

3(39)/66-67—ट्रांसपोर्ट में प्रकाशित हुये
थे, सभा-पटल पर रखता हूँ।

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-2091/67].

12.09 Hrs.

MESSAGES FROM RAJYA SABHA

SECRETARY : Sir, I have to report the following messages received from the Secretary of Rajya Sabha :—

- (i) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 111 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to enclose a copy of the Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill, 1967, by Diwan Chaman Lall, M.P., which has been passed by the Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 15th December, 1967."
- (ii) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 111 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to enclose a copy of the Haryana State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill, 1967, which has been passed by the Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 19th December 1967."

BILLS AS PASSED BY RAJYA SABHA

SECRETARY : Sir, I lay on the Table of the House the following Bills as passed by Rajya Sabha :—

- (1) The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill, 1967, by Diwan Chaman Lall, M.P
- (2) The Haryana State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill, 1967.

12.10 HRS.

**COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS
EIGHTEENTH REPORT**

श्री रामावतार श.स्त्री (पटना) : श्रीमन्,
मैं गैर-सरकारी सदस्यों के विधेयकों तथा
संकल्पों संबंधी समिति का 18वां प्रतिवेदन
पेश करता हूँ।

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC UNDERTAKINGS FIFTH REPORT

श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा (हमीरपुर) : अध्यक्ष
महोदय, मैं गन्धक के आयात के लिये भारत के
राज्य व्यापार निगम द्वारा मैसर्स ओवल
इन्डस्ट्रीज, न्यूयार्क के साथ किये गये करार के
सम्बन्ध में सरकारी उपक्रमों सम्बन्धी समिति का
पांचवां प्रतिवेदन पेश करता हूँ।

12.10½ Hrs.

**STATEMENT (UNDER DIRECTION
115) BY MEMBER AND MINIS-
TER'S REPLY THERETO**

SHRI D. N. PATODIA (Jalore) : Mr.
Speaker Sir,

Under direction 115 of the Directions
by the Speaker I wish to point out inaccuracies
in the statement made by the hon. Minister
for Information and Broadcasting while replying
to a calling attention notice on the 4th December,
1967 relating to an agreement signed between
'Novosti' (or APN) and Press information Bureau.

The hon. Minister made a categorical
statement saying : "We have made en-
quiries. This Agency are not the sponsors . . ." This
is not a correct statement as will be seen from the following :

- (a) A news item published in the 'Hindu' on 13th August, 1967 quotes one employee of the Radio Peace and Progress station interviewed by the Reuter representative saying that the station was founded in 1964 by a group of public organizations consisting of among others APN News Agency. Similar report was published in the 'Hindustan Times' on 1-12-1967.
- (b) Such reportings in the Indian press are also supported by the announcements made on Moscow Radio from time to time, and the English translation of two such announcements reads like this :
 - (i) This is a quotation from the broadcast over Moscow Radio in Swedish language to Sweden on 26th January, 1967 at 19.00 hrs. GMT. This radio station belongs to Soviet Social

[Shri D. N. Patodia]

Organisations. Its originators are Soviet Trade Union Associations, the Composers' Union and the Journalists' Union, the News Agency APN, etc. etc."

- (ii) This is a quotation from another broadcast from Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in German language to Germany on 19th October, 1967 at 15.30 hrs. GMT: "This is Radio Peace and Progress. You are listening to the transmitter of Soviet public opinion. Radio Peace and Progress is the voice of social organisations. It was founded in 1964. The founding organisations were: The Journalists' Association of USSR, the Novosti News Agency, etc. etc."

Relation between Novosti and Radio Peace and Progress is no more a concealed or an unknown fact and is known the world over.

- (c) This Agency's (Novosti's) material was being distributed regularly via Press or Information Departments of the Soviet Embassy. The Delhi correspondent of Novosti was reported to have returned back to Moscow in 1964 and his duties to represent Novosti were taken over by the Information Department of Soviet Embassy.

MR. SPEAKER: He has to make his statement only by way of correction.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA: I am giving only the facts.

MR. SPEAKER: He has only to point out the corrections in the hon. Minister's statement. He need not give the whole history. He should only point out where the mistake was.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA: This is the second correction.

The hon. Minister, while justifying this agreement further stated that "the difference in language leaves no doubt that PIB is not obliged to distribute whereas APN is obliged to distribute", and that "as

compared to what is done with other countries not one inch more or one item more is done under this agreement . . ."

This statement is also not correct:

- (a) The element of difference is clear and definite. In case of a reciprocal goodwill arrangement, the publicity materials are kept for reference by the respective countries at their own option and discretion, without any obligation. In the case of the present agreement with Novosti, the UIB is no more left with any option or discretion and is obliged to make all Novosti materials available not only for reference but also for publication whenever demanded by any journal, magazine or newspapers.

I, therefore, demand that the hon. Minister will kindly acquaint this House with true facts in the matter.

With your permission, I want to lay these papers on the Table of the House.

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI K. K. SHAH): I will be failing in my duty to the Chair if I were not to bring it to the notice of the Hon'ble the Speaker of the House, who is the custodian of our rights and privileges, the extraordinary developments to this statement. On 11th December, the Hon'ble Member sent a statement (hereinafter called the first statement) which reached under Direction 115 to which I sent a reply on 13th December, 1967. In the afternoon of 19th December, 1967 I received an advance copy of his statement (which hereafter will be referred to as second statement). This was replaced by another statement (hereinafter referred to as the third statement) which reached in the evening of 19th December, 1967.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA: There was no third statement. There were only two altogether.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: I am going by record. Paragraph 3 of the first statement which had accused me of misleading the House on the ground that the agreement could not have been signed in

Moscow even though the copy of the agreement laid on the Table of the House on 4th December, 1967 left on doubt that it was so. This was dropped. The third statement which replaced the second was altered materially. It was received at 7 P.M. on 19-12-67, leaving hardly any time to examine fresh points mentioned in the 3rd statement. It also varies materially in some places from the contents of the second statement. A comparison of all the three documents throws considerable flood of light and raises a number of questions. One thing, however, is certain that the Hon'ble Member for reasons best known to him has been shifting his ground. The additional information contained in the third statement about Moscow Radio's announcement in Swedish language on 26-1-67 and in German language on 19-10-67 raises difficult questions. The hon. Member does not state who monitored these statements and how and when he came into possession of these statements. The time lag between his second and the third statement is very short. The language used in both raises serious doubts about its veracity. Paragraph (b) starts with hon. Member's assertion that the announcements were made on Moscow Radio whereas b(i) purports the quotation from broadcasts on Moscow Radio. While (b) (ii) again, purports a quotation from another broadcast from Moscow Radio Peace and Progress; (b) (i) mentions composers' union and journalists union whereas (b) (ii) mentions Journalists Association of USSR; (b) (i) mentions the news agency APN whereas the (b) (ii) mentions Novosti News Agency which can only be in an abridged form ANN tell their own tale. If it were possible to collect information on Swedish and German broadcasts I do not know what additional anomalies could have been brought to light.

I submit with respect that I have not made any wrong statement. Enquiries made by the Government have not been able to support the statement contained in the issue of the 'The Hindu' dated the 13th August, 1967. The issue of the 'The Hindu' dated the 13th August says as under :—

"An employee of the station said that it had been founded in 1964 by a

group of public organisations—among them the Union of Soviet Journalists, the Union of Soviet Writers, the APN News Agency, the Union of Soviet Youth Organizations and other groups.

It further states as under :

'The station is controlled by its own broad and broadcasts over equipment rented from Radio Moscow the official Soviet Radio System', the employee said".

The Hon'ble member has also stated in his 2nd statement I quote 'Similar report was published in the *Hindustan Times* on 1-12-1967.' I unquote. I wish the hon. Member had fully quoted the *Hindustan Times* dated 1-12-67. It also stated and I quote, 'although the Government of India does not accept the lame excuses made by the Russian Govt, it has decided on the advice of the External Affairs Ministry not to pursue the matter further' I unquote. That means according to *Hindustan Times* that the Government of India does not accept the excuse of the Government of the USSR about Radio Peace and Progress having been started by the organisations mentioned therein. This supports my stand. On the contrary if it is compared with what Shri Krishan Bhatia, correspondent. The *Hindustan Times* vide issue of the *Hindustan Times* dated the 12th December, 1967 quoting his report from Washington dated the 11th December, 1967, under the caption 'Moscow's Third Man in Delhi'; sub-head 'Mirdin's tasks' says my stand is vindicated. He says, 'Radio Peace and Progress' is a Soviet Propaganda machine which is allegedly independent and unconnected with the Soviet Govt, but which is known to be located in Moscow and functioning under direct Russian supervision'. This supports my statement completely and gives credence to my argument that for whatever happened on the soil of Russia, Government of USSR is responsible. Enquiries made by the Government of India do not support or lend credence to the statement appearing in the 'Hindu' dated the 13th August, 1967, about the sponsorship of Novosti.

In the 1st and 2nd statement of the Hon'ble Member it was suggested that I

[Shri K. K. Shah]

had not accepted that Novosti and APN were the same. I have not denied that 'Novosti' and APN are the same. The copy of the Agreement laid on the Table of the House leaves no doubt whatsoever. Even the statement made by me mentions in brackets 'APN' after 'Novosti'. The question is why does the hon. Member make insinuations which are not supported by facts in his possession.

Points made out by the hon. Member in Paragraph (c) of his 3rd statement which were (b) and (c) of his 2nd statement support the contention that the Government of USSR must be held responsible for 'Novosti' and do not contradict the statement made by me about 'Novosti' not being the sponsor of the Radio Peace and Progress. If Novosti's material was distributed by information department of the Soviet Embassy and if the duties of the Delhi correspondent of Novosti were taken by the information department of Soviet Embassy as suggested by the hon. Member Shri Patodia, they support my argument that Government of USSR must be held responsible for 'Novosti'. How these assertions support the contention of the Hon'ble Member that 'Novosti' was the sponsor of Radio 'Peace and Progress' one fails to understand.

The hon. Member also refers to my argument which says 'This difference in language leaves no doubt that P.I.B. is not obliged to distribute whereas APN is obliged to distribute.' I submit that the argument is correct. The agreement was laid on the Table of the House and the contention is based on facts mentioned in the agreement. If the hon. Member does not accept my contention, he cannot say that a wrong statement has been made. He is requested to compare the wordings of clauses (a) and (b) of the agreement. The words for distribution etc. are not used in clause (a) which defines the obligation undertaken by P.I.O. It mentions the words 'to make it available etc.' I submit 'to make available' can never mean 'to distribute'. When we say, a thing is available it does not mean it is distributed. As an illustration if a person from Hyderabad writes asking for material of 'Novosti' he will not be supplied with it, i.e., the material will not be distributed. He can come to PIB's library and have a

look. That is why in the last paragraph of my statement I have stated, 'P.I.B. receives material from other agencies, BIS, USIS, which is kept for reference in the library and can be seen by any journalist. This is the meaning of making available'. In the same way the material supplied by 'Novosti' is made available, i.e., it is kept for reference in the library and can be seen by any journalist. The hon. Member had added a new argument which was not there either in the 1st or the 2nd statement. He has now copy of the agreement. How does he say for publication whenever demanded. I submit that my statement about 'Novosti' not getting any additional advantage as compared to other countries is correct. The material received from other countries is also made available to others for reference. In the 1st statement dated 11th December, 1967, written to the hon. Speaker, the hon. Member had stated and I quote 'The reply of the hon. Minister was incomplete and misleading when he said that the agreement was entered into when P.I.O. went to Russia, etc.' and I unquote. This was dropped in the 2nd statement. The copy of the agreement laid on the Table of the House clearly shows that the Agreement was entered into at Moscow. In spite of such cogent evidence the hon. Member could accuse me of giving incomplete and misleading reply. Such an attitude I must say with regret shows that the hon. Member somehow wants to keep the Question alive. In fact it is he who owes an explanation to the House.

According to the hand out released by Soviet Embassy 'Novosti' has established broad contacts with press organs like the 'Washington Post', 'New York Times' of the U.S.A. and *Financial Times* of the U.K. which negatives any such suggestion as mentioned in 'The Hindu'.

It is, therefore, submitted with regret that it is not possible for me to correct the statement or own the mistake. While making the statement, I also said, 'but I will go a step further: whatever happened on the soil of USSR, can any body say that USSR, is not responsible?' That summarises the correct position. Under the political system prevalent in the USSR, it is the Government of USSR which is

supposed to sponsor everything that happens on the soil of Russia.

It is respectfully submitted that the contentions of the Hon. Member are not correct.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : He made certain irresponsible charges. . . .

MR. SPEAKER : I made a mistake. Let me not make second mistake. I thought it was a correction and allowed a long statement to be made, and a bigger, longer statement in reply. No please.

12.23 hrs.

UNLAWFUL ACTIVITIES (PREVENTION) BILL—Contd.

MR. SPEAKER : We have to take up Clause 5. I would like to tell the House that the Business Advisory Committee had allotted 2 hours, but we have already taken 3 hours and we are still on Clause 5.

There are some amendments.

श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा (हमीरपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा पायंट आफ आडर है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : क्या इम विल के बारे में ?

श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा : नहीं, इस हाउस के 107 मेम्बरों ने दस्तख्त कर के आप को लिखा है कि इस हाउस में हजारी रिपोर्ट पर बहस की जाये। उस का कोई जवाब नहीं दिया गया है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आर्डर, आर्डर।

श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपको मेरी बात सुननी पड़ेगी।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आर्डर, आर्डर। आनरेबल मेम्बर बैठ जायें।

श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा : नहीं, अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप को यह सुनना होगा।

MR. SPEAKER : No point of order. I have taken up the Bill.

SHRI S. KUNDU (Balasore) : He says *sunna hoga*. It is a threat to you.

श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा : अध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे पत्र का जवाब नहीं दिया गया है। हमें जवाब कब मिलेगा ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नहीं मिलेगा।

श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा : क्यों नहीं मिलेगा ? ऐसे काम नहीं चल सकता है। हमेशा इस बहस को टाल दिया जाता है। पिछले सेशन में भी टाल दिया गया था और इस सेशन में भी टाला जा रहा है।

श्री इसहाक साम्मली (अमरोहा) : मैंने भी उस खत पर साइन किये हैं। विजिनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी ने यह तय किया था कि हजारी रिपोर्ट पर बहस होगी।

MR. SPEAKER : No, no. I cannot allow you. If I do not allow him, I am not going to allow you also. I am not going to answer it. The Business Advisory Committee's meeting is there. You can go there if you want. Mr. P. C. Verma may also go there. All of you can go to that meeting. Please sit down.

श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप को हमारे पत्र का जवाब देना चाहिये और इस बहस के लिये वक्त मुकर्रर करना चाहिये। इस को लगातार टाला जा रहा है।

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur) : Sir, I move that the hon. Member be named.

SHRI V. KRISHNAMOORTHY (Cuddalore) : He may be named.

MR. SPEAKER : I request the hon. Member not to raise that point again and again. I have already requested him to sit down.

SHRI NATH PAI : Sir, I move that the hon. Member be named for persistently defying the Chair.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA (Delhi Sadar) : I second that motion. He should be stopped from doing like that. (*Interruption*).