

derably over the last year. The amount of water for which the agreement provides discharge from the Ganga at Farakka is now even more inadequate than it was at that time on the basis of the expert report. Whether in view of this the clause in the agreement which provides for a periodical review will be taken advantage of by our government to see that these new factors which have come into existence do not add to the detrimental character of the flow of the river below Calcutta?

**SHRI A. B. A. GHANI KHAN CHAUDHURI:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon'ble Member must be aware of the fact that in Calcutta port in lean months with less than 40,000 cusecs of water there is bound to be a problem. Nothing else can solve this problem fully. We know this. (*Interruptions*) We entered into an agreement. We have the Joint River Commission, and that is why these exchanges have taken place. But, unless this 5 year period is over, I don't think anything can be done on this.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA :** I seek your protection, Mr. Speaker. There is a clause in the agreement. If I am wrong, he will please correct me. Though it is a 5 year agreement there is a provision for the periodical review every year. In view of this clause which I have mentioned, should that review not be undertaken?

**SHRI A. B. A. GHANI KHAN CHAUDHURI:** Sir, I don't think there is anything like that. We cannot get away with the parent agreement.

**SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER:** I raised this question in the Fifth and the Sixth Lok Sabha.

**SHRI A. B. A. GHANI KHAN CHAUDHURI:** The hon. Member raised a very important issue. As far as I have been able to read the agreement, I have not been able to find any such clause. However, since the hon. Mem-

ber has raised this issue, I will certainly go through that and let him know.

**SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER:** Now at least the Minister has admitted that to save the Calcutta Port at least 40,000 cusecs of water will be required in the lean period, in the lean months. The Minister has admitted that there is agreement between India and Bangladesh. Regarding Ganga water flow through Farakka barrage, the position should be reviewed. The Minister has agreed. So, I want to know from the Minister categorically whether he is going to take up this issue with the Bangladesh Government, to review the position as early as possible.

**MR. SPEAKER:** It has already been answered.

**SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER:** The agreement is that we will get 43,000 cusecs of water.

**MR. SPEAKER:** It has already been answered. Next question.

**Practice to allow Opposition to express its views after Broadcast by Prime Minister**

+

\*21. **PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:**  
**SHRI ATAL BIHARI**  
**VAJPAYEE:**

Will the Minister of INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the practice of allowing the opposition to express its views following the broadcast by the Prime Minister has been discontinued; and

(b) if so, the reasons thereof?

**THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING AND SUPPLY AND REHABILITATION (SHRI VASANT SATHE):** (a) and (b). The practice followed by All India Radio/Door-darshan since 1977 is that whenever the Prime Minister broadcasts to the

Nation on assumption of office or on completion of a full year in office, the Leader of the Opposition is also invited to broadcast. I am happy to state for the benefit of Shri Madhu Dandavate that this practice has not been discontinued.

Nobody from the Opposition was invited to broadcast after the recent broadcast by the Prime Minister, on assumption of office, on 14-1-80, as there is no recognised Leader of the Opposition in the Lok Sabha.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: The hon. Minister has only quoted the form of the practice and forgotten the substance of it. It is true that when the Prime Minister broadcast to the nation or addressed the nation, at that time, there was no recognised opposition. But I would like the Minister to keep up with the spirit of the practice that was followed previously. Would it not have been possible for the Minister of Information and Broadcasting to request either the Leader of the Largest Group in the Lok Sabha or any other leader most acceptable to the various groups? Would it not have been possible for him to invite a representative chosen by various opposition groups in the Lok Sabha or a seniormost member in the Opposition? Would it not have been possible to select a leader of the largest Opposition Group, that is, the recognised party in the Rajya Sabha—Shri L. K. Advani—and request him to address the nation?

SHRI VASANT SATHE: The hon. Member himself, while asking the question, has put in so many 'ifs' and 'buts'. Now, we treat all the Leaders of various Groups and various parties of the Opposition with equal respect. I could not have discriminated as between junior and senior. As far as Shri Advani is concerned, he became the Leader of the Opposition in the Rajya Sabha only on 21-1-1980. Therefore, that was also a difficult question and I was helpless in the matter.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Shri Advani might have become the Leader of the Opposition afterwards. But it was a fact that the Janata Party in the Rajya Sabha was the largest Opposition party which was qualified to become the Opposition Party and as such it could have been possible for the Minister to call him. My second supplementary is that there have been certain conventions and practices that have been followed. For instance, in the case of broadcast by various Opposition Groups for Assembly elections and for the mid-term Lok Sabha poll, even the parties which were not recognised as Opposition parties in various State Legislatures, in Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha were allowed to address the nation on the radio. In view of this practice, will you at least in future follow the practice of extending the same facility to the opposition so that their viewpoint may be placed before the people through TV and radio broadcast?

SHRI VASANT SATHE: My friend is not correctly informed. The practice in the States in relation to the Chief Ministers was that if there was no recognised Leader of the Opposition, no Opposition Leader would be called. To give a concrete example, in the case of U.P., during the Janata Party's regime, on 26-6-1978 when the Chief Minister was called to broadcast to the people, at that time there was no Opposition Party and as such no Opposition Leader was called to address. I do not want to deviate from that.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I want to point out to you that I was referring to the broadcast for election campaigns and there even the parties which were not recognised were allowed to address. There was no mention about this in his reply.

श्री अदल बिहारी बाजपेयी : माननीय मंत्री जी ने कहा है कि कोई मास्यता प्राप्त विरोधी दल का नेता नहीं था इसलिए उसे प्रधान मंत्री जी के

सम्बोधन के बाद बोलने के लिए आमंत्रित नहीं किया गया। अध्यक्ष महोदय, मान्यता के ये नियम सदन के बनाए हुए हैं। इन नियमों के आधार पर यह सरकार इस स्थिति पर नहीं पहुंच सकती कि सदन में या देश में कोई प्रतिपक्ष नहीं है। कितनी संख्या में प्रतिपक्ष का बुलाया जाएगा यह एक टेक्नीकल बात है। निमतण की भावना किस आधार पर निर्धारित की गयी यह उसके अनुकूल है या नहीं, मैं इस बहस में नहीं पड़ना चाहता। मैं अब यह पूछना चाहता कि श्री आडवाणी अब विरोधी दल के मान्यता प्राप्त नेता हैं, क्या उन्हें बुलाने का सरकार का इरादा है या नहीं ?

श्री बसन्त साठे : अब जब मौका आयेगा, तब विचार करेंगे। क्योंकि जब प्रधान मंत्री स्थान ग्रहण करें या एक वर्ष पूरा हो जाए तब यह होता है। जब ऐसा मौका आयेगा, तब विचार करेंगे।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : आप स्थिति बदल रहे हैं जब आप कहते हैं कि जब मौका आएगा तब विचार करेंगे।

MR. SPEAKER: He has already answered your question.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : उनका दूसरा उत्तर जो बाद में दिया गया वह पहले उत्तर को काटता है। विचार करने का सवाल नहीं है। आपको मान्यता प्राप्त विरोधी दल के नेता को बुलाना है।

श्री बसन्त साठे : सवाल तब आएगा जब वह समय आएगा। अभी से उसके बारे में क्यों सोच रहे हैं। तब तक मालूम नहीं आडवाणी जी नेता रहते भी है या नहीं रहते हैं।

SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR: The hon. Minister has said in his reply that the practice has not been discontinued. I would like to ask him whether he would assure the House that this practice shall not be discontinued in the future also.

MR. SPEAKER: He has already done that.

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT: I would like to know from the hon. Minister that if he cannot do anything else, can he express some sympathy for the sad plight of the opposition groups.

MR. SPEAKER: This is not a question.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: What is the objection on the part of the Government to call and give the leaders of the major opposition groups a chance...

SHRI VASANT SATHE: It will make confusion worse confounded.

### Termination of Services of the Workers of Mana Camp

\*23. SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: Will the Minister of SUPPLY AND REHABILITATION be pleased to lay a statement showing:

(a) how many workers of Mana Camp have been served with notices of termination of services;

(b) whether Government have received any representation from the workers;

(c) the number of years they have served in these camps; and

(d) whether Government propose to give them some alternative employment?

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING AND SUPPLY AND REHABILITATION (SHRI VASANT SATHE): (a) 43.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) 6 to 15 years.

(d) Efforts are being made to find alternative employment for the affected persons.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: The hon. Minister, in his reply, has said that efforts are being made to provide alternative employment for the affected persons. I would request him that this assurance should be categorical that they would be provided with alternative employment. In this connection, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister that termination notices on the workers and staff of the