any promise, but Parliament is intended to review all the statutes that are there.

SHRIMATI SUSHILA ROHATGI: I do not know how and why the contents of the telegram were found to be objectionable; the reasons may be best known to the officer concerned. But we feel that it is something more than that. May I know whether when the telegrams were withheld, the reasons were conveyed to the teachers so that they could rewrite it and send another telegram?

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH: We had not only given the reasons but we had also requested the Joint Action Committee to take back the money that they had deposited while booking the telegram.

श्री स० श्री० बनर्जी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जो टेलीग्राम लिखा गया था उसमें केवल

हड़ताल की खबर थी जो कि हुई थी। यह बतलाया गया था कि हड़ताल कामयाब है और पीसफुली भागे बढ़ते रहो साथ ही स्ट्राइक की कामयाबी पर दूसरों लोगों को बधाई दी गई थी। आपने देखा होगा कि उसके बारे में एडीटोरियल्स भ्रष्टचारों के निकले हैं और तमाम राजनीतिक दलों ने टीचर्स को बधाई दी है कि जिस प्रकार से शांतिपूर्ण रहकर उन्होंने अपने भ्रान्दोलन को चलाया है। यहाँ तक कि हमारे शिक्षा मंत्री ने भी कहा है कि टीचर्स ने शान्तिमय ढंग से भ्रान्दोलन किया है और कोई तोड़फोड़ नहीं हुई है। जो टेलीग्राम अभी यहाँ सदन में पढ़ा गया है उसमें केवल दूसरे लोगों को शांतिमय ढंग से स्ट्राइक चलाने पर बधाई ही दी गई है और मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे डा० राम सुभग सिंह प्रोडक्ट आफ नेशनल मूवमेंट हैं वह एक नेशनल लीडर हैं और इस नाते मैं उनसे यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या वह ऐसे टेलीग्राम को जो कि बिल्कुल इनफोरमेटिव था और जिससे कोई देश को कोई नुकसान होने वाला नहीं था उसे विद्-होल्ड करना क्या उचित था? दूसरे ऐसे समय जब कि हजारों टीचर्स गिरफ्तार हो गए थे और राज्यपाल, प्रधान मंत्री और शिक्षा मंत्री सब इस बात की कोशिश कर रहे थे कि वह टीचर्स की हड़ताल खत्म हो और समस्या सुलझे, ऐसे मौके पर यह टेलीग्राम्स को विद्होल्ड करने का किसने आदेश दिया था उस ऐयारिटी का नाम बतलाया जाय।

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : मैं इसका उत्तर पहले ही दे चुका हूँ कि उत्तर प्रदेश के गृह विभाग के सचिव के आदेश पर वैसे किया गया।

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: The first part of my question can be answered. May I know whether as a national leader, he feels that this was wrong?

MR. SPEAKER: That is not a question for an answer.

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : इधर के एक माननीय सदस्य के यह कहने पर कि वह अंग्रेजों की झोलाद हैं वह नाराज हो गए लेकिन इसमें नाराज होने की तो कोई ऐसी बात नहीं है क्योंकि अंग्रेजों के बारिस के रूप में वह यहां पर बैठे हैं. . .

MR. SPEAKER: He is a national leader. There is no doubt about it. The hon. Minister need not answer this question.

श्री शिव नारायण : इंडियन कास्टी-ट्यूशन में हर एक सिटीजन को फंडामेंटल राइट्स मिले हुए हैं तो मैं इस सरकार से जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या वह इन फंडामेंटल राइट्स को विद्वहा करेंगे ? टीचरों ने अग्रर टेलीग्राम दिया तो उसे रोकने का क्या औचित्य था और अग्रर उसे जाने दिया होता तो कौन सा पहाड़ टूट पड़ता ? क्या उस अशिक्षित ने उसे रोक कर उस सिटीजन के फंडामेंटल राइट को नहीं तोड़ा है और क्या मंत्री महोदय उस जिम्मेदार अफसर का इस बारे में जवाब तलब करेंगे ?

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : माननीय सदस्य श्री शिव नारायण ने बहुत महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न उठाया है। उनके दिल की बात मैं जानता हूँ कि टीचरों के लिए उनके दिल में कितना दर्द है और कितना उन्होंने प्रधान मंत्री और शिक्षा मंत्री से मिल कर उनकी उचित मांगों को मनवाने के लिए प्रयास किया है। जो इनके दिल की बात है उसको कार्यान्वित करने का यत्न करूंगा। मैं जानता हूँ कि फर्नान्डीज जी की तरह ये कोकोडाइल टीचर्स कभी नहीं बहाते हैं।

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: From the contents of the telegram read out just now, it appears that there is nothing objectionable. May I know whether when the hon. Minister had received this question, and got this information from the concerned authorities he made inquiries and whether it struck him that there was nothing objection-

able and whether he found out why it was withheld? Was it because some general instruction was issued to the postal authorities that as long as the strike continued, they would not permit any telegram or message to be transmitted to the Central authorities or to Delhi by any agency whatsoever?

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH: It all happened at Lucknow, and it was with a view to giving precise details that I had accepted this short notice question.

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO: I find that there is nothing particularly objectionable at all, in the section as it stands, but the question is about the proper implementation of the provisions of the section. So far as this particular telegram is concerned, we have all read it and we find absolutely nothing wrong in this particular telegram nor is there anything objectionable in it. In this context, I would like to know whether the order given by the concerned officer is a general order prohibiting the sending of telegrams in connection with strikes as such or there was individual discretion with reference to the merits of each telegram. In view of these things, will Government consider the matter further and see that even if a general order is issued, the merits and demerits of the order are also taken into consideration before it is accepted?

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH: There is no general order; whenever any officer feels anything, he does consult the appropriate State authority, and it was in pursuance of this that this had happened. Anyway, as has been suggested by the hon. Member, I shall examine the matter.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN: We have been all along under the impression that the duty of the telegraphic department is to communicate messages. But, unfortunately here we are given to understand that they have been given power to screen and process messages which are given to them for transmission. This is a very serious matter. It will have far-reaching consequences. In the light of what has happened at Lucknow, I would like to know whether Government are prepared to give a categorical assurance that as far as the Telegraph Department is

concerned, the duty of screening or processing will never be done by them and whatever objection might be there to the contents of the telegram, it should not be withheld; probably they may have the power to inform the Home Ministry, but the Telegraph Department should not take upon itself the duty of screening the telegrams. That is highly objectionable. I would like to know the reaction of Government to this.

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH: I accept this. Our misfortune is that we are guided by the State authority.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN: My question has not been answered. In this particular department, they need not be guided by the State authorities, because this is a Central Department....

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH: It was not screened by the booking clerk or the CTO officer, but he consulted the appropriate authority and then only it was withheld and the persons concerned were intimated.

SHRI SHIVAJI RAO S. DESHMUKH: May I draw the attention of the hon. Minister to a recent judgment of the Supreme Court in this regard? Under the Bihar regulations, the Sugarcane Commissioner of Bihar was supposed to exercise a particular discretion in the matter of imposing or lifting a particular restriction. The Chief Minister ordered that the discretion should be exercised in a particular way, and the sugarcane Commissioner issued the notifications accordingly. The Supreme Court has held that such exercise of discretion at the dictation of a Chief Minister who is not the specified authority under the statute is wrong. So, on the basis of that judgment, the action of the postal authorities who exercised their discretion on the recommendation of the UP Government was equally wrong. On the basis of that judgment, the action of the postal authorities who exercised their discretion on the recommendation of the UP Government was equally wrong. On the basis of the same judgment do Government propose to take action against the officer for the wrong exercise of discretion construing it *ipso facto* as an act of indiscipline?

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH: Not indiscipline; but I will go into the matter.

श्री कान्वर लाल गुप्त : मैं मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो सैकशन आपने पढ़ा, जिसमें पब्लिक एमरजेंसी की बात कही गई है, उस दृष्टि से इस टेलीग्राम में पब्लिक एमरजेंसी की क्या बात थी ?

दूसरा—जिस अधिकारी ने—होम सेक्रेटरी हो या कोई और अधिकारी हो— इसका ठीक इन्टरप्रेटेशन नहीं किया— ब्राह्मन्दा इस प्रकार की घटना न हो, क्योंकि यह सैन्ट्रल एक्ट है, स्टेट एक्ट नहीं है, क्या सरकार कोई डिटेल्ड इन्स्ट्रक्शन अपने पोस्ट-ऑफिसिज को भेजेगी ताकि ब्राह्मन्दा ऐसे तारों को न रोका जाय ?

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : इसका तो मैं जवाब दे चुका हूँ । आपका सवाल ही यूजलेस है ।

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: He has not replied what is the public emergency involved.

MR. SPEAKER: He has replied. It is a repetition of the question.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: Are you convinced about the public emergency?

MR. SPEAKER: He has answered.

SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM: The hon. Minister is relying upon the advice given by the Home Department to his official. As has already been pointed out, it was not the duty of the Home Dept. of UP to give any advice to the postal department which is exclusively under the control of the Centre. But before amending the Act, could he give instructions to the postal officials not to obstruct transmission of any message, unless it contained positively objectionable or obscene language or was a positive incitement to violence? Of course, it is within his power to give instructions. We want an assurance from him that he will do so.

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH: As the hon. Member knows, I use my power very scrupulously, and I hope that I shall never use it in a wrong way.

भी विज्ञप्ति लिख : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जो लोग खराब भाषा लिख कर देते हैं, इनको खुद कन्डेम करना चाहिए। मैं सरकार से जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो इस तरह की भाषा में तार देते हैं, क्या सरकार उनके खिलाफ कोई कार्यवाही करने की बात सोच रही है? क्योंकि जान-बूझ कर लोग ऐसी भाषा का इस्तेमाल करते हैं, इसलिए कानून में इस तरह से परिवर्तन किया जाय, ताकि उनके खिलाफ भी कार्यवाही की जा सके?

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : आप से बात करके और सारी बातों को जानने के बाद उनकी तह में जाने की कोशिश करूंगा।

श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री : अध्यक्ष महोदय, उत्तर प्रदेश का इस सदन में प्रतिनिधि होने के नाते, मैं शिक्षकों के आन्दोलन से पूर्णतया परिचित हूँ। जिस समय यह आन्दोलन प्रारम्भ हुआ, उत्तर प्रदेश के शिक्षकों ने अपने साधियों को बड़ी बलवती भाषा में यह बात कही थी कि यदि कभी भी इस आन्दोलन में हिंसा या तोड़फोड़ का समावेश होगा, तो तत्काल हम अपने आन्दोलन को वापस ले लेंगे। गृह विभाग (उत्तर प्रदेश) ने जो आदेश आपके पोस्ट-ग्रॉफिसिङ को तार रोकने के लिए दिया—क्या उनको इस प्रकार की कोई जानकारी मिली थी कि पीसफुली शब्द का अर्थ अशान्ति उत्पन्न करना है—यदि ऐसा था तब तो यह सम्भव हो सकता है कि उन तारों को रोका जाता। लेकिन जब उनके आन्दोलन का प्रारम्भ शांतिपूर्ण है, मध्य शांतिपूर्ण है, तो आपके विभाग को जो आज्ञा आलोचना का विषय बनना पड़ा है, क्या आपने अपने विभाग में कोई ऐसी व्यवस्था नहीं बना रखी है कि वे अपने स्तर पर भी इस बात की जानकारी लेते कि गृह विभाग का निर्णय उस सम्बन्ध में कहां तक सही है?

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : यह ठीक है। इसका कोई खास जबाब मैं नहीं समझता हूँ।

SHRI PILOO MODY: May I ask one question?

MR. SPEAKER: If it is only one question, I do not mind. But Shri Hem Barua, Shri Nambiar, Bakshi Sahib, all want to ask questions. I have already given half an hour to this. Therefore, it is not proper to spend more time on this.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Interpreters in External Affairs Ministry

* 813. SHRI KAMESHWAR SINGH: Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) the total number of I. F. S. Officers who know foreign language other than English and are able to accompany the Heads of the Missions on top diplomatic missions; and

(b) the total amount spent annually on the Interpreters and their numbers?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT): (a) Out of 294 Indian Foreign Service officers 224 have qualified in a foreign language at the advanced level. Besides these 116 IFS(B) and 25 Information Officer have a working knowledge of at least one foreign language. Qualification in atleast one foreign language, other than English, at the advanced level is now compulsory for all direct recruits to the IFS selected as a result of competitive examinations.

(b) 103 persons are employed as interpreters cum-translators in Indian Missions and Posts abroad. Government spends a sum of Rs. 18,26,425/- on them. In addition, there are 6 interpreters and translators employed in the Ministry of External Affairs. The annual expenditure on them is Rs. 53,135/-.

A. I. R. Programmes

* 817. SHRI S. C. SAMANTA: Will the Minister of INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING be pleased to state:

(a) the reasons for the All India Radio