

Mohammad Asrar Ahmad might be asked to appear before the Committee for oral examination at their next sitting.

I replied to the letter of Mr. Ahmad on 18th June 1983.

At their third sitting held on 28 June 1983, the Committee examined Shri Mohammad Asrar Ahmad. The Committee also decided that the Ministry of Education and Culture might be asked to obtain an authenticated copy of verbatim proceedings or any other record...

MR. SPEAKER : Enough.

SHRI R.R. BHOLE : I, therefore, request that the time be extended.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

“That this House do extend upto the last day of the first week of the Winter Session, 1983, the time for presentation of the Report of the Committee of Privileges on the question of privilege raised by Shri Mohammad Asrar Ahmad, MP against the Vice Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University for his alleged undignified and unbecoming behaviour with him at a meeting of the Court of Aligarh Muslim University held on 20 March, 1983, referred to the Committee on 29 April, 1983.”

The Motion was adopted.

12.25 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the chair*]

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER
OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Reported refusal to Chief Minister of
Andhra Pradesh to broadcast from
AIR station Hyderabad

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR
(Gorakhpur) : I call the attention of the
Minister of Information and Broadcast-
ing to the following matter of urgent pub-

lic importance and request that he may
make a statement thereon :

“the reported refusal to Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh to broadcast from All India Radio Station, Hyderabad, on 18 July, 1983 in connection with strike by the non-gazetted officers in Andhra Pradesh.”

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE
MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND
BROADCASTING AND MINISTER OF
STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF
PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI
H.K.L. BHAGAT) : There has been no
change in the AIR policy to provide
broadcast facilities to the Chief Ministers
and other Ministers (subject to the AIR
Code which is applicable to all such
broadcasts).

The same practice has been followed
in Andhra Pradesh. The Chief Minister,
Shri N.T. Rama Rao, used this facility on
the AIR on four occasions, i.e. 9th Janu-
ary, 6th April, 14th April and 15th July.
Similarly some of the Ministers of Andhra
Pradesh Cabinet have been utilising the
AIR from time to time.

The Chief Minister's appeal on the
threatened strike of NGOs was broadcast
on the evening of 15th July at 7.45 p.m.

On 18th July Chief Minister's office
sent a requisition to Assistant Station
Director of AIR for making arrangements
for the Chief Minister to broadcast again
on the subject of NGOs strike on the
same evening.

The station Directors are not required
to get any clearance from the AIR Head-
quarters for such broadcasts. The As-
sistant Station Director, Hyderabad Sta-
tion, however, was not clear whether a
broadcast on the same subject could
be made again so soon after two days.
Moreover, he was being pressed by the
representatives of the NGOs and some
opposition leaders in Andhra to provide
similar broadcast facilities to them on the
issue. He, therefore, approached AIR

[Shri H. K. L. Bhagat]

headquarters for clarification through a telephonic message on 18th July. In view of the difficulties expressed by him, he was asked to await further instructions before proceeding with the proposed broadcast.

On the same day, i.e. 18th July, he was asked by the AIR authorities to proceed with the broadcast. Due to communication difficulties the message could be given to him only in the evening and he informed the Chief Minister's staff and some others concerned with the State Information Department accordingly on the same evening. He was informed that the Chief Minister would decide only on the next day i.e. 19th July. Again on the 19th, Chief Minister's office was informed that the broadcast arrangement could be made. The AIR was informed that the Chief Minister would decide as to when he would make the broadcast.

The Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh sent a telex message to the Prime Minister on the subject and she immediately made enquiries and was informed that the instructions to proceed with the broadcast have been given already.

From the above it is clear that AIR had no intention whatsoever to deny the broadcast facilities to the Andhra Pradesh Chief Minister and that there was no question of discrimination against him.

The House will agree with me that on practical considerations, normally, it would be good to give adequate time to the AIR authorities to make arrangements for broadcasts and avoid as far as possible, repetition of broadcast on the same subject at short intervals. Normally, it becomes difficult for the authorities to arrange for broadcast on the same day.

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR : I was feeling that the hon. Minister, Shri Bhagat, was very nice man. I never expected that he would make such a baseless and very wrong type of state-

ment. There are several questions which arise out of the statement itself. The statement starts with the sentence that there has been no change in the AIR policy to provide broadcast facilities to the Chief Ministers and other Ministers. If there was no change in the policy, then why was that thing happened? At the same time, he is saying in the statement that the Assistance Station Director, Hyderabad Station, however, was not clear whether a broadcast on the same subject could be made again so soon after two days. How is it that he was not clear on this? Who is he to decide? So far as the Chief Ministers are concerned they should not be treated like that. I think, basically the person is very ignorant and very incompetent and he should be removed from the post. At the same time, the hon. Minister says that due to communication difficulty the message could not be given. When the whole thing was delivered by hand, then what was the communication difficulty? It is really very difficult to understand this type of statements. Also, there is an advice in the last para, "repetition of broadcast on the same subject at short intervals should be avoided". This is a very ridiculous advice and this advice must be withdrawn by the hon. Minister. So far as the Chief Ministers are concerned, they are Constitutional authorities. They have been elected by the people and they are having every right to speak to the people. They will have to speak in the larger interests of the State and the people for whom they have been elected. They are equally.....(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please sit down. This is Calling Attention in which no clarification can be sought. Only the listed people will speak.

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR : The Chief Ministers are equally important like the Prime Minister or any other Minister of the Central Government because they are also elected by the people. They are placed in their positions only to work for the people and once they want to work in the large interests of the people, they must be allowed. It is a

Constitutional position, how can you just deny ?

Now, I would like to say very categorically and the hon. Minister for Information and Broadcasting must take serious notice of this. Government media, specially the A.I.R. and the T.V. are losing their credibility very fast because of their ridiculous and shameful behaviour. This is a very important thing. Today, people are not having any trust in these media. They listen to BBC broadcasts because they want to get correct news. This is the position of A.I.R. Previously I was having a lot of faith in A.I.R. during my childhood and day by day I found that there has been continuous erosion because.....(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Because children's programmes were more at that time.

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR : I am talking something very serious, Sir.....
(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I am as serious as you are.

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR : You are making everything so light. When I did not join the politics, I am talking of that particular period, I was having a lot of faith in A.I.R. but day by day there has been continuous erosion. This is the case not only with me but with the crores of people of this country. It is a loss of credibility.....(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Only Mr. Harikesh Bahadur's observations will go on record.....(Interruptions)**

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR : Examples of corruption can be quoted just now.....(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please come to the subject. I have already given the instructions to my office that during Calling Attention no interruption should be recorded. You need not reply.

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR : I was coming to the subject. Sometimes you are interesting, sometimes they are interfering, that is the difficulty. My point is that AIR and TV both are working as agents of ruling Party as well as of the Government. There had been a meeting of eleven Opposition Parties on 30th June. Several important resolutions were passed but AIR gave hardly 5-6 lines in its broadcast whereas there were several other very minor issues which had been highlighted on that date itself. At the same time, there had been elections in Jammu and Kashmir and the entire AIR was misused for false propaganda by the Central Government. As I have told you, the Chief Minister is a constitutional authority. Shri N.T. Rama Rao was not given an opportunity to broadcast to his people, when he wanted to speak to them in the larger interests of that State and the people. I feel that he was ill-treated. The behaviour of AIR deserves the strongest condemnation.....
(Interruptions)

I understand that AIR wanted the text of his speech, which he wanted to broadcast on that day. It is most condemnable. I would like to know whether AIR wanted the text of his speech. In my opinion, it is unprecedented. No Chief Minister has been asked for that before. That is why I say that AIR misbehaved with Shri N. T. Rama Rao.

I would like to quote from AIR broadcast of 19th July at 9 p.m. :

"An official spokesman said in New Delhi today that All India Radio had extended an invitation yesterday evening to the Andhra Pradesh Chief Minister, Mr. Rama Rao for a broadcast on the NGOs strike in the State. The invitation was renewed this morning also but the Chief Minister did not find it convenient.

Meanwhile, the State Information Minister, Mr Venkata Rama Jogaiah, told newsmen in Hyderabad this evening that there was no immediate proposal to avail

[Shri Harikesh Bahadur]

of the permission to broadcast on All India Radio by the Chief Minister. Whenever they feel the necessity, they will avail it, he said. Mr Jogaiah added that the text of the message prepared for the broadcast yesterday was already released to the press."

When the text was released to the press, there was no necessity for broadcasting it. Therefore, he said that he was not interested in it at that time. But the fact remains that when he wanted the permission, it was denied to him. When it was released to the press, what was the necessity of giving him an offer to broadcast? Yet, it was offered to him at that time for the purpose of propaganda throughout the country, only to justify the behaviour of the Government of India.

I have come to know that the Director-General of AIR has said that he had received instructions from the highest authority to do like that. He mentioned this to them on telephone. Who is that highest authority who was indulging in such type of things? It is an important question. I would like to know from the hon. Minister who is that highest authority who directed the Director-General of AIR to instruct the Hyderabad station not to allow Shri NTR to broadcast.

Then there was the plea from the Director-General that the NGOs also wanted to broadcast. If the NGOs wanted to broadcast, it is all right, you provide them an opportunity. But, at the same time, when the Central Government employees go on strike, you must provide an opportunity to them. What happened in the year 1974 when there was a railway strike? You condemned the strike throughout the country by using your media. You did not provide any opportunity to the leaders of that movement, who had gone on agitation. Therefore, if you are trying to adopt this policy, we will welcome definitely that policy, because we are pro-

working class. But please remember, you must provide an opportunity to the NGOs if there is any strike in any department of the Central Government in any part of the country. Sir, I am sure that as a leader of the trade unions, you will support this demand.

After some time there was an allegation, it came to us, it actually came to the knowledge of the people, that some officers were responsible for that. In his statement the Minister has said that the person was ignorant whether Shri NTR should be given permission to broadcast or not. If some officials are responsible at the Central level.....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : When I was in the P&T Department, there was a strike, in which I participated. After that I came to the Rajya Sabha.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY : This shows that if you participate in a strike you will go to Rajya Sabha.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRIISHNAN : Pilgrim's Progress.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) : But if you go on strike in the Lok Sabha, what will happen?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I will go to Rajya Sabha.

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR : Previously it was alleged that it was because of the fault of certain officers sitting in Delhi. What did the officers do? They got it published in a newspaper, the *Indian Express* or some other newspaper, saying that they did it at the instance of the Deputy Minister of Information. Nobody knows whether the Deputy Minister of Information had given this kind of instructions or not. But one has ample opportunity to believe it because he belongs to that State and he has got certain political interests there. Therefore, it can be that he might have instructed the AIR authorities not to give permission. Therefore, this point has to be clarified.

On 16th July, news of the strike was in the headlines both in the morning and evening. They had given so much importance, and if any other organisation, or employees of other organisations of the Central Government go on strike, they will try to avoid the complete news, that means there will be complete blackout.

Sir, here I would like to quote the news which was read on 15th July at 9 p.m. in English—this is also very important.

“Later Mrs. Gandhi dedicated to the nation the recently constructed Bangalore—Guntakal broad gauge Railway line and flagged off the Bangal ore-Bombay Udyan Express. The new train will save two-and-a-half hours journey time besides eliminating transshipment and attendant difficulties. The Railway Minister, Mr. Ghani Khan Choudhuri, presided over the function. The Central Ministers, Mr. Shankaranand and Mr. Virendra Patil, accompanied the Prime Minister, Mrs. Gandhi.

The Prime Minister, Mrs. Gandhi, has since returned to New Delhi.”

The Chief Minister of Karnataka, in whose State the whole function was going on, was present in that meeting, he spoke also, but his name was not mentioned. This is the behaviour. Why? Is it not an arrogant behaviour? It is the most disgraceful behaviour of the AIR.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You will get a reply from the Minister.

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR : But the convention of the Railways is that the Chief Minister should preside over the function, but the Chief Minister was not allowed to preside over the function. The Railway Minister himself presided over the function. That is why they have

decided to black out the name of the Chief Minister also.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Yes, Mr. Harikesh Bahadur, you continue.

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR : I can yield if you allow him, Sir.

In the Statesman there was a news item. I would like to quote from this :

“Mr. A.R. Antulay appearing in some form or the other 300 times in a 10-Month period on Bombay TV while he was the Chief Minister.”

This is the situation that the Ruling Party Chief Ministers are given 300 opportunities within 10 months. But what is happening to the Chief Ministers of Opposition Parties' governments? This is the behaviour. *(Interruptions)*. Our Prime Minister repeats time and again that she is not against the Opposition Parties' governments in the States, but this act itself shows that the Central Government is against all the Opposition Parties governments in the States, and that is why I condemn this behaviour. *(Interruptions)*. That is why it is said that AIR and TV both are being used for false propaganda, for family propaganda and also for propaganda against the Opposition. If the Prime Minister speaks against anything or against the opposition, it is broadcast several times in the AIR and it is telecast also.

There is an hon. Member of this House. Wherever he goes and delivers a speech, it is immediately broadcast and it is always telecast.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Who is that Member ?

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR : Everybody knows who is that member.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Do not record anybody except Shri Harikesh Bahadur.

(Interruptions) *

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR : There is an hon. Member of this House. Wherever he goes and speaks, his name and speeches are always broadcast and telecast.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Calling Attention is not a discussion. You can ask for clarification from the Minister.

*(Interruptions)***

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Do not record anything.

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR : People of India must know what A.I.R. is doing. Let the Minister reply in these questions.

*(Interruptions)***

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please sit down. No clarification, no point of order. The observations of other Members are not being recorded.

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR : I am challenging the behaviour of the AIR and T.V. Hon. Minister is sitting here. He can reply so that people should know. I do not object to it that if any Member is speaking anywhere his speech should not be broadcast. It must be broadcast, I say. But my point is why there is discrimination. You are just going to broadcast the speech of a particular Member, but why are you not going to broadcast the speech of other Members, other General Secretaries of various political parties and Presidents of other political parties? You do so because he happens to be the son of the Prime Minister. It is a very wrong thing.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY (Buxar) : Some Members are in the habit of levelling baseless charges. *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Prof. Tewary, he is asking some questions from the Minister and he has not mentioned the name of the Member of this

House. It is left to the Minister to reply or not.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Everybody is expected to know the rules on the Calling Attention.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Mr. Harikesh Bahadur, you now please conclude. Please sit down. Nothing is recorded here except the portion of Shri Harikesh Bahadur.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : Even his charge should not be recorded.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Even if it is a charge, it is for the Minister to rebut it and to reply to it. Other hon. Members need not interrupt.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Mr. Nadar, why can't you sit down? By too much of participation, the subject is lost. One advice to you. Mr. Harikesh not as a Member of Parliament but as my son is, "Don't get angry".

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR : I am not angry at all.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : If you are emotional, you will lose your reasoning power. You can put any point but.....

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Nothing is recorded. You are not mentioning any name. He is not mentioning any name.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : Are you proud of this son?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I am only reminding him. I want my son not to get angry and not to get emotional. Otherwise, reasoning will be lost. With

a smile face if you say, nobody would oppose from this side also.

AN HON. MEMBER : You should also keep a smiling face.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I am always smiling.

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR : I am happy that Dr. Bhoi has said that I am out of his Party. I would like to go on record that to speak the truth only, I left that place and came here. Otherwise, it is very difficult to speak any truth. (Interruptions)

I would like to ask one particular question.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You have asked so many questions.

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR : Previously, when Members of Parliament were participating in the debates, at least their names were being broadcast in the main news of the AIR—in the main bulletin. But now it has been stopped completely. Members of Parliament are not given importance except one Member, I am told. That is why, I do not want the broadcast of any name. You never broadcast anybody's name. I never want that. But why this one Member has been given undue importance? Why not others?

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Mr. Harikesh, please conclude. There are 4 more names.

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR : I am just concluding. There are several things which we come to know from the newspapers and the AIR never reports that. There is a point. Here is a photograph. An hon. Member of Parliament is catching his ears before one of the important persons whose names are always being recited in the country and published by several newspapers. The hon. Member is catching his cars. This

kind of things are never reported by AIR.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : I am on a point of order. This is a departure from the conventions of the House. Has the hon. Member shown this photograph to you earlier? Has the hon. Member submitted it to the Secretariat of the House? If not, this should not be permitted.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : He has not shown it to the House and he has not laid it on the Table. I have not permitted him. You come to the subject.

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR : A Member has been catching his ears—this has been published in several newspapers. My point is that the Governments are elected to serve the interests of the people and the Union Government is a federal government. Therefore, it should not have the monopoly of this kind of thing and just denying the Chief Minister the facility to broadcast and all that. If this thing happens, I am just asking a very important question. If AIR and TV authorities do not behave properly, tomorrow every State will ask Union Government to have their own AIR and TV. If you start behaving like this, then that is what will happen.

A code of conduct should be evolved by the Parliament for AIR and TV. I want to know whether the hon. Minister is going to accept this point.

Also, I want to know whether he is prepared to give autonomy to AIR and TV. During the Janata rule, a Bill was also brought before the House. But when the Janata Party went out of power, that Bill was also lost for ever. When this Government came to power, they did not feel any necessity of it.

Lastly, I want to know whether action will be taken against those officers who are responsible for denying the facility to MTR to broadcast on AIR.

SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Member and others for raising this issue in the House. My hon. friend, Mr. Harikesh Bahadur is young and intelligent and, irrespective of what he has said in the House, whether he speaks relevant or irrelevant, I have immense liking for him, no less liking that what Mr. Bahuguna has for him. I have very carefully listened to his points. Of course, he has not made any attempt to provoked me. In any case, I refuse to be provoked by anybody. He has made a number of points. I would not like to give my general observations. I will take point by point what he has said.

He has asked, if there is no policy change in AIR, why was this done? I have said that there is no policy change in AIR to welcome Chief Ministers for a broadcast. My hon. friend said that we are discriminating against the Opposition Chief Ministers and so on. Perhaps, he is not aware of the facts. Even if he were aware of that, I do not know what he would have said.

The fact of the matter is that NTR is the Chief Minister in the whole country who stands No. 2 in order who has used AIR facility maximum as compared to other Chief Ministers. He has come on AIR five times between January and July. The Chief Minister, Mr. Arjun Singh, is No. 1 who has come eight times. All other Chief Ministers are behind NTR. There might be one or two Chief Ministers at par with him. But most of them are behind him. I want to tell Mr. Harikesh Bahadur that the Chief Minister of his own State, Uttar Pradesh which is the largest State has come only once. I am only trying to tell you that it is his choice. The hon. Member's insinuation in the House that on political grounds we are discriminating against the Chief Minister is absolutely unfounded and baseless. There is no question of discrimination against him.

I am glad today other young friends are also there—it is chance of lot and luck—like Mr. Ram Vilas Paswan, Dr. Subramaniam Swamy and others. I am

happy that young parliamentarians have raised this issue and I will have an opportunity to reply to their points.

The hon. Member, Mr. Harikesh Bahadur has asked as to why the Assistant Station Director referred that matter to the headquarter, he is a very incompetent man and why I did not take action against him and remove him. My hon. friend, Mr. Harikesh Bahadur is a very intelligent person. If he wishes to understand, he can understand. Normally, the practice is that all these things are not referred to the Centre. Now, by what I have said that does not show that he is incompetent. What I am saying is that he is acting under a peculiar situation and that peculiar situation is that he gets the intimation that the Chief Minister wants to broadcast. Now let me clarify it, since he says that they were rude to him and treated him badly, that is absolutely baseless. They were prepared to record a speech. I am very sad at this. He says that on the 18th morning itself—let me make it clear that it was on the 18th morning itself—a formal requisition came to the AIR, that the Chief Ministers would broadcast on the same evening and he would come to AIR, for studios, for making broadcast. They said "Welcome".

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Point of order.

SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT : When I come to that point, you can raise that point of order. I am not anticipating Hon. Member Shri Ram Vilas Paswan. I know what point you wish to raise. I will answer that at that time. If I answer that now, you will have nothing to ask. Now what I am saying is this. You want to raise the question of 17th and so on. I will answer that. If you want I can answer it right now. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : When he puts that questions separately, you answer.

SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT : Very good, On the 18th morning itself, they range up

to say that "Look, the Chief Minister wants to come to the studio for a record." All right. They were prepared to welcome him and were ready with the arrangements to record his broadcast. Then they telephoned again that since there is a gherao in the Secretariat, it is not possible for him to come, you people, come, we will give the protection to you, police protection to you and you come and make a record." They say it is all right? 23 will go and make a record. So, they have not shown any discourtesy of that type. If anybody has been rude or discourteous to the Chief Minister, I would have taken very firm action against him irrespective of the fact whether a Chief Minister belongs to this party or that party. Now he has not done so. Meanwhile, he was not here. You know the situation, as I said, I do not want to use this occasion to go into the question, of NGO strike in Hyderabad, what it is, what situation, in what situation the Assistant Director of AIR is functioning and operating. Now the strike is there. On the one hand, the Chief Minister made a broadcast two days earlier. He is being suppressed by the NGOs that "Look. Give us a chance also." And some Opposition leaders also said likewise. You might have seen this in the press. Now he is acting in a state of tension. In that state of tension, he does not take a decision about broadcast. He only telephonically asked for the advice, from here, from his superiors. Now the superiors say "All right. Wait. You will not proceed and then we will let you know" and on the same day, in the evening, after some hours, they told him "No. No. You must proceed with the broadcast." He communicates the same to the Chief Minister, to his people, he did not talk directly to the Chief Minister but to his people on the same evening,—the scheduled time was 8 P.M., almost near about that—he says "No. We will proceed with the broadcast. There is no problem." Therefore, there has been no question of his being rude and the AIR ill-treating the Chief Minister. There is no question. Now I do not want to make any parallel. Sometimes, sitting here, we are also not clear about many things and I am sure Mr. Harikesh

Bahadur has the advantage. Mr. Bahuguna is sitting here. He goes and asks for advice, but this fellow was sitting in Hyderabad and he asked for advice. The advice is given. He communicates to him. For that, you would like me to make him a scapegoat. I am sorry I cannot. No. It will not be fair to do that. It will not be fair to take any action against him for that purpose. Now, therefore, my hon. friend Shri Harikesh Bahadur mentioned a broadcast saying that "Look. The Ministry said that they had given the opportunity but Mr. Jogaiah said something different. If you see the newspapers, —I have got them with me— you would agree on facts that even Mr. Jogaiah does not differ on the point that they got the information on the same evening. They have got the information. It is said that the information has been communicated but the Chief Minister in his wisdom thinks that he may not. All right. It is his choice. Now my hon. friend says "Look. The press conference has been given.—it is his wisdom—where was the question of his broadcasting? I am nobody. It is his choice nor can my friend decide when he should broadcast. But, in any case, the Chief Minister's speech would have appeared in the newspapers the next day. The broadcast would have come earlier on the same night. Therefore, your argument is very fallacious.

I do not know. I do not want to indulge in politics. I want to say "Well, what kind of friends are we, of Mr. NTR? When I say 'I', I mean 'you'. Therefore, I say it was up to him. This is not disputed by the State Government, by Mr. Jogaiah, that on the same evening, the information went to him that the Chief Minister could make the broadcast. I did not except my friend, Mr. Harikesh Bahadur, to do that because, I believe, he is a knowledgeable man. Here sometimes he may act in any manner he likes. He said that the script was asked for and the trouble arose because of that. He knows that script is necessity. No trouble has arisen because of the script. During your own time, Mr. Harikesh Bahadur, when Mr. Bahuguna was also in the ruling Party as a Part and component of the Janata in 1978, during Mr.

[Shri H. K. L. Bhagat]

Advani's time—I have the decision on file—they have said that the script must be given well in advance. They have said that the Station Director is liable for action. He can be used for defamation. He has to see that the script is scrutinised in accordance with the code. Let me tell him this. He asks whether I am prepared to consult the Parliament and prepare a code. Perhaps, he does not know this. He should know that this Code itself which now exists was prepared in consultation with the Opposition leaders, Chief Ministers and everybody. And there has been no criticism of the Code. You are not suggesting any new Code. This Code was applicable then and this Code is applicable now. The question of script is applicable to a Chief Minister, it is applicable to an Information Minister, it is applicable to the Prime Minister. It is applicable to everybody. This is a Code which is universally accepted, by everybody. Everybody says that the Code is there. Nobody takes objection to it. One that, should I have another consultation? What is the fun? There is no need for that. Another thing I am saying is that there is no dispute on this basic fact. The crux of the matter is that the Chief Minister has broadcast a number of times. This point in his mind and on the same evening it was cleared. If they had wanted, it could have been done. Script is a necessity. Yesterday some hon. Member—I do not know whether I can refer here to what was said in Rajya Sabha—pointed out there that even the Prime Minister had to delete one or two sentences once from her speech because it was pointed out to her. In fact, the hon. Member knows that the question of having a formal Code arose because the Labour Minister of West Bengal, Mr. Subodh Banerjee, wanted to make a speech in which there were many things which, the Station Director felt, offended the Constitution; the Station Director thought that it advocated violence, and so on, it went against the convention. Then there was this convention. Then the matter came here, and when the matter came here, it was decided to formulate a Code. It is the Station Director who is held responsible; if he permits anything

against the Code, you will hold him responsible. I will hold him responsible. Therefore, he has to see that everything goes according to the Code, and in case a difference of opinion arises between the Station Director and the speaker about some portions, about which a dispute is there, according to the Code itself, then the matter has to be referred to the Information and Broadcasting Minister. That is where the Information and Broadcasting Minister, whoever he is, comes into the picture. I can only say that my friend has been misinformed about this fact. Again I am emphasizing on the 18th near about the scheduled time, the clearance was there and our people were ready to record his broadcast and put it, and it would have appeared in any case before his speech appeared in the newspapers. Of this point, they have not made so much of a grievance as you are making. I can understand your anxiety, Mr. Harikesh Bahadur. Don't misunderstand me. Well, it is politics. It is a sad day for the country because parties which are national parties—I believe they have a national perspective—think that perhaps they can get some strength by drinking some water from the regional wells. Therefore, I can understand your political compulsion to say many things which I do not know whether you would have said otherwise or not.

He says, communication. Mr. Harikesh Bahadur don't you know this living in Delhi itself? I do not want to make the Telephone Department a scapegoat for this. If there is any mistake, I will own it and I am responsible for it. I know, the Minister is responsible. I never shirk any responsibility. I am not making them a scapegoat. Here in Delhi itself this happens sometimes. If you want to talk to me, sometimes you do not get me—I am not available or the line is not available, this side or that side. It is a telephonic communication. Therefore, if there has been a gap and if the information had gone one hour earlier or 2 hours earlier or 3 hours earlier or 4 hours earlier, that is what I am referring to, as the communication gap which is not at all case.

He has said that I have given some advice in the last paragraph where I have said that a person should not come on the same subject so soon on the AIR. That advice is not meant for NTR alone. I will not call it an advice. It is a suggestion by the Minister. You may call it advice—I do not mind it. It is meant for everybody. It is meant for all Chief Ministers and Ministers including the Prime Minister. It is meant for everybody, for you and me and for the Information Minister also. Why I have said it is this. A question was asked of me—why did you do it? I do not anticipate a situation in this country. I do not at all anticipate a situation in this country when a Chief Minister or a Minister would like to come to the AIR with something absurd, something stupid or something again and again on the subject. I do not anticipate it. Here, I have no grudge against NTR for coming a second time on the strike. I think he was well within his right because the strike was going on he can speak to the people a second time. I was speaking in a general way. I do not anticipate the situation. I said it in a general way. I do not expect any such situation would arise. If that arises, then the Central Government will have to look as to what they should do.

The other thing my friend Shri Hari-kesh Bahadur has said is that AIR has lost credibility totally and that it has completely lost credibility. If it has, it suits you. But I am sure you are afraid of All India Radio. You do not believe that it has so much lost credibility. You say. I do not say that everything is good with regard to the credibility of AIR and TV. I am not saying that. But still I say your charge that it has lost credibility because it is becoming a mouthpiece of the ruling party is not correct....

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR : It has not lost, but it is losing very fast.

SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT : I did not interrupt when you spoke. I gave you so much consideration and respect because you deserve it. But what I am

saying is this. You just understand. What I am saying is that the Chief Ministers are welcome to broadcast. There is no departure in our policy and that is why I said it. Now you are reminding me of this and that. Let me make it clear to you. The Director General of All India Radio has never said that instructions went from the highest authority. It is wrong. Nobody has said it. Not even the Andhra people have said it. You are saying something which they even have not said. Therefore, you are trying so our-Herod the herod. In your anxiety to act in a political manner you are trying to out-Herod the herod. Nobody has said it. It is categorically wrong. At no level was there any interference and there is no question of the highest interfering in that. Nobody has interfered in that.

About the Prime Minister I have already said. An inquiry was made and they were told that it was already cleared. You referred to a newspapers report. I am glad you gave me an opportunity to clarify that—where somebody mentioned that Mr. Mallikarjun, my colleague, did it. You always used the language, 'Perhaps he could have done it.' Do we talk here on the basis of evidence or on the basis of suspicion, inferences, this and that? Whatever strong language you use or clever language you use, it is no substitute for evidence. Mr. Mallikarjun has absolutely nothing to do with that. The position is that a clarification was sought by the Asst. Director and the clarification was given by the Director-General here and there is no question of anybody being involved in it. Perhaps it could have suited me politically to say, 'Oh, the officer said it.' This is not the case. We could have said, 'The officers stopped it and I ordered it.' No, this is not our position. Otherwise, we could have taken that position. Therefore, it is no use blaming the officials for it.

Of course, it is your constant practice and it has become a habit—to bring many things which should not have been brought in. My friend mentioned that in Jammu and Kashmir.

[Shri H. K. L. Bhagat]

All India Radio was missed. It is totally wrong. In Jammu and Kashmir what happened was that the National Conference wrote a letter to us. All these things are outside the domain of the subject but as they are connected, I am mentioning it. They wrote to us a general letter saying, 'We will not use your All India Radio' without a single instance where we had been unfair and without any evidence put in. In a general way they wrote. They were told, 'No, no. Please come.'

As a Minister I might tell you this. My friends, you think as if the Opposition Members only complain. Even the ruling party Members complain everyday well, this has not been done. You are mentioning the M.P. I have not taken the name. I am not taking the name. I have received a complaint. The people holding responsible positions are all covered according to the guidelines. In that case also a number of functions have not been covered. But, that man was so humble and so shy that he tried to keep away as much from the publicity. It is not like me and you who would like to get into the publicity quickly.

About Jammu and Kashmir, I want to say that there was nothing of the kind. Even afterwards, we organised a talk here on Kashmir elections and we requested them to come here. We even said that the Chief Minister may come or he may send his nominees. He did not send them. Still, when they returned back. I would want them to utilise the media. We do not want to keep them away from there. On the T.V. also we had discussions and we requested the National Conference to come here. The other opposition parties had participated in the discussions, Still they did not come. (*Interruptions*) About the script I have said. He said the Central Government employees should also be given an opportunity to broadcast in a similar manner. I am afraid we are not doing that. When you were in power, you never did that. I never talk as an individual but I talk as a party. That party

is gone. You are lucky in one sense because you have a number of parties. Who knows, the number may increase on your side next day. We have one leader. You have several leaders — a number of them. A person having the following of three persons gets a similar opportunity. Therefore, what I am saying is that I do not want it. We want that the view of striking employees should be fully projected on the radio and the T.V. in the news form. We did tell the authority about that. We told them to do that in the normal manner.

Your charge is not correct, The broadcast projected on the network of the media has been quite fair. Whatever be their view should be given in a free manner. The Deputy Minister has also said it. One point that you mentioned was that the Chief Minister of Karnataka was in that function with the Prime Minister while a railway line was opened. Therefore, he was present. His name was not there I shall check that up why his name was not mentioned. We have no intention of keeping Shri Rama Krishna Hegde's name out. He was invited to that function and he was present. He welcomed the Prime Minister. There could be no intention to keep his name out from the Radio or T.V. Sometimes this happens. I do not know what has happened in this case. You are asking me offhand. His name should have been mentioned. I can tell you frankly this. If you ask me, as a Member of Parliament from Delhi and also as the President of the Congress(I) Committee, I have figured on the radio and T.V. very little, very rarely I was called. I also had the feeling as some other Members might that on the radio and the T.V. the Ministers are covered more as the Leaders of the Opposition. You raised another point. The names of the members are not mentioned in the news as it used to be mentioned before. They have adopted certain criteria. You have raised a calling attention motion. Your name will come with so and so. That does not mean that we are discriminating in your favour. You should give some technical consideration when in a broadcast of 10 to 15 minutes, sometimes the

number of people speaking is 30 or more.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Bhagat, look at Shri Harikesh Bahadur. Whenever a calling attention comes up. I have seen that his name is always No. 1.

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT: He is very lucky. I may tell my hon. friend, especially when we have Parliament's proceedings on the radio and T.V., all the names are mentioned. Sometimes they are also by mistake omitted. We tell them that this should not happen.

I do not want to dig the dead. I do not want to go into the past. I need not remember something which is unsavoury.

Now, you are making a charge that we are misusing. You have used very strong language obviously to catch the headlines. No harm. *(Interruptions)* You may not accept it. This is my weakness also. I do the same thing. You do the same thing. What I want to say is that—I do not want to hurt my friend Mr. Rajda, Dr. Swamy and Prof. Dandavate, for whom I have the greatest respect for his ability and integrity — that T.V. and A.I.R. were misused during the Janata time. I agree two wrongs do not make one right. We do not propose to follow you. The gravest misuse of the media in this history of this country was made during the Janata time when Mrs. Gandhi was persecuted against. Why? I can tell you. Under the law you cannot bring any allegation before the media until courts have taken cognizance of those allegations and taking cognizance of allegations means that an F.I.R. has been registered. During those times no F.I.R. was registered. Some investigator was appointed, a statement recorded and you brought it on the T.V. newspapers and radio without even a case having been registered and also without the man concerned being heard. It was done day and night. It is an old story but you may consult your lawyer. *(Interruptions)* Many people could have been persecuted and proceeded against but we did not do it.

So, Sir, as I have mentioned this incident has happened which I did not like. I did not like this incident. I had said it in the other House also. My friend said the States will ask for separate T.V. or radio. We do not want this situation to arise. We want to associate more and more people both on the national hook-up and regional hook-up. My feeling is that India is a beautiful bouquet. The States and territories are flowers — all beautiful flowers. If you try to separate a bouquet from the flowers or the flowers from the bouquet then everything is lost. The other day at a function outside Dr. Subramaniam Swamy said something about regionalism. What I am saying is let us remember India is above all parties and all States. If India remains everybody remains. I do not believe that to make India strong weak States are needed. No. A strong Centre is necessary with strong States just as you have a bouquet and if you remove a few flowers the shape of the bouquet is lost. That is our policy. We stand for the concept of federalism. We wish to stick to it. We want to survive. There is no question of discrimination against NTR. He can come to the AIR and as far as your insinuations are concerned I do not want to attribute motives to you because something you might have said in ignorance.

SHRI GOTTE BHOOPATHY—rose...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No, no, it is not permitted. I am not permitting you. You please sit down. The rules do not permit you.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY - SPEAKER: Don't record whatever he says.

*(Interruptions)***

(At this stage Shri Gotte Bhoopati and Shri Puchalapalli Penchaliah left the House)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, there are four Members to speak on this Calling Attention Motion. The next name is Dr. Subramaniam Swamy. Now, it is nearing 1.30 P.M. Can we take it up after Lunch?

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: You can have it after Lunch also.

MR. DEPUTY - SPEAKER: We adjourn the House now and will meet at 2.30 PM.

13.30 hrs.

(The Lok Sabha then adjourned for Lunch till Thirty minutes past Fourteen of the Clock)

(The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at Thirty minutes past Fourteen of the Clock)

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE—Contd

Reported Refusal to Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh to broadcast from AIR Station, Hyderabad.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

MR. SPEAKER: I want to bring to your kind notice that Calling Attention means a specific matter for which we have taken up the discussion. And if this unprecedented deluge on certain other extraneous matters should be brought in and dragged on throughout the day, then it is not going to be calling attention any longer. I would like the Members concerned to keep to the point in view with reference to all these Calling Attention and every Member of this House should concentrate fully and I will specify certain minimum or maximum time for that. Otherwise this is not going to be at large that you can go on like that.

And also in regard to your letter, I gave specific instructions. If you have to introduce anything extraneous, you must have given it to me before.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: You take it. These are the Press cuttings.

MR. SPEAKER: These press cuttings are nothing. You must make a note

that you must refrain from anything except this specific matter of AIR.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY (Bombay North East): Sir, the question is what is this Calling Attention Motion about? It is not really whether Mr. Rama Rao should get permission or not. He had, in fact, been invited to make a broadcast and the Minister himself in his reply to Mr. Bahadur said that he was not very happy with the incident. So, this is not the question whether Mr. Rama Rao was right or All India Radio was right as such, because the Minister himself says that he was not happy with the incident. The question really that I would like to raise here is not regarding the matters connected directly with this incident, but the fact that this incident has happened not once, but before also. And we would like to get to the bottom of it and like the House to have an assurance to see that this thing does not recur.

Sir, the Minister in his reply has made four points in sequence.

The first point is, he says: the Assistant Station Director, Hyderabad Station, however was not clear whether the broadcast on the same subject could be made again so soon after two days.

The second point is: Moreover, he was being pressed by the representatives of the NGOs and some Opposition leaders in Andhra to provide similar broadcast facilities to them on the issues."

The third point is: "He, therefore, approached AIR headquarters for clarification through a telephonic message on 18th July." Fourthly, he says: "In view of the difficulties expressed by him, he was asked to await further instructions before proceeding with the proposed broadcast."

Here is a statement in four parts; and the main thing is that the Station Director said that the Chief Minister had already spoken, and whether he should be allowed again. And along with it, the other point is that the others are also

asking, i.e. the other parties in the dispute are also asking for time. For that all, there was pressure. And then the Station Director refers it the Central headquarters, and the Central headquarters says: "All right; you wait till we make up our mind". I say that this is in contradiction to the assurance given in Parliament by the earlier Minister, Mr. Vasant Sathe when, on 23rd February 1981, in reference to the Kerala Chief Minister's incident, of a similar type, he said that there were certain guidelines. This was said on the floor of Parliament, *viz.* that there were certain guidelines i.e. when a Chief Minister asks for time, the Station Director was competent to handle it; and, as a matter of course, he should take the decision. This is in the guidelines and this is an assurance given by the Minister in Parliament. Such incidents were ugly. This is not a happy incident, because it is an incident between an elected representative, and a Government servant; and such incidents are always unhappy ones. They foul the atmosphere.

When there is a conflict between me in the opposition and him on the ruling side, in the House, it is understandable. That is a part of the democratic game. But when there is a conflict between the Chief Minister and a Government servant, this is a very unsavoury thing; and at that time in 1981, we assumed that such things would not happen, because guidelines were there. But here, the guidelines are being violated all along the line. First of all, the Chief Minister asks for time. The Station Director has no business to say whether it should be given to him once, twice, three times or whatever. He has no business to say that. He could have said 'No'. In that case, it would have been an entirely different situation. He has no business to debate on this question. He was also wondering: what about the pressure from the opposition, from the NGOs? They also want to speak. This is not in the guidelines at all. He could not even think about this.

There is an American principle called the principle of equality of time. A man

presents a point of view; then the person affected by it will get an equal time, to make representation on the same medium. This principle, unfortunately, we don't have in our country. So, all of a sudden, this Station Director should not have been suddenly gripped by this desire for equal time principle. I do not find any basis for his thinking so. There was never any question during all these 35 or 36 years of our independence, of All India Radio ever considering the other point of view as a matter of right. Therefore, there could never have been any question in the mind of the Station Director that he should consider the other side.

The third point is...

PROF. N. G. RANGA (Guntur): The other side is also within the Government.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: No; this is not in that sense of a Government. NGOs and the Chief Minister cannot be equated. Anyway, the third violation of the guideline is that he approached the headquarters for a clarification. Mr. Vasant Sathe had very clearly stated, if you see the Kerala Chief Minister's case, that there is no question of this being referred again. This is a matter that will be handled in the Station itself.

But he did approach. This overzealousness—why was he afraid? Did he think that that the Central Government was not happy, with the State Government; and, therefore, if he gave that chance, may be he would be accused of favouritism? Or, was he perhaps a person who was not in sympathy with the Chief Minister? I do not know. I do not want to make any allegation. But I would say that it is a violation of guidelines by the Station Director, to have referred this matter.

The third violation that has taken place is this. Here, they say that in view of the difficulties, he was asked to await further instructions.

[Dr. Subramaniam Swamy]

There again the Central Government should have told the Station Director that there was no question of guidelines. He was competent to handle it and that he should handle it. There was nothing for us to think about it. The matter should have been resolved in a minute. He should have been told that this need not be referred and he should take a decision. If he gets into difficulty, we will defend him. But they seemed to have all tongue tired and their hands tied.

I don't want to go into the question whether Mr. Bhagat and Mr. Mallikarjun were available or not. I was told that for three hours the State Government kept trying them. But that is understandable. Mr. Bhagat is a rare bird. It is very hard to get him. Sometimes he is in Moscow; sometimes he is in Shahdara; sometimes he is somewhere else. I do not want to go into that. But I will say that both the Director-General and the Station Director had violated the guidelines. So, an unhappy incident, by Your own words, has taken place. What should be the normal course? You have been graceful, I would say. You have cut your losses to that extent by finally agreeing to allow him to speak. But you should also say, sorry, this has happened. You should tell Mr. Rama Rao that you are unhappy. May be Mr. Rama Rao has his own angularity, I do not know. I have got telephone calls to say that every time when Mr. Rama Rao comes to the All India Radio, they have to spend 7-8 hours, because he is very fussy about what he says. Since he is a man of very precise wording, he would naturally be very fussy about what he says. I do not know whether that is a problem with them. But I was told by somebody within the administration that this is the problem they have got. Not only you are right on your part ultimately to give him permission but you should have told him, well, look here, we are very sorry if you have been very unhappy about this and put the matter to an end.

I think this is not an ordinary issue,

because this keeps on recurring. The question is how to put an end to it. Have you devised new guidelines what are you going to do? There is a fundamental question which has to be asked here and that is what about the autonomy of the All India Radio? Now, to this question, he flatly said, no, earlier. But I will ask him again about it. My moral authority to ask this question is not too strong because when my Janata Party was in power, we did have an excellent report prepared by Mr. B.G. Verghese on this question. But we did not implement it. We also did the same thing. I am not in a very strong position to accuse the All India Radio of partisanship. During the Janata party rule also, you will be surprised to know that Mr. Advani also put me on the blacklist. In fact, I am now in the unhappy situation that my name comes more often in the All India Radio than it used to come during the Janata party rule. But that does not solve the malady. In fact, during the Janata rule, even Mr. Morarji Desai's name did not come so very often. It was only Mr. Vajpayee and nobody else.

You may have seen yesterday's national T.V. news. There was no mention of any other Member of Parliament. Only the Minister's statement was given. This creates an impression in Tamilnadu and the rest of the country that the opposition members did nothing. Many people are giving us telephone calls to say that we must raise this question. Fortunately, the newspaper corrected the imbalance. But the All India Radio reaches 90 per cent of the people whereas newspapers do not reach anywhere near that percentage.

There have been complaints from the State Governments regularly. For example, in Jammu & Kashmir, they debated the question of gun factory and the whole proceedings were blocked by the All India Radio. These instances are coming. What is he going to do about improving the credibility? You do not want autonomy. Then what is the goal, what is the objective? I&B Report says that the purpose of the All India Radio

is to motivate people for national reconstruction. That is a dangerous sentiment if it is not properly safeguarded. You have set up a Media Advisory Committee. Has it come up with a single recommendation restructuring the All India Radio and the T.V. ? If not, what do you propose to do improve the credibility of the All India Radio ?

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT : I am always impressed by the hon. Member, Dr. Subramaniam Swamy...

MR. SPEAKER : By his fairness or by his eloquence.

SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT : I have the appreciation on both sides. I always expect something original from him. Except for a bit of information which I did not expect him to have with him, there was nothing original. And there also he is not quite correct when he said that Shri N. T. Ramarao takes 7 to 8 hours for a broadcast. Shri N.T. Ramarao is a very experienced and seasoned man. I have great respect and regard for him. He has been in a line where recording and so on goes on and there they are meticulous. Therefore, he does it part by part, bit by bit, point 1, point 2 and like that. So, normally he takes more time than others, but not 7 to 8 hours. Probably on one or two occasions he took about three hours for recording a small speech of ten minutes. It is true that he does it in a different manner as we do it in pictures and so on. But we have no complaint against him for that. We would like a person of his stature to do it as meticulously as he wants to do that. It is not because of that this whole thing has happened.

My good friend, Mr. Swamy, has said that it is a matter between the officials and the elected representatives. I am sorry to say that I do not agree with him on that. It is not as if the officers wanted to slight Shri Ramarao. Ultimately the responsibility of the whole episode falls on the Ministry, on us. We are responsible. I am also elected.

Similarly, all of us are elected. It was not a dispute between officers and the Chief Minister. The officers have great respect for the Chief Minister. When he said that he would come to the studio for recording the speech, they were ready to receive him. When he said that he could not come because he was busy in the Secretariat and people were there on *dharna*, they were prepared to go there.

He said that the code has been violated. I have said it myself that the Station Director need not have any clearance from the Centre in such matters. It was not necessary for him. I would have been happy if he would not have referred the matter and finished it there. Then probably, this would not have given an opportunity to some people to use this against us. An attempt has been made to use it against us, as if we are denying the opportunity, discriminating between the Chief Ministers of other States, we have no regard and affection for Telugu language and so on and so forth. All this is wrong. We have as much regard for Shri Ramarao as my friend, Mr. Subramaniam Swamy has. We have great respect and regard for the brave Telugu people as well as the Telugu language.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY : Why do you not say sorry to him ?

SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT : I myself have said that I am not happy at all. I have repeated it. But as I said, there are circumstances. After all, we are all human beings. Here you and I do so many things. After all, a Station Director is being asked to give a broadcast second day on the same subject. There a situation of its kind has arisen. Moreover, he is being pressed by the NGOs, who have threatened to sue him. He is being called to the office and police escort is being provided and so on. He is walking in a peculiar situation. In that situation he feels that he should consult the Centre. I do not think that you call that as something.....(Interruptions) Mr. Subramaniam Swamy, I have always listened to you with great regard

[Shri H. K. L Bhagat]

when you talk relevant, when you talk irrelevant, when you talk with sense or otherwise. You are a very sensible friend and Member of Parliament. I have great regard for you. Same thing I would say about the Director General. Now, he says the Director General should have cleared in a minute. This conversation takes place on phone. He reports the situation to the Director General A.I.R. Now, he says the Director General should in a minute have said : all right, you proceed with that. Therefore, I say, he has to go into the situation, circumstances and so on. So, he said you hold it over, we will let you know, don't put it, and then they informed him in time. As I myself say, I am not happy about it, I would have been much happy if the whole thing should have been cleared then and there itself. I am saying it from the Government angle and in fairness. Then this opportunity should not have arisen. Now there is a communication gap in other ways also. The newspapers got the reports, a number of articles, a number of things were written. I do not blame them. Of course, none of them cared to find out what was our view point, none of them found out other things. A number of articles were written on certain facts. Some paper wrote, the Deputy Minister is responsible. I do not blame them. Their job is to get the news from whether they can. But it has not helped us. I do not like this incident at all but to say that the Station Director or the Director General should not have done this, should not have done that, or they are biased or they wanted to do this or that or saying that this is a matter between the executive and the elected people. With due respect to him, he is not correct. I do not know the American democracy, he knows mere. He has been to America a number of times. Unfortunately, not me so far. Of course, in this connection we have been given opportunity, certain category has been given opportunity. We place our viewpoints in a balanced manner. The views of the striking employees in this case, as in other cases, should go on the media and they do go. In this case also the instructions were given that their view should go. No-

body can and nobody should ignore the views of the striking employees anywhere, whether it is in Andhra or it is in Delhi or it is in Bombay, their views should definitely go on media and they have been going and they went in this case also. Of course, we have never equated the Chief Ministers with others though every citizen in this country has equal right. This is in our Constitution. But in the use of media and so on, there have to be some norms, some guidelines and we have gone according to that.

Now, he says that this officer is over-zealous. Mr. Subramaniam, with due respect to you I say that if a man is a bit cautious, don't call him zealous in the sense that he is working in such a situation I think in over-zeal probably I and you can beat anybody else. We are very zealous in many many things, in raising matters and so, on, I do not want to go into that.

Another point is he has talked about the question of autonomy. He knows, he has said that they did not do it and our position also is that we do not consider it necessary to make them autonomous corporations. I need not dwell at length at the moment on the point. why we do not consider it necessary. *Ipsa facto*, by the existence of an autonomous corporation itself everything will go right and nothing will happen? Well, some people may think so but this is a theory which is built for some years. How many autonomous corporations have come in this country which were being criticised day and night for not being impartial, for not being fair, for not being just and not being honest. I am not using it as an argument. Even autonomous corporations which are in U.K. and elsewhere, they have come in for very strong criticism, they are criticised and there also the Government have some control over them. He himself has said in what a situation Ministry of Information and Broadcasting are placed. He himself said talking about the Janata period, that even Morarji was not covered. He says that, I do not know, He says that it was the same Party but Morarji was not covered. Similarly, I

am saying that today I am blamed not only by opposition but by my own Party number of times, today also, that this thing has not appeared, that has not been covered, important functions have not been covered. Similarly, the charge levelled by Congress Members is that all officers are overwhelmed by their Government, by their officers, by their Chief Ministers, therefore they are ignored. Similarly, the opposition people say "we are ignored". As a Minister, I am a party man. I do not deny that I am a political person; I am as much political person as you are. But I have to carefully weigh the things at my disposal. When mostly general allegations are made without substantiation, I have to say with respect, I have to ignore it. Therefore, I say these things lead us nowhere.

Regarding the Varghese Committee Report, I have said that it is not necessary to make it an autonomous corporation.

Then he made mention of an incident about a TV news where only one name was mentioned, and that was of the Minister. Before becoming the Minister, when I was sitting here as a member, I had a feeling that in the media, and to a great extent in the press also, mostly it was the Ministers and the leaders of the opposition who were covered more. You are very fortunate because you have so many leaders of the opposition, as I said in the morning. In fact, your number may grow as new parties come in.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
After the next election you may be luckier... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT : In the Hindi national news they do not give the names. Now the names are given in the Parliament Bulletin. Because of difficulties and practical considerations, all the names are mentioned in the Parliament Bulletin.

Now I am raising another fundamental question and I want you all to go into that question. What should be the con-

tent of the news. I have received a number of letters from various people. They say not only about the media but even about the press "you are projecting and giving too much of importance to political news". They say that news on social, cultural and economic development, what is more attractive to the people, what is more meaningful in this country, that is not given the attention that it should be given. I am myself a political man and I say that political news should be projected. But the listeners are the whole nation, the nation as a whole where we have a very rich and diverse culture, where we have so many things in the country, so much to project apart from the day to day politics, which is no less important and more attractive. I am impressed by this argument. I have held a meeting in my Ministry and told the officials that we should secure news from all the corners of the country, we should import better content to the news and also quality and that while we project the political developments, we should also project more social, cultural and economic richness of this country and the developments which are taking place in these fields. This is a question which I would pose even to the newspapers. I do not say that they do not project the developmental activities; they should do it. But it is a serious question which should be thought of as to what kind of news we should project.

It is true that if there is a case of murder, it is projected. I am not against reporting it. By all means report it. But my grouse is that while it is given importance, the developmental activities do not get that importance. While it gets a big headline, the developmental project goes unnoticed. I am not blaming the press, let it be clear to everybody, but this is an aspect which cannot be ignored.

My hon. friend has referred to the Media Advisory Committee. This Committee has made certain recommendations from time to time.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :
What? You lay it on the Table of the House.

SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT : Whenever an opportunity comes, I will do that.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY : That is an assurance that he will lay it on the Table.

SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT : If you ask for it, I will do that.

He said in the beginning itself, because he is very intelligent, that the issue is not NTR's broadcast. As he very intelligent he has tried to say many things. He has himself said that the issue is not that. We have ourselves said it that he could have broadcast at that time. So, I may inform Dr. Subramaniam Swamy that he is absolutely right that we had no intention to deny facilities to Shri N.T. Rama Rao. I said it on the floor of the House and I am saying it again, he can come forward and make a broadcast from A.I.R.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY : The recommendation of the Media Advisory Committee must be laid on the Table of the House. This assurance has to be given. They did not exist. That is why I do not know he is going to lay them on the Table of the House.

श्री रामविलास पासवान (हाजीपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह मामला नियम का नहीं है, नीयत का है। मैं भगत जी का बहुत आदर करता हूँ और इसलिए भी आदर करता हूँ कि वे सारी चीजें गहराई में जानना भी चाहते हैं और जानकर फिर उस को झुठलाना भी चाहते हैं। अभी मैं इन के सामने एक न्यूज पढ़कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ मंत्री जी ने बहुत सफाई के साथ कहा है कि सिर्फ न्यूज कन्टेन्ट्स आने चाहिए, पोलिटीकल और दूसरे भी, लेकिन जब पूरा देश और पूरा संसार पोलिटीकलाइज है, तो न्यूज को पोलिटीकलाइज करने से या

पोलिटीकल सिचुएशन से अलग नहीं रख सकते हैं।

श्री एच० के० एल० भगत : मैंने यह नहीं कहा है।...

श्री राम विलास पासवान : आप ने कहा है वह भी आने चाहिए। मैं आप को कल रात का दूरदर्शन बुलेटिन पढ़ कर सुनाता हूँ जिस चीज पर सदन में कल दिन भर डिस्कशन हुआ विदेश मंत्री जी के सम्बंध में तो कहा गया कि उन्होंने कहा, यह कहा, लेकिन अपोजीशन के एक भी मेम्बर का एक शब्द भी नहीं था। राम विलास पासवान ने इनीशियेट किया या इन्द्रजीत गुप्ता ने क्या कहा या मधु दण्डवते जी ने क्या कहा—यह सब कुछ नहीं दिया। कम से कम इतना ही कह देते कि वहाँ पर घटनायें हो रही हैं उन के सम्बंध में विरोधी दलों ने भी चिन्ता व्यक्त की है। प्रसारण में विदेश मंत्री जी के वक्तव्य के अन्त में, जब उन का वक्तव्य खत्म होता है, तो कहते हैं कि आज नई दिल्ली में कांग्रेस (आई) के बहुत से संसद सदस्यों ने प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी से भेंट की और उन से लंका के बारे में भारतीयों के बारे में चिन्ता प्रकट की और कहा कि यह लंका का अदरूनी मामला नहीं है, बल्कि यह भारतीय नागरिकों का सवाल है। इस अवसर पर विदेश मंत्री भी मौजूद थे। इस तरह-से आप देखेंगे कि कांग्रेस (आई) के संसद सदस्यों की बात को कहने का मौका मिल गया, परन्तु पूरा दिन जो डिबेट हुई उस के सम्बंध में दूरदर्शन ने एक शब्द नहीं कहा। इतना भी नहीं कहा कि विरोधी दलों के लोगों ने भी चिन्ता व्यक्त की। आप कहते हैं कि नीयत साफ है, इस से क्या अर्थ निकलता है, किस ने प्रोशर्राइज किया ?

सभापति महोदय : यह तो एन० टी० आर० के बारे में है ।

श्री राम विलास पासवान : यह दूरदर्शन और रेडियो के पक्षपातपूर्ण रवैये के बारे में है, केवल एन० टी० आर० के सम्बंध में ही नहीं है

इस में कोई सन्देह नहीं है कि एन० टी० आर० ह्यूमिलिएट किया गया, आप चाहे लाख सफाई दें, लेकिन आप ने ह्यूमिलिएट किया है । मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ—आपका जैनेरल सेक्रेटरी हवाई जहाज से जाता है, आप के चीफ मिनिस्टर को ह्यूमिलिएट करता है, उस का असर वहाँ के सभी लोगों के मनोभावों पर पड़ता है । साउथ का चीफ मिनिस्टर कान्फरेंस करेगा तो आप कहेंगे कि यह देश टूटने का मामला हो गया है, कान्फरेंस क्यों की जा रही है ? अगर आप का यही रवैया रहा तो प्रत्येक मुख्य मंत्री कान्फरेंस करेगा । जितने विरोधी दलों के मुख्य मंत्री हैं, बतनाइए, रेडियो और दूरदर्शन ने किस को ह्यूमिलिएट नहीं किया ? मेरे पास यह अखबार है — “केरल के मुख्य मंत्री को भाषण प्रसारित नहीं करने दिया । उनको आकाशवाणी के त्रिवेन्द्रम स्टेशन से भाषण नहीं करने दिया गया ।” यह 29 जनवरी 1981 का अखबार है । “आन्ध्र प्रदेश, कर्नाटक, त्रिपुरा के चुनावों के दौरान आकाशवाणी और दूरदर्शन की तरफ से घोषणायें की गईं उन से ऐसा लगता था मानों अपना ही देश आपातकाल से गुजर रहा हो । “यह नेशनल समाचार पत्र का एडीटोरियल है जो आन्ध्र के मुख्य मंत्री के सम्बंध में है—“आन्ध्र के मुख्य मंत्री श्री एन० टी० रामाराव के साथ आकाशवाणी ने जो बर्ताव किया है उस की जितनी भर्त्सना की जाय, थोड़ी होगी ।”

समाचार के अन्त में कहा गया है कि इस में कोई संदेह नहीं हो सकता कि महा-निदेशक का निर्णय जो था वह उनका अपना निर्णय नहीं था बल्कि वह निर्णय किसी मंत्री का था, जिसने आकाशवाणी को अपनी जायदाद समझ रखा है । यह आल इंडिया रेडियो नहीं है और मैं यह भी नहीं कहना चाहता किसी व्यक्ति का नाम लेकर कि यह उनका रेडियो है लेकिन मेरा कहना यह है कि रेडियो प्राइवेट लिमिटेड होता जा रहा है । यह कांग्रेस (आई) का भी नहीं है क्योंकि रंगा साहब जो कांग्रेस (आई) के इतने बड़े नेता हैं, उन का नाम भी उस पर नहीं आता है और कांग्रेस (आई) के 4-5 जनरल सेक्रेटरी हैं, उन में से किन-किन का नाम उस पर आता है और टेलीवीजन पर किस का चेहरा आता है ।

मैं एक चीज यह भी साफ-साफ कहना चाहूंगा कि यह जो न्यूज है, इस के बारे में आप एक चीज की जांच करवाएं कि किस ने यह न्यूज दी, किस ने इस न्यूज को बनाया और कहां से यह न्यूज आई । कल 193 में यहां पर डिस्कशन हो रही थी और एक कोड आफ कंडक्ट बना हुआ है कि अगर उस के बारे में मेन्शन करते हैं तो कम से कम सूवर का नाम तो मेन्शन होना चाहिए । आप अपोजीशन के मेम्बरों का नाम नहीं ले सकते, ट्रेजरी बेंच के मेम्बरों का नाम नहीं ले सकते, तो यही कहिए कि सत्ता पक्ष के लोगों ने यह कहा या विपक्ष के लोगों ने यह राय दी और अगर आप यह भी नहीं कह सकते हैं तो दोनों का एक साथ कह दीजिए कि सत्ता पक्ष और विपक्ष के लोगों ने इस बारे में चिंता व्यक्त की है लेकिन यह नहीं करते हैं और कांग्रेस (आई) के एम०पीज के बारे में रेडियो पर कहने में उन को चिन्ता है ।

सभापति महोदय : यह तो सब आप बोल चुके हैं, अब आप अपना भाषण खत्म कीजिए ।

श्री राम विलास पासवान : सभापति जी, यह मामला बहुत जटिल है और आप बीच में घंटी बजा कर हम को मत दबाइए । मैं आपका बहुत आदर करता हूँ । मैं बोल रहा हूँ और जब साढ़े तीन बज जाएं, तब आप घंटी बजा दें और अगर इस बीच में कोई अनपार्लियामेंटरी शब्द बोलूँ, तो उसको आप कार्यवाही से निकाल दीजिए ।

सभापति महोदय : यह अनपार्लियामेंटरी शब्द का सवाल नहीं है ।

You are repeating the same thing. What is the use of repeating the same thing ?

श्री रामविलास पासवान : मैं यह कह रहा था कि यह सिर्फ नाम की बात नहीं है और यह नीयत की बात है कि आपकी नीयत क्या है । पश्चिम बंगाल की सरकार ने आप के ऊपर क्या आरोप लगाए हैं और आप की प्रधान मंत्री रेलवे लाइन का उद्घाटन करने के लिए बंगलौर गई, तो आपका रेडियो, आपका आकाशवाणी कर्नाटक के मुख्य मंत्री का नाम देना भूल जाता है । वहाँ के चीफ मिनिस्टर का नाम नहीं दिया जाता है । वहाँ के चीफ मिनिस्टर को प्रीसाइड करना चाहिए था और उसका नाम देना वह भूल जाता है । तो इस से देश के लोगों को आप क्या फीलिंग देना चाहते हैं । क्या आप उन को यह फीलिंग देना चाहते हैं कि यह आल इंडिया कांग्रेस पार्टी का रेडियो है ? क्या आप यह कहना चाहते हैं कि श्रीनगर का अपना अलग से रेडियो स्टेशन

हो ? क्या आप यह कहना चाहते हैं कि एन० टी० रामाराव का आन्ध्र प्रदेश में अलग रेडियो स्टेशन हो और क्या आप यह चाहते हैं कि कर्नाटक का अलग से रेडियो स्टेशन हो । मैं यह कहता हूँ कि जब आप सेन्ट्रल और स्टेट रिलेशनशिप पर एक कमीशन बैठा रहे हैं, सरकारिया कमीशन आपने बैठाया है, तो फिर आप इंडिया रेडियो के लिए क्या कर रहे हैं । क्या आप इस के लिए एक कमीशन बैठाने को तैयार हैं ? अगर आप अभी तैयार नहीं हैं तो आप को एक कमीशन इसके लिए बैठाना होगा । यह 1950 का जमाना नहीं है मंत्री जी । आज आप वहाँ बैठे और राज्य में भी आपका ही राज्य था । आज आप यहाँ हैं और कल आप यहाँ होंगे । इसलिए मेरा कहना यह है कि आप को इस के लिए एक कोड आफ कंडक्ट बनाना होगा ।

सभापति महोदय, अब मैं एन० टी० रामाराव के पत्र के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ । उन्होंने जो पत्र लिखा है, उस में बाद में उन्होंने यह कहा है :

In this connection, officers of my Information and Public Relation Departments contacted the local All India Radio Officers on 17.7.1983 and after securing their consent issued a Press Note that I will be broadcasting on 18.7.1983 at 8 P.M. However, to-day afternoon (18.7.1983) I was informed by the local Director of All India Radio that the Director General, All India Radio, did not give clearance for my talk over the A.I.R. on the ground that I had already broadcast on 15.7.1983.

मैं आप से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या वहाँ लोकल आफिसर ने इस चीज को रोका

या लोकल आफिसर चाहता था लेकिन ऊपर के आफिसर ने रोक दिया। आप ने कहा कि एसिस्टेंट डाइरेक्टर को सब पावर थी। एसिस्टेंट डाइरेक्टर को पावर है लेकिन एसिस्टेंट डाइरेक्टर को जब डी० जी० ने कह दिया कि तुम ब्रोडकास्ट न करो, तो वह कैसे ब्रोडकास्ट करवाएगा। आपका वर्शन है कि एसिस्टेंट डाइरेक्टर ने इसके बारे में पूछा डी० जी० से लेकिन मेरा आरोप यह है कि मंत्री जी ने डी० जी० को कहा और डी० जी० ने रुकवा दिया। सारी की सारी चीज हो चुकी थी और सारी चीज ले ली गई थी और उसके बाद उसको रोक दिया गया। आप को मालूम होगा 17 तारीख को कहा गया और 18 तारीख के प्रेस नोट में आ गया कि मुख्य मंत्री जी वहां स्पीच देने वाले हैं और उसके बाद उनको रोक देते हैं। वे मुख्य मंत्री किसी एक पार्टी के नहीं हैं। वे मुख्य मंत्री सूबे के मुख्य मंत्री हैं। कांस्टीच्युशन आफ इंडिया की धारा 19 की उपधारा (1) में लिखा है—

“Freedom of speech and expression.”

यह किस के लिए है? क्या यह आपके लिये ही है, क्या यह सिर्फ प्रधान मंत्री के लिए ही है, आपके मुख्य मंत्री के लिए ही है, आपके जनरल सेक्रेटरी के लिये ही है? क्या यह देश के सब नागरिकों के लिये नहीं है? अगर है तो आज समय आ गया है कि आल इंडिया रेडियो और दूरदर्शन के सम्बंध में फिर से विचार किया जाए। यह आपकी प्रापर्टी नहीं है, यह देश की प्रापर्टी है। अगर यह सब की प्रापर्टी नहीं है तो इस के नाम के आगे से आल इंडिया रेडियो हटा दीजिए। अगर आप इस नाम को रखना चाहते हैं तो इसके लिए सम्यक् दृष्टि अपनाइये।

सभापति महोदय, मंत्री महोदय ने अपने जवाब में कहा है —

“इसके अलावा आंध्र प्रदेश के अराज-पत्रित अधिकारियों के प्रतिनिधियों तथा कुछ विपक्षी नेताओं द्वारा उन पर दबाव डाला जा रहा था कि इस विषय पर उन्हें भी इसी प्रकार की प्रसारण सुविधाएं उपलब्ध की जाएं।

किस को कौन दबाव डाल रहा था, यह आप हमको सिखलाते हैं। प्रधान मंत्री जब स्पीच देती हैं यो क्या हम लोग भी डालते हैं कि हमको भी जवाब में बोलने दिया जाए? 1974 की एक घटना आपको याद दिलाई गयी। महाराष्ट्र में, बम्बई में टेक्सटाईल की हड़ताल चल रही है। उसमें अरबों रुपये की प्रापर्टी का लास हुआ है। आपने कितने दिन कर्मचारियों को बोलने का मौका दिया। आज वहां आपके मुख्य मंत्री श्री वसंत दादा पाटिल हैं। इसके पहले वहां के और मुख्य मंत्री थे। उनके पहले अन्तुले मुख्य मंत्री थे। उनके सम्बंध में कितने दिन आपने रेडियो से बताया है, कितनी बार आपको प्रेस किया गया है। क्या यह सारा मामला अब प्रेस करने पर छोड़ा जाएगा? (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय, आंध्र प्रदेश के मुख्य मंत्री की मैंने आप से बात कही है। जबय हां अटेंशन होता है तो उसके बारे में आपकी क्या नीति है? किसलिए यह रेडियो बनाया गया है? (व्यवधान)

श्री हरीश कुमार गंगवार... (व्यवधान)**

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please do not record these things. Ram Vilasji, kindly cooperate with the chair.

श्री राम विलास पासवान : मैंने पहले ही कहा है कि मैं किसी पर आक्षेप नहीं करूंगा और न मैं किसी पर आक्षेप कर रहा हूँ। मैं नीति की बात कह रहा हूँ। आज ये मंत्री हैं, कल को दूसरे मंत्री होंगे। आज आपकी सरकार है, कल को किसी ओर की सरकार भी हो सकती है। आज आप वहाँ बैठे हैं, कल को यहाँ भी बैठ सकते हैं। आप इस के लिए एक कोड आफ कंडक्ट बनाइये। जब आपसे मुख्य मंत्री ने कहा तो आपने मुख्य मंत्रियों का सम्मेलन क्यों नहीं बुलाया? जब-जब आपसे शिकायत की गई तब-तब आपने उसके सम्बंध में क्लेरीफाई करना शुरू किया है लेकिन स्पष्ट नीति नहीं बनाई कि अपोजिशन के किसी मुख्य मंत्री के साथ भेदभाव नहीं किया जाएगा, सब के लिए समान नीति अपनाई जाएगी। आप कोई अपोजिशन का मुख्य मंत्री बता दीजिए जिसके साथ ऐसी घटना न घटी हो। सब के साथ ऐसी घटना घटी है।

एमर्जेन्सी के समय में क्या स्थिति थी? हम लोग आल इंडिया रेडियो की बजाए बी० बी० सी० को सुनना पसंद करते थे। वहीं से हम लोगों को न्यूज मिलती थी। आज भी वही हालत न बनाइए कि अपने मीडिया से हमारा विश्वास ही उठ जाए और हमें बी० बी० सी० सुनना पड़े।

(व्यवधान)

दो-दो कमेटियां बनी हैं। वर्गिस कमेटी ने बहुत सी सिफारिशें दी हैं, उनको आप मानिए। आकाशवाणी और दूरदर्शन के आटोनामी के सिद्धांत को स्वीकार कीजिए। आउटराइट रिजेक्ट मत करिए। अगर करते हैं तो कोई विजिलेंस कमेटी बनाइए जिसमें सभा पार्टी के सदस्य शामिल हों। यह कमेटी एक गाइड लाइन तय करे

और उस पर कार्य किया जाए। आपने कहाँ गलती की है तो उसको रिग्रेट किया है, मुझे खुशी है। अगर कोई अफसर गलती करता है तो उसको भी ताड़ने का काम कीजिए। उसके विरुद्ध कार्यवाही करने का काम कीजिए। (व्यवधान)

किसी मुख्य मंत्री के सेंटिमेंट के साथ खिलवाड़ मत कीजिए, उसको ह्यूमिलेट मत कीजिए। आज आप दूरदर्शन और आकाशवाणी को गांव-गांव में फैलाने का विचार रखते हैं। क्या आप सब जगह एक इंप्रेशन देना चाहेंगे कि हमारा संकीर्ण दृष्टिकोण है, एक पार्टी का दृष्टिकोण है। इसको एक पार्टी की प्रापर्टी मत बनाइए। (व्यवधान)

मैं इसको राजनीतिक रंग इसलिए दे रहा हूँ क्योंकि सारी चीज राजनीतिक स्तर पर हो रहा है। आज सिर्फ एक पोलिटिकल पार्टी का प्रचार हो रहा। (व्यवधान)

अपोजिशन को इसके माध्यम से मारने का काम किया जा रहा है। अपोजिशन को गाली देकर मारने का काम करने में या तो सुधार लाइये अन्यथा हमें सदन के अंदर, सदन के बाहर, आल इंडिया रेडियो के गेट पर दूरदर्शन के गेट पर विरोध करना पड़ेगा। इसको एक पार्टी की प्रापर्टी बनने नहीं दिया जाएगा।

15.19 hrs

(Dr. Rajendra Kumar Bajpai in the Chair)

श्री एच० के० एल० भगत : सभापति महोदय, पासवान जी नौजवान हैं, योग्य हैं और गुस्से में बोलते हैं। जब वे ज्यादा गुस्से में बोलते हैं तो मैं उनको ज्यादा प्यार से सुनता हूँ। उनकी बात को मैंने बड़े प्यार से सुना है और बड़े प्यार से उसका उत्तर

दूंगा। उनकी बात पर मुझे गुस्सा नहीं आता है। गुस्सा आएगा तो गलत बात कह जाऊंगा।

उन्होंने एक दिलचस्प बात कही है कि तुम लोग हमें खत्म करवाने में लगे हुए हो, रेडियो, टी वी सब अपोजीशन को खत्म करना चाहते हैं। मेरे भाई सोचो कि क्या आपको रेडियो टी० वी० ने खत्म किया है। दोनों आपके पास ही रहे हैं जब आप खत्म हुए। दोनों आपके कंट्रोल में थे तब भी आप खत्म हो गए। रेडियो टी० वी० से आप खत्म हो सकते हैं कभी? एमरजेंसी के बाद 1977 में रेडियो टी० वी० हमारे पास थे, आप आ गए पावर में इधर। उसके बाद दोनों आपके पास थे, हम आ गए। एक ओर आप कहते हैं रेडियो टी० वी० की अपनी क्राइबिलिटी कुछ नहीं है। दूसरी तरफ आपको डर लग रहा है कि उसका एक्सपेंशन हो गया तो हमारा क्या होगा? अपोजीशन की जो आज हालत हो रही है यह क्या रेडियो टी० वी० कर रहा है? दो लोक दल बन गए क्या यह हमने करवाया या रेडियो टी० वी० ने करवाया? लोक दल को छोड़ कर आप चले गए, यह क्या हमने करवाया, यह भी क्या रेडियो टी० वी० की खबरों से हो गया?

मैं उनका आदर करता हूँ, उनसे प्रेम करता हूँ। वह बुरा न माने मेरा यह कहने का है कि रेडियो, टी० वी० का इतना असर हो गया है कि रोज आप पार्टी तोड़ लेते हैं, रोज जोड़ लेते हैं? अगर इतना असर हो गया है तो भगवान भी आपकी रक्षा नहीं कर सकता है।

मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ। अभी कुछ पहले कांग्रेस के एक मुख्य मंत्री श्री अर्जुन सिंह जी की एक ब्राडकास्ट रिकार्ड हुई थी। उसके नजदीक में कोई बाई इलैक्शन होने

वाले थे। यह कहा गया कि उनकी ब्राडकास्ट को ले लिया जाए। लेकिन उनको कहा गया कि अभी नहीं होगा, इलैक्शन के बाद होगा। कई दिन तक उस ब्राडकास्ट को रोका गया। उसके बाद किया गया। कारण यह था कि बाई इलैक्शन नजदीक थे और इस तरह के ब्राडकास्ट इलैक्शन के दौरान नहीं होने चाहिये।

वर्गिस कमेटो की रिपोर्ट के बारे में मैं पहले कह चुका हूँ कि हमारी राय नहीं है कि आटोनोमस कारपोरेशन बनना चाहिये। उसके रीजंज भी थोड़े बहुत मैं दे चुका हूँ।

बम्बई स्ट्राइक के बारे में या यहां की स्ट्राइक का जहां तक ताल्लुक है मैं इस हक में हूँ कि जो स्ट्राइकिंग एम्प्लायीज हैं उनका व्यू भी आना चाहिये। लेकिन उसका एक तरीका यह रहा है कि स्टेटमेंट की शकल में वह आता है। इसमें भी है, उसमें भी है। यहां भी हमने कहा था कि उनका व्यू आना चाहिये। मुख्य मंत्री जी का मैं भी आदर करता हूँ जैसे आप आदर करते हैं। हमने उनका आदर किया। आंध्र वाले जो बात नहीं कर रहे हैं, आंध्र वाले जो नहीं बोल रहे हैं वह पासवान जी बोल रहे हैं। मंत्री जी ने आर्डर दिया होता तो उनमें हिम्मत थी कि वह यह कहते कि मैंने कहा था। अफसरों ने क्लेरिफिकेशन मांगा उनको दे दिया गया।

श्री राम बिलास पासवान : अफसरों ने क्लेरिफिकेशन नहीं मांगा। ऊपर से यह कहा

श्री एच० के० एल० भगत : मंत्री जी जिम्मेदारी से बचते नहीं हैं, डरते नहीं हैं, घबराते नहीं हैं लेकिन जो बात वह भी नहीं कह रहे हैं, वह आप कह रहे हैं, जो आंध्र

[श्री एच० के० एल० भगत]

गवर्नमेंट नहीं कह रही है वह आप कह रहे हैं। उनका नोट यह है कि डी० जी० ने उनको मना कर दिया कि न करिये। हम कह रहे हैं कि डी० जी० ने कहा कि अभी न करिये हम बतायेंगे।

दल के नामों के बारे में उत्तर दे चुका हूँ। न्यूज बुलेटिन जो होते हैं उसमें सभी मੈम्बर जो बोलते हैं उनके नाम नहीं आते हैं। सभी मੈम्बरों की बात पार्लियामेंट रिव्यू में आती है। उसमें आई...

श्री राम विलास पासवान : अपोजीशन ने जो चिन्ता व्यक्त की उसका जिक्र नहीं किया गया।

श्री एच० के० एल० भगत : माननीय सदस्य ने कहा कि कांग्रेस आई के एम० पीज प्रधान मंत्री से मिले इसको क्यों दिखा दिया गया। मैं समझता हूँ कि उसमें कोई आपत्ति की बात नहीं है, उसको दिखाने में कोई गलत नहीं हुआ है।

श्री राम विलास पासवान : हम लोगों को छोड़ देना ठीक है ?

श्री एच० के० एल० भगत : रात को डिबेट हुई। डिबेट में हमारी प्रैक्टिस रही है कि मिनिस्टर या जो लोग शुरू करते हैं उनका आता है। डिबेट में... ..

श्री राम विलास पासवान : हिन्दी इंग्लिश दोनों में नहीं आया। पढ़ लें।

श्री एच० के० एल० भगत : पढ़ लूंगा। जो आपने कहा है मैं उस बुलेटिन को जरूर पढ़ूंगा। जो पार्लियामेंट का रिव्यू आया उसमें सबके व्यू प्वाइंट दिए गए। नाम भी दिए

गए। सभी पार्टियों को लिया गया। जो आपने कहा है उसको मैं देख लूंगा, यह मैं कह चुका हूँ।

आपने कहा कि साउथ के चीफ मिनिस्टर्स की कानफरेंस हुई, उनकी राय है वह कर सकते हैं, करी भी, सारी चीजें की गई, अपोजीशन की न्यूज को कवर किया गया। अभी कहा गया कि अखबारों में एडीटोरियल हमारी निन्दा में निकलें। हम उनको पढ़ते हैं, उन पर सोचते हैं, विचार करते हैं और उनके पोइंट्स का लाभ उठाते हैं।

अभी आपने केरल के मुख्य मंत्री श्री नायनार की बात कही। मैंने कहा था कि वहां भगड़ा श्री नायनार के ब्रोडकास्ट पर नहीं था, उनके ब्रोडकास्ट के साथ 6 मंत्री और ब्रोडकास्ट करना चाहते थे, जिसकी वजह से स्टेशन डायरेक्टर को आपत्ति हुई और मामला साठे साहब के पास आया इसलिए उसमें देर लगी। लेकिन इस केस में तो उसी दिन क्लीयरेंस हो गई, जबकि उस देश में अगले दिन फैसला हुआ था। इसी तरह से जहां तक बंगाल के लेबर मिनिस्टर की स्पीच की बात है उनकी स्पीच का जो कंटेंट था उसके बारे में स्टेशन डायरेक्टर का कहना था कि संविधान के खिलाफ है। तब तक कन्वेंशन था, कोड नहीं था। कोड बना। और जैसा मैंने कहा श्री अर्जुन सिंह का ब्रोडकास्ट तो कई दिन तक रोका गया।

आपने कहा डेमोक्रेसी है। हो सकता है कल आप पावर में आ जायें। हो सकता है, कुछ असम्भव नहीं है। लेकिन मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ। मैंने आपको पहली दफा जिस दिन इस सदन में श्रीमती गांधी के खिलाफ प्रिवलेज मोशन आया था उस समय मैं गैलरीज में बैठा हुआ था और आपको

बोलते हुए पहली दफा सुना था। मैं बहुत प्रभावित हुआ था आपको बोलते हुए देख कर। लेकिन उस दिन आपका ध्यान नहीं आया, जैसा मैंने कहा मैं दोहराना नहीं चाहता I do not want to dig up the dead. जनता पार्टी के जमाने में प्रोफेसर दंडवते जी ने कहा, प्रोफेसर इन्द्रजीत गुप्ता ने कहा, दोनों ही बहुत योग्य हैं Prof. Indrajit Gupta is much more capable than I am...

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat) :
I am not a professor...

(Interruptions)

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT : I am very sorry. My apologies. But you are much abler than many professors.

मेरा कहना है कि जिनकी केस शीट्स कहा जाता है, जिसके पीछे कोई क्रिमिनल प्रोसीजर कोड की सेंक्शन नहीं थी, कोई केस रजिस्टर नहीं था, कोई फर्स्ट इन्फार्मेशन रिपोर्ट नहीं थी, और माननीय रवीन्द्र वर्मा जी उस समय पार्लियामेंटरी अफेयर्स मिनिस्टर थे जो बहुत ही योग्य आदमी हैं, लेकिन किसी को यह ध्यान नहीं आया कि ला में किमी डिफोमेटरी ऐलीगेशन का जब तक कोई कानूनी केस न ले ले तब तक कोई बात नहीं लायी जा सकती है। बड़े दुख की बात है कि उन केस शीट्स को मीडिया और अखबारों में छापा गया। मैं अखबार वालों का आदर करता हूँ इसलिये मैं उनसे कह रहा हूँ कि वह आगे के लिये सोचें, कोई भी पार्टी पावर में हो, क्या यह बात ठीक थी कि केस शीट्स को, जिसके पीछे कोई ला की सेंक्शन नहीं थी, उनको अखबारों में महीनों छापा गया। मैं मानता हूँ आप उस समय सोचते थे कि आपने चुनाव नहीं जीता बल्कि कई बार जीती है। लेकिन कहां से कहां अखबार वाले, जिनका मैं

आदर करता हूँ, उनके बारे में मेरी बहुत अच्छी राय है, वह भी अपना कोड बनायें, उन केस शीट्स को जिनके पीछे कोई ला की सेंक्शन नहीं थी उनको महीनों अखबारों में छापा गया। और उस समय मीडिया का जब इतना दुरुपयोग हुआ तो माननीय राम विलास पासवान जी जरा भी नहीं बोलें। मुझे दुख है कि वह बोले नहीं। अब मेरा कहना यह है कि,

श्री राम विलास पासवान : हरिजनों पर अत्याचार के बारे में हम लोगों ने इतना बोला कि आल इंडिया रेडियो ने कहा कि यू० एन० ओ० तक मामला जायेगा।

श्री एच० के० एल० भगत : आपने ठीक कहा और साफ कहा कि मैं इसको पोलिटिकलाइज कर रहा हूँ, मैं पोलिटिकल आदमी हूँ।

I like this straightforwardness.

ठीक बात है, पोलिटिकल आप है, पोलिटिकल मैं हूँ। मैं बड़े अदब से, विनम्रता से, प्रेम से कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप ठीक कहते हैं कि एन० टी० रामाराव के इश्यू को भी आपने और बहुत से लोगों ने पोलिटिकलाइज करने की कोशिश की है ताकि इसमें कोई फायदा हो जाये। You are right. You are trying to politicalise it and you can use it for your ends.

लेकिन मैं आपको कहना चाहता हूँ अनुभव के आधार पर और छोटे कार्यकर्ता के रूप में आप लोग तो नेशनल पार्टीज के लोग हैं, नेशनल लीडर्स हैं, प्रोस्पैक्टिव हैं, यहां बैठे हुए हैं, मैं आपका आदर करता हूँ, चाहे ज्याग्रोफीकली पार्टियां सारे देश में हैं या नहीं, उस मायने में नेशनल हैं या नहीं, लेकिन नेशनल प्रोस्पैक्टिव एप्रोच है। मैं

[श्री एच० के० एल० भगत]

आपको दोस्ताना मश्विरा दे रहा हूँ, आप पसन्द नहीं करेंगे। हर रीजन के जो इन्टर-रेस्टस है, उनकी रक्षा करना बहुत अच्छी बात है, मैं उस रीजनलिज्म को अच्छा मानता हूँ, बुरा नहीं मानता हूँ लेकिन सैंटर कोशिश करके नीचे को खत्म करे और इस तरह से सैंटर मजबूत हो जाये तो नहीं होगा और अगर रीजनलिज्म लिमिट क्रॉस कर के कोई सोचे कि सैंटर की साख पर रीजनलिज्म मजबूत हो जायेगा तो वह होने वाला नहीं है। अगह आप नेशनल प्रोस्पेक्टिव के लोग समझते हैं कि जो बहुत ज्यादा रीजनल विचार के कुए हैं, उनसे पानी पीकर कोई अमृत आपको मिल जायेगा तो मैं आपको बताता हूँ, मेरी राय आप माने या नहीं मानें, लेकिन इस देश की जनता आपको इधर नहीं बैठने देगी। मैं मिसाल दे रहा हूँ।

आन्ध्र प्रदेश ओर कर्नाटक में हमारी पार्टी के हारने के बाद फौरन जो चुनाव हिन्दुस्तान में हुए और आज तक हुए, उसमें आपने सोचा, मैं यह नहीं कहता कि हमारी पार्टी कई जगह हारी, कई जगह जीती लेकिन आन्ध्र और कर्नाटक के बाद फौरन दिल्ली में जीती और उसके सौलिड कारण थे, पौजिटिव रीजन थे, उसमें एक कारण यह भी था कि लोगों के मन में आया कि सैंटर को ठीक रखना चाहिये और उन्होंने रीजनलिज्म को बहुत पसन्द किया।

MR. CHAIRMAN : One thing I want to make it very clear is that when a call attention motion is discussed in the House, a member whose name does not appear in the call attention in the List of Business, is not permitted to ask a ques-

tion or seek any clarification. This is the rule.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA : Only I wanted to draw your attention that he is saying something which is irrelevant.

श्री एच० के० एल० भगत : उसके बाद जो जनरल ट्रैंड आया वह भी आप जानते हैं। मेरी विनम्र प्रार्थना है कि इन सारे सवालों पर सोचें, एन० टी० रामाराव के मामले में मैंने जो पोजीशन साफ की है वह बिल्कुल साफ है और और आपकी बातों से लगता है कि आप भी समझ गये हैं।

MR. CHAIRMAN : You must follow the rule. I will not allow any member other than the Members whose names are in the list. Only they will be called and nobody else. It is already 3.35 and we are discussing only call attention. We have other business also to do. So please cooperate and do not interrupt. It also takes time.

Now, Shri R. P. Das.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA : Madam, you are appealing to the entire House.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Yes.

SHRI R.P. DAS (Krishnagar) : I have heard the Minister speaking for about an hour. He spoke at length. He wanted us to believe that in denying permission to N.T.R., there was no political motive behind it.

Madam, Chairman, you know that there is something in the madness in denying the different Chief Ministers of States to speak over the A.I.R. or to broadcast over them their viewpoints. In all these things, you will find in the Code itself that all Chief Ministers might speak through the Radio if they like expressing their viewpoints. My question to him is : why was this not follow-

ed in the case of Shri Rama Rao ? Why was he refused permission to speak over the AIR ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please try to put questions and be brief. Don't make a long speech.

SHRI R.P. DAS : In this case Madam, the officer preferred to seek clarifications from the headquarters." Why he had sought clarifications from the headquarters when the Code itself was clear enough. There was no bar in giving him permission to speak through the AIR. This type of seeking certain clarifications from the headquarters was done with a view to delaying that and denying the permission to the Chief Minister.

Sir, N.T.R. had spoken five times or so in his 7 month's office. What was wrong in it. He should have been given much more time to broadcast over the Radio in his State. Take the case of Shri Antulay. When Shri Antulay was the Chief Minister of Maharashtra. He was allowed to speak for more than 300 times in 10 month's time, that is, thirty-times in a month. It comes to almost one speech a day. But, the question of frequency did not occur to the officers of the Bombay Station of A.I.R. But, here in this case, the question of frequency was raised by the officer concerned and he denied the permission to the Chief Minister. We do not know why this question of frequency arises here. Is there anything in the A.I.R. Code that the Ministers or the Chief Ministers of States cannot be given 12 time to speak over the AIR because of the frequency condition in the Code ? If so, the code, no doubt, has to be revised. I would like to know from him whether this code, if there is at all any, should be revised forthwith. I should rather suggest to hon. Minister that he should call a meeting of the Opposition leaders including the Chief Ministers of States so that they could arrive at a consensus on the code and that code may be followed by all the officers of the A.I.R. in India.

Madam, the Minister, in his long speech, avoided some of the suggestions of the other Members. I would like to know from him whether he is agreeable to have such a meeting to analyse the Code and see what are the points that should be included in that Code. As regards facilities that may be given to the leaders of the NGOs to broadcast their viewpoint, it has been said that as the representatives of the NGOs and some Opposition leaders demanded the similar broadcasting facilities the officer was confused as to whether such facilities could be given to the leaders of the movement or not which turned to be one of the reasons for his seeking clarification from the headquarters.

Sir, in 1966 when the industrial leaders were invited by the Calcutta radio centre to give their views about the introduction of automation they were allowed to speak at length over the radio but when the leaders of the All India Insurance Employees Association wanted to speak over the radio and demanded the similar facilities the same were denied to them and a letter which they wrote to the concerned authorities was not even replied back. At that time it was clear to officers that the movement leaders could not be accorded such facilities and in fact they were not given such facilities and, as such, their request was turned down. But in this case you would find the Assistant Station Director of Hyderabad Radio Station chose to seek clarification on the question whether such facilities could be given to the NGO leaders or not. These are the pleas which made the Assistant Station Director to refuse permission to the Chief Minister of Andhra to broadcast on 18th July last. All this shows how the All India Radio and also the T.V. are working in the country. This type of functioning should immediately be stopped and some sort of discipline should be given to them for the proper functioning of the Radio and for guidance of the officers.

Sir, it has been said by my friend that the Assistant Station Director of AIR Hyderabad is responsible for the refusal of permission to the Chief Minister and

[SHRI R. P. Das]

therefore he should be punished accordingly. I do not share this view. I am more or less convinced that the responsibility has to be fixed elsewhere in the administration or somewhere which can be located in the Capital of the country, because there might be some people who were really directing this man to work otherwise to serve the purpose of the ruling party which ultimately resulted in the denial of permission to NTR. So, the responsibility should be fixed on those people who were working from behind the scene. In this case the Assistant Station Director has only been caught red handed and that is why the Members thought that he should be punished. Therefore, Madarrs the whole thing rests with the ruling party and the responsibility should be fixed on those persons who were working from behind the scene. Therefore, I should say that the functioning of the A.I.R. and the T.V. should be regulated in such a fashion that these could not be made a mouth-piece and political organ of the party in power.

The credibility of the AIR and the TV has been dragged down to the lowest level. It has lost its credibility. It has gone down to such an extent that the people who listened to the AIR news and other programmes were forced not to listen to what it is broadcasting. I may point out here that at the time of the Railway strike in 1974, during the emergency and labour strike the Radio was always giving some false information and incorrect figures and discription of some incidents which had never happened. They tried to make the people believe in what they always said.

Now, in Andhra Pradesh or in West Bengal or in Tripura during the election period, the radio network was used in such a manner that anybody who listened to Radio had to hear the false news and the description of incidents which had not at all happened in those parts of the country. So, the news and other programmes put out by AIR and the TV have not always been in conformity with what is actually happening in the

country. That is why I would like to say that the credibility of the A.I.R. and the TV has gone down. It is because of this reason that the people in the country switch on to the BBC, Radio Bangladesh, or Radio Cylon to know the real picture of the country. From their news and other programmes they come to know how the A.I.R. and the TV have been painting the picture of the country and how the people should believe in what they put out in the air. So, this kind of erosion of credibility of the A.I.R. and the TV has to be checked. I would like to know from the Hon'ble Minister whether he is in a position to check the erosion of the credibility of the A.I.R. and the TV.

Now, I would like to point out one more question relating to allocation of time to the various parties and the State Governments and also other matters connected therewith, which should be referred to the Sarkaria Commission. At present, the A.I.R. and the TV are functioning under the guidance of the ruling party alone and they are functioning in such a manner that their credibility is at the lowest ebb in the eyes of the people. The ruling party at the Centre should not be given all the advantages to popularise their policies and the programmes. The States should also be given their due share in broadcasting their viewpoints and also some powers should be given to them so that the States can also popularise their policies and programmes, through radio-network. This thing has to be decided upon by the Sarkaria Commission or by some other Commission that may be appointed by the Government. Now, the Sarkaria Commission has been appointed by the Central Government. Therefore, the question may be referred to this Commission for sorting out the problems between the States and the Centre. Before I conclude I would like to place before the hon. Minister one more point, whether he would agree to have a full-fledged discussion on the entire problem of A.I.R. and TV which has become very much necessary, and let the Opposition leaders and other Members of the House participate in formulating the guidelines and also help improve the func-

tioning of TV and AIR for the benefit of the listeners and TV viewers in general.

SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT : Madam Chairman, I am grateful to the Hon. Member for having brought in one or two new points. Though he was in a position where he was speaking almost at the tail-end. So, even with that difficulty one or two points he has brought.

He has said that this matter be referred to the Sarkaria Commission. Unfortunately, I don't find myself in agreement with him. I don't think that it is necessary to refer this matter to the Sarkaria Commission.

The other point the Hon. Member made was that there should be a fullfledged discussion on Radio and TV. I would say that I have never shied away from discussion on Radio and TV in the whole House. I don't think it is now necessary to do. The occasion when we could have discussed it was when the Budget grants for the Ministry came. Which Ministry should be chosen up for discussion in the short time available, it is always discussed in the Business Advisory Committee. It is there that certain Ministries are decided upon. It was perhaps decided that this Ministry need not be taken up. Left to myself, I would have welcomed it. And when the next opportunity comes, I would very much welcome a discussion. Those special discussions are very necessary and we had a lot of discussion today.

The other points are just repeated by my friend.

The Hon. Member has said whether I am prepared to go into the question of Code. I said this Code was evolved in consultation with the Chief Ministers, in consultation with the Opposition leaders. Copies of it were placed on the Table of the House. Nobody objects to that Code. Chief Ministers are welcome to make broadcast. I have already explained the particular circumstance of this case. And I can very much appreciate the argu-

ment which he has given about the Assistant Station Director. I have seen he is not blaming him, though I do not agree with him, in other matters I would tell him that. There is nothing else beyond what I have stated.

One thing I would like to say and he should not mind my saying so. Of course, I can understand what he considers about the AIR and TV credibility. In his own way he is free to have his own opinion and others also can have it. I have never said that everything is perfect and fine with the health of Radio and TV. Radio and TV in various ways need to be improved—not only politically. I would like to improve its political credibility. I think its credibility should be further improved and that we should try to satisfy you as far as possible. That is what I want to do. But to say that the people of the country look to BBC, Pakistan and Bangladesh to find out what is happening in this country, with due respect to you is atrocious. I never expected a senior colleague of mine to say that All India Radio is so bad, that the people of the country look to Bangladesh Radio or to Radio Pakistan or to BBC. I am not being jingoistic.

(Interruptions)

It is another thing to say that people here and there on the border may see some TV and here some programmes, but for you to say that people listen or view them for news and what is happening in India, I would very humbly tell you to rethink in your own mind about what you have said. Not now, go home and sit and see what have you said. Of course, in the heat of a moment we may say things.

(Interruptions)

I am not imputing any motives to you. You are as much a patriot as I am, I have respect for you Mr. Das, but what you have said to my mind it is atrocious.

The other points which you raised, I have answered them already.

श्री रामलाल राही (मिसरिख) : सभापति महोदया, इम कार्लिंग अटेंशन के माध्यम से माननीय सदस्यों ने कई महत्वपूर्ण सवाल उठाए हैं। माननीय मंत्री महोदय ने जवाब देने का प्रयास किया है। मैं बड़ी विनम्रता से कहना चाहता हूँ और सभापति महोदया आपने भी महसूस किया होगा कि मंत्री जी ने जो कुछ कहा है उस पर इनको स्वयं भी विश्वास नहीं होगा। ये अपने विश्वास से कुछ नहीं बोल रहे हैं और मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि किसी को खुश करने के लिए बोल रहे हैं जिससे इनका सिक्का जमा रहे। इसके अलावा और कुछ नहीं है। बड़े जोर से कहा गया कि आचार संहिता बनी हुई है, मार्गदर्शी सिद्धांत बने हुए हैं। मेरा कहना यह है कि उन मार्गदर्शी सिद्धांतों पर अमल नहीं हो रहा है ! आपको ईमानदारी से यह स्वीकार करना पड़ेगा और यह भी स्वीकार करना पड़ेगा कि आपका प्रसारण मीडिया निष्पक्ष नहीं है। इस बारे में जिन लोगों ने सवाल उठाया है वह सही है।

आपने बताया है कि प्रधानमंत्री, मुख्य मंत्री और मंत्री इत्यादि और अन्य लोग जो आमतौर पर हिस्सा लेते हैं, उनके लिए आचार संहिता बनी हुई है। आप एक साल का रिकार्ड उठाकर देख लें कि जितनी भी रिकगनाइज पार्टियां हैं, चाहे क्षेत्रीय पार्टियां हों या राष्ट्रीय पार्टियां हों, उनके अध्यक्षों, सचिवों, महासचिवों आदि को कितना-कितना समय दिया गया। आप अपनी ही पार्टी में देख लीजिए कि किस-किस को कितना-कितना समय मिला है। अगर इस चीज को देखा जाएगा तो निश्चित रूप से उसमें पक्षपात मिलेगा। अगर आपने इसके लिए कोई योग्यता का मापदण्ड रखा है तो उस योग्यता का मापदण्ड क्या है ?

आप सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री जरूर हैं लेकिन मुझे शक है कि आपके मंत्रालय में ही जो कुछ हो रहा है उसका पता भी आपको है या नहीं। किसी और के कहने से वहां पर काम होता है। एन० टी० रामाराव के बारे में आज यहां बात की गई। उनको वहां पर नहीं बोलने देना चाहते थे। मेरी जानकारी यह है कि अराजपत्रित कर्मचारी जो आंदोलन कर रहे हैं उसमें आपकी पार्टी का हाथ है। उन लोगों ने प्रसारण पर दबाव डाला कि अगर इनको बोलने का मौका दिया गया तो आपका बिस्तर यहां से बंधवा देंगे। इस डर से वे मौका नहीं देना चाहते थे। जब एन० टी० रामाराव ने बताया कि आचार संहिता बनी हुई है तो ये लोग अपना बोरिया बिस्तर लेकर उनके घर गए और उनसे कहा कि हम आपके यहां आए हैं।

16 hrs.

(Shri R. S. Sparrow in the Chair)

आपने हस्तक्षेप किया। एन० टी० रामाराव ने प्रधान मंत्री से बात की। प्रचार अखबारों में इसका हुआ। उसका हवाला दिया। तब मजबूर होकर इन्हें कहना पड़ा कि इनको आज्ञा दीजिये। आप जैसे मुख्य मंत्री प्रान्तों में बनते हैं। कांग्रेस पार्टी के और जिनका बड़ा वखान आप करते है, उत्तर प्रदेश के या अन्य प्रान्तों के, वैसे वह मुख्य मंत्री नहीं हैं, जब चाहा कान पकड़ कर उठा लिया और जब चाहा बिठा दिया, वैसे वह मुख्य मंत्री नहीं हैं। प्रधान मंत्री ने जब कहा कि उनको समय दे दिया जाए तो श्री रामाराव ने कहा कि मुझे शक नहीं है, प्रदेश की जनता ने मुझे मुख्य मंत्री बनाया है, मेरी यह औकात बनाई है और आपकी पार्टी जैसे मुख्य मंत्री है और जैसी उनकी औकात है, वैसी मेरी औकात नहीं है। उन्होंने समय नहीं लिया। उन्होंने अपने

स्वाभिमान को बनाए रखा, मुख्य मंत्री जैसे महत्वपूर्ण पद की गरिमा को उन्होंने बनाए रखा ।

यह कहा गया है कि सहायक स्टेशन इंचार्ज को जानकारी नहीं थी । जानकारी नहीं थी तो उनको उस पद पर क्यों बैठा दिया गया ? जिसको चार्ज दिया जाता है उसको जानकारी तो होती ही है और योग्य समझ कर ही उसको जगह दी जाती है । प्रधान मंत्री ने यह समझ कर ही आपको यह विभाग दिया है कि आप इस विभाग को अच्छी तरह चलाएंगे । जहां वह समझती हैं कि कोई चला नहीं पा रहा है तो उसके कान पकड़ कर वह उनको हटा देती है । यह घटना 17-18 तारीख की है । अगर उसकी गलती थी तो उसके खिलाफ आपने क्या एक्शन लिया ? आपको अब तक एक्शन ले लेना चाहिये था । आपने नहीं लिया । आरोप आपकी स्थानीय पार्टी पर लगाया जा रहा है । यह कहा जा रहा है कि उसके दबाव में वहां के लोग हैं और उसी दबाव के कारण यह सब हुआ है । वहां उसने हस्तक्षेप किया और दबाव के कारण ही आप उस अधिकारी के खिलाफ कुछ कार्रवाई नहीं कर रहे हैं । मैं चाहता हूं कि स्थिति को आप साफ करें ।

आकाशवाणी को स्वशासी बनाए जाने के बारे में कई माननीय सदस्यों ने सवाल उठाया है । कोई कमेटी वगैरह भी इसके बारे में बनी थी और उसकी रिपोर्ट भी आई थी । आपने कहा है कि इसकी कोई जरूरत नहीं है । मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूं । जब कांग्रेस सत्तारूढ़ थी तब भी आक्षेप लगा था कि दूरदर्शन और आकाशवाणी निष्पक्ष नहीं हैं, पक्षापातपूर्ण कार्य कर रही है । जब जनता पार्टी आई तब आपकी ओर

से यही आरोप लगाया गया । आज फिर आप पावर में है । आपकी कांग्रेस नहीं तो आई पावर में है । आज सारे विरोध पक्ष के लोगों द्वारा ही नहीं बल्कि स्वायत्तशासी संगठन जो हैं, स्वतंत्र रूप से जो काम करते हैं, उनके जिम्मेदार लोग भी आज आरोप लगा रहे हैं कि दूरदर्शन और आकाशवाणी निष्पक्ष नहीं हैं । तात्पर्य यह है कि आप पर भी और हम भी इस तरह के आरोप लगाते हैं । इसका साफ मतलब यह है कि कहीं न कहीं तो गलती है ही । अगर है तो क्यों नहीं उसको सुधार लिया जाता है । जब तक इनका स्वायत्तशासी संगठन नहीं बनता है तब तक कोई भी सरकार आए उसके नियंत्रण में यह रहेगा यह निष्पक्ष नहीं हो पाईगा, अपने-अपने हक में वे इसका इस्तेमाल करेंगे जैसे आप कर रहे हैं । इस वास्ते इसको निष्पक्ष बनाने की जरूरत है । यह जरूरी नहीं कि आप हमेशा वहां बैठे रहे, हमेशा राज करते रहें । कल को दूसरे बैठेंगे तब फिर जैसे पहले आप शिकायत करते थे वैसे शिकायत करेंगे, वैसे शिकायतों का अवसर आयगा और शिकायत की बात बनी रहेगी । समझ में नहीं आता है कि क्यों इस शिकावाली बात को खत्म नहीं कर दिया जाता है । मेरी प्रार्थना है कि आप अपने विभाग को साफ करें और एक अच्छी राय बनाएं ताकि यह भी मीडिया निष्पक्ष रूप से काम कर सके, किसी के दबाव में यह न रहे और जो मार्गदर्शी सिद्धांत आपने बनाए हैं और जिन पर अमल किया जा रहा है उन पर निष्पक्ष ढंग से अमल किया जा सके । जोरदार शब्दों में कहना चाहता हूं कि निश्चित रूप से आचार संहिता पर पुनः विचार करने की आवश्यकता है । आचार संहिता ही सब जानते होंगे । अगर इस पर डिस्कशन न हुआ होता तो हम देखते ही नहीं ।

[श्री राम लाल राही]

90 फीसदी सदन के सदस्य नहीं जानते होंगे। इस महत्वपूर्ण मीडिया के लिये आचार संहिता पर विचार करें और अपने पक्ष के लोगों को और विरोध पक्ष के लोगों को मिला करके, जो कि मेरी राय में आवश्यक हैं, क्षेत्रीय पार्टियों को भी आमंत्रित करके इसके बारे में कोई निष्कर्ष निकालना चाहिए ताकि जो आरोप लगाता है और जिसको आपको गलत साबित करने का अवसर मिलता है, उस पर रोक लग सके और मीडिया ठीक हो सके।

अगर आपको लगे कि राजनीतिक दृष्टि से आपके अफसरान द्वारा केवल सत्ताधारी दल और उसमें भी सत्ता पर हावी परिवार के लिये इस मीडिया का इस्तेमाल हो रहा है तो आपको निष्पक्ष रूप से इस पर विचार करना चाहिए और इस नियंत्रण को हटाना चाहिए। अगर कोई नीति निर्देशन, मार्गदर्शी सिद्धांत अच्छे बना दें आप, तो वह आपके जीवन के लिए लाभदायी होगा।

बड़ी चर्चा होती है, हमारे मंत्री जी ने कहा कि दूरदर्शन पर हमारी फोटो ज्यादा न दिखाया करें। अच्छी बात है। जितना आप अपने दल को मौका देते हैं उतना ही और दलों को भी दें ताकि क्षेत्रीय पार्टियों के लोगों को शिकायत न रहे और इस राष्ट्रीय मीडिया का लाभ सभी लोगों को मिल सके, निष्पक्षता से यह मीडिया काम कर सके, यही मुझे कहना है।

श्री एच० के० एल० भगत : मान्यवर, मैंने अभी माननीय सदस्य का भाषण सुना। मैं इसको भाषण कह रहा हूँ। सोचता हूँ जबकि किस चीज का दूँ, क्योंकि उन्होंने कोई नई बात नहीं कही। यह बात सही है कि

यहां हम जो चाहें कह सकते हैं, यह हमारी प्रिविलेज है, लेकिन जन प्रतिनिधि होने के नाते हम से लोग आशा करते हैं कि जब कोई बात बोलें तो किसी तथ्य के आधार पर बोलें। माननीय राही जी ने सारी बात शक की बिना पर कही, एक भी तथ्य सामने नहीं रखा। मैंने बताया जिन हालात में हुआ। आपने कह दिया हम नहीं करते हैं बल्कि मिनिस्ट्री में दूसरे लोग करते हैं। तो कोई बुनियाद तो होनी चाहिए। आपकी सारी बातें गलत हैं। मेरे यहां जो अधिकारी को करना होता है वह अधिकारी करते हैं, और जो मंत्री को करना होता है वह मंत्री करता है, जिसके लिए मैं जिम्मेदार हूँ। आप चिंता न करें।

दूसरी बात आपने कही कि हम पर दबाव है अपने स्थानीय पार्टियों के नेताओं का। यह बात बिल्कुल निराधार है। मुझे किसी स्थानीय नेता ने आन्ध्र प्रदेश में जो हमारे नेता हैं उन्होंने मुझ से इस मामले पर कोई चर्चा नहीं की।

मैं एन० जी० ओज की स्ट्राइक की बहस में नहीं जाना चाहता क्योंकि रामाराव के ब्राडकास्ट के बारे में बहस की इजाजत स्पीकर साहब से मिली है। मुझे पता नहीं कि आपकी पार्टी का क्या रुख है, लेकिन ज्यादातर अपोजिशन पार्टीज आन्ध्र प्रदेश में एन० जी० ओज की स्ट्राइक का विरोध कर रही हैं। आप कह रहे हैं कि हमने वह करवाया। क्या हम यह समझते हैं कि एन० टी० आर० को रेडियो पर न बोलने देंगे तो हमारी कोई सेवा हो जायेगी? कम-से-कम इतना बुद्धु तो हमें न समझिये कि हम अपने हित को नहीं समझते हैं। यह निराधार है।

राही जी हम और आप बहुत देर तक एक राह पर चलते रहे हैं। उस समय भी यह बात थी, उस समय भी रेडियो और टेलीविजन के क्रिटिसिज्म की राय थी लेकिन उस समय आप बिल्कुल नहीं बोले। प्राइम मिनिस्टर के खिलाफ केम का फैसला हुआ था और सोलिडेरिटी रैली हिन्दुस्तान में हो रही थी, बहुगुणा जी भी बसें लाये, उस वक्त बहुगुणा जी साथ थे, चीफ मिनिस्टर थे। बहुगुणा जी भी मुझे जानते हैं, मैं भी उनको जानता हूँ, वह मुझ से छिपे नहीं हैं, मैं उनसे छिपा नहीं हूँ। जब उत्तर प्रदेश में चुनाव हुआ था तो वहाँ के चुनाव का संचालन मुझे दिया गया था। अब मैं आपकी बातें सुनता हूँ तो मुझे आश्चर्य होता है।

श्री नवल किशोर शर्मा : भगत जी, इनका कच्चा चिट्ठा मत खोलिये।

श्री एच० के० एल० भगत : राही जी जब आप बहुत जोर से विरोधी दल की बात कह रहे थे तो मुझे गलत न समझिये, मुझे शक हो रहा था कि आप कब तक विरोधी रहेंगे। मैं कहना चाहता था, मजबूरी में कह रहा हूँ आप मुझे क्षमा करें, सारी परिस्थितियों को सुनने के बाद सब स्वयं महसूस कर रहे हैं कि एन० टी० रामाराव के मामले में जितनी बात कही गई वह तथ्य ठीक नहीं थे। हमने साफ बात रखी है और सब बातें सामने आ गई हैं।

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : Sirhet, Minister was very sweet in his reply .. (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : You cannot be permitted. Kindly listen to me. I am bound by rules.....

(Interruptions)**

We abide by the rules. Under some other circumstances you may speak but not now.....

(Interruptions)**

No further discussion on this. We will take up matters under Rule 377.

MATTERS UNDER RULE 377

- (i) Need to Broadcast Sansad Samiksha in Hindi and English on T.V. through National Programme

श्री राम विलास पासवान : (हाजीपुर) सभापति महोदय, मैं अत्यन्त लोक महत्व के विषय की ओर सदन एवं सरकार का ध्यान आकृष्ट करना चाहता हूँ।

संसद् राष्ट्र की सर्वोच्च संस्था है। संसद्-समीक्षा हिन्दी एवं अंग्रेजी राष्ट्रीय दृष्टिकोण से अत्यन्त महत्वपूर्ण है, लेकिन खेद है कि इतने महत्वपूर्ण विषय को दूरदर्शन के राष्ट्रीय प्रसारण में अभी तक सम्मिलित नहीं किया गया है। फलस्वरूप देश के अन्य भागों की करोड़ों जनता संसद्-समीक्षा दूरदर्शन के माध्यम से सुन नहीं पाते हैं।

अतः सरकार से मांग है कि संसद्-समीक्षा हिन्दी एवं अंग्रेजी के प्रसारण को राष्ट्रीय प्रसारण के माध्यम से प्रसारित किया जाए।

- (ii) Measures to control the pest known as, JAV' affecting Rabi paddy Crops in Orissa

SHRI BRAJMOHAN MOHANTY (Puri) : This year again the Rabi paddy crop in Orissa was extensively damaged on account of being affected by pest, which is being called JAV. Pesticide and used were completely ineffective. Past experience also indicates that the pesti-