

Fourteenth Lok Sabha

Session : 9

Date : 08-12-2006

Participants : [Panda Shri Prabodh](#), [Maran Shri Dayanidhi](#), [Jindal Shri Naveen](#), [Karunakaran Shri P.](#), [Rawat Prof. Rasa Singh](#), [Radhakrishnan Shri Varkala](#), [Majhi Shri Shankhlal](#), [Swain Shri M.A. Kharabela](#), [Chandrappan Shri C.K.](#), [Francis George Shri K.](#), [Mahtab Shri Bhartruhari](#), [Maran Shri Dayanidhi](#), [Gadhavi Shri Pushpdan Shambhudan](#), [Kumar Shri Shailendra](#), [Bhargav Shri Girdhari Lal](#), [Swain Shri M.A. Kharabela](#), [Rijiju Shri Kiren](#), [Panda Shri Prabodh](#), [Prabhu Shri Suresh](#), [Mahtab Shri Bhartruhari](#), [Maran Shri Dayanidhi](#), [Prabhu Shri Suresh](#)

an>

Title: Statutory Resolution regarding disapproval of Indian Telegraph (Amendment) Ordinance, 2006 (No. 3 of 2006) and Indian Telegraph (Amendment) Bill, 2006.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you for your cooperation.

Now, Items 20 and 21. Shri Prabodh Panda.

(Shri Mohan Singh *in the Chair*)

SHRI PRABODH PANDA (MIDNAPORE): I beg to move:

“That this House disapproves of the Indian Telegraph (Amendment) Ordinance, 2006 (No. 3 of 2006) promulgated by the President on 30 October, 2006^[r26]6.”

THE MINISTER OF COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (SHRI DAYANIDHI MARAN): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

“That the Bill further to amend the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885, be taken into consideration.”

The Universal Service Obligation Fund was established under the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885, with the fundamental objective of providing access to basic telegraph services to people in the rural and remote areas at affordable and reasonable prices.

The telecom sector in India is witnessing a period of unprecedented growth in the last few years. Overall teledensity has increased from 2.9 in March 2000 to 15.70 in October 2006. However, while urban teledensity has increased by more than five times from 8.2 to 44.05, rural teledensity has moved up from 0.7 to 1.86 only.

It is cheaper to provide mobile telephone services as compared to fixed lines and the operational expenditure is also lower. In this background, a decision was taken to create shareable infrastructure in rural, remote and inaccessible areas and to support telecom service providers to use this infrastructure for provision of mobile services.

At the time when this scheme was envisaged, it was pointed out that the definition of the Universal Service Obligation in Clause (1A) of Section 3 of the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885 included the word 'basic'. Though the word 'basic' is not defined in the Act, in usage the word 'basic' refers to wire line and fixed wireless terminals. It was felt that because of this connotation which the word 'basic' had, it would not be possible to support the mobile infrastructure activities from the Universal Service Obligation Fund. The Department of Legal Affairs opined that it would be necessary to delete the word 'basic' by a suitable amendment. Also the Department of Telecommunications would be safeguarding itself from possible litigation.

In several debates in Parliament, hon. Members of Parliament have urged that provision of telecommunication facilities to the rural and remote areas should be given the topmost priority. Further, there is consensus on the need to provide support for taking mobile telephony into the rural and remote areas. In order to extend support for cellular services in rural and remote areas from the Universal Service Obligation Fund require this amendment in the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Motions moved:

“That this House disapproves of the Indian Telegraph (Amendment) Ordinance, 2006 (No. 3 of 2006) promulgated by the President on 30 October, 2006.”

“That the Bill further to amend the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885, be taken into consideration.”

Now, Shri Prabodh Panda.

SHRI PRABODH PANDA : Hon. Chairman, Sir, in fact, I am not against the content of this Bill but I must protest about the route which is taken, that is, promulgation of this Ordinance. Sir, the explanation given by the hon. Minister is not satisfactory and not convincing.

The Indian Telegraph (Amendment) Bill, 2006 was introduced in this august House on 19th May, 2006. After the introduction of this Bill in this august House, this Bill has been referred to the Standing Committee on Information and Technology. The Standing Committee also recommended, and that recommendation had been placed but the Bill has not been discussed in this House. In the meanwhile, this Ordinance has been promulgated. The reason that is given is:

“The reason is that the Department of Tele-communications was of the opinion that the promulgation of an Ordinance would be necessary because waiting for process of the Bill already before the Parliament would delay the launching of the scheme by several months.”

Sir, this Ordinance was promulgated on 30th October, 2006. The Winter Session of this House commenced on 22nd November, 2006. So, where is the reason of saying that it would be delayed by

several months? What is the reason behind it? Rather, this sort of word is misleading the House and giving misinformation to the House. So, promulgation of this Ordinance is quite unfair, unconvincing and unwarranted.[\[R27\]](#)

Sir, let me remind the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs that when they were sitting in the Opposition benches during the last Lok Sabha, each and every time, they used to protest the procedure and method of bringing the Ordinance. But now, same case is being repeated by this Government itself.

That is why I am moving this Resolution for disapproval of this Ordinance. I think, this would be considered and the hon. Minister will give a satisfactory reply on this aspect. I am not opposing the content. That is my view.

SHRI P.S. GADHAVI (KUTCH): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to express my views on the Indian Telegraph (Amendment) Bill, 2006.

The Amendment in question was brought in by the Ordinance, as was told by my learned friend, just now.

This is a very important Amendment. Instead of an Ordinance, this type of Amendment should be brought before Parliament so that the hon. Members could discuss this thoroughly and the same could be passed by Parliament. But it has become the normal practice with the UPA Government to bring such important Amendments by way of Ordinances, which is very unfortunate.

Sir, this Amendment envisages for providing support to the cellular mobile services in the rural areas from the universal obligation fund, besides the basic telegraph services.

The Indian Telegraph (Amendment) Bill, 2006 was introduced in the Lok Sabha on 19th May, 2006 and the same was referred to the Standing Committee on Information Technology, which had submitted its Report on 31st July, 2006.

Sir, under the new Telecom Policy of 1999, during the tenure of the NDA Government, it was envisaged to achieve 'Telephone on Demand' in the rural areas by the year 2002, and to increase the rural teledensity from the level of 0.4 to four by the year 2010.

As on 30th April, 2006 while the urban teledensity, largely spearheaded by mobile phones, increased to 40.65 from 14.3 in March, 2003. But the rural teledensity increased marginally to 1.86 from 1.05 in March, 2003.

It is evident that the cellular mobile services, which have brought about a revolution in the urban areas can be effectively used to provide services to the people in the rural remote areas, that too at affordable and reasonable prices.

As you know, in our country even now, many remote areas and hilly areas do not have cellular mobile services. I may bring it to the notice of the hon. Minister that I come from Kutch district. In area it is the third largest area of our country. It is on the border of Pakistan. There is one place known as Khadir, which is surrounded by the Rann of Kutch, which is very remote. More than 20 hamlets are there; and they do not have any telephone connectivity. With all efforts, there was one connection given in the one village known as Dholagira. But other areas do not have any telephone connections. From the Taluka headquarters, distance of that area is more than 200 kilometres. Like that, there are so many other areas,

which require telephone connections. It is a very good thing that you are providing the cellular mobile services almost everywhere. Here, I would request the hon. Minister that the remote area of Khadir and also other remote and hilly areas should get the cellular mobile services. In this regard made I have submission earlier also.

Sir, it is also evident that landline services are costlier option owing to difficulties of terrain and cost of laying of copper cable, OFC etc. We know, it is difficult. Landline telephone becomes costlier.[\[r28\]](#)

Hence, to facilitate telecom penetration in the rural areas, it becomes imperative to support new wireless technologies which are cheaper, and they can be rolled out much faster. With the advancement of new technologies, the cost of mobile handsets has also come down. So, this type of spreading is a welcome thing.

Now, the need for present amendment, as it is stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons, is that, "Section 9-A of the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885 provides for the establishment of a Fund called the "Universal Service Obligation Fund". As per clause (1A) of Section 3 of the said Act, Universal Service Obligation means the obligation to provide access to basic telegraph services to people in the rural and remote areas at affordable and reasonable prices."

As per the view of the Department, at present the USO fund is being provided only for the basic telegraph services, that is, wire line and fixed wireless terminals. But USO Fund cannot be utilized for cellular mobile services.

Therefore, in order to facilitate telecom penetration in the rural areas, it was considered desirable to support new wireless technologies which can be rolled out much faster.

Accordingly, the financial support from the USO Fund is required to be provided for cellular services in such areas.

The USO Fund was established with effect from 1st April, 2002. Various telecom service licensees are paying licence fee to the Government at the rate of 6-10 per cent of Adjusted Gross Revenue (AGR). Out of such licence fee, five per cent of the AGR is towards USO Fund contribution.

Thus, Rs.10,787 crore has been collected as Universal Service Obligation Fund levy as on 31st March, 2006. Surprisingly, out of the same, an amount of only Rs.3,581.43 crore has been allotted and disbursed and the balance amount to the tune of Rs.7,206.42 crore has not been released so far. The DoT maintained that the amount allocated to the service providers is grossly inadequate to meet their needs. The Standing Committee has also expressed their dissatisfaction over the inadequate release of money to the USO Fund for meeting the universal service obligation. They strongly support the views expressed by the DoT and are of the opinion that the very purpose of creating the USO Fund is defeated when the amount needed for providing basic telephone facilities in the rural and remote areas is not provided for.

The Committee, therefore, had recommended that all out efforts should be made for releasing the full amount to the USO Fund so that the Department of Telecommunications is able to discharge the functions of universal service obligation in an effective manner.

Sir, I would like to submit here that the object of providing USO Fund to cellular mobile services could have been very well achieved without amending the Section 3 of the Indian Telegraph Act but this could have been achieved by making suitable enabling provisions/amendments in the rules framed under

the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885. If you could have made some amendments in the rules, it could have been made. You could have achieved the object instead of waiting for this much period. It was not necessary to make an amendment. It is not the only solution to make the amendment and to delete the word 'basic'. Without deleting that word 'basic', if you could have made amendments in the enabling provisions of the rules, you could have achieved the object. However, you have brought this amendment. It is a good thing. Otherwise, this object could have been achieved. There should have been no need for going in for Ordinance and this put delay. Therefore, this was the view expressed by the Standing Committee also.

[\[MSOffice29\]](#)

Lastly, I would like to submit that the Government should avoid making amendments to the Acts by resorting to Ordinance. This is my humble submission that the Government should have avoided, as far as possible, to resort to Ordinance. Moreover, the object of bringing this amendment could have been very well achieved because if the Government had a sincere will, they could have made suitable enabling provision/amendment in the Rules framed under the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885.

It is a good thing. So, I welcome it. Wherever the remote and hilly areas are there in our country, they should have telephones. Now a days, telephone is not a luxury. It is very much a necessity. Now, day by day, mobile services are expanding all over the country. So, I welcome this move. Therefore, I support this Bill.

SHRI NAVEEN JINDAL (KURUKSHETRA): Hon. Chairman, Sir, I am very happy to get this opportunity to speak on and support the Indian Telegraph (Amendment) Bill, 2006.

Sir, I compliment *Thiru* Dayanidhi Maran, the hon. Minister for Communications and Information Technology for bringing this Bill to the House. He is a young Minister who has brought great changes in the telecom sector in a very short span of time. I have always admired his young ideas, bold initiatives and futuristic perspective. That is what the House and the country expect from a young Minister.

Sir, the Bill is very brief and simple in its content. It seeks to omit the word 'basic' from section 3 clause 1(a) of the original Act of 1885. However, it is very significant in its aim and its objectives. Sometimes, the omission or addition of one word in a Bill has far-reaching ramifications. This is one such Bill.

As part of its commitment to change the face of rural India, the UPA Government has launched several schemes for rural housing, employment, education, power supply and better connectivity through roads and other means of communication. The present Bill is a link in that chain. The purpose of the present Bill is to provide financial support for cellular services in rural and remote areas of our country from a Fund called Universal Service Obligation Fund. This Fund was set up under the Act of 1885, but it could be utilised only for wire-lined and fixed wireless terminals.

During the last two years, we have made major strides in the field of tele-communication. The UPA Government has assured that every village of the country will be connected with telephone facility. Now, we have to expand this facility in a big way and narrow the gap between urban and rural tele-density. Every month, about 50 lakh telephones are being added in the urban areas, but the rural areas are lagging behind. We have not only to eliminate this gap but we also need to provide telephone facility to our villagers at

very reasonable rates so that people can easily afford those services. Even if we have to subsidise this in the beginning, we should do so.

It has been stated that the Government has certain ambitious target of 250 million connections by December, 2007 and more than 50 million rural connections are to be provided in the next three years. This indeed is a tall order, but I am confident that with the vision of our hon. Prime Minister and the dynamism of a young Minister, *Thiru Maran*, it is not beyond our reach.

I will emphasise on mobile telephone services which are much cheaper than the fixed lines. Whatever support is necessary to be given to service providers should be given to create a sustainable infrastructure in the rural areas, particularly in remote areas, in mountainous areas and in the deserts. Once such an infrastructure is ready, it will change the lifestyle of people living and working in rural areas. All the information they need will be available to them at their doorsteps. It will help in preventing the influx of people to the cities.

Sir, I will conclude by making two suggestions. When we are planning to have a big network of telephone facility in rural and remote areas, it is necessary to provide service centres also close to the villages.[\[s30\]](#)

Please allow these centres to be manned by the people from these areas itself, so that it will provide them gainful employment.

The Indian Telegraph Act was passed in 1885, which was more than a century ago. Almost everything has changed during this long period. It is right time that the Government is having a fresh look at the Act, and revamping it to bring it in line with the latest developments, and those that are in the offing.

With these words, I support the Bill and oppose the Statutory Resolution. I wish *Thiru Maran* and *Dr. Shakeel Ahmad* all the success in their endeavours.

SHRI P. KARUNAKARAN (KASARGOD): Sir, this Bill was introduced in this House, and it was referred to the Standing Committee. There were intense discussions on this Bill in the Standing Committee, and there were also some dissenting notes. I was one among them, who had given dissenting notes.

The Standing Committee Report has come in this House, but it is unfortunate that it does not include the recommendations or the deliberations of the Standing Committee. I am saying this because the Ordinance had already come before we took this Bill in this House. The Ministry has to take the spirit of the Standing Committee's intense discussion on this issue into account. I really appreciate the initiative taken by the hon. Minister in dealing with many of the issues, which are coming in the telecom sector.

The Indian Telegraph Act was passed in 1885, that is, during the British rule. The Ministry of Telecommunications has amended this Act many times. Now, a new amendment has come, and we are discussing about it. I think that the main issue is this. In the original Act, the word 'basic' was used. The

objective of this Act is to delete the word 'basic'. But there was no definite definition given to the word 'basic' in the original Act itself. But it is presumed that the word 'basic' refers to the landline as also the fixed wireless line.

I think that it is true that BSNL and MTNL are doing a lot of work, and we are able to see this when we go to the rural areas. I am talking specially about the functioning of BSNL. But we cannot say that any of the private companies are going to the rural areas. Hence, we have given this dissent note on this specific issue itself.

We have been discussing about increasing the teledensity. There is tremendous change in the telecom sector, which was stated by our hon. Minister also. In India, the teledensity has increased to 14.10 in 2006 from 2.5 in 2000. In urban areas, there is a big change to 44.05 from the earlier 8.22. It is also true that it is very insignificant in the rural areas, that is, an increase to 1.86 from 0.7.

There are at least 5,000 new connections every year in the urban areas. I do understand that it is in the context of this issue that the Government has come for an amendment. The main objective of the amendment is to use the Universal Service Obligation (USO) fund. It was used by landline, and the Department has now decided to use it for mobile services also. If this amendment comes, then it is my apprehension that it would reduce the share of USO fund to BSNL and MTNL, which really are the public undertakings. This may also enable the private companies to get more USO funds.

I would like to go through some of the answers given by the Government to the questions asked in the Lok Sabha. In reply to Q. No. 2,281 of 5 December 2004, the Government has given the break-up of the operational loss incurred by BSNL for providing telephones in the villages. In the answer, it is given that there was a loss of Rs. 2,587.79 crore in 2001.[\[R31\]](#)

In 2001-02 it was Rs.6,913.16 crore. In 2002-03 it was Rs.7,880.80 crore. In 2004-05 it was Rs.9,528.88 crore. The total loss comes to about Rs.26,000 crore. During the same period, they received only Rs.6,000 crore or Rs.7,000 crore from this fund. It means that there is a loss of about Rs.20,000 crore for the BSNL. But you see that no private company has come forward to give connectivity in the rural areas. At the same time, they are concentrating their business in the urban areas because they are profitable to them and there is no risk involved for them in those areas. When we speak about the rural areas, we see the geographical difficulties and uneven development. So, private companies do not go there.

Why I have given a dissent note is that nowadays the mobile service has grown very fast. There is a lot of scientific progress seen in the mobile service. So, there is not much expenditure or loss incurred in providing mobile services. But it is entirely different as far as the line service that we see in the rural areas is concerned. No company is willing to go to those areas. In this context, if we divert this Universal Service Obligation Fund which is mainly meant for the benefit of the public undertakings, the BSNL and the MTNL, and of course if these amendments come, it is true that the private people may get a share but on the hand it would result in a reduction in the share of the public undertakings. That is why I expressed this apprehension. Sir, if you see the years 2000 to 2006 you will find that the two public undertakings have incurred heavy losses since only they undertook this obligation of providing service in rural areas and no other company has come forward to do that.

While I am not opposing this Bill, my suggestion is that it is only a justification on the part of the Government to access the PSUs financial assistance for the loss that they have incurred for the year 2006. That is a duty of the Government itself. The infrastructure that is there is done only by the Government, by

the BSNL or MTNL, and not by any private company. Even in the era of globalization, we need to get some assistance and the losses incurred by the BSNL have to be compensated by the Government.

With these words I conclude.

SHRI SURESH PRABHAKAR PRABHU (RAJAPUR): Sir, while I would like to support the spirit of the Bill and the Bill itself, I am a little bit amazed by the fact that the Government has to think about such a novel idea only during the period when the Parliament is not in session. I do not understand why the Government wore the thinking cap only when the Parliament is not in session. If something like this had to be introduced, I do not see any reason why – across the political parties everybody is supporting this – we should bring about an Ordinance for this. Therefore, something like this should now become as a practice that Ordinance will actually legislate and the Parliament then will be told that we have made an Ordinance, why do not you support? I think it is a good idea. I hope that in the future, the Minister who is efficient and very dynamic take Parliament more seriously and make sure we will actually not legislate outside Parliament but through the Parliament.

13.35 hrs

(Shri Balasaheb Vikhe Patil *in the Chair*)

Rural telephony is a big challenge. In fact for our country the urban rural divide itself is a challenge. While India continues to grow at nine per cent or close to that, there are areas which in fact are registering negative growth.[\[r32\]](#)

Now, villages which are becoming distant than the cities are always called as rich city's cousins. But now we will have to say that we cannot call them cousins any more because they look so distant. Therefore, it is about time we should try to bridge this gap. One of the best ways to do that is through communication. Therefore, communication provider has to incentivise to go to the rural areas. Therefore, the USO Fund was really created. Therefore, the USO Fund has to be used now for the rural areas. That is why the Government is trying to introduce this legislation. Hence, I support it. While doing that, I would like to really request the Minister to tell us that while bringing the change in the legislation, which only enables him to use the Fund for some purposes, which he has not able to do it before, is there a guarantee that the problems in rural areas would be solved totally? My constituency is 93 per cent rural; there are 1,200 villages; there are several hamlets which are more than 6,000 to 7,000 in number, each of the hamlets is like a village. What has happened is that you are trying to say that we would meet the demand by such and such a period. How would you actually estimate the demand? We have seen now that the Telecommunications Department is refusing to accept applications unless there are more than 150 or 200 people coming in and saying that they would like to buy this. Tell me a village or a hamlet which has a small density where you want to increase the tele-density. What about the density of population in certain parts of India which is not very high? How do you make sure that demand would get registered to begin with? If it is not, then, how would you be catering to the demand? Your supply can follow when the demand is known. But here, you are not able to capture the reality of demand. Therefore, my first request to the Minister would be that if you want universal service obligation, universality demands that each and every person must have the right to register himself as a potential consumer. If you are not doing that the USO Fund would not really serve the purpose. First of all, let the Minister assure the House that he would

change the policy and make sure that anybody can go and register as a potential consumer for telecommunication services. If he does that, the concept of universality can really be implemented. So, this is my first request.

Secondly, we are saying and the TRAI itself has said that by 2010 it would not be able to attain tele-density of more than four per cent. Even if your colleague from your State is very generous and give Rs.30,000 crore – I hope he does that – and if you are not going to get that type of budgetary support and you are going to solely depend on the USO Fund to meet the new demand as well as the existing ones, I do not really see any way in which you can actually attain this target. Therefore, the law was not holding you back there in bringing in this universal coverage of telecommunication services. It is something more than the law. You have the support of the House but I would also like to know from the Communications and the Finance Ministers together because in these days of convergence, I hope they would converge in this objective of meeting universal demand by all the consumers in the shortest time. How are you going to provide money if the USO Fund is not enough to meet it? By what time, you think, you would be able to meet it because TRAI has already raised a cautious signal? They say that it is not going to be possible.

The third issue I am trying to flag off is to find out this. How are you really thinking about the telecommunications sector where the regulation has really succeeded? Why has it succeeded? What is the measure of that success? Have the tariffs fallen? That is something very good but if the consumer does not know and the sector is growing, then, there is something seriously wrong. Here, in the sector in which consumers are also benefiting besides of course, the telecommunications itself is benefiting. We have no problem with that. But here, are you thinking about – I am just raising the issue and I would like to know your views – creating a regulatory framework exclusively to deal with by giving more focus on rural areas? I am thinking of this now because now the cross-subsidisation is not something which you are contemplating. The USO Fund is actually a separate fund which is going to be used for separate purposes or by separate institutions. How are you thinking about it? I would like to know about that because you are actually thinking about creating a passive infrastructure. What you are saying is this. In the future rather than creating more and more towers, one tower be shared by more than one service provider.^[r33]

It is a good idea. It is prevalent in the US; it actually could reduce the cost eventually. But for that you need a strong regulation; it cannot happen if the person who is going to create the tower or the passive infrastructure as is known, is not going to be regulated properly. At the same time, it could not happen if it is not incentivized enough. But more than that, if more than one company has to share the same services, on what basis it is going to be done – that is actually an important issue. Therefore, are you thinking of making such a thing?

Sir, I am from the rural area; you must give me some more time. Rural people do not get opportunities to speak. You are also from the rural area.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Rural people stay in urban cities – that is also an issue. Okay, kindly conclude now. You have taken more than ten minutes.

SHRI SURESH PRABHAKAR PRABHU : Sir, the Minister is from the urban area; let me give him the rural flavour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Everybody is sympathetic towards rural area, but still that is starving.

SHRI SURESH PRABHAKAR PRABHU : Sir, there is an enabling provision. There is a new amendment, which is wide enough to cover various services. Is he thinking of using the USO Fund? This is really required. We talked about convergence, a little earlier. So, please do not just confine it now to rural telephony by way of saying that it will give the mobile phones. Internet is also important; in fact, multimedia is also important; it is not just voice that should be heard. But I hope, it will be heard because sometimes, they provide it but we do not hear. So, it should be data transfer; that should also happen at the same time.

Is he thinking of using the USO Fund, for not just one, but for multimedia, Internet and other connectivity. Why is this important? Why am I saying this? It is because once we lay the infrastructure, it should be sufficient enough to capture and to make sure that all these issues are properly taken care.

I hope the Minister will be unequivocally saying this that in future irrespective of number of consumers coming forward to register the demand, actually they will do it. Therefore, I request him to do that.

श्री शैलेन्द्र कुमार : माननीय सभापति महोदय, आपने मुझे भारतीय तार (संशोधन) विधेयक, 2006 पर बोलने का मौका दिया है, इसके लिए मैं आपका आभारी हूँ।

महोदय, माननीय मंत्री जी यहां बैठे हुए हैं। कई सम्मानित सदस्यों के विचार और सुझाव इस बिल के संबंध में आए हैं। यह बिल वा 1885 के अधिनियम में संशोधन करने के लिए प्रस्तुत किया गया है। जहां तक देखा जाए तो आज भी ग्रामीण स्तर पर टेलीफोन संचार व्यवस्था की स्थिति बहुत खराब है। मैं इसके विस्तार में नहीं जाना चाहूंगा। इसके पहले ग्रामीण स्तर पर WLL के टावर लगाकर गांवों को संचार व्यवस्था से जोड़ने की व्यवस्था की गयी थी, लेकिन उसके पर्याप्त मात्रा में काम न करने के कारण दूरसंचार विभाग को बहुत बड़ा नुकसान उठाना पड़ा और वह व्यवस्था ज्यादातर ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में कारगर नहीं हुई। जहां तक मोबाइल फोन को देखा जाए तो आज भी लैण्डलाइन फोन ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में काफी हद तक अच्छे साबित हुए हैं, उनकी कार्य करने की क्षमता और ज्यादा दिनों तक अच्छी सर्विस देने की बहुत अच्छी सुविधा लैण्डलाइन फोन में है। टेलीफोन मोबाइल फोन की अपेक्षा ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में ज्यादा कारगर हुए हैं। आज अगर देखा जाए तो लोग लैण्डलाइन टेलीफोन लेना पसन्द नहीं करते, बल्कि मोबाइल फोन लेना पसन्द कर रहे हैं। ग्रामीण स्तर के जो कमजोर और मध्यमवर्गीय किसान या मजदूर हैं, अगर वे थोड़ा-बहुत सक्षम हैं तो वे इससे कहीं भी जाकर बात कर सकते हैं। आज दूरसंचार के माध्यम से हमें ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों की स्थिति सुदृढ़ करनी पड़ेगी, अच्छी बनानी पड़ेगी। जैसा कि कई माननीय सदस्यों ने चिन्ता व्यक्त की है और देखा जाए तो आज भी ग्रामीण स्तर पर कई ऐसे दैवी आपदाएं आती रहती हैं, चक्रवात है, बाढ़ है, सूखा है या कहीं पर कोई अप्रिय घटना हो जाती है।[\[H34\]](#)

कहीं पर आग लग जाती है तो फौरन हमें इन दैवीय आपदाओं से बचने के लिए पुलिस, तहसील और फायर ब्रिगेड आदि संस्थाओं को सूचना देनी होती है। दूर संचार की व्यवस्था न होने पर वहां इस प्रकार की कई अप्रिय घटनाएं घटित होती रहती हैं, जिनसे जानमाल का भी नुकसान होता है।

जहां तक टेलीफोन के नेटवर्क की बात है, तो हम देखते हैं कि शहरों में तो नेटवर्क की प्राब्लम नहीं है, लेकिन गांवों में है। इसलिए हमें वहां नेटवर्क को सुदृढ़ करना होगा। आप कहीं पर भी रहें, दूर-सुदूर इलाकों में, शहरों में तो हम लैंड लाइन टेलीफोन से, मोबाइल फोन से पीसीओ में जाकर बात कर लेंगे, लेकिन इन इलाकों में नेटवर्क की समस्या से लोग आज भी परेशान हैं। इसलिए वहां दूर संचार के नेटवर्क को दुरुस्त करने के लिए इन दूर-सुदूर इलाकों में पैसा खर्च करने की जरूरत है। आज भी बीएसएनएल की अपेक्षा निजी कम्पनीज के नेटवर्क ज्यादा कारगर सिद्ध हो रहे हैं। उनके नेटवर्क हर जगह अच्छी तरह से काम करते हैं और सर्विस भी अच्छी होती है।

आज प्रतिस्पर्धा का युग है। इसलिए सरकारी दूर संचार की कम्पनीज को अपने देश की निजी कम्पनीज और बहुराष्ट्रीय कम्पनीज के साथ मुकाबला करना होगा। अतः दूर संचार की प्रणाली को अधिक सुदृढ़ बनाने के लिए विशेष ध्यान देना होगा।

मैं इतना ही कहकर अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ और इस विधेयक का पुरजोर समर्थन करता हूँ।

प्रो. रासा सिंह रावत (अजमेर): सभापति महोदय, मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ, लेकिन मुझे खेद के साथ कहना पड़ रहा है कि पहले इसके बारे में अध्यादेश लाया गया और वह भी 30 अक्टूबर, 2006 को लाया गया, जबकि 22 नवम्बर से संसद का सत्र शुरू होना था। इन 22 दिनों के अंदर ऐसा क्या हो रहा था जो मंत्री जी ने लिखा है कि आप सर्विस से पीछे रह जाते। मैं समझता हूँ कि इसके पीछे कारण दूसरा है। 19 मई, 2006 को यह बिल संसद में प्रस्तुत हुआ था। उसके बाद संसद की स्थाई समिति में गया। इस बिल में बेसिक शब्द को हटाने की बात थी। टेलीग्राफ से केवल फिक्स्ड लाइन करने का मतलब था, वह करना था, लेकिन संसद की स्थाई समिति ने उस पर अपने विचार व्यक्त करके रिपोर्ट दी। उस कमेटी ने 31 जुलाई को अपनी रिपोर्ट भेज दी थी। उसके बाद 30 अक्टूबर को आप अध्यादेश लेकर आए। इस बीच मानसून सेशन भी चला गया, उसमें भी आप यह बिल ला सकते थे। ऐसा लगता है कि दाल में कुछ काला है। मैं मारन साहब से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि दुनिया के सबसे बड़े लोकतांत्रिक देश भारत में अध्यादेश तभी लाया जाता है जब कोई अपरिहार्य कारण हो, विशेष परिस्थिति हो। हम हमेशा इस बात को संसद में कहते रहे हैं।

गांवों में टेलीफोन सेवा आवश्यक सेवा बन गई है और मोबाइल सेवा भी आवश्यक हो गई है। लेकिन हमने देखा है कि यह से वा शहरों तक ही सीमित होकर रह गई है। जब हम अपने क्षेत्र में जाते हैं तो लोग कहते हैं कि पांच साल हो गए, सात साल हो गए 1000 रुपए जमा कराए, लेकिन अभी तक लैंड लाइन कनेक्शन नहीं मिला। मेरे अपने सांसद कोटे से 100 में से 25 फोन अभी तक नहीं लगे हैं।

संसदीय कार्य मंत्री तथा सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री (श्री प्रियरंजन दासमुंशी): आपको तो टेलीफोन के लिए कहने की जरूरत ही नहीं है, क्योंकि आपकी आवाज ही इतनी अच्छी है कि बिना उसके गुंजती है।

प्रो. रासा सिंह रावत : गांवों में टेलीफोन के सम्बन्ध में काफी परेशानी हो रही है। आप शहर में रहते हैं इसलिए आपको नहीं लगती। हमारे क्षेत्र में गांवों के लोग हमसे कहते हैं कि आप संसद में जाते हैं, हमारा प्रतिनिधित्व करते हैं, क्या एक टेलीफोन नहीं लगा सकते। इसके अलावा वे यह भी कहते हैं कि जब हम टेलीफोन विभाग के अधिकारी के पास जाते हैं और टेलीफोन कनेक्शन न मिलने की बात करते हैं, तो वे कहते हैं कि अपने पैसे वापस ले लो। भले ही वह लैंड लाइन टेलीफोन की बात हो या मोबाइल फोन की बात हो। शहरों में तो रिकशा चलाने वाले और सब्जी बेचने वालों तक के पास मोबाइल फोन है। लेकिन जो लोग दुर्गम स्थलों में रहते हैं, पहाड़ी और जंगल एरिया में रहते हैं, वहां दूर संचार की काफी दिक्कत है। वहां के लोग अपने परिवार से बात नहीं कर पाते। आपने जैसे तो ऐसी कई जगहों पर सैल्युलर सर्विस शुरू की है और वीपीटी लगा दिए हैं तथा नेशनल टेलीकॉम पालिसी बना दी है, लेकिन उसका अधिक फायदा नहीं हुआ है। पहले गांवों के लिए 'मार' सिस्टम लगाया था, लेकिन उसे भी मार दिया गया और वह अभी तक नहीं बदला गया। [R35]

ग्राम पंचायतों के अंदर जहां पर पुराना मार-सिस्टम वीपीटी लगे हुए थे वे कई जगह बदलने थे, वे भी नहीं बदले। कई गांवों में प्रतीक्षा सूची बाकी है। हमारे अजमेर जिले में बताया गया है कि 7000 लोग प्रतीक्षा सूची में हैं। राजस्थान क्षेत्रफल की दृष्टि से सबसे बड़ा राज्य है, वहां पर रेगिस्तानी, पहाड़ी और दुर्गम इलाके हैं, हम विभाग से कहते हैं कि डब्ल्यूडब्ल्यूएल लगा दो, तो कहते हैं कि जितनी मशीनें आनी चाहिए थीं वे नहीं आईं, 31 मार्च तक आयेंगी। लेकिन 31 मार्च भी निकल जाता है लेकिन वे मशीनें नहीं आती हैं। हाई-पावर मोबाइल टावर्स ऊंचे-ऊंचे पहाड़ों पर लगाने चाहिए जिससे 25 किलोमीटर तक के क्षेत्र को वे कवर कर सकें। आंधी-तुफान आने पर भी वे काम कर सकें। मान्यवर, यह हमारी पीड़ा है। सभापति जी, मैं आपका संरक्षण चाहूंगा। प्राइवेट सैक्टर की कंपनियां विज्ञापनों के माध्यम से प्रचार करती हैं। बीएसएनएल, एमटीएनएल ये घाटा सहकर भी गांवों के अंदर सेवा देने का कार्य कर रहे हैं। आपने यूएसओएफ लगाया, उससे आप उनको कंपनसेट करने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। इन प्राइवेट कंपनियों ने लाखों रुपये का जुर्माना दे दिया लेकिन गांवों में जो लक्ष्य रखा गया था वह पूरा नहीं किया। चाहे टाटा हो, हच हो या रिलाइंस हो, ये कंपनियां गांवों के अंदर नहीं गयी हैं। इसलिए उनके ऊपर पाबंदी लगनी चाहिए थी जिससे भारत सरकार की जो कंपनियां हैं वे घाटे में न जाएं। वे विज्ञापन निकालते हैं कि आजीवन सस्ती सेवा लेकिन आपने लाइसेंस तो उन्हें एक साल का दिया है तो वे आजीवन सेवा कैसे दे सकती हैं? लोगों को ये प्राइवेट कंपनियां ठग रही हैं लेकिन उस ओर आपका ध्यान नहीं जा रहा है। वे विज्ञापन देती हैं कि उपभोक्ता को इनकर्मिंग का कुछ नहीं देना पड़ेगा, आउट-गोइंग

का कुछ नहीं देना पड़ेगा। उससे उपभोक्ता का शोण हो रहा है। बीएसएनएल की मानसिकता में परिवर्तन आना चाहिए। पुराने समय में जो लोगों की मनोवृत्ति थी कि हड़ताल और यूनियनबाजी, तो जब नयी कंपनियां कम्प्टीशन में आ गयी हैं तो इन बीमारियों से दूर रहकर उनकी मानसिकता में परिवर्तन आना चाहिए। बीएसएनएल के हम बहुत आभारी हैं कि ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में वे सेवा प्रदान करने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। माननीय मंत्री जी आज स्पष्ट उत्तर दें कि प्रतीक्षा सूची कब तक पूरी हो जाएगी। जैसे शहरों में है कि आज टेलीफोन मांगा और मिल जाता है इसी प्रकार गांवों में भी होना चाहिए। सेनाओं में काम करने वाले अधिकतर लोग गांवों में ही रहते हैं।

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN (CHIRAYINKIL): I am for the disapproval of the Ordinance. The Bill is for replacing the Ordinance. Now, I would like to submit that as per article 123 of the Constitution if at any time, except when both Houses of Parliament are in Session, the President is satisfied that circumstances exist which render it necessary for him to take immediate action, he may promulgate such Ordinances.

Now here is a case wherein the Bill was introduced in this House as early as on 19th May, 2006. The Bill was circulated on that day. It was also mentioned that the President having been informed of the subject matter of the Indian Telegraph (Amendment) Bill, 2006 has recommended introduction and consideration of the Bill under article 117. So, the Bill was introduced and circulated in this House on the recommendation of the President.[\[R36\]](#)

The Bill was referred to the Standing Committee and they have made some recommendations. In legal parlance, the House is seized of the matter. We are considering the Bill. When we have taken cognizance of the Bill and when such is the case, how can the President issue an Ordinance? ... (*Interruptions*) I am speaking for disapproval of the Ordinance. Once the President has recommended the consideration of the Bill, subsequently, can he issue an Ordinance when the House is not in Session?

MR. CHAIRMAN : You cannot discuss the authority of the President here.

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN : Then I will stop here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am only objecting your mentioning about the authority of the President. Can we discuss the authority of the President here? You are a lawyer. You know it.

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN : I have already moved a resolution for the disapproval of the Ordinance and on that basis, I am speaking. I am speaking on the basis of a resolution which I have already moved.

Now, I would like to draw the attention of the House to one point. You may be aware that an Ordinance is a committed legislation. The House cannot make any amendment because the Executive has already committed certain points and they will have to be passed as they are without amendments. That is why I say that the powers of the House are curtailed. It is more or less like delivering a child by a caesarian operation and not normally. My humble submission is this. The House is deprived of its powers. It is a fraud on the Constitution for having issued an Ordinance when the House has taken cognizance of the matter. When the House has referred the Bill to the Standing Committee, the President has no powers to issue an Ordinance. The President has already recommended to the House to consider the Bill and we have taken cognizance of the Bill. And the Bill was subsequently referred to the Standing

Committee. In the meanwhile, the Executive should inform us as to what was the urgency and emergency. Even admitting that the President has already issued an Ordinance, he must convince the House of the emergency. After going through the Bill, it will be seen that in 1985, the Telegraph Act was passed introducing the Universal Service Obligation Fund. This Fund has been there for years. Then what was the necessity for issuing an Ordinance for operation of a Fund which has been in existence since 1985? The Universal Service Obligation Fund is already there. What was the necessity to issue an Ordinance for the utilization of the Fund which had come into existence in 1985?

The Bill was naturally introduced, we have taken cognizance of it and we were discussing it. My humble submission is, this being a matter of no urgency, the Government should not have resorted to emergency provision. They could have brought it in the normal course. After all, these mobile phones are used in rural areas. What was the necessity to issue an Ordinance? I humbly request the Chair that this is a matter which ought to have been done in the usual course by bringing a Bill. The Bill could have been discussed by the House and passed. Without doing that, unfortunately, they have resorted to the emergency provision of the Constitution. They are not entitled to use that power since it is only a normal business. On this ground, I strongly oppose the issue of Ordinance. About the Bill, I have no objection.

14.00 hrs

I have no objection over the Bill. But I object to the way in which it has been done. Had a Bill been introduced, I would not have opposed it. Had a Bill been introduced, I would have supported it in the natural course. But resorting to ordinances is not good. As a Member of the House, I have a power to make amendments in the Bill. That power is being taken away by issuing ordinances. That is why I oppose it. I am not opposing the Bill. I oppose the way in which the ordinances are issued.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Thank you. Well done.

... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing will be recorded.

(Interruptions) *...

* Not recorded

SHRI B. MAHTAB (CUTTACK): Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for giving me an opportunity to participate in the discussion on The Indian Telegraph (Amendment) Bill, 2006. This reminds us of the National Telegraph Policy of 1999. It had set a target of achieving rural tele density from the level of 0.4 in 2002 to 4.0 by the year 2010. We are told that the rural tele density has increased to 1.77 by the year 2005 and that there is a need to facilitate telecom penetration in the rural areas. The Government has taken recourse to an easy way of utilizing the USO Fund to extend cellular mobile phones. The logic that has been put forth is that the cellular mobile services can be deployed for rapid expansion of telephony in rural and remote areas at affordable and reasonable prices.

The amendment that has been proposed is to remove the word “basic”. On the face of it, this amendment looks very simple. But it is not so. Despite the Standing Committee objecting to it, the Government is going ahead with this amendment. I would just like to mention that the difference in the definition between the cellular and basic phones came into existence only in 1994. We are deliberating on an Act of 1885, The Telegraph Act. As per clause 1 (A) (A) of Section 3 of the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885, telegraph means:

“any appliance, instrument, material or apparatus used or capable of use for transmission or reception for signs, signals, writing images and sounds or intelligence of any nature by wire, visual or other electronic and electro magnetic emissions, radio waves or hertzian waves, galvanic electric or magnetic means. As wire as well as radio waves and electro magnetic emissions are stipulated in the definition, it covers both wire and wireless services.”

I would like to understand as to why the Minister has said, while introducing the Bill in this House, that the Legal Department insisted on it. The Legal Department also met the Standing Committee. Yet, the Standing Committee said, “We are not convinced”. We would like to hear from the

Government as to why this necessity has come. The amendment or the definition which has come in 1994, was not incorporated in the Act. It is just for our understanding that cellular and basic telephones have been differentiated. But when you are removing the word “basic”, a larger connotation is pregnant in that amendment. That is my concern and that concern, I think, is more or so of Shri Varkala Radhakrishnan or of anyone who represents a rural area. I would like to understand from the hon. Minister as to what is the reason behind removing the word ‘basic’. What repercussion is there? The repercussion is, diversion will be there and more stress will be on cellular mobiles. I am of the opinion that more stress should be given on fixed landlines. Mobile telephone is for the richer person and he who has more income prefers a mobile telephone. ... (*Interruptions*)

We have six lakh villages in this country and still around 50,000 or 60,000 villages are to be provided with a single telephone. It means around ten per cent of the villages of this country are yet to be provided with a telephone facility. ... (*Interruptions*) I am talking about the eligible villages, villages which has a population of more than a fixed number say 300 or 500 persons who live in the village. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI B. MAHTAB : When these great strides have been made in expanding telephone facility in this country, manifold increase has been done. More input also has come in with the introduction of optical fiber. But, of course, more investment is required to lay optical fiber to provide fixed landlines. But here the Government is taking recourse to cellular and BSNL which is a public sector undertaking, is provided with certain job to do and certain targets to meet. But now that is being shared. Earlier, a person of rural background was getting a telephone at a cheaper rate. Now, he is forced to buy the instrument. The instrument may be costing him around Rs. 3,000 or Rs. 40,000. ... (*Interruptions*) But by this way, the telephony system is being confined to a specific section of the society. A large section of the society who is invariably poor, especially in a State like Orissa where around 50 per cent of the people are below the poverty line, how do you provide a telephone in a village? By cellular mobile? This is my concern. So, I would like to have an assurance from the hon. Minister. Of course, a large number of political parties representing here in this Parliament are in favour of providing cellular mobile in rural areas.

Sir, I am in a minority. I am aware of it. But my only concern is that I need an assurance from the hon. Minister and from this Government. Please do not divert money from USO, at least keep a portion of USO fund for fixed landline. This is a policy decision which is being taken and there is a shift in the existing policy. There is a shift in the existing policy by removing the word 'basic'. But I am really alarmed the manner in which this Bill is being piloted. I am sure it is going to be approved. But my concern here is – I want to record it – that underprivileged people are being denied the service that was assured by the new Telecom policy.

श्री गिरधारी लाल भार्गव (जयपुर) :सभापति महोदय, मुझे लगभग वही बात कहनी है, जो मुझसे पहले कईमाननीय सदस्य कह चुके हैं। माननीय मंत्री जी आपने स्वयं माना है कि गांवों में जो टेलीफोन लगने चाहिए, उनका घनत्व कम है। आपने 14 दिसम्बर को संसद में यह बात कही थी। आप एक अच्छा बिल लाये हैं और आप दस हजार मोबाइल टेलीफोन सेवा गांवों में और देना चाहते हैं, इसके लिए आपका रुवागत है। अध्यादेश के बारे में जो हमारे माननीय अध्यक्ष रहे हैं, वह कह चुके हैं कि अध्यादेश नहीं आना चाहिए था[[MSOffice38](#)]।

मैं समझता हूँ कि दो-तीन महीने का गैप होता और फिर आप अध्यादेश लाते तो ज्यादा अच्छा होता। इसलिए अध्यादेश का तो मैं विरोध करता हूँ। बाकी आप अच्छा बिल लाए हैं, इसमें कोई दो राय नहीं हैं। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि आज भी गांवों में टॉवर खड़े हुए हैं लेकिन वे टॉवर खराब पड़े हुए हैं। भाई राजेश जी, जो हमारे पूर्व में संचार मंत्री रहे हैं, उनको मैं धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ कि गांवों को उन्होंने शहरों से जोड़ दिया। इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि मोबाइल सेवा बहुत अच्छी सेवा है लेकिन आखिरकार जगह-जगह बोर्ड लगे हुए हैं, कोई कम पैसे में कनेक्शन दे रहा है, कोई मुफ्त में दे रहा है और कोई कह रहा है कि एक बार पैसा जमा करा दो और फिर आपको

जिन्दगी भर पैसा जमा नहीं कराना पड़ेगा। इस संबंध में भी आप विचार करें और जो टॉवर खराब पड़े हुए हैं और पहाड़ी क्षेत्र में टॉवर की खराबी के कारण से ठीक से सुनाई नहीं पड़ता है, इस ओर भी आपको ध्यान देना नितांत आवश्यक है। अब कई कंपनियां आ गई हैं और सबने अलग-अलग सुविधाएं देने वाली बात कही है। आप अच्छा बिल लाए हैं, इसका मैं स्वागत करता हूँ लेकिन अध्यादेश नहीं लाना चाहिए था, इसका मैं विरोध तो नहीं कर रहा हूँ लेकिन टॉवर वाले सिस्टम को आप ठीक करेंगे और गांव भी मोबाइल टेलीफोन सेवा से जुड़ जाएं, यह अच्छी बात है। इसलिए इस बिल का मैं स्वागत करता हूँ कि बिल अच्छा है, इसमें कोई दो राय नहीं है। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

MR. CHAIRMAN : Bhargava ji, very kind of you.

श्री शंखलाल माझी (अकबरपुर) : सभापति जी, धन्यवाद। भारतीय तार (संशोधन) विधेयक पर चर्चा के लिए आपने मुझे समय दिया, इसके लिए मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ। तार टेलीफोन के मामले में इस देश ने पिछले दशक में काफी प्रगति की है। इसलिए हम मंत्रालय को और खासतौर से माननीय मंत्री जी को भी बधाई देते हैं। मैं सिर्फ यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि सन् 2002 में पूरे देश में प्रदेश में लैंडलाइन टेलीफोन के लिए बहुत सारे फॉर्म जमा कराये गये थे लेकिन उनका पैसा भी आज तक पड़ा हुआ है और उनका कनेक्शन आज तक नहीं दिया गया है। गांवों की जनता के बीच में जो एक संदेश देना था कि हम गांवों को टेलीफोन से जोड़ रहे हैं और हर गांव को टेलीफोन सुविधा से जोड़ रहे हैं, हर गांव को जितनी आवश्यकता है, उतना कनेक्शन हम उपलब्ध कराएंगे लेकिन यह पैसा अभी तक नहीं दिया गया है। इससे विभाग की खामी उजागर होती है। टेलीफोन के मामले में देश ने उन्नति की है, स्वर्गीय राजीव गांधी जी का सपना था, टेलीफोन और टी.वी. को बढ़ावा देने की उनकी सोच थी और उसी के आधार पर उन्होंने कृषि और मजदूरी, बागवानी मत्स्यकी उद्योग को बढ़ाने की बजाए इस टेलीफोन और टी.वी. के लिए ज्यादा जोर दिया था। उसका परिणाम है कि आज देश ने इसमें उन्नति की है। हम सिर्फ यह कहना चाहते हैं कि हमारे लोक सभा क्षेत्र अम्बेडकर नगर अकबरपुर में बी.टी.एस. टॉवर लगे हुए हैं लेकिन उनका नैटवर्किंग खराब है। आज जब पूरे देश में तमाम टाटा मोबाइल्स, रिलायंस, एयरटेल और बहुत सारी कम्प्यूटीटिव कंपनियां आ गई हैं, ऐसी स्थिति में गांवों में आज भी एम.टी.एन.एल के लिए क्रेज है इसलिए मेरी यह मांग है कि हमारे लोक सभा क्षेत्र में जो बी.टी.एस. टॉवर लगे हुए हैं, उनको ठीक से संचालित कराया जाए और उनकी जो नैटवर्किंग की समस्या है, उसको दूर किया जाए। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thank you for your kind cooperation. Shri Kharabela Swain. Please take two minutes.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (BALASORE): Sir, I shall be brief.

At the very outset, I would like to say that I am not against this Bill *per se*. But a paradoxical situation has already developed. Now, thousands of people are waiting for a fixed telephone line in the rural areas. My district Balasore in Orissa is having the highest number of wait-listed persons in Orissa. The Telephone Department keeps on assuring the wait-listed persons that the waiting list would be wiped out. But it never materializes. For the last so many years, we have been talking to the hon. Minister and we are being told that due to the cancellation of the global tenders, the BSNL is unable to procure the instruments. That is the reason for which the BSNL is unable to install telephones on demand in the rural areas.

Mr. Minister, it is said that you are a dynamic person. I also agree that you are a dynamic person.

But I think that he should show his dynamism here by keeping his words. He said several times on the floor of the House that telephone would be provided on demand. I hope that he would do it because

everyday people are coming to us with the demand that telephone should be provided to them. We have been telling them that they would get it in three or four months, but it does not materialize and so we are the people who are blamed for this. I would like to say that it is a paradoxical situation because when there is such a long waiting list, three million people have already returned their landline telephones and more and more people are returning it. Why are they returning it? Even now, I saw a news item in the newspaper that the Chairman of the BSNL is going to write letters to those persons who are returning their fixed line phones not to do so and even the Lineman is now going to function as a Salesman. What is the hon. Minister going to do about this? Why are they returning their telephones? Is it not because of the inefficiency in providing quality service? Will the Minister do something about it so that they do not return their landline telephones?

Sir, let us take the example of mobile service. I find that there are many people who are now shifting from BSNL to other private mobile service providers. What is the reason for this? One of the main reasons is that there is a lot of congestion in the BSNL mobile network and for hours together we do not get the signal. How is the Minister going to deal with this situation? We are fond of the Government of India, we are fond of BSNL and we are having BSNL mobile phones. But when we face this problem, we feel very sorry about it. So, I would appeal to the hon. Minister that he should do something to rectify this problem.

Lastly, I would like to know whether the Government has any plan to take the Broadband facility to rural areas through optical fibre. At the time of reply, I hope the Minister will reply to my questions.

THE MINISTER OF COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (SHRI DAYANIDHI MARAN): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I thank all the hon. Members who have participated in this discussion. Most of the Members, I can say all the Members, have supported the Bill, but all of them have not supported the way in which it was brought.

Sir, the Standing Committee, in the 34th Report presented to the Lok Sabha on 31.07.2006, has supported the proposal to take mobile service to the rural areas and made the following observation in Part II of the Report. I quote:

“The Committee are, therefore, convinced that the cellular mobile services which have brought about a revolution in the urban areas can be effectively used to provide cellular service to the people in the rural and remote areas also at affordable and reasonable rates. The Committee, therefore, fully endorses the proposal for extension of support from the Universal Service Obligation Fund for provision of cellular service in rural, remote and inaccessible areas. But the Committee do not agree with the Indian Telegraph (Amendment) Bill, 2006 seeking the amendment of Clause 1 (A) of Section 3 of the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885 by deleting the word ‘basic’ from the expression ‘basic telegraph services’. The Committee is of the view that there is no bar even now for extending subsidy support for the cellular service because the word ‘basic’ does not have any meaning and qualifies the word that follows. The definition of ‘telegraph’ is comprehensive and sufficiently wide to cover any type of technology.”

But the Department clarified that it could appropriately be done by making a suitable amendment to the Act. We sought legal opinion on this. When we are trying to take the success of cellular services in the cities to the cousins in our villages, why should we have any legal dispute? The Legislative Department said that we should bring an amendment and we should go ahead and remove the word 'basic' from the expression 'basic telegraph services'.

Then, most of the Members asked as to why the promulgation of Ordinance was necessary. The Monsoon Session of Parliament ended on 25th August, 2006. The preparatory work on the scheme of support infrastructure for cellular services in rural and remote areas was at an advanced stage. If we had waited for the passing of the Bill, the scheme would have been pushed back by several months.[\[R39\]](#)

[\[r40\]](#) Delaying of launching the scheme would affect the provision of not only voice telephony, but also the effort of extending the broad band connectivity in the rural and remote areas.

Keeping in view the strong sentiments expressed in the Standing committee, the Consultative Committee and in the debates in the Parliament about the urgent need, to bring telecom services in the rural areas, it was felt that promulgation of Ordinance would help the early launching of scheme.

It is pointed out that after the issuing of the ordinance, a draft scheme has been placed on the web site of the Department of Telecommunications and notice inviting tenders will be issued in the third week of December.

Sir, we have seen telecom in India. I am a witness and most of the senior Members are witness to those old days when we had to file an application form for telephone and wait for years together. It was in 1980s when our late Leader Rajiv Gandhi brought the telecom revolution in India and we saw the STD booths mushrooming in all the villages, which brought about a telecom revolution in the fixed line service.

But technology changed. Today, we have mobile services. Mobile services were introduced way back in 1994. When it came in 1994, the cost per minute was Rs.16.80. We had to pay for both sides, that is, the calling party as well as the receiving party had to pay. We had such expensive bills which were to be paid. So, mobile was thought of as if it was only for the rich, for the elite. The common man was not even eligible to use the mobile. The cost of the mobile phone was something like, Rs.50,000. The service was so exclusive and limited to only cities. When this UPA Government took over, we had 75 million users. Today, we have 180 million users. The growth is tremendous. This January, our growth was five million. There were five million new users. In fact, I had an opportunity to meet the Prime Minister of Finland. He asked me, how is the telecom growth in India. I jokingly told him, 'we are adding your population to the number of new users in India'. This is what we have today. Last month, it was 6.2 million. For the previous month, it was 6.8 million. We are touching seven million.

Today, the mobile phone is not the sole property of the rich, the mobile phone is for the whole masses. Today, mobile phone has become so common that today we see a rickshaw-walla, a bhaji-walla, a farmer, everyone is using a mobile phone. It has changed the way we do business.

Thanks to the policies taken by this UPA Government, we have reduced the long distance licence fee, we have reduced the long distance international licence fee from Rs.100 crore to Rs.2.5 crore. Sir, today, could anyone think of calling from any part of India, from Kashmir to Kanya Kumari, at the cost of Re.1. It is happening. It is happening in India. Today, we have the lowest tariff compared to other sectors.

MR. CHAIRMAN : We must congratulate you.

SHRI DAYANIDHI MARAN: That is also increasing the telecom sector. In the last two years, after the UPA Government has taken over, we saw a reduction of telecom tariff. We are doing it. The growth is coming. We never kept quiet. We also capitalize the growth. Today, we have capitalized the growth and said that we will not import all the equipments which are needed to be used in our country. Today, we can see Nokia, Motorola, etc. are all setting up their plants in India, manufacturing in India to ensure that they make them in India and supply to Indians. We have this growth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This has brought proud to our country.

SHRI DAYANIDHI MARAN: This growth has come and it is because of this phone technology. We should take this growth.

Yes, it is a paradox, as Shri Swain has said. We saw that the teledensity in cities is 48 per cent. When we go to the rural areas, it is bad. We have taken a conscious decision, this House has taken a conscious decision to make the Department of Telecommunication into a public sector unit. We have now made BSNL and MTNL to behave like private players. When we want them to compete, we should let them compete. We cannot say, after making a Department of Telecommunication into the public sector unit that they should be what they were as the Government of India.

At the outset, we have opened up the telecom now. We have so many private operators and everyone is trying to compete. Naturally, with the capital market what they do is that they all go to the cities where they can make profit and that is exactly what has happened. All the telecom companies are now mostly in Delhi, Mumbai and in the cities only. But they have been going on. Today, if any telecom service provider has to go, he has to go to the rural areas.

We have also moved forward. We have the Universal Service Obligation Fund. It is a fund which is collected from the licence fee of the operators. So, five per cent of the licence fee is collected from them. [41] We too now have collected about Rs. 10,800 crore. Out of this, the Finance Minister was kind enough, we have been able to allot Rs. 3,600 crore, we still have Rs. 7,200 crore. This amount keeps on adding. We try different schemes.

An hon. Member mentioned that we had MARRs; so many equipment came and they did not work. One successful thing is mobile be it GSM or CDMA. It has been successful. We want to take it to the rural areas. How do we incentivise them? We have the USO Fund. We are not giving this fund for them to put tower in Delhi or Mumbai or Chennai; we are asking them to go to the remote villages where there are no towers.... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : He is not yielding. Please sit down.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DAYANIDHI MARAN: Let me complete..... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is coming to the rural areas.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, kindly go ahead.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think, the hon. Minister is competent to reply.

Mr. Minister, kindly reply.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DAYANIDHI MARAN: I have not completed my reply. Let me complete.... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him complete and then you can say something, if you are unsatisfied.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DAYANIDHI MARAN: An hon. Member was asking as to how many MARRs were replaced. Out of 1,86,872 MARRs to be replaced, we have already replaced 1,63,436 MARRs as on 31.10. 2006. The remaining MARRs will be completed by the year 2007. In fact, we want to utilize the Universal Service Obligation Fund not to put towers in cities, in urban areas but in rural areas, in villages and in inaccessible areas where you want. That is what the Government of India wants to do. We are trying to take these towers to cover the areas where the population is more than 2000. We are trying to introduce this process. Sir, 8,000 towers are going to come up. These towers are going to cover the length and breadth of the country where no single operator had put these towers. Is it not what you want? We want to take this cellular revolution which India is going through to our rural customers, to our villages. I am from Tamil Nadu. Probably I am elected from Chennai but I am also aware of all the rural problems. We feel that operators do not want to go. We have to incentivise them. The incentive is that we are trying to subsidise the cost of the passive infrastructure. We are subsidizing the tower cost, the diesel, the shelters, the switches needed. We are not only going to use them for voice; we want to use them for broadband also. In fact, we are going to subsidise for five years so that we feel that in the five years time it will be profitable enough for these operators; it can be BSNL, it can be Tatas, it can be Reliance, it can be Airtel, it can be anyone. We are allowing maximum three people to be fixed in this and share those towers so that they may be able to provide service to the people in the rural areas.

We will have 250 million phones by the end of next year. The speed at which we are going, we will be achieving much faster. We have also realized that in 2006 that we have to have targets. For the first time, the Department of Telecommunications is setting up targets. The targets such as the number of owners of telephone connections or tele-density we should have, we have never had this earlier. It is only in the last two years, after the UPA Government has taken over that we are putting targets and targets are being achieved, and we will be definitely over shot also. By the year 2010, we will have 500 million mobile phones. Today, I can say we have joined the elite club of hundred million mobile users.... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Sir, several times he said that he has set target but it has not been achieved. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Let the Minister complete his reply. After the Minister completes his reply, I will allow you to put one or two questions.

Now, Mr. Minister, you kindly go ahead.

SHRI DAYANIDHI MARAN: Sir, we have six lakh villages in India. Only 66,822 villages were to be covered. Out of these 66,822 villages, we have already covered 36,014 villages. The remaining villages will be covered by November, 2007. Sir, it is a continuous process.

Shri Swain has asked as to why we are not going to the fixed line and he said that we should invest in that. We never said that we would shy away from using the USO Fund for fixed line; wherever viable it will definitely be done.

Shri Swain wanted to know why people are surrendering the fixed line. It is a good question. Today, everyone wants a mobile phone. The husband carries a mobile phone; the wife carries a mobile phone; the son or the daughter carries a mobile phone; and they feel that when they have to pay rent for all these mobile phones, they do not want to pay for a landline. That is why they are surrendering the landline connections. Sir, we have reduced the cost under BSNL so as to reduce their bill. Today, everyone is paying less.

Sir, new formula will come. When things are changing, then our priorities will have to be changed. At this point of time, I would like to mention that India for once is on the right track, and what we are doing for mobile is on the right track. We are trying to push this success to the villages, to connect the villages and to take the telephone connections, broadband and other new technologies, to the villages. The world is talking about WiMAX technology. Two years back, we decided to set up WiMAX Research Centre in India, and the world is expecting us to come out with the technology. We will be coming out with the technology. Today, we will be the first one to come out with WiMAX technology, and we will be the leaders. We will be putting up the new technology. Every time when we reach somewhere, the technology will always lead us to go forward.

Let us do what we know. Let us take the success of mobile to the villages. Let us try to do that. With these words, I seek the support of all the sections of this House in passing this Bill.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Mr. Minister, do you give us the date by which the waitlist numbers will be wiped out? If you give us the date now, then we can mention to our people that the hon. Minister has promised on the floor of the House that the waitlist numbers would be wiped out by such and such a date.
... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, Shri Chandrappan. Please be brief.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing will be recorded except what Shri Chandrappan says.

(*Interruptions*)* ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, let all the questions come first. After that, you can answer.

Now, Shri C.K. Chandrappan.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN (TRICHUR): Sir, very appreciable things have come in the telephone sphere and we appreciate it. We face a serious problem especially in the hilly areas where you connect WLL connection. The complaint is perpetual. People are sending memorandums to take away this WLL connection because they could not contact anybody but they have to pay for it. What is the remedy that you are suggesting? Is there any time bound programme by which you will find a solution to this?

SHRI K. FRANCIS GEORGE (IDUKKI): I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Minister for all the fast development that has taken place in the Ministry. The problem is this. He has already mentioned that. I have to highlight it. I represent the hilly area constituency, and people in the hilly areas have been waiting for years, for almost 9 to 10 years, for getting the connection. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please put your question.

* Not recorded

SHRI K. FRANCIS GEORGE : Sir, he has to understand the problem. The USO funds are going to be used for providing towers. What I am suggesting is that preference should be given to the hilly areas. It is because those towers which have come up in the hilly areas cannot cover major areas, they cannot cover 20 kilo metres due to the hilly terrain. What is happening now is because of the coverage under WLL and mobile, no landline is being given, no new exchanges are being constructed and no landline is being put up. As a result, people have been waiting extraordinarily for a long time, for almost five to ten years to get a fresh connection. ... (*Interruptions*)[\[R42\]](#)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. George, your point is already taken. Please take your seat now.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI K. FRANCIS GEORGE : So, Sir, thrust has to be given on those sectors.

There are also new secondary switching areas... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Put a very pointed question straightaway. There is no need to elaborate. Otherwise, nothing of what you speak would go on record.

SHRI K. FRANCIS GEORGE : Give me, just one minute.

I am requesting the hon. Minister to form a new secondary switching area because my Constituency covers three districts plus Lakshadweep. The development work there is progressing at a snail's pace. So, new secondary switching area has also to be formed... (*Interruptions*)

MR CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr.Prabhu.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KIREN RIJIJU (ARUNACHAL WEST): Sir, North-East is also there. Kindly allow me also to speak... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know, North-East is there. Kindly allow Mr. Prabhu to speak now. I would give you a chance.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will give you a chance after Mr. Prabhu.

SHRI SURESH PRABHAKAR PRABHU (RAJAPUR): What has been accomplished so far, nobody is questioning. Let the hon. Minister assure the House. What we are discussing is not a party issue, the Opposition issue or the Government issue; we are discussing the rural population, rural telephone issue, which has to be properly addressed. There are three possibilities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Kindly be very brief.

SHRI SURESH PRABHAKAR PRABHU : I am asking very specific questions. There are fixed lines, there is WiLL, that is, wireless in local loop; and there is a cellular phone. Of course, there is a multimedia. I would request the hon. Minister to tell us very categorically. We represent the people. All these facilities should be available to the consumers. You please do not say only fixed line or cellular.

In the rural areas, the consumer must have the right and the choice to choose between the fixed telephone, cellular and wireless local loop. The consumers want to register the demand. The BSNL must be directed that all demands would be registered; may be there is one person who is registering from the village. It is because, what is happening today is that many BSNL officers are refusing to register their demand by saying that at least, 150 demands should be there... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members, kindly cooperate. Now, Shri Rijiju.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI B. MAHTAB : Sir, let me also ask one or two points.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mahtab, you have already spoken. He has not spoken in the debates. He is from the North-East.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI B. MAHTAB : I am not making any debate now... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KIREN RIJIJU : Mr. Minister, you may kindly go back to your statement. You have said that you have gone ahead of the target. Now, we had invited you for the meeting with the Members of Parliament from the North-East, where unfortunately, you failed to come. Your Secretary came. All the promises given there are not being met with. Now, for example, take the entire districts of Arunachal Pradesh. Forget about mobile, there is no landline connection even.

I just want to ask you a specific question, Mr. Minister. When are you coming to my State and what are you going to do for those places where you said, it is economically not viable? If you see everything from the economic point of view, what about our saying of Welfare State? The BSNL should consider welfare as one of the major approaches. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, the hon. Minister.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI B. MAHTAB : May I ask a specific question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Kindly be very brief.

SHRI B. MAHTAB : Yes, Sir. By November, 2004, some 66,000 odd villages were yet to be covered with telephony. By December, 2005, 17,000 villages had already been covered within 13 months time. You are diverting funds from USO for cellular mobile, Another 49,000 odd villages are yet to be covered. I wanted an assurance from the Minister and I am yet to get that.

सभापति महोदय : मेहताब जी, यह बात हो गयी, उन्होंने इस बारे में काफी रिप्लाई दिया है।

...(व्यवधान)

SHRI B. MAHTAB : Will this USO fund be provided for expansion of landline telephone, village public telephone to those villages in a faced manner? The assurance is there that by 2007 all villages will be covered.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, the hon. Minister. You would also be very brief and precise e. Otherwise, it would be an unending discussing.

SHRI DAYANIDHI MARAN: Sir, all the hon. Members wanted to know about the waiting list... (*Interruptions*)

PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT (AJMER): Mr. Chairman, Sir, may I ask a small point?... (*Interruptions*)

प्रो. रासा सिंह रावत : महोदय, मेरा प्रश्न ... (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : रावत जी, आप अपना प्रश्न पूछ चुके हैं।

...(व्यवधान)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Prof. Rawat, you had asked and he had responded.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not a Question Hour. Everybody cannot enjoy this facility. You have already spoken. The hon. Minister had noted down your points, and he had responded some points, in between also.

Now, kindly allow the hon. Minister to reply.

SHRI DAYANIDHI MARAN: Sir, all the hon. Members raised very valuable questions. I am sure, hon. Members do realize and I also do realize when they go to their Constituencies, they are faced with a lot of

questions.[r43]

We have this process. We understand and the hon. Member should also understand that today in Orissa, we have a waiting list of 20,777. But what happens is that while we try to complete the waiting list, fresh waiting list is coming. It is an ongoing process. I can say that today we are able to provide “mobile connection” on demand for more than 90 per cent or 95 per cent of the people. I say “mobile connection”. Mobile connection is now available on demand.

The hon. Member has also asked what technology is going to be used. It will be a judicious mix. Basically we are now going through the tender process. So, it is going to be a mixture. Wireless technology is required for these towers. It can be CDMA technology, or GSM technology. It is going to be a judicious mix. We are allowing three people to come. So, it all depends on who wins the bid and who wants to come there and do it. So, we are trying to do that.

Regarding North-East, I am sure that we are closely following North-East. Let me say at this point, as we talk, that we have already realized the congestion problem. The BSNL cable was going there. We had frequent cuts. The cable used to get cut in North-East and North-East is used to get cut. We are using satellite medium to connect North-East but the traffic is too much. We already have, as I speak, 64 STM systems in North East, which is being extended to improve the bandwidth for both voice and data. As I speak, after this Parliament Session is over, I will be sending my colleague, Dr. Shakeel Ahamad... *(Interruptions)* Do you not want the Minister of State to be sent there?... *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please address to the Chair. Do not address the Members.

SHRI DAYANIDHI MARAN: I will be sending the Minister of State to go and assess the problem. But I can also say that since you all want the BSNL to do the welfare activities, we have taken it. Even before this happens, we have already taken it because the BSNL has assured me that it is going to take the year 2007 as the welfare year for the North-East.

Also, in Kashmir we are going to make sure that we are going to increase our presence. We are going to increase the capacity both in North-East and in Kashmir. With this, I conclude my speech. ... *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: How can I do that? He is responding. What can I do?

PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT : I mentioned about Rajasthan. ... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI DAYANIDHI MARAN: I am very surprised. Kerala people are the luckiest people in our country. The maximum tele-density is from their State. The maximum coverage is from their State. Even then there is no satisfaction. They want more and more, and we are ready... *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to respond to Rajasthan?

SHRI DAYANIDHI MARAN: I can say that by 2010, under the scheme, by these 8,000 towers, we are trying to cover the villages with population of more than 2000. If these hill areas are eligible, they will definitely be covered. ... *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. It is not a Question Hour. I cannot force the Minister to reply as we desire or you desire. Now, Mr. Prabodh Panda.

... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Kindly go to the Minister as a delegation and discuss with him. He will assure you and the work will be completed. This is not the only forum.

... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing will be recorded except Mr. Prabodh Panda's speech.

(Interruptions)* ...

SHRI PRABODH PANDA (MIDNAPORE): Hon. Chairman, Sir, I must thank the Minister for his encouraging reply and the assurance which he has given in this august House. But, at the same time, I am disappointed with regard to his reply which is related to the promulgation of the Ordinance.

However, considering the importance of this Bill, I am not pressing with the Statutory Resolution. Sir, I beg to withdraw this Statutory Resolution.

* Not recorded

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the House that the Resolution moved by Shri Prabodh Panda be withdrawn?

The Resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

“That the Bill further to amend the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885, be taken into consideration.”

The motion was adopted[\[MSOffice44\]](#).

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now, the House will take up clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

Clause 2 Amendment of Section 3

Amendment made:

Page 1, line 4,--

after “Indian Telegraph Act, 1885”

insert “(hereinafter referred to as the principal Act)”. (2)

(Shri Dayanidhi Maran)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

“That clause 2, as amended, stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2, as amended was added to the Bill.

Motion Re : Suspension of Rule 80(i)

SHRI DAYANIDHI MARAN: Sir, I beg to move:

“That this House do suspend clause (i) of rule 80 of Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha insofar as it requires that an amendment shall be within the scope of the Bill and relevant to the subject matter of the clause to which it relates, in its application to the Government amendment No. 3 to the Indian Telegraph (Amendment) Bill, 2006 and that this amendment may be allowed to be moved.”

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

“That this House do suspend clause (i) of rule 80 of Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha insofar as it requires that an amendment shall be within the scope of the Bill and relevant to the subject matter of the clause to which it relates, in its application to the Government amendment No. 3 to the Indian Telegraph (Amendment) Bill, 2006 and that this amendment may be allowed to be moved.”

The motion was adopted.

New Clause 3 Repeal and Saving

Amendment made:

Page 1, *after* line 6, *insert*—

Ord. 3 “3.(1) The Indian Telegraph (Amendment) Ordinance, 2006 is
of 2006 hereby repealed.

(2) Notwithstanding the repeal of the Indian Telegraph (Amendment) Ordinance, 2006, anything done or any action taken under the principal Act, as amended by the said Ordinance, shall be deemed to have been done or taken under the principal Act, as amended by this Act.” (3)

(Shri Dayanidhi Maran)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

“That new clause 3 be added to the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

New Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

Clause 1 Short Title and Commencement

Amendment made:

Page 1, for line 3, substitute—

“1.(1) This Act may be called the Indian Telegraph (Amendment) Act, 2006.

(2) It shall be deemed to have come into force on the 30th day of October, 2006.”
(1)

(Shri Dayanidhi Maran)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

“That clause 1, as amended, stand part of the Bill.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, as amended, was added to the Bill.

The Enacting Formula and the long Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI DAYANIDHI MARAN: I beg to move:

“That the Bill, as amended, be passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

“That the Bill, as amended, be passed.

The motion was adopted.

