

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no. Nothing will go on record *(Interruptions)* बिल्कुल नहीं, बैठिए। ..(व्यवधान).. आप नोटिस दीजिए। ..(व्यवधान).. आपको प्रोसीजर मालूम है। ..(व्यवधान)..आपको नोटिस बनाने में टाइम लगा....(व्यवधान).. श्री भट्टाचार्य। कुछ रिकॉर्ड में नहीं जाएगा। *(Interruptions)* Please sit down. *(Interruptions)* We have to take up Special Mentions. Shri Shantaram Laxman Naik.

SHRI SHANTARAM LAXMAN NAIK (Goa): Sir, my Special mention relates to ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You please lay it on the Table. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY (Karnataka): Sir, as far as Special mentions are concerned ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please do not take cognizance. Nothing is going on record. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: Sir, I am not saying that. *(Interruptions)* I am saying that it is the right of the members to make Special Mentions. *(Interruptions)*. Everyday, Special Mentions are being laid on the Table.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Poojary, we have some Government business. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: Sir, it is the right of Member. *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is as good as reading. It will go on record. It will get the same benefits. *(Interruptions)* No, no. No Point of order. *(Interruptions)* No Point of order. We are having Special Mentions. *(Interruptions)*

THE SPORTS BROADCASTING SIGNALS (MANDATORY SHARING WITH PRASAR BHARATI) BILL, 2007

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we shall take up the Statutory Resolution regarding Sports Broadcasting Signals (Mandatory Sharing with Prasar Bharati) Ordinance, 2007. Shri Ram Jethmalani. Not here. Dr. Muri Manohar Joshi. Not here. Shri Ramdas Agarwal. Not here. Mr. Minister to move the Bill.

[9 March, 2007]

RAJYA SABHA

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI PRIYARANJAN DASMUNSI): Sir, I move:

"That the Bill to provide access to the largest number of listeners and viewers, on a free to air basis, of sporting events of national importance through mandatory sharing of sports broadcasting signals with Prasar Bharati and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto, as passed by Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Sir, I may submit through you to the distinguished members of the House that since 1995 in Calcutta High court, in Delhi High Court and finally in the Supreme Court, there are enough number of petitions. I do not like to take the time of the House to read them one after another. These are pertaining to the position of the airwaves and the downlinking or uplinking policy of the Prasar Bharati.

Sir, the Supreme Court held that the airwaves were the public property and later on gave directions to frame guidelines for downlinking and uplinking policy. Accordingly, Sir, the idea was mooted in 1997 to bring a comprehensive broadcasting legislation in Parliament. Unfortunately, due to dissolution of the House, that could not take place. Although my distinguished predecessor, Sushma Swarajji, again tried to bring it as a Convergence Act, that also could not take place due to dissolution of the House. At the end of the day, we planned to bring a comprehensive legislation on three counts. We shall discuss it with the stakeholders; the freedom of expression and speech, and independence of the newspaper editors, and television anchors will not be interfered; and there should not be a kind of regulatory body where the Government take control of the media to oppose it. Therefore, Sir, our UPA Government adopted a policy that such a draft Bill should be discussed among all the stakeholders, not just once but ten times. We are in the process and hopefully, Sir, we will bring that comprehensive law very shortly. And I claim, Sir, today, on the floor of the House that the Bill that we will bring will be unparalleled in any democratic country in the world.

Sir, in the meanwhile, we are caught in a bad situation. The guideline was supposed to be mooted in the law earlier. Since the law could not take place, the guideline, after the directions of the court, was prepared for downlinking and uplinking, especially the sports related matters. For that,

a guideline was framed; it was debated by a Group of Ministers; and then the Cabinet approved it. The guideline worked well. Sir, nobody challenged the guideline. The same group, which was shouting in the media, responded to the guideline till 2006. But in 2007, a few of them went to court and said it was only a guideline and not a law and that they were not bound to abide by a guideline. Till 2006, they said it was very good and worked well. But, suddenly, in 2007, I do not know what happened. I do not want to accuse them. Some of the sports marketing groups and the channels went to court and said it was only a guideline and not a law. Sir, there is a very interesting thing, which my distinguished predecessor, Shri Ravi Shankar Prasad, will appreciate. While seeking the downlinking permission licence, they said that they would take it as per the guidelines. But in the provision of mandatory sharing, they moved the court and said that it was not a law; it was only a guideline. The court did not stay the guideline. The court only asked: Why should not the Government come forward with a legislation to back it by a law?

Sir, we were negotiating with them. Prior to the evening of the last match between India and West Indies, they said that they would abide by the guideline and come back next afternoon. We never thought of going back to court again or to the Cabinet for a law. The same evening, when we all were waiting in the Prasar Bharati Office, instead of their coming, we got a notice of the court. The time was too short; match had to take place at 9 o'clock in the morning. The court said that it would dispose of the petition of the guideline later on, but directed that instead of 15 minutes' delay, they should go for seven minutes' delay. And that it will decide the matter later on.

Sir, this was not only the incident. It is further more the property of the popular game called cricket. If you talk of the intellectual value of the property, it was not built by television. When television was not in India, it was built by the popular radio commentary of the All-India Radio by Vijay Merchant, Hazare, Umrigar, Lala Amarnath, and Pankaj Roy. Day in and day out, this was made a popular thing in every household through the All-India Radio, and the property became a real property. Before the thriving of market economy, as it is now, again, it was the Doordarshan which had to cover it by risking its revenue on many occasions.

Sir, with folded hands, Prasar Bharti appealed to them, "We don't want to quarrel. Forget doordarshan and if you want to fight the guideline in the court, do it. But allow the radio to cover it." And they put a condition that unless we agree to their terms on Doordarshan, they are not prepared to give it for radio commentary also.

Sir, the interesting part of this thing which was not revealed to media and which has now been revealed is, you may say right or wrong, in India, the terrestrial platform belongs to Prasar Bharti. And when the contract was given, the tendering was done by BCCI. They bonded all the property to sell to a group, to bid to a group or many groups, including terrestrial rights. I don't mind for satellite rights; I don't mind for cable; I don't mind for any other right for internet or mobile. But the terrestrial right in India belongs to Prasar Bharti and those terrestrial rights were sold, without concurrence of Prasar Bharti, with a mutual talk that let us sell it off and we will cooperate as per the guideline. They did cooperate. But when they found that money could not be earned without exploiting terrestrial rights, the group which bought the property declined and said that they would not do it and it would be exclusive for their own satellite channel. Then, Sir, when arguments took place in the courts, every time they filed an affidavit and the logic of that affidavit was that it was a guideline and not a law. The court said, "Why don't you think of a law?" Sir, the time was too short then and the match was on. Sir, fifty million T.V. homes depend on terrestrial coverage in villages and semi-urban areas. Even in rural clubs, they may have only one television set, sometimes only black-and-white television, to watch matches when these matches come. People came to know that terrestrial right was sold they could not see the match through terrestrial coverage. It was, therefore, the bounden duty of the Government, to honour the guidelines, to think of something, which could justify the cause of the people in the greater public interest. Therefore, Sir, we had to bring an Ordinance keeping in view that the World Cup Cricket was coming up. Again somebody can go to the court on this plea and argue that we have no legislative backing. I had no option but to bring an Ordinance.

Sir, the Government's intention is not to grab somebody's property. The Government's intention is not that of confronting with the industry and the free market economy in a manner that the sports body suffers. I myself am a sports body chief. But, I do not like to bring in the interest of my discipline or any other discipline while I discharge the obligation of the

country, through the Government. I have to uphold the public interest first than any other interest. Therefore, Sir, we discussed and found that why should we take their money. We should give their money back. By showing a cricket match from 9 o'clock in the morning till 5 or 6 o'clock in a day, Doordarshan can earn money if it puts the money in its own coffer. Here, we are not earning money. We are asking the stakeholders that you take back whatever revenue is generated by advertisement either by you or Doordarshan. You take 75 per cent share and give only 25 per cent to us. And why is this 25 per cent? Sir, it is the opportunity cost which includes placing the cameras, sending people, commentary, power supply, positioning of 1400 transmitting stations, etc. All this opportunity cost comes to nine or ten per cent. So, we are left with only 15 per cent or so. I argued in the Cabinet and the Cabinet concurred that this 15 per cent should not be put into the exchequer of the country. That 14, 15 or 16 per cent should be earmarked to support those disciplines which sometimes bring gold, silver or bronze medals, but do not get any kind of backing of any sponsor-like Kabaddi in which every time we get a gold, like archery, track and field events, rifle shooting, etc. They do not get even one big banner. Nobody covers their game. When we talk to the Indian Olympians, they say that their disciplines, their national events, championship quarter-final, semi-final, etc. may be covered by Doordarshan from time to time. We can project these disciplines through Doordarshan and ask the All-India Radio to give commentary. The moment they know that these matches will be shown on Doordarshan, they can go to the market and get sponsors. That money will again be spent on these disciplines which are not watched like cricket or tennis. Therefore, Sir, after all these things, we brought this provision. Now, there are two points raised in the market. Should this signal be pirated outside India? It is free to air. In that case, how can the Government ensure the actual property interest of the stakeholder who bought the property by making such a huge investment? Sir, I know that no Government gives money to the sports, except the socialist and the communist Governments. It is the market which protects the sports. Nobody else protects them in the world. Sir, I know that. I belong to FIFA. I know how the television is more important to get money for the games. I know that. But one should also appreciate that the fund which is generated for tickets for the whole world—I am not talking of India—the entire world's tickets fund, more than 75 per cent is generated from the Indian market alone. Caribbean generates 5 to 7 per cent, Australia

generates 9 to 10 per cent, the balance is generated by U.K., New Zealand etc. Seventy-five per cent of the market money goes from India, and the Indian common viewers cannot see the match. What a pathetic scene. Now, the question is encryption. The Cabinet wisely appointed a Technical Committee, represented by the BCCI and all other disciplines, represented by the sports channels, asking Prasara Bharati to see to it and work out a mechanism to ensure how this signal could be protected from piracy. They have finished their third meeting. They will have a final meeting on the 16th. Whatever is the outcome of the meeting, we shall faithfully translate it either in the rules or in the guidelines to ensure that the mandate is honoured properly. So, there is no fear on that count. Sir, at the end, I should only say before the Members take part, specially, to those distinguished Members who take interest in sports, I would like to refer to ESPN Sports Channel, Zee Sports Channel, even the Channel which has shown exclusively the cricket in the West Indies match was the News Sports. They have said in public, and I have got their press release, that after the Government took a decision to show it compulsorily to the Terrestrial Channel, our revenue had gone up because we used to take the advertisements for 60 millions TV homes, the moment they come to know about it, 50 millions more have been added, that is, it has gone up to 110 millions, and our advertisement revenue had gone up not to the tune of Rs. 1 crore or Rs. 2 crore, but to the tune of Rs. 25 crores, and new companies have joined it. So, we are not disturbing them. Whatever we are generating, they take away 75 per cent of that. The second point is about the details. Direct TV to home is a revolution in the Indian Television system. Suppose, you are a subscriber of DD1. Now, DD1 is Doordarshan DTH; DD1 is Tata Sky DTH; DD1 is Zee Sky DTH, DD1 may be some other DTH tomorrow. Now, if you are a subscriber of DTH where you do not need any support from cable, if you feel that since DD1 is showing cricket, I will switch on to DD1. How can I technically stop it? DD1 is allowed to public as terrestrial, but DD1, at the same time, should be clicked in the DTH. It is technically impossible. Yes, Sir. We are discussing the issue, and hopefully, on 16th, we will come out with a solution. Therefore, we carefully kept clause 7 which says that rules and other details shall be prescribed by the Government from time to time, and whatever is the outcome of this Expert Committee, we shall try to accommodate their views. Otherwise, if you see every clause of this Bill, it is not only pro-people, pro-sports, but for the first time, an organization of Public Service

Broadcasting Authority has been created at the cost of risking its own revenue. Whatever little is generated, is ploughed back into other disciplines. Such a law is not prevalent in any part of the world.

Lastly, for the knowledge of the hon. Members, I say that much more stringent provisions of the law are there in England and Australia. While it is said that the first offer should be given to their chosen channel terrestrial network, and the Minister will decide it, I have brought the Australian law and the England law. We are not doing like that. We are saying that the game of national importance should be chosen after consulting 3 stakeholders, (a) discipline, which game it is, with kabaddi, with football or with cricket; (b) the telecasting group Prasar Bharati, and (c) the man who bought the property. With them, we have to mutually settle which of them is of national importance. Now, tennis can say, "We are sending our delegation to Wimbledon. We are sending our delegation to Davis Cup." They can say, "To us, the national importance starts with the first appearance of Sania Mirza or our national importance is the first quarter final." Hockey can say, "Either you show us as a national team on the qualifying round from the day one or you show us only on the final." It is to be mutually settled, not Government, to arbitrarily decide and dictate. Therefore, that flexibility is there, and with this intention, Sir, I plead before the House to consider the matter with its own wisdom and lend its support, and support to millions and millions of viewers who cannot afford to buy the pay channel. And also, Sir, for the knowledge of my friends, here, in the Parliament, I mention that in West Indies' match, Ravi Shankarji would inquire how in his CAS area, the same channels which got the cable net neo sport where the pay channel fixed for Rs. 5/- in CAS area, till the last day, they settled and threatened the cable to increase the price from Rs. 30/- to Rs. 50/-. And the complaint came right to us. Then, we intervened. This is why, Sir, it was necessary that the public viewing scheme should be protected, and protected without harming the interests of the game and the property holders. That is all I can submit, Sir.

The question was proposed.

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD (Bihar): Sir, we have heard the introductory remarks of hon. the Information & Broadcasting Minister. Cricket, today, is not only a game, but it is almost a passion in India, and an obsession for some. If India plays and if India loses, people feel the

sorrow. If India wins, they are happy. Therefore, cricket has been a lucky game in India. We have many other games like football, hockey, *kabaddi*, but cricket has become the pride of place. I remember my childhood days. Mr. Dasmunsi mentioned about the cricket commentary on radio. We were kids. We had not only Vijay Hazare, Pankaj Roy but also Chakrapani and Sarvadhikari as special commentators. They were not only commentators, but they became even the household names in the country. Therefore, cricket was created for the people by the radio, in one way right. How much important cricket, of late, has become, let me be very frank about it. I will come to the Bill subsequently. But cricket is the basis for this intervention through the Parliament. The reasons? He has explained something; I would share something. And yes, we are one with you that the ordinary people of the country, who have got a simple antenna of the terrestrial should have the right to see the cricket matches because cricket, today, is not only an elitist game, but you see, in rural areas, poor people with the simple *lakdi ka wicket* or bricks settle there, playing cricket with an improvised bat. That is where the game has reached about.

I remember, Sir, that even in the Lagan movie, cricket was the instrument to show as to how an Indian team can win over the British team. Naturally, the management of cricket also became important. When I say that, I must compliment the BCCI for having improved the conditions of the workers in many ways. I was reading an interview by Venkat Raghavan that when they used to go to play abroad, they had only two sets of dresses. Now, our cricketers are well paid. I am given to understand that even the retired cricketers are given pension and all these things. And, therefore, the BCCI has become important. And not only that; even the elections of BCCI have become important. It has become an interesting media event to watch the elections of the BCCI; the alliances are intra-party, and the opposition is inner-party! We see that also. Hon. Minister, you are the Chairman of the Football Federation. Ahluwaliaji and we were talking that the cricket is overpacked, and, therefore, we are deciding to go into the politics of football to break your monopoly; I would like to warn you because you are there for a long time! Anyway, that is a good interest which is developing in the games all over the country. I have a few queries to ask, hon. Minister, because they are very important. We have around four crore cable homes in the country, I correctly recollect. We have around 4.5 crore terrestrial homes in the country. I do not think

any statistics have come about on the DTH homes because that is a question which I will subsequently refer to.

Therefore, if there are 4.5 crores of terrestrial homes in this country, those people must have the right to view the games. There have been so many litigations in the past. I remember the famous case of West Bengal Association of 1995. Then there was a case of Zee Telefilms towards the end of 2000. So many cases are going on; so many litigations are going on. Every year, whenever there is a bidding, there will be a spate of litigations, litigations relating to the election to the BCCI in various High Courts and litigations against awarding of a tender for telecast right in various courts of the country. People always ask the question; Why are we suffering? Therefore, in that way, our party appreciate your concerns through this legislation. We are with you. But the common people, the poor people, the ordinary people who have got only access to antenna on a terrestrial platform, must have the right to see our teams playing abroad or in India. That point is well taken.

Now, what are the concerns which need to be addressed, whenever a party takes a particular bid? You have mentioned about the question of encryption. If I am not wrong, we have got 1,400 transmitters all over the country. They will pick up signals. Now the footprints of the terrestrial signal are also seen in South-East Asia and Japan. If because of their powerful beams, they capture these signals and again transfer them in a clandestine manner to other agencies, what is the safeguard? Yes, I do understand the need that the ordinary people, the common people, the poor people, the simple people, having the means of terrestrial network only, should have the right to see it. But your committee is functioning. The matches are coming. But 1,400 transmitters are also to be given the facility of encryption so that signals do not stand on the way under the garb of terrestrial network, Hon. Minister, I would like to know from you as to how this is going to be tackled. What are the ways that you are considering because it needs investment as well? Cricketers are seen on television daily giving advertisements. We wish they would concentrate more on playing cricket than selling dant ka manjan and ganne ka rass. That will be better for the country. But good luck to them. Kindly see what is happening today. The stadium is covered with a lot of logos. As for those logos, their is a separate price in the stadium there is a separate price on television and there is separate price on radio. Now, the sportsmen's

hand-gears are having the name of some company, the chest is having the name of Sahara and the shoulders are having the name of some other company. Everything is sold. As some cartoonist has rightly pointed out, a time will come that all the playing a cricket match would have, at least, 20 logos on their body. Those concerns are there. That is a matter for the BCCI to decide and naturally the Government should not intervene. But the encryption should not be conveyed or transmitted or communicated in a clandestine manner. That is very important. What are the steps being taken for that purpose?

The second concern, hon. Minister, is that you have mentioned about DTH. All of us are having some knowledge about DTH. The DTH is still in a state of infancy. It is still being marketed. But you can't say the private or Doordarshan DTH is not a commoner's platform. Let us be frank about it. Therefore, what is the distinction that you have? What is the reach of DTH? What is the need to give these signals also on the DTH platform? If I recall, with my past experience of heading this Ministry, maybe, in some of the hilly areas of North-East, we had some programme of DTH because the cable connectivity and the terrestrial connectivity were facing some problems there. What is the success rate there? If you give the signal to DTH, how would the encryption part, the sanctity of that, be maintained? That is an issue to be considered. I would appreciate if you kindly respond to this concern.

Thirdly, there are a few more concern, hon. Minister. You kindly look at the Bill, clause 4. Let me read it out. Sir, clause 4 of the Bill says, "The Central Government may specify penalties to be imposed, including suspension or revocation of licence, permission or registration for violation of various terms and conditions..." why should this power be left to the Government? You are appropriating to yourself the power to impose the penalty of Rs. 1 crores and revocation of licence. My suggestion to you is that the power to impose penalty must be transparent, must be mentioned in the Bill itself, in the rules itself. If the Central Government is to have all these powers, the problems are going to come again and again. Therefore, on this issue, I would like to have your clarity because the power to impose penalty being a serious power, it ought to have been mentioned in the Bill itself. Under what condition you will suspend the licence, under what condition you will revoke the licence and what other penalties you will impose, all this ought to have been clarified in the Bill itself. Hon.

Minister, we understand that it is all being done for the Doordarshan. We all want the Doordarshan to grow. It is an age of competition. So many channels have come. There hundred channel's footprints are there in the country's sky today. It is a competitive world; it is a world of TRP and all of them are driven by commerce. Only Doordarshan is a social platform for education, for social activities and for reach of common people. What steps are we taking to improve professionalism in Doordarshan? What steps are we taking so that Doordarshan becomes competitive? That is an issue to be taken not of. I am told that the post of DG of Doordarshan is vacant for three months. Are we not having eligible people to become Director-Generals of Doordarshan? Or, some person is being allowed to become eligible after sometime? This is not a world in which Doordarshan used to live in the past. Doordarshan will have to become professional, will have to become competitive and in addition, will have to undertake all the obligations which as a public broadcaster, it has; and we are proud of that. Let us not forget that the entire television industry in the country has grown on the shoulders of Doordarshan. We are indeed proud of that. But in the present competitive world, Doordarshan will also have to learn to understand and appreciate the rules of the game which includes professionalism and competitiveness.

The last request, Mr. Minister, I have to make to you has two shades. The first is, if Doordarshan is there, it has to become professional. The Government will have a say there. But non-Government say should also be there in the Doordarshan. That is an area of concern. I do not want to elaborate it further. I will come to you with some questions in future. But there has to be a proper blend in order to have acceptability, in order to have credibility and in order to have reach. The second shade of my last query is, how these concerns would be addressed in future. I would like to know whether everything would be done by the Government, the Minister of Information and Broadcasting and the Secretary, or, we need to have a regulator. I remember, we were thinking of convergence laws. But that could not be there. Then, there was the Broadcasting Bill which we sought to move when Shrimati Sushma was the Minister for Information and Broadcasting. But that could not see the light of the day because we were not in office. Now, today, we need a regulator. You know the TRAI was created to take care of broadcasting needs. Today, we talk of all the rates, CAS rates and other rates. Now the TRAI is addressing these issues. Those concern are being taken care of. Similarly, there is a crying need for

a broadcaster regulator to address all these concerns. I would have appreciated if the penalty part which you have talked about, its imposition, its preconditions, ought to have been given to a regulator because things can be taken care of as in objective manner. Mr. Minister you will certainly appreciate that cricket will remain an icon for the country. I see that even kids of three to four years now appreciating the rules of the game. In a family function of mine, when a player got out and action was being replayed on television, a kid of four years, after seeing the reply said, "He is out". That is the kind of Reach we are having of television today. Therefore, this is going become a great process with television connectivity becoming wider and wider. It imposes serious responsibility on us in future as well.

Therefore, I am requesting the hon. Minister to take this issue serious, We need to have a Regulator for Broadcasting just like we have the Press Council for the print media. There is no forum at all today, and the Government should, as far as possible, stay away from this. We all have freedom of speech and expression. There is the freedom of the print media, freedom of the Press. An, in view of the expanding role of the electronic media, there are so many news channels, sports channels, and so on - issues keep oncoming around. Hence it is important that we have a regulator. I would appreciate if the UPA Government makes an efforts in this direction.

श्री जय प्रकाश अग्रवाल (राष्ट्रीय राजधानी क्षेत्र, दिल्ली) : आदरणीय उपसभापति महोदय, मैं मंत्री जी को धन्यवाद करना चाहता हूँ मैं आशा करता हूँ कि वे एक खिलाड़ी भी हैं और गेम्स के प्रति उनका बड़ा आकर्षण रहा है और आज हमारे सामने जो बिल वे लाए हैं, वह उसी की एक कड़ी है।

महोदय, हिन्दुस्तान एक बहुत बड़ा देश है इसके अलग-अलग हिस्सों में अलग-अलग भाषाएं बोली जाती हैं। लेकिन सब का ध्यान हमेशा गेम्स की ओर रहता है कि हम क्या कर रहे हैं, क्या देख रहे हैं, कैसे देख रहे हैं और सरकार का उसमें कितना बड़ा हाथ है मैंने अभी रवि शंकर प्रसाद साहब का बड़ा अच्छा भाषण सुना, लेकिन मुझे यह लगा कि आप क्रिकेट के अलावा उससे बाहर निकलने को तैयार नहीं थे। क्या यह बिल सिर्फ क्रिकेट से संबंधित है? क्या सिर्फ क्रिकेट से पैसा मिलता है? हम सिर्फ उन्हीं का ध्यान रखें, जो क्रिकेट खेलते हैं और बोलते हैं? क्या सारे हिन्दुस्तान में इसके अलावा और कोई चीज नहीं है? क्या हमारा यही पहला गेम है? हिन्दुस्तान में अलग-अलग हिस्सों में अलग-अलग गेम्स खेलने वाले हैं। हमारे जो ट्रेडिशन गेम्स हैं, उनकी ओर हमारा ध्यान बहुत कम जाता है, क्योंकि हमें उनसे कम पैसा मिलता है मैं आशा करता हूँ कि आप जो बिल लाए हैं, इसमें भी आपने क्रिकेट का जिक्र कर दिया कि मैच होने वाला था इसीलिए आप यह बिल लाए हैं।

शायद अगर आप इसके साथ—मुझे खुशी है कि आपने सही समय पर एक सही कदम उठाया, लेकिन इससे पहले कुछ सालों में—इससे पहले वाली भी सरकार थी, उस समय भी जब सेट टॉप बॉक्स की बात चली थी, तब लोग बहुत परेशान थे ये बॉक्सेज 5-5 हजार रुपए में, 8-8 हजार रुपए में बिके, तब भी किसी ने यह नहीं सोचा कि आगे हमारे जो लोग हैं, उनको दूरदर्शन के मार्फत, प्रसार भारती के द्वारा किस तरह मदद कर सकते हैं।

सर, हमारे बहुत सारे नेशनल गेम्स होते हैं। लेकिन उनका कोई प्रचार नहीं होता, उनका कोई प्रसार नहीं होता। कोई उनको बढ़ावा देने के लिए तैयार नहीं है, क्योंकि हमारे पास कोई चैनल नहीं है, जिसके द्वारा हम उन खिलाड़ियों को प्रोत्साहित कर सकें। हम यह दिखा सके कि ये इंटरनेशनल स्टैंडर्ड के खिलाड़ी हैं। अगर इनको थोड़ा भी पिक-अप मिलेगा, अगर उनका थोड़ा भी प्रचार टेलिविजन के मार्फत होगा, तो सारी दुनिया उनकी तरफ आकर्षित होगी। हमारे बहुत सारे गेम्स ऐसे हैं। इनमें से एक आप भी फुटबॉल से संबंधित हैं, लेकिन आज हमारी स्थिति फुटबॉल में क्यों खराब है? वह इसलिए खराब है कि उन्हें एक्सपोजर नहीं मिल पाता। वे अपने-अपने छोटे ग्राउंड्स में खेलते हैं, उसके बाद नेशनल लेवल पर खेलते हैं। लेकिन उनको इंटरनेशनल लेवल पर जाने का मौका नहीं मिलता। मैं आपका धन्यवाद करता हूँ कि आप यह बिल लाए, जिससे बाहर जो कुछ हो रहा है, वह भी देख सकते हैं और जो हमारे यहां हो रहा है, वह हम बाहर भी प्रसारित कर सकते हैं, जिससे हमारे खिलाड़ियों को बहुत प्रोत्साहन मिलेगा। आप जो खिलाड़ी हैं और खेल-संस्थाओं से जुड़े हुए हैं। मैं कई बार आपके साथ गया भी हूँ। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि इस बिल के अलावा भी जो कमियाँ रह गयी हैं, उनको आप पूरा करेंगे, ताकि जहां आप प्रसार भारती को और मजबूत करें, जहां आपको जो रेवेन्यू शेयर मिलता है, उसका पैसा आप उन खिलाड़ियों के ऊपर खर्च करें या संस्थाओं पर खर्च करें ताकि हम इंटरनेशनल स्टैंडर्ड पर आ सकें। मकसद बहुत अच्छा है और मैं आशा करता हूँ कि आप अपने मकसद में कामयाब होंगे।

महोदय, आज जो चैनल हिन्दुस्तान में दिखाए जा रहे हैं। हमें उनके मुकाबले में भी कंपीटीशन में रहना पड़ेगा। जो आपकी कवरेज है, मुझे मालूम नहीं क्योंकि टेक्नीकल आदमी नहीं हूँ, मैं पता नहीं उन शब्दों में कह पाऊंगा या नहीं कह पाऊंगा, लेकिन जैसे यह आपका टेन-स्पॉर्ट्स है, इसपीएन वालों का है, उनकी जिस तरह की कवरेज है, जो लाइवकवरेज ये दिखाते हैं, बहुत अच्छे स्टैंडर्ड की है, लेकिन मुझे पता नहीं आपके पास मशीनरी की कमी है या कैमरों की कमी है या टेक्नीशियंस की कमी है कि हम अपने दूरदर्शन पर उस हिसाब से नहीं दिखा पाते हैं? मैं आशा करता हूँ कि आप इस ओर भी ध्यान देंगे। हम राइट्स लेकर या रेवेन्यू लेकर सिर्फ किस तरह उसे खर्च करके, शायद इससे हमारा कोई मकसद है। शायद हमारा मकसद यह है कि हम खेलों को प्रोत्साहन दे सकें और प्रोत्साहन देने के साथ-साथ हम इस तरह का एनवायरमेंट दे सकें कि हम

जो और दूसरे चैनल हैं, उनके मुकाबले अपने चैनल को और ज्यादा मजबूत कर सकें, अच्छा कर सकें, उनके बराबर आगे ला सकें। अगर आज आप दूरदर्शन के कवरेज को देखेंगे, जिस तरह से कवरेज करते हैं, तो आपको पता चलेगा कि गेम्स को कवरेज करते हुए एक तरफ कैमरे लगा देते हैं और कवर करते रहते हैं। जिसका कोई पता नहीं चलता कि क्या दिखाना चाहते हैं या क्या उसका मकसद है, लेकिन आप दूसरे चैनल देखोगे, तो वे अलग-अलग एंगल से दिखाते हैं। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि आप इस ओर भी ध्यान देंगे ताकि आप अपने मकसद के साथ इसमें भी कामयाब हो सकें।

महोदय, जहां तक एडवर्टाइजमेंट का है, चूंकि हमारे सिगनल्स अच्छे नहीं होते या हमारी कवरेज अच्छी नहीं होती, इसलिए जो डीडी न्यूज है, डीडी स्पोर्ट्स है या डीडी चैनल है, उनके लिए लोग एडवर्टाइजमेंट नहीं देते हैं और यह इसलिए नहीं देते कि शायद हम जो करना चाहते हैं, वह ठीक से नहीं होता। अब जिस तरह हमारे लोग वहां हैं, शायद सोचते हैं कि एक सरकारी नौकरी है, मिली हुई है, कोई कहने वाला नहीं है कि हम क्या चीज दिखा रहे हैं, किस तरह दिखा रहे हैं। क्या कभी हम कोई कंपीटीशन भी देखते हैं? क्या कोई आपकी ऐसी बाँडी भी बनी हुई है, जो यह देखती हो कि दूसरे चैनल जो दिखा रहे हैं और जो हम दिखा रहे हैं, उनमें क्या फर्क है? हम उनके बराबर क्यों नहीं आ सकते, हम किस तरह से इसे पूरा कर सकते हैं? आज जमाना बेचने का है कि आप किस तरह अपनी चीज को बेचना चाहते हैं, आप किस तरह दिखाना चाहते हैं। अगर ये मल्टीनेशनल कंपनीज हैं, बड़ी-बड़ी स्पोर्ट्स एजेंसी हैं, तो हमारे यहां भी कोई कमी नहीं है, हमारे यहां पैसे की भी कमी नहीं है, हमारे यहां इतनी स्पोर्ट्स बाँडी है कि उसकी भी कमी नहीं है, चाहे आप फुटबाल वालों को देख लें, आपकी स्पोर्ट्स बाँडी है, हाँकी वाली है, रेसलिंग वाली है। आप अगर डब्लूडब्लूएफ की कवरेज और अपनी कवरेज देखिए, कितना फर्क है? तो हमारे खिलाड़ियों को प्रोत्साहन कहां से मिलेगा? मैं आशा करता हूँ कि आप इस ओर भी ध्यान देंगे और जिस मकसद से आप इस बिल को लाए हैं, उसमें सफल होंगे।

महोदय, मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम बहुत देर बाद जागते हैं। जिस समय सेट-टॉप-बॉक्स आया था, उस समय से लोग परेशान हुए, कोर्ट केस हुए, फिर खुले, उसके बाद यह कहा गया कि कब सप्लाय होंगे, किस रेट पर होंगे, किस तरह होंगे, उससे लोग काफी हरेस हुए हैं पिछली सरकार में उस समय इन्होंने यह कहा था कि हम सारे हिन्दुस्तान में शायद मुम्बई और दिल्ली का पहले कहा था, हम सेट-टॉप-बॉक्स देंगे, जबरदस्ती लादने की कोशिश की गई थी, बहुत से थोप भी दिए गए और यह कहा था कि पांच हजार से कम में नहीं मिलेगा। मैं जानना यह चाहता हूँ कि क्या उस समय आपने यह देखा था कि क्या हिन्दुस्तान में वह available है। या नहीं है? उस समय लोग तंग हुए थे, परेशान हुए थे और यह लगता था कि कल से टेलीविजन बन्द हो जाएगा।

श्री सुरेश भारद्वाज (हिमाचल प्रदेश): वह बिल तो आपने भी पास किया था।... (व्यवधान)... वह जो बिल था, उसको सबने पास किया था, आप भी उसमें पार्टी थे और जिसे कानून बनाया गया था।

श्री जय प्रकाश अग्रवाल: हम बाद में आए थे। वह चुप बैठे हैं, अभी बताएंगे।... (व्यवधान)...

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद: सुरेश जी, एक मिनट। मेरे मंत्री बनने से पहले कानून पास हो चुका था। मैं आपको जानकारी दे दूँ और कांग्रेस पार्टी ने, यूनेनिमसली पास किया था।

श्री जय प्रकाश अग्रवाल: सर, मैं आशा करता हूँ कि जब भी कभी आप इस तरह की पालिसी लाने वाले हों, तो उससे पहले आप सोचेंगे कि हम क्या करना चाहते हैं अगर हम आज ही सोचेंगे कि हमें क्या करना है और आज ही हम लाएंगे, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह ठीक नहीं होगा। इतनी बड़ी सरकार है, आपके पास इतने बड़े अफसर हैं, क्या करते हैं उन कमरों में बैठकर, क्या उनका ध्यान नहीं जाता कि अगले पांच साल में क्या होने वाला है, अगले पांच साल में दुनिया कहाँ जाने वाली है, किस तरह के क्या हालात होंगे और क्या हमारा होना चाहिए? हमारे चैनल, हमारे डीडी न्यूज, हमारे दूरदर्शन के जितने व्यूअर्स आज हैं, शायद उतने और किसी प्राइवेट चैनल के नहीं होंगे।

फिर हमें इसे बढ़ावा देने में, अच्छा बनाने में, इसे कम्पिटिशन में लाने में कोई कमी नहीं छोड़नी चाहिए। दुनिया हमारी तरफ देख रही है, लोग हम में विश्वास रखते हैं आप में विश्वास रखते हैं, इसलिए मैं जहाँ इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ, वहीं आशा करता हूँ कि कोई ऐसी बॉडी आपकी जरूर होनी चाहिए, जिसकी रिस्पॉन्सिबिलिटी हो, जैसे रवि शंकर प्रसाद जी ने कहा कि रेगुलेटरी अथॉरिटी हो, लेकिन कोई मैनेजमेंट कमिटी भी इस तरह की हो कि जिसकी रिस्पॉन्सिबिलिटी फिक्स हो कि उन्होंने उस ओर ध्यान दिया या नहीं दिया।

मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ कि और आशा करता हूँ कि इस तरह की चीजों को आप प्रोत्साहित करेंगे, लाएंगे और लोगों की और खिलाड़ियों की मदद करेंगे।

श्री बृजभूषण तिवारी (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपसभापति महोदय, यह जो विधेयक आया है और इसके बारे में माननीय मंत्री जी ने जो अपना मंतव्य जाहिर किया है, उससे यही लगता है कि सरकार इस संबंध में किसी सोची-समझी नीति के बजाए ऐडहॉक किज्म पर ज्यादा यकीन करती है। क्योंकि, जैसा कि अभी कहा गया है कि एक कम्प्रिहेंसिव बिल टेलिविजन ब्रॉडकास्टिंग के बारे में लाने का विचार बहुत दिनों से विचाराधीन है, लेकिन अभी तक लाया नहीं गया है और शायद यही कारण है कि जब कभी भी ऐसी स्थिति या ऐसी दिक्कत सामने आती है तो सरकार ऑर्डिनेंस लाती है और फिर उस ऑर्डिनेंस को सम्यक रूप देने के लिए विधेयक पास करती है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अभी माननीय सदस्य ने सही कहा है कि आज जिस तरीके से दूरदर्शन का महत्व बढ़ रहा है और जिस

प्रकार से इस ग्लोबलाइजेशन के दौर में विदेशी चैनल आ रहे हैं और उनका प्रभाव बढ़ रहा है, उसमें इस बात की जबर्दस्त आवश्यकता है कि इसके लिए भी एक रेगुलेटरी बॉडी बनाई जाए। क्योंकि, आज बाहर के जो विभिन्न चैनल्स आ रहे हैं, उनका मकसद कोई समाज सेवा नहीं है, उनका मकसद किसी अच्छी बात को या अच्छे सिद्धान्त को बताना या सामाजिक न्याय की बात करना या आम आदमी, जिस आम आदमी की चर्चा, जिस आम आदमी की जिंता माननीय मंत्री जी ने की है, उनकी नजर में उस आम आदमी की हित बिल्कुल नहीं है, वे तो शुद्ध रूप से व्यावसायिक हैं। जैसा कि अभी श्री जय प्रकाश अग्रवाल जी ने कहा कि आज समय माल बेचने का है, हम हर चीज को बेचना चाहते हैं, परन्तु मेरा मानना है कि अगर केवल यही दृष्टि हो कि हमें हर चीज बेचनी है और इसे बेचने के कारण नैतिकता की कोई बात हो, संस्कृति की कोई बात हो, सिद्धान्त की कोई बात हो, कोई नई बात लोगों को समझाने की हो या नई पीढ़ी के सामने कोई आदर्श उपस्थित करने की बात हो, अगर इसकी अनदेखी की जाती है तो बहुत ही जबर्दस्त विसंगति समाज में पैदा होगी।

मान्यवर, एक बार एक फ्रांसीसी नवयुवक से हमारी मुलाकात हुई। बात-चीत के दौरान उसने कहा, "I am alien to my country", "मैं अपने ही देश में विदेशी हूँ"। हमने उससे पूछा कि वह कैसे? तो उसने, पहली बात यह कही कि "I am staunch vegetarian", दूसरी बात कही, "I don't have television", तीसरी बात कही, "I am bachelor and in search of a faithful wife" और चौथी बात कही, "I pay regards to my parents"। ये चार बातें उस फ्रांसीसी नवयुवक ने मुझे बताईं। जब उसने यह कहा कि "I don't have television", हमने उससे पूछा कि इसका क्या कारण है? उसने कहा कि हमारे जो बच्चे हैं, वे पढ़ते ही नहीं हैं, वे दिन-रात टेलीविजन देखते हैं। टेलिविजन देखने से हमारी नेत्र की इन्द्रिय तो काम करती है, लेकिन जो हमारा दिमाग है, वह सोचने-समझने का, विचार करने का कार्य बंद कर देता है, एक किस्म से दिमाग की एक्सरसाइज नहीं हो पाती इसलिए दिमाग लूज हो जाता है। उस समय मुझे महसूस हुआ कि उस दार्शनिक की बात पूर्ण रूप से सही है कि अगर दुनिया में इसकी रिसेप्टिविटी एक करोड़ से ऊपर हो गई तो बुद्धि का लोप हो जाएगा।

दूसरा, मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ, जैसा कि माननीय मंत्री जी ने अभी कहा कि दुनिया में 75 फीसदी जो रेविन्यू जेनरेट होता है, वह भारत से होता है। यह सही है कि इस समय क्रिकेट बहुत ही लोकप्रिय है, परन्तु आप क्या जानते हैं कि शुरूआत में जब यह क्रिकेट खेला जाता था, तो किन-किन देशों के लोग इसे खेलते थे? गुलाम देशों के। यह कभी भी आम लोगों का खेल नहीं था। गुल्ली-डंडा तो था, गुल्ली-डंडा गांवों में खेला जाता था, लेकिन अब वह गुल्ली-डंडा भी बदल गया। जैसा अभी-अभी आदरणीय सदस्य महोदय ने कहा कि बस दो ईंट रख लिया, कोई बॉल खरीद कर ले आए और आज गांव-गांव में खेत-खेत में यह खेल होने लगा है। मगर उसकी गुणवत्ता क्या है? आज उन खेलों का हमारे ऊपर क्या असर पड़ रहा है? क्रिकेट आज भी ओलिम्पिक

1.00 P.M.

खेलों में शामिल नहीं है। आज क्रिकेट प्रतिष्ठा का सूचक बना हुआ है। क्रिकेट पर आज इतना पैसा खर्च होता है, जैसा अभी कहा गया कि आज क्रिकेट के जो खिलाड़ी हैं, वे भी कमाडिटी हो गए हैं, वे पदार्थों को, समानों को बेचने के प्रतीक बन गए हैं। इस क्रिकेट ने, हमारे जो देशी और राष्ट्रीय खेल थे, उनका भट्ठा बैठ दिया है। आज उन खेलों के प्रति कोई भी आकर्षण न तो खेलने वालों में रह गया है और न ही देखने वालों में रह गया है। सबसे बुरी हालत तो यह है कि उन खेलों के लिए जो पैसा उपलब्ध होना चाहिए, वह पैसा भी उपलब्ध नहीं हो पाता है। उनको इन्सैटिव नहीं मिल पाता है। सरकार और इस प्रकार के खेलों की जो संस्थाएं हैं, वे अपना आधिपत्य जमाए हुए हैं और इस नाते उन खेलों का जो विकास होना चाहिए, उनमें जो गुणवत्ता आनी चाहिए और जो कॉम्पिटिशन होना चाहिए, उसका अभाव रहता है। इसी कारण हर जगह, चाहे वे एशियाड खेल हों या ओलिम्पिक खेल हो, चीन के मुकाबले और कभी-कभी तो छोटे-छोटे देशों के मुकाबले भी हमें मुंह की खानी पड़ती है।

मान्यवर, तीसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि यह जो दूरदर्शन है, इसके लिए यह ठीक ही कहा गया है कि इसमें व्यावसायिक क्षमता होनी चाहिए। हम पुरानी बात तो नहीं कह सकते हैं, मोनोपली की बात तो नहीं कह सकते हैं, लेकिन आज के युग में, जब विदेशी चैनल्स हैं, कॉम्पिटिशन है तो यह बात सही है कि हमें दूरदर्शन की क्षमता को और उसकी व्यावसायिक दक्षता को बढ़ाना चाहिए। परन्तु दूरदर्शन आज भी ब्यूरोक्रेटिक कंट्रोल में, नौकरशाही के शिकंजे में फंसा हुआ है, भ्रष्टाचार से ओत-प्रोत है, इसलिए उसमें कोई विजन नहीं है, उसमें कोई अन्वेषक दृष्टि नहीं है। इसी कारण उसका इतना बड़ा क्षेत्रफल होने के बावजूद, उस पर इतना पैसा लगाए जाने के बावजूद और इतना बड़ा नेटवर्क होने के बावजूद भी आज दूरदर्शन की जो स्थिति होनी चाहिए, वह नहीं है। आज दूरदर्शन को हर समय सरकार की सहायता की जरूरत पड़ती है, सरकार की मदद की जरूरत पड़ती है। आज सबसे बड़ी आवश्यकता यह है कि दूरदर्शन के क्रियाकलापों को ठीक किया जाए, दूरदर्शन को नौकरशाही के शिकंजे से मुक्त किया जाए और शीघ्रातिशीघ्र इसके लिए एक कॉम्प्रिहेंसिव बिल लाया जाए, जिससे नये समाज, नये मन और नये व्यक्ति का निर्माण किया जा सके। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ, मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं, धन्यवाद।

[उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो० पी०जे० कुरियन) पीठासीन हुए]

श्री सेमन पाठक (पश्चिमी बंगाल): महोदय, खेल प्रसारण सिगनल (प्रसार भारती के साथ अनिवार्य हिस्सेदारी) विधेयक, 2007 को समर्थन करने के लिए खड़ा हूं। देश के बड़े हिस्से के लोग ज्यादातर ग्रामीण क्षेत्र के लोग देश विदेश में खेले गए क्रिकेट एवं अन्य महत्वपूर्ण खेलों का आनंद उठाने से अभी तक वंचित हैं। प्रसार भारती के साथ खेल प्रसारण सिगनल में अनिवार्य हिस्सेदारी के माध्यम से राष्ट्रीय महत्व के खेल अधिकतम दर्शकों, जिनके पास केबल की सुविधा नहीं है, को यह

सुविधा पहुंचाने के लिए एक विधेयक आर्डिनैस को स्थापित करने के लिए लाया गया है जिसमें सरकार की सकारात्मक सोच है। मैं इसके लिए माननीय मंत्री जी को धन्यवाद देना चाहूंगा। आज प्रसारण प्राइवेट कम्पनियों के हाथ में होने के कारण, उनका बोलबाला होने के कारण चैनलों का एकतरफा मॉनोपाली मार्केट चल रहा है। इसलिए हम लोग सरकार को हमेशा पब्लिक सेक्टर को ही बढ़ावा देने का सुझाव देते रहते हैं। अभी तक 60 प्रतिशत दर्शक प्रसार भारती के ऊपर निर्भर हैं, जिसके पास केबल सुविधा नहीं है। दूरदर्शन के दर्शकों के साथ बहुत भेदभाव दिखाया जाता है, क्योंकि जिस कम्पनी से इसका फीडबैक मिलता है, वह पहले अपने प्राइवेट चैनल को देता है, स्पोर्ट्स चैनल को देता है और जब दूरदर्शन पर उन कम्पनियों के माध्यम से खेल देखते हैं तो वह तमाम कैमरा, एंगल, ग्राफिक, एक्शन से प्ले जैसी चीजें गायब कर देते हैं। तो इस तरह दूरदर्शन को दिए जाने वाले प्रसार में 15 कैमरा वाला फीड दिया जाता है और अपने स्पोर्ट्स चैनल को 24 कैमरा पर आधारित प्रसारण दिखाया जाता है। अगर ऐसा है तो सरकार को इन तमाम चीजों को देखते हुए पहले ही लगाम लगाई जानी चाहिए थी तथा पहले से ही इसको ठीक करते तो आज यह स्थिति उत्पन्न नहीं होती। यहां इस बिल के उद्देश्यों और कारणों के कथन में नम्बर-4 पर कहा गया है कि हाल में भारत-वेस्ट इंडीज़ का एक दिवसीय मैच श्रृंखला के दौरान बीबीसी-सीआई राइट होल्डर भारतीय जनसंख्या के 89 परसेंट तक रखने वाला लोक प्रसारक है और प्रसारण के क्षेत्रीय अधिकार रखने वाला एकमात्र नेटवर्क है, को प्रसारण से इंकार करने के कारण लोक श्रृंखला का प्रथम मैच नहीं देखा जा सका। महोदय तब जाकर आप यह बिल लाए हैं। अगर इस मामले में हम लोग पहले से ही इनीसिएटिव लेते तथा सरकार की ओर से हस्तक्षेप किया जाता तो ऐसा नहीं होता। इसलिए मैं सरकार से कहना चाहूंगा कि कोई भी स्थिति हो उससे पहले ही सरकार उसमें हस्तक्षेप करें। मुझे विश्वास है कि जबकि यह (आर्डिनैस को तो हम लोग समर्थन नहीं करते, लेकिन) आर्डिनैस जब बिल के रूप में आए तो मैं उस बिल को पूरा समर्थन देता हूं और मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि विधेयक पास होने के बाद दूरदर्शन एवं आकाशवाणी के करोड़ों दर्शकों को देश विदेश में होने वाले राष्ट्रीय और अंतर्राष्ट्रीय खेलों को देखने से अब वंचित नहीं होना पड़ेगा। निजी चैनलों का एकाधिकार खत्म करके लाइव प्रसारण प्रसार भारती के साथ हिस्सेदारी से देश के तमाम दर्शकों को फायदा तो होगा ही साथ ही साथ प्रसार भारती को रेवेन्यू का भी फायदा होगा, मैं यह उम्मीद करता हूं।

माननीय मंत्री जी, खेल के बारे में भी बड़ा इंटेरेस्ट रखते हैं तथा वे मेरे क्षेत्र उत्तर बंगाल से आते हैं, उनको मैं जानता हूं और इस ओर माननीय मंत्री जी का बड़ा इंटेरेस्ट रहा है। उनके इनीसिएटिव से जो बिल लाया गया यह जो क्रिकेट प्रिय और खेल प्रिय हैं उनकी भावनाओं को समझते हुए यह विधेयक लाया गया है और इस विधेयक के अनुसार 98 परसेंट जो प्रसार भारती उस नेटवर्क एरिया को कवरेज करते हैं। स्थिति यह है कि इस बिल को लाने के बाद मुझे नहीं लगता कि जो देश की 98 परसेंट जनसंख्या है, वह सभी देख पाएगी। क्योंकि अभी तक गांवों में बुनियादी सुविधा भी उपलब्ध नहीं है। क्योंकि अभी तक बुनियादी सुविधाएं भी गांवों में और देश के विभिन्न

क्षेत्रों में उपलब्ध नहीं हैं, वहां पर अभी तक बिजली उपलब्ध नहीं है, जब वहां पर बिजली उपलब्ध नहीं है, तो उनको टी॰वी॰ देखने की सुविधा भी उपलब्ध नहीं हो पाती है। जैसा कि मंत्री जी ने बताया कि यह विधेयक लोकहित में लाया गया है, इसलिए लोकहित में, मैं इस विधेयक को समर्थन देते हुए, दो-तीन सुझाव देना चाहूंगा।

मंत्री जी, कम से कम यह सुनिश्चित करें कि जो विधेयक में लाया गया है कि देश के अंदर फ्री सिगनल तो मिलेगा ही, लेकिन देश के बाहर, गल्फ देशों और अन्य देशों को भी खेलों का सिगनल फ्री में मिलेगा या उसके पैसे लिए जायेंगे। ... (समय की घंटी)... मेरा सुझाव है कि..। फ्री नहीं करना चाहिए।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN) Mr. Pathak, wind up. You are making points, but what can I do? There is time constraint.

श्री समन पाठक: तो इसके लिए रेवेन्यू भी बाहर से लाया जाए, ताकि उस पैसे से कम से कम अपने देश के स्पोर्ट्स का डेवलपमेंट हो सके, उसको बढ़ावा दिया जा सके।

इस विधेयक में राष्ट्रीय महत्व का जो प्रसंग उठाया गया है, इसमें राष्ट्रीय महत्व को डिफाइन नहीं किया गया है। मेरा सुझाव है कि इसको सुनिश्चित करना जरूरी है। इसके साथ-साथ यहां पर तमाम माननीय सदस्यों ने क्रिकेट की बात कही है। क्रिकेट बहुत महत्वपूर्ण खेल है और यह भारतवासियों की भावनाओं से जुड़ा हुआ विषय है, लेकिन इसके साथ-साथ हमें दूसरे खेलों का भी प्रसारण करना चाहिए, हमें दूसरे खेलों को भी महत्व देना चाहिए, जो गांव के तमाम लोगों के, साधारण लोगों के प्रिय गेम्स हैं, उन सब गेम्स को भी इसमें शामिल करना चाहिए।

महोदय, मैं एक-दो बात कह कर अपनी बात समाप्त करने जा रहा हूं। दूरदर्शन के अंदर इसका जो इंफ्रास्ट्रक्चर है, उसको मजबूत करना है। दूरदर्शन के जो प्रशिक्षित और अनुभवी कर्मचारी हैं, उनको और ज्यादा सहूलियत देकर इसके इंफ्रास्ट्रक्चर को और अधिक मजबूत करना है। दूरदर्शन और आकाशवाणी में बहुत सारे रिक्त पद हैं, रिक्त पद के चलते, सफिसिएंट कर्मचारियों के बिना प्रसार भारती उत्तम क्वालिटी के प्रोग्राम प्रस्तुत नहीं कर पायेगा। इसके बारे में सर्टिफिकेट की 23वीं रिपोर्ट में भी सुझाव दिए गए हैं उन पर अमल करें जिस स्परिट से मंत्री जी इस विधेयक को यहां पर लाए, मैं अपनी ओर से और अपनी पार्टी की ओर से इस विषय पर ध्यान देने का अनुरोध करते हुए, इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूं। धन्यवाद।

SHRI N. JOTHI (Tamil Nadu): Sir, I am a sportsman during my college days.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT (West Bengal): Oh! How many years before?

[9 March, 2007]

RAJYA SABHA

SHRI N. JOTHI: About thirty years before.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY (Gujarat): What happened thereafter?

SHRI N. JOTHI: Thereafter, I got into my studies.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Mr. Jothi, there is time constraint

SHRI N. JOTHI: Yes, Sir. I know. I want to speak a little about the legal position of this Bill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): But remember, your party has only six minutes. I will stick to the time.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Sir, it is not sportsman like spirit.

SHRI N. JOTHI: Even though I was a sportsman earlier, I may not be in a position, as a Member of Parliament,...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Here also you are like a sportsman.

SHRI N. JOTHI: to support this Bill. I see several grey areas—if you look at legally—in this Bill. I doubt very much about the validity of the Bill before court of law. I feel it would be struck down. Sir, I make a caution now itself. I will list them out. I am not saying something inhuman, etc. But, my feeling is, it may not be possible that this Bill sustain the scrutiny of court. The reasons are many. I will start mentioning them now. Mr. Munsir, Sir, I don't know whether you have got legal backing. I don't know much about you, except yourself being a sportsman and a good person.

Sir, kindly see Clause 2(s). It says, "the sporting event of national importance would be decided by publication in the Gazette." What is the guideline for that? Who will decide on that? Suppose an officer decides that an event is not of national importance, then the purpose of the Bill is defeated. So, who will decide about its publication in the gazette because only then this Act will come into force? So, this is one grey area where Guidelines are lacking.

Secondly, clause 3 deals with the live coverage. Suppose a service provider transmits the signals one minute later, it will not come under live coverage. So, the Act will not apply here. It can be manoeuvred technically.

Suppose the transmission of a cricket match is delayed by one minute, it will not be considered as a live coverage. Then, this Bill will not have any teeth. This is number two.

Thirdly, the national importance of sports events can be determined only between the Prasar Bharati and the service provider by means of certain terms and conditions. Suppose, the service provider does not come forward for an agreement, how can you force him? He must come forward for an agreement. It is not you only who is ready with a pen and a paper. The service provider should also come forward. Where is the machinery here to compel him to come forward for an agreement? It is lacking in this Bill, because let me read it out. Clause 3 says, "To re-transmit the same on its terrestrial networks and Direct-to-Home networks in such manner and on such term and conditions as may be specified". Such terms and conditions specified by whom? By the parties; both by the service provider as well as by the Prasar Bharati. Suppose, he is not coming forward, how will you make use of this Act? This is another grey area. Sir, I will go one step further. Kindly go to clause 3(2) which says that the terms and conditions of sub-section (1) shall also provide that the advertisement revenue shall be shared. That means, it reinforces that the service provider must come forward for terms and conditions. For example, I am one of the service providers and I am not willing to come forward before the Government of India. What is the use of this Act? this is another grey area. Then, come to clause 4 which says, "The Government may specify penalties to be imposed, including suspension or revocation of licence, permission or registration, for violation of various terms and conditions as may be specified under section 3, subject to the condition that amount of a pecuniary penalty shall not exceed one crore rupees". If there is a penalty possibility for a service provider to pay, why should he come forward? He will not come forward. Sir, I do not know why this Bill is being brought forward in such a hurry and what is the purpose of it—what is the real purpose of it and what is the inner agenda behind this Bill. Of course, I can visualise, but I won't tell it openly. This is to embarrass somebody. This is certainly to embarrass somebody that this Bill has been brought in. I can visualise that. I am also in party for quite sometime. But I won't tell that in public. But the real intention behind this Bill is not to serve public. I don't think this is all possible because knowing well that I will be penalised why should I come forward for terms and conditions. I will not. So, unless terms and conditions

[9 March, 2007]

RAJYA SABHA

are there, this Bill will not apply. I have said this several times. I will not repeat that again.

If you look at the ratio of sharing, it is 75:25. What will happen if he does not agree to that because you have brought it into the Bill itself? How will you fulfil it? You can't act beyond the law. "Seventy Five" is put in the statute. Suppose he says that he wants 76 per cent or 80 per cent, what will you do? These are the things that you have to look into.

Further, no compensation has been provided there. Only sharing of revenue has been provided. Under article 19(1)(G), under the Chapter. The Fundamental Rights, one is free to carry on trade. But this is subject to certain limitations. Government is not at all blamed. We can lay hands on everything. The Government can't say that. They are protected under article 19(1)(G). Without compensation and only having revenue on sharing basis, I don't think this could stand the scrutiny of law. Compensation is not a part of this Bill. Then, finally, Sir, I only look at the Bill from a different angle. You have now brought this Bill aiming at some event. I am asking myself one question. Given the scenario of UPA Government's functioning, had the Sun Television Network added the sports channel, would you have brought this legislation? I don't think you would have brought it. It is impossible for you to bring it. It is not possible. It is, absolutely, impossible for them to even think of it. Anyway, some big service providers' are there in the field, they thought about this legislation. Sir, I was discussing this with some people; some my legal colleagues. It is nothing but copyright violation. This enactment is nothing but copyright violation. And, you are violating this by means of a statute, by the teeth of a Parliamentary legislation, you want to violate copyright. I do not think the court will agree to this.

Then, Sir, it is rightly said in my private conference and please permit me to say this. Sir, it has rightly been said in conversation with me.(Interruptions)... All right, it is stated by some of my friend that it is nothing but thieving by legislation; theft by legislation. It is theft to which I do not want to be a party. Even though I am a sports lover and I love sports, but still my vote cannot be in favour of this Bill, which by law wants to thief somebody's property. I am not prepared for that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Please come to the last point.

SHRI N. JOTHI: The Intellectual Property Rights are recognised by our legislation of Parliament. You are interfering in that also. Several cognate Acts are being interfered with by this Bill. I caution this Government not to be in a hurry. Please don't be a laughing stock before the court. This Bill, I caution on legal principles, not on sentiments, not on national patriotism, not as a sports lover. I caution it on legal principles for which this legislation is created and this Parliament is created. We must make proper and correct law and not bad law. So, I caution the Government to please think several time before passing this Bill. Thank you, Sir.

प्रो० राम देव भंडारी (बिहार): माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं 'खेल प्रसारण सिगनल, विधेयक, 2007', का समर्थन करता हूँ और मंत्री जी को विधेयक लाने के लिए बधाई देता हूँ। महोदय, बड़ी प्रसन्नता की बात है कि इस समय दो बड़ी हस्तियाँ, जो खेल जगत से संबंधित हैं, सदन में उपस्थित हैं। माननीय जेटली जी क्रिकेट जगत से संबंधित हैं, माननीय मंत्री जी फुटबॉल जगत से संबंधित हैं और दोनों ही बड़ी हस्तियाँ हैं।

महोदय, मैं रवि शंकर जी को सुन रहा था। बहुत अच्छी अंग्रेजी बोल रहे थे, मगर मेरी इच्छा थी कि वे हिंदी में बोलते। वे हिंदी भी बहुत अच्छी बोलते हैं और हिंदी हमारी राजभाषा है। उन्होंने "passion" शब्द का प्रयोग किया था। क्रिकेट आज खेल नहीं रहा गया है passion हो गया है। मैं उसकी हिंदी बोलता हूँ "जुनून"। क्रिकेट आज जुनून बन गया है। जब भी दूसरे देश के साथ भारत का मैच होता है, पूरे देश पर एक जुनून सवार हो जाता है। बच्चे और नौजवान तो उस जुनून में शामिल होते ही हैं, बड़ी उम्र के लोग भी होते हैं, वे भी किसी न किसी रूप में शामिल हो जाते हैं।

महोदय, मैं गांव से आता हूँ जिस समय मैं स्कूल में पढ़ रहा था, क्रिकेट की कोई बात नहीं थी गांव में, तब फुटबॉल खेलते थे। जब फुटबॉल का मैच होता था, तो आठ-दस गांवों के लोग मैच देखने के लिए जमा होते थे। भारी भीड़ होती थी, जो आजकल क्रिकेट में होती है। रवि शंकर जी बता रहे थे कि दो-तीन ईंटें खड़ी करके, दो-तीन लकड़ियाँ गाड़ करके, कहीं से कोई छोटा सा डंडा लेकर, कोई बॉल लेकर क्रिकेट चल रहा है, और यही कारण है कि झारखंड के धोनी जैसे प्लेयर का आज दुनिया में नाम है। दूसरे देशों के साथ मैच होता है, तो जुनून होता है। मैं मैदान में मैच देखने नहीं जाता, टी०वी० पर कभी-कभी देखता हूँ। जब देश की टीम जीतती रहती है, तब थोड़ा ज्यादा भी देखता हूँ इस बार जब मैच हो रहा था भारत वेस्ट इंडीज का, तो टी०वी० में सात मिनट देर से मैच आ रहा था। दूसरे न्यूज चैनल्स थे, उनमें अद्यतन स्थिति के बारे में जानकारी आ रही थी। मुझे यह देख कर बड़ी मायूसी हुई कि हम अपने दूरदर्शन पर लाइव ब्रॉडकास्ट नहीं देख पा रहे हैं। केवल मुझे ही मायूसी नहीं हुई, बल्कि जो हमारे जैसे अन्य देशवासी थे, जो क्रिकेट का मैच देखते हैं, क्रिकेट से प्रेम रखते हैं, उनको भी मायूसी हुई। महोदय, यह बहुत आवश्यक था कि मैच का

दूरदर्शन के माध्यम से डायरेक्ट प्रसारण हो, इसलिए इस दृष्टिकोण से यह बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण बिल है। महोदय, गांवों की ओर भी खराब स्थिति है। एक तो वहां पर टीवी कम हैं अगर टीवी हैं भी तो केवल कनेक्शन गांवों में नहीं होते हैं, वहां पर कोई सैटेलाइट से प्रसारण नहीं होता है। गांवों में जो भी टीवी होते हैं, उन पर केवल दूरदर्शन के प्रोग्राम ही उपलब्ध होते हैं। गांवों में दूरदर्शन का सीधा मैच प्रसारण नहीं होता है तो इससे सिर्फ शहर के लोगों को ही नहीं अपितु गांवों के लोगों को भी भारी मायूसी होती है और वे अच्छा खेल देखने से भी वंचित रह जाते हैं। महोदय, मैंने उद्देश्य और कारणों के कथन को भी देखा है, 98 परसेंट जनसंख्या के लिए दूरदर्शन प्रसारक हैं उनके लिए क्षेत्रीय अधिकार रखने वाला दूरदर्शन केवल एकमात्र नेटवर्क है। हमारा इतना बड़ा नेटवर्क है इतनी बड़ी जनसंख्या तक हमारी पहुंच है, ऐसी स्थिति में यह बिल बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण है। महोदय, इसका एक दूसरा पक्ष भी है। हम पर टीवी का प्रतिकूल असर भी पड़ता है। मैं उस पर नहीं बोलना चाहता हूं, लेकिन यह जरूर कहना चाहता हूं कि बच्चों की पढ़ाई पर इसका बहुत असर पड़ता है। फुटबाल का मैच 90 मिनट का होता है। थोड़े समय में मैच हो जाता था सुबह दस बजे से लेकर सायं पांच बजे तक क्रिकेट देखने में सरकारी काम में बाधा होती है, घरेलू काम में लगे होते हैं, उनको भी इससे बाधा होती है। पहले जो मैच पांच दिन का होता था, अब उसकी पॉपुलैरिटी एक दिन वाले मैच ने ले ली है। महोदय, मैं तिवारी जी के भाषण और वे अच्छी बात कह रहे थे। वे भी ग्रामीण परिवेश से ही आते हैं। हमारे जो गेम्स होते हैं, चाहे वे एशियन गेम्स हों या ओलम्पिक गेम्स हों, उनमें जो हमारी मैडल्स लेने की स्थिति है, वह अच्छी नहीं है। यदि ओलम्पिक गेम्स में हमारे पास एक सिल्वर मैडल भी आ जाता है तो हम बहुत प्रसन्न होते हैं। दुनिया में बहुत से छोटे-छोटे देश हैं, वे गोल्ड मैडल्स लेते हैं, सिल्वर मैडल्स लेते हैं जबकि हमारा देश इतना बड़ा देश है, हम गोल्ड मैडल नहीं ले पाते हैं और मुश्किल से ही कभी सिल्वर मैडल ओलम्पिक गेम्स में ले पाते हैं। हमें एशियन गेम्स में तो कभी कुछ मैडल मिल भी जाता है, मगर ओलम्पिक में नहीं। इस तरफ सरकार का ध्यान जाना चाहिए। हमारे गांवों के लोगों में टैलेन्ट्स हैं, हमें वहां टैलेन्ट्स ढूँढने की जरूरत है। वहां टैलेन्ट्स ढूँढकर अच्छा प्रशिक्षण दें तो.... (समय की घंटी).... निश्चित रूप से चाहे एशियन गेम्स हों या ओलम्पिक गेम्स हों, हमारे लड़के अच्छा प्रदर्शन करेंगे और हमें मैडल्स भी मिलेंगे। हमारे पारंपरिक गेम्स हैं, हॉकी है, कबड्डी है, फुटबाल है, इनके बारे में मंत्री महोदय कह रहे थे, जैसा मैंने सुना है कि क्रिकेट के लिए, टेनिस के लिए, स्पोर्ट्सशिप मिलती है, स्पोर्ट्स मिलते हैं, बड़ी संख्या में मिलते हैं, क्रिकेट में पैसा भी बहुत मिल रहा है मैंने समाचारपत्रों में पढ़ा है कि रियलमैट होने के बाद कई फुटबाल प्लेयर्स को चाय की दुकान खोलनी पड़ी है। यह कोई ठीक स्थिति नहीं है। जिसने देश का नाम रौशन किया है, जिसने देश को रिप्रजेन्ट किया है, रियल होने के बाद सरकार का काम है कि बहुत अच्छी सुविधाएं नहीं दे सकते हैं, जीवन जीने लायक सुविधाएं तो दी ही जा सकती है। दूसरे गेम्स पर भी सरकार को ध्यान देना चाहिए। उनके प्लेयर्स को बहुत आमदनी नहीं होती है। जितनी आमदनी आज क्रिकेट प्लेयर्स की होती है। रियलमैट के बाद उनकी भी देखभाल सरकार

को करनी चाहिए। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ, मैं मंत्री जी को बधाई देता हूँ और बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ। धन्यवाद।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Shrimati N.P. Durga. Please stick to the time. You have got only three minutes; please don't take more time than that.

SHRIMATI N.P. DURGA (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I rise to support this Bill moved by the hon. Minister of Information and Broadcasting. Though the Bill is a simple one, it is attached to the sentiments of sports-loving people who are eagerly waiting for this move of the Government. Hon. Minister himself is associated with football, and so, he would understand the difficulties of sports-loving people when live telecast of any cricket match, that too, held in India is not available. So, it is a good move. But the entire problem arose because as early as in November, 2005 the Government had issued guidelines without giving any statutory backing. The recent rift between Prasar Bharati and a private TV channel in connection with the telecast of One Day Cricket Series between India and West Indies led to promulgation of the Sports Broadcasting Signals Ordinance, 2007. The Bill also assumes importance when in only four days from today the Cricket World Cup is going to begin in the West Indies.

Sir, the Government had promulgated this Ordinance to unduly favour, if I may say so, Prasar Bharati, Prasar Bharati is supposed to be both economically and operationally an independent organization. Therefore, the question is limited only to telecast of sports, and not to the development of sports. The whole problem arose since *Nimbus* got telecast rights through an open bid, in which Doordarshan had also taken part, and the BCCI held the bid and it failed. Under the garb of *aam admi*, the Government is twisting the arm of the private player. On the one hand, Government says that there should be a level-playing field and on the other, under the garb of *aam admi*, take these kinds of measures. To what extent is it prudent? I leave it to the Minister.

Sir, the Government is encouraging a game like Cricket. In fact, it should have taken pride in saying that they are taking steps to promote soccer, hockey, kabaddi, kho-kho etc.

Sir, the first clarification I wish to seek from the hon. Minister is, what are the reasons or difficulties that Prasar Bharati has in encrypting as

suggested by content-provider, and making the content available on DD's terrestrial service and , whether you have any safeguards if you use unencrypted signals. The second one is, is it also true that if you use unencrypted signals, there is a possibility of signals being caught in our neighbouring countries and in West Asia? This may kindly be explained. The other point is, whether it is also true that a technical expert committee has been constituted in the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting to look into the issue of encryption to prevent the live feed from being pirated by broadcasters and cable TV operators within and outside India. If yes, the details may be given.

Sir, finally, is it not a fact that imminent promulgation of this Ordinance is a blow to the very notion of independent and free private enterprise and issuing Ordinance is in a sense legitimising piracy? The proposed legislation certainly frees Doordarshan from bidding telecast rights because once the private broadcasters win rights, Doordarshan would get unhindered access to it. The Bill does not speak which is of national importance and public interest. I am saying this because cricket certainly comes under the category of national importance, more than archery, football or chess. So, how the Government is going to classsify and define a sport as being of national importance and public interest? I would request the hon. Minister to clarify this.

So, Sir, these are some of the issues on which I wish to share my thoughts. I would request the hon. Minister to reply to the questions raised by me. Thank you.

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह (झारखंड): उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, अमूमन मैं इस बिल के बारे में बोलने के लिए तैयार नहीं होता, क्योंकि जिस व्यक्ति द्वारा यह बिल रखा गया है, न सिर्फ उनके विचारों से, बल्कि खेल के प्रति समर्पण की जो भावना है उनके अंदर है, उससे मैं अवगत हूँ। इस बिल के माध्यम से दो-तीन बातों को मैं उनके दिमाग में जरूर रखना चाहूंगा। मैं उनसे उम्मीद भी करता था और जिससे आपकी ज्यादा उम्मीद होती है, उसी से परेशानी भी होती है। माननीय मंत्री जी का यह बिल अगर अपने दूरदर्शन के सुधार की तरफ भी कुछ आगे बढ़ा होता तो मुझे और ज्यादा प्रसन्नता होती है। हमारे मित्र रवि शंकर प्रसाद जी ने कहा दूरदर्शन को अखिर आपने क्या बना रखा है; दूरदर्शन को निहायत वैसे मुलाजिम्ओं की जमात बना रखा है, जिनको कहीं जगह नहीं मिल रही हो, उनको दूरदर्शन में लाकर स्थापित कर दिया। रिटायर्मेंट हो रही तो और अच्छा है। मंत्री जी आज मैं आपसे बहुत विनम्रता से बात कहा चाहता हूँ कि प्रसार भारती बनाने का क्या मकसद था। उसका एक ही

मकसद था कि वैसे लोग, जो दुनिया की होड़ में शामिल होने वाली चीजों को आगे देख रहे हों, वैसे लोगों के समूह से टेलीविजन को चलाया जाए।

इतना पैसा लगा है भारत सरकार का, टैक्सपेयर्स का और पता नहीं मंत्री जी स्वयं दूरदर्शन को देखने की इच्छा रखते हैं या नहीं। क्या हालत हो गई है उसकी? इसलिए मेरी आपसे गुजारिश है कि यह जो बाबू लोगों की जमात आपने इकट्ठी की है, उससे थोड़ी मुक्ति दिलाइए। 30 साल, 35 साल, 40 साल वे दूरदर्शन में काम करते हैं और जब सबसे बड़ी जिम्मेदारी देने का समय आता है, तो आप IAS Officers Association के लोगों की बहाली कर देते हैं। इससे अगर आप बचेंगे नहीं, तो आप इसमें कितना भी संशोधन करें, आप इसको ठीक नहीं कर पाएंगे। इसलिए मेरी सलाह है कि आप अपने दूरदर्शन की ताकत को समझिए। आप भी उसकी ताकत इतनी है, जिसका कोई मुकाबला नहीं कर सकता है, इतना धन उसमें लगा हुआ है, अगर आप उसका इस्तेमाल करेंगे, तो कोई उसका मुकाबला नहीं कर सकता है।

मैं आपसे कोई लंबी-चौड़ी बात नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ। मुझे मालूम है कि आप खेल के प्रति समर्पित लोगों में से हैं और आपने जो किया है, वह खेल के लिए किया है, यह बात सही है, लेकिन दो बातें मैं आपकी जानकारी में लाना चाहता हूँ। एक बात तो मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहूंगा कि आपने कहा कि आप गरीब आदमी के लिए यह कर रहे हैं और आपके विचारों में भी प्रतिबद्धता है कि आप खेल को गरीब आदमी तक पहुंचाना चाहते हैं, लेकिन इसमें गरीब आदमी के साथ-साथ आपने यह क्लोज़ लगाया है कि आप DTH के जीतवन्ही इसको दिखाएंगे, तो मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि DTH गरीब आदमी के पास नहीं होता है, यह पैसे वाले के पास होता है। दोनों बातें नहीं चल सकती हैं, हम लोग तो 1991-92 से कह रहे हैं कि स्टार टीवी और सीता-सावित्री की संस्कृति, दोनों को आप एक-साथ नहीं चला सकते। अगर आप सचमुच आम आदमी के लिए करना चाहते हैं, तो इससे परहेज कीजिए। दूसरी बात मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहूंगा कि आप देश में इसका फैलाव करना चाहते हैं, लेकिन जो आपने क्लोज़ लगाया है 3(1), उसके तहत आपने Terrestrial Transmitters के बारे में कहा है। जो Terrestrial Transmitters हैं, आपको मालूम है कि उनका प्रसार कितनी दूर तक होता है—अरेबिया से लेकर जापान तक यह चला जाता है। तो विदेशियों को आप यह सुविधा क्यों दे रहे हैं? इसको कि तरह से आप रोकने का प्रयास करेंगे, इस बात की सफाई देश को मिलनी चाहिए, नहीं तो इससे confusion पैदा होंगे।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बिल बहुत अच्छा है, खेल के प्रति समर्पित है, इस बिल से मेरा कोई विरोध नहीं है, लेकिन इसकी दो खामियां हैं, जो मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ और मुझे यकीन है कि जिन लोगों ने यह बिल बनाया होगा, उन्होंने इसका ख्याल नहीं रखा होगा। आपके जैसे आदमी की राय इन दो clauses के बारे में स्पष्ट है, यह मैं व्यक्तिगत तौर पर जानता हूँ। इसलिए जब आप अपना भाषण करेंगे, तो इन चीजों का ख्याल रखेंगे।

अंत में मंत्री जी, मैं आपसे एक बात कहना चाहूंगा कि आप खुद फुटबाल एसोसिएशन के प्रेजीडेंट हैं, मैं राईफल एसोसिएशन का प्रेजीडेंट हूँ, यशवंत सिन्हा जी, टेनिस एसोसिएशन के प्रेजीडेंट रहे हैं, आप यह गलतफहमी मत पालिए कि गांव-गांव में क्रिकेट देखा जाता है। मैं इसको बहुत ईमानदारी से कह रहा हूँ कि आप भी गांव-गांव में फुटबाल सबसे ज्यादा लोकप्रिय खेल है। कुछ लोगों ने, आपके टेलीविजन में क्रिकेट दिखाने की सुविधा दी और यह तो खेल ही शर्म का खेल है। मैं किसी खेल के खिलाफ नहीं हूँ, मैं भी क्रिकेट देखता हूँ, यह तो उपनिवेशवाद ... (व्यवधान) कौन कहता है? मैं तो कल ही अपने गांव जा रहा हूँ फुटबाल के कप बांटने के लिए, जहां कम से कम 20,000 लोग आएंगे। आज भी फुटबाल गांव-गांव में खेला जाता है और उसे देखने के लिए ज्यादा से ज्यादा लोग आते हैं मैं आपसे इतना कहना चाहूंगा कि आपके दूरदर्शन के लोग पहले जब खेल दिखाते थे, तो रॉयल्टी के तौर पर कुछ राशि एसोसिएशंस को देते थे, अब वह पैसा देना आपने बंद कर दिया है। हमारा खुद का कितना ही पैसा आप पर बकाया है-वर्ल्ड शूटिंग कराई थी, कॉमनवैलथ कराया था, वह पैसा आज तक नहीं मिला है आप जैसा खेल प्रेमी आया है, आप इसका ख्याल रखें कि इन चीजों का निपटारा जरा जल्दी हो जाए। आप अपने दूरदर्शन वालों और ऑल इंडिया रेडियो वालों को कहिए कि यह हो जाए। आप बहुत अच्छी नीयत से यह बिल लाए हैं, मैं इस बात को मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूँ कि आम आदमी को इससे नुकसान होगा, आम आदमी को इससे फायदा होगा, लेकिन अगर इन दो बातों को आप स्पष्ट करेंगे, तो आपकी मंशा भी लोगों को समझ में आ जाएगी कि मंत्री जी बहुत सोच-समझकर, आम लोगों के लिए यह बिल लाए थे। धन्यवाद।

SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI (West Bengal): Mr. Vice Chairman, Sir, I stand here not only to support this Bill but also to compliment the hon. Minister who besides being good friend is also a sports person. Sir, normally, I was always opposed to politicians being in sports unless they themselves are sports people. But, today, I think, I have to change my views by seeing the contribution of so many people here whether it is Shri Sharad Pawarji, Shri Priya Ranjan Dasgupta, my friend Shri Digvijay Singhji or Shri Jaitleyji. I think, only the people's representatives will take care and support whatever is good for the people, and, this particular Bill, Sir, is in that direction.

Sir, our friend Shri Ravi Shankar Prasad has already mentioned a lot of stuff. I do not want to get involved into it and he has said it all. Sir, so vividly and so rightly, the hon. Minister gave the background and went back into the history how All India Radio and Doordarshan have been pioneered. We have our hon. Minister for Health sitting here, and, it is known how AIIMS has been pioneered in giving public health services. Sir, the reason of my mentioning all these things is that these are for the common people and cricket has also become a game for the common

people. So, in that direction, I would like to compliment the Minister but when he was giving the reasons, the history and the background, I thought, Sir, I would like to take this opportunity also to mention that this is a wake up call for the Government. I am not against the private sector but this is what the private sector can do. They can blackmail at the last minute the way the hon. Minister mentioned about the West Indies game. I am very glad that he has taken the right step. But, at the same time, I have always believed that a private monopoly is worse than a public monopoly because a public monopoly is accountable, at least, to the people and to this hon. Parliament but a private monopoly is accountable only to money and nothing else. So, again, I want to compliment the hon. Minister for bringing forward this Bill at the right time. Normally, I do not support the Ordinances but this is one such, which I have no hesitation to support.

Sir, I will not take much time of the House. Sir, India is considered to be a country, which has unity in diversity in many areas. Cricket is one such example, where irrespective of caste, creed, religion, colour of the skin, who comes from which region, and, without reservation, players come and play. Cricket is one such game, which unites this country, and, rightly so, the common man on the street has a right to know as to what is happening in the game.

Sir, today, if you see the composition of the team itself, you have people who are coming from such a humble background where the parents have hardly means to train the boys and lot of these boys, these youngsters, these talented people have got inspiration out of watching the game purely on Doordarshan, and, I won't be wrong if I say that they perhaps would not even have the means or the money to go and buy a ticket and watch the game.

So, from that angle also, Sir, I would like to compliment the Minister. Yes, we have the right to give this game to the common households where the boys are encouraged to participate so that finally we see them not only shining for themselves but truly making India proud.

Sir, I understand from the hon. Minister, and he has mentioned it, that 70 per cent of the revenue comes from India and the Indian viewership. Sir, I would like to know what is the share, how much the country gets. I have no problem BCCI becoming rich. I have no problem at all. Whenever a game of cricket takes place, for the *bandobast* --whether it is stadium,

[9 March, 2007]

RAJYA SABHA

whether it is in terms of physical assets, whether it is security, whether it is police, whether it is traffic--lot of money is being earned and I have no problem. But if the country is giving the support, I think, the BCCI must share their profitability with the Government. I am sure they must be sharing but the proportion has to go up manifolds, and, I tell you why, Sir. Today, we have villages where there is no drinking water. We have villages where there are no facilities for health or education. People are also not getting two square meals. Game of cricket cannot fulfill the entire thing but, at least, it will be a drop in the ocean. So, my humble submission to the hon. Minister would be also that some sharing of this entire revenue of the BCCI, the lion's share must come to the exchequer and that money should be spent for the needy and the poor. I have two points, Sir. I know that I have to conclude.

Sir, we have talked about pay channels. Sir, today, pay channels have become very complicated. I totally agree with my friend, Digvijay Singhji. I also do not understand what comes on which pay channel. I think somewhere it should be made very simple that if you want to watch Doordarshan or some Government channel, you just do not need anything, whether it is a Set-Top Box or whatever it is. I think something needs to be done. Otherwise, as he said, we are giving rights but the people will not get the signal. Again, they will have to go through same complicated process.

Having said that, Sir, I know that I do not not have much time, but, again, I would like to compliment the Government, especially the hon. Minister, and I wholeheartedly support this Bill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Shri Sharad Ananttrao Joshi. Please remember the time constraint.

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI: (Maharashtra): Sir, what is the time given to me?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): You can take five or six minutes.

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI: Sir, as a cricket lover and a cricket player of the R.G. Nadkarni and Nari Contractor vintage, I should welcome this Bill because that would give the opportunity to spectators and those interested in the game of cricket even in the distant villages to watch the

game. If that was, all I would only be complimenting the Minister and welcoming the Bill.

In fact, however, Sir, I stand to formally oppose this Bill on my personal behalf and on behalf of the Swatantra Bharat Party, which is the only liberal party in the country. This Bill is a knee-jerk reaction which came firstly in the form of a notification and now being put in the form of a Bill. The immediate provocation was, of course, the desire of the people to be able to see cricket matches, particularly those played outside India. But there are going to be some long-term consequences.

The first consequence is going to be that the myth of the autonomy of Prasar Bharati is broken. Prasar Bharati is now clearly seen as an arm of the Government. If this is how the Prasar Bharati is going to grow, then, the dream that one day Prasar Bharati will be autonomous in the same way as the British Broadcasting Corporation, would be frustrated. There are absolutely no hopes of survival.

Secondly, Sir, the most important point is that a company or a channel or a content owner has acquired the rights of broadcasting or telecasting in a particular normal contractual way. There was a time when during the emergency, we put the word 'socialism' in the Preamble of the Constitution. The Supreme Court judgement used to say that in view of the fact that socialism is the tenet in the Constitution, we interpret the law in a particular way.

Sir, recently, in a case, the Supreme Court decided that any officer who was suspended would not necessarily get the arrears of pay, etc. The Supreme Court has said since the market economy is the basis of our economic policy, we give a judgement of this type.

Now, nowhere 'socialism' is really the basic tenet, even though it continues to be in the Preamble. Therefore, anybody who has acquired the rights to telecast in a proper manner, to expropriate it by a mere fiat of a notification or a law is an encroachment on the rights of private property. Firstly, this is arbitrary. What is of 'national importance' is very difficult to say. You would say that the cricket matches of the World Cup are of national importance. But then why didn't you think of it when we were playing kabaddi matches in Doha and we were coming on the top?

We had only fifteen-minute coverage of the Kabaddi matches in Doha Games in the evening. We did not think of providing live coverage of those matches. So, there is a certain slant in this Bill. The Government, at any point of time, can say that this event is of national importance. The representatives of the Bollywood are not here, but, I am afraid if the Government turns to say that there is something of national importance even in fields other than sports and the rights can be acquired by Prasar Bharti, then, I would say that this Bill would provide the thin end of the wedge. Nimbus is already in the court and we are passing this Bill. This Bill is not going to be approved by the Supreme Court. I can tell you that. You will come back again with an amendment to the Constitution because this kind of an encroachment on the private property is unlikely to be accepted by the courts. And if the amendment itself is rejected, the Minister will say that we will have to revise the Ninth Schedule. This is exactly the manner that was followed when we abrogated property rights, and, I am afraid, this is going to be the procedure that will be followed here. And, therefore, this is a thin end of the wedge. It was open to Prasar Bharti to go and negotiate with Nimbus, to find out what would be a commercially and economically viable contractual way.

Sir, one more point is, if we wanted this kind of an authority, the correct thing to do was what France did. Sir, France introduced colour televisions eight years after the United States because France wanted a system of television telecasting which would not be on American system. Therefore, they waited and have an entirely different system which uses a different number of cross lines. If you wanted that your telecasting should be a national priority, then, you should not have easily borrowed the technology from the Americans. You should have developed your own technology.

Lastly, Sir, precisely when every Member in the House is talking about the rights of the farmers against SEZs, if we say that farmers' rights are important but on intellectual property rights we maintain they are not important, I think, we are setting a very wrong precedent. Sir, I oppose the Bill formally, I would say, when it comes to vote, I will ask for division and vote against it. •

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Thank you. Now, Mr. K.P.K. Kumaran.

SHRI K.P.K. KUMARAN (Tamil Nadu): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman. Sir, I support this Bill. The signals of sports events of national importance must be made available to all citizens, especially common people living in rural areas. Sir, more the sports is broadcast, it would be better for the youth who would take up sports and games, and they will have less time and inclination for anti-social activities. So, I support this Bill. I have one caution. The money earned by sportspersons directly arises out of TV coverage. So, the ad revenue earned by these broadcasts has a direct bearing on the money earned by sportspersons. As the Minister says, because of Doordarshan coverage, overall commerce is growing, then, that is fine. But, these measures must ensure that the overall commerce does not come down because of the measures taken in this Bill.

Sir, I will also record my objection to the statement of the hon. Member from AIADMK Party. He made a hypothetical assumption and based on that assumption, he made an unwarranted statement casting aspersions on the integrity of the Government...*(Interruptions)*...and sun TV.

SHRI N. JOTHI: You cannot say what I should speak . *(Interruptions)* You have no right...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): You can put forward your views. *(Interruptions)*...Please, please...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI K.P.K. KUMARAN: This House is not the forum for making such hypothetical statements. *(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): You continue your speech...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. JOTHI: It is not hypothetical. It is a matter of fact. I am telling you...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI K.P.K. KUMARAN: Kindly appreciate the Minister's statement, saying that the money earned out of the cricket broadcast is going to be used for the telecast of other sports and games.

This is the only way that we can bring up the other disciplines, Sir. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Now, the Minister.

SHRI PRIYARANJAN DASMUNSI: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, first of all, I sincerely congratulate all the distinguished Members who took part in this debate. Before I begin the merit of the debate and give my response, I would like to state that the Government and this House together, we wish a great success of the Indian team in West Indies and hope that our team would come back victorious. Sir, if you see the text of the Bill and the title of the Bill, you will find that it is not a cricket-specific Bill. The Bill is not named as cricket mandatory sharing. Incidentally, the word cricket has come, that is a different issue. But the Bill is titled as The Sports Broadcasting Signals (Mandatory Sharing with Prasar Bharati) Bill, 2007. Sir, my distinguished friend and colleague, an eminent lawyer Jothiji, began the debate on the technical flaws of the law, as he understood, and felt that the UPA Government is trying to embarrass someone. I do not know why Jothiji always suffers for his own political problem. I am also head of a sports body and I tell you honestly that my Executive Committee has opposed me. But I cannot forget that I took an oath under the Constitution before the Rashtrapati before joining the Government not to encourage the conflict of interest, but to defend the interest of the public, come what may. If you feel that individually, some sports body is not happy, its all right. Next to cricket in the country, the sports which can get some money is football, and I am proud to say that since my boyhood, I have been watching and playing football. I grew in football and would like to die in football. That is my passion. There is no question of politics or winning the election or not. It is something different. It is some dedication, some common sense. Sir, is India doing something extraordinary? Is the Government doing something extraordinary? I would like to inform Jothiji that I am not a competent lawyer like him. I respect your legal acumen, I respect the legal acumen of Shri Arun Jaitley. Sometimes, some of your arguments educate me. I must admit this. But I would like to say with all humility at my command that this Government is not at all interfering in the internal matters of any sports body. We uphold the autonomy of the sports body. The Government should not interfere with the sports autonomy of any sports body, the Government cannot do so, and the Government in future should not interfere with the sports autonomy of any sports body, whether it is cricket, kabaddi or any other sports. That is a different issue. Sir, I take only one thing. I will not read out all. This is not the time to do so. I respect the BCCI, its President, and all the colleagues. How respectful they are to the country and me also! They, in their own declaration about

the rights distribution, have said, and I quote. "The exercise and enjoyment of the media right is subject to the broadcaster guidelines, which were issued in 2005. The branding guidelines and all applicable laws of the relevant territory, including, without limitation, the local laws relating to the television and radio coverage of designated events of major important events in society, if any." I respect it. They accepted it. They honoured it. They embraced it. Everyone respects the law of the land, and then accommodate how it is fitted. Sir, I take now the liberty to inform you about the relevant part of the law of Australia. The Australian law is much more stringent. There, they have made it clear that not only the first option of entire coverage to be given to their own terrestrial net....

They call it SKS or ABS.

The name is here.

"The Minister shall decide which event. And the law is passed by the Parliament."

Similarly in U.K. You cannot just agree or arrange any kind of agreement for a full coverage or part coverage without giving the total domain of the public view. Of course, there is a provision of nominal fees. 'Nominal'. I am using the word 'nominal'. I am not doing something *hara-kiri*. I am not doing something against sports body. I am quite aware of the sports; sports bodies have to get their money by their sponsors, have to get their money by television. That is the only earning channel. But I begin with a recently concluded sports channel 'Neo Sports'. Some Members have got it right. What is the statement? Have you gone through the statement, published in the *Economics Times* and the *Business Standard*. They say: "Before the terrestrial platform was opened, the revenue was less than what we expected. The moment it was opened, we got new clients. Because of 110 million homes, it jumped up to 32.5 crores!" They admitted it. Therefore, every business house wants, "My brand, my product, my campaign should have the larger viewers." And that is why, we have said in the clause that the sharing formula should not be with your advertisement; you take it. In addition to that, if you want to earn more revenue, you do it. If we do it, we do it. But take that Rs. 75/- What wrong have we done? I do not understand what wrong we have done. Sharadji says 'grabbing private property'. We are not grabbing private property. What property are we grabbing? Doordarshan is losing. Sir, Doordarshan is losing. When you

[9 March, 2007]

RAJYA SABHA

2.00 P.M.

bundle the right with the terrestrial right and sell it, how do you, without the consent of the Prasar Bharati, do it? British law says 'with the consent'. Austrian law says 'prior consent'. You said it. We did not bring it because we believe in sports certainly. The question is why the laws are not brought earlier. Because we believe in these sports certainly. We believe in the negotiating mechanism as a sports-friendly atmosphere. That is why the guideline was imposed. You said it; Jothiji said it. Well, I do not claim any legal acumen though I studied law and practised in Calcutta High Court for a certain period.

SHRI N. JOTHI: We were together.

SHRI PRIYARANJAN DASMUNSI: But I just tell you, yes, I am fortunate to have been taught by Sabyasachi Mukherjee and Chittodas Mukherjee. All have become eminent Chief Justices and Justices of various courts. Sir, at the heart of hearts, I always feel that the sports body which is to carry the bills of everybody has to take the players' bill, conduct bill, programme bill, promotion bill, training bill, coaching bill; no Government will pay for that. And they need sponsors' support; they need television support. At no point of time, our mind is open; otherwise I would have passed this, having seen by the Cabinet, and come back. There is a purpose behind this. When the Cabinet gave a direction, let a technical committee be constituted, and the committee should deliver how the encryption mechanism could be worked out, how the DTH mechanism could be worked out, and we shall come out with a decision. My mind is open; Government's mind is open. We do not have a closed mind. Come and catch hold of something; embarrass someone. Those things are with you. I know you mean something. If any friend has helped me, if any friend in the Cabinet has helped me, to respond to the public interest, it was my colleague Sharad Pawarji in the Cabinet. Therefore, don't be under the impression that there is politics, Mr. Jothi. That is why my distinguished predecessor, Ravi Shankar Prasadji spoke at length. Many of the things I share with you. Yes, we do not have a regulator now. Why? The comprehensive Broadcasting Bill which was attempted in 1997, which was attempted by Sushmaji, got foiled because of collapse of Parliament, dissolution of Lok Sabha and holding of elections.

We have taken a decision to bring a comprehensive Bill. We have engaged in talks with the stakeholders on three principal counts. Number

one, the Government should not regulate. Number two, the Government should not interfere in the content of terrestrial base of the TV or the newspapers. Number three, the Government should give some guidelines and shall not impose itself as an arbitrator in the matter. Let them manage their system as the Press Council of India does. Ravi Shankarji has subscribed a view to the encryption part. That is why my entire talk with the stakeholders is not over. It is still on. I said in the beginning that it would be one of the most important Bills that any democratic nation of the world has ever witnessed. That is what we are doing. We are talking of BBC. Sharad Joshiji, I would tell you, with all respect and without accusing any Government, that the report on the issue of Weapons of Mass Destruction, whether they are there in Iraq or not, was reported by BBC. You must know about the so-called freedom, the so-called independence of BBC. The British Government sacked lock, stock and barrel all the top people of BBC. There was no hue and cry in the House of Commons. We don't do it here. If some private channel abuse me or accuse you, we try to negotiate. You can furnish some information. We just give him some show cause notice. We wait for the reply. We again negotiate. Our democratic atmosphere and culture is unparalleled in the world history. So, we do it in our country. Is this particular legislation grabbing the private property? Grabbing means, you have a profiteering mind. We are losing, Sharad Joshiji. Arun Jaitleyji was also in my chair earlier in this office as also Ravi Shankarji. We are losing. The Doordarshan is losing revenue by showing these games. But during that time, the Doordarshan could show so many other things and programmes. But it is a public service obligation that has been vested by the Parliament on Doordarshan. I tell you, Sharad Joshiji, there are many people who abuse Doordarshan every day and they have a right to do so, including you, and we have a right to correct ourselves. I bow my head when criticism comes because most of the criticisms are correct. Again you think of it. There were National Games in Assam. I was in Berlin for a Film Festival a few days ago. The whole European Press was there, including Steinmeier, No. 2 in German Government. The German Government has signed an agreement with India. They were amazed and asked, "How is it possible that you are having the National Games in Assam?". The European media told me that it is next to impossible. Every boy and girl from every part of the country reached there in spite of their parents' decision or indecision, whether they would be killed or shot dead. All shooters, all kabadi players, football players, etc., went to the place to

salute the country and show that we are one. I should say, without accusing any private channel, except Doordarshan no private channel found time to focus for ten minutes on any one of the athletes who assembled in Assam from Kashmir to Cape Comarin. This is done only by Doordarshan. Polio campaign, it is done by Doordarshan; anti-aids campaign, it is done by Doordarshan; Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan, it is done by Doordarshan; how to fight flu, the details have been prescribed by the Health Ministry and doctors, to be shown selectively by Doordarshan. I don't accuse anybody. I only mention about public service obligation. Take, for example, krishi. Sharad Joshiji, you are one of the champions of farmers issues. You tell me about any one channel in India except Doordarshan which conducts long programme on krishi thing. But you find that Doordarshan is grabbing. They are loosing. उन्होंने कहा कि इसमें जो 25 पैसा मिलेगा, वह हमको रखने दीजिए, लेकिन हमने कहा, नहीं, उनके कमाए हुए पैसे को आप लोге, यह बात ठीक नहीं है। देश को दिखाओ, लेकिन उस पैसे को उन लोगों में बांटो जिनके गेम को दिखाने के लिए कोई तैयार नहीं होता है, जिसके लिए किसी बिस्किट कम्पनी का एक लाख या पचास हजार का बैनर भी नहीं मिलता है। लेकिन वह गेम कौन तय करेगा? वह मिनिस्टर तय नहीं करेगा, उसे एपेक्स बॉडी ऑफ द स्पोर्ट्स, इंडियन ओलिम्पिक एसोसिएशन, स्पोर्ट्स मिनिस्ट्री, प्रसार भारती और वह पार्टिकुलर डिसिप्लिन तय करेगा, जिसमें वह गेम खेला जाएगा। वे लोग तय करेंगे कि हमारा इस साल में फलाना चैम्पियन होगा, फलाना क्वार्टर फाइनल होगा, वह तय करेंगे बैठकर। इसमें क्या बुराई है। इसलिए मैं आपसे यह दरख्वास्त कर रहा हूँ कि प्रसार भारती के बारे में बहुत कुछ कहना चाहिए, जरूर कहिए, मैं जवाब दूंगा। आज तो मैं लिमिट में हूँ इस बिल के अंदर। लेकिन मैं आपको कह रहा हूँ कि आज की तारीख में भी Prasar Bharti's entertainment, you can say, is not good. यही प्रसार भारती ने किया। प्रसार भारती ने रमायण, महाभारत को घर-घर पहुंचाया। यही प्रसार भारती ने स्पोर्ट्स ऑफ टीवू सुल्तान सब को पहुंचाया। हां, इसमें कुछ कमी है। I agree with Shri Ravi Shankar Prasad fully that the Prasar Bharati should get a kind of professional culture within itself which is free from the so called Babu culture of the bureaucracy. I agree with you. That is why the UPA Government has appointed a Group of Ministers chaired by Shri Shivraj Patil to look into three aspects: the employees issue, the programme issue and how to professionalise the whole system and to bring appropriate amendment to the Act itself. The Group of Ministers is to conclude its findings. The moment it is there, the Cabinet will come with a policy and I will come back to you. I fully share and sincerely support your contention in this regard. I have nothing to say against that.

Now I come back to the main issue of the Bill. The Bill is supported widely. There are two apprehensions which you all have mentioned. The first apprehension is, whether the signal will be pirated and in that case why India should subsidise other countries who do not have a right to it. As a Minister, as an MP, as a sports lover and as a sports administrator, I fully support the entire apprehension. Since I am a very typical man, I immediately wrote this question to Nimbus. I said, "My report is till yesterday, not one part of a signal has been pirated in Sri Lanka, Bangladesh and Pakistan. If you can bring one instance, I will take action". In the meeting, they said, "It is not in our Terms of Reference. So, we should not debate on this issue." Factually, there was no pirated issue in that. But it can be. It is not that it was done. I say, "It can be." I did talk to the Technical Section. The Technical Section informed me, "The DD signals are generally beamed from PAS 10 Satellite which is called world beam. However, during cricket match, the signals are beamed through INSAT-3E which is restricted to India with natural spill over to neighbouring countries only like Bangladesh, Pakistan, Nepal, Bhutan and Sri Lanka. INSAT-3E beams are not visible in Japan and other South East Asian countries with normal dish. Yes, because Sri Lanka is a cricketing nation, Pakistan is a cricketing nation and Bangladesh has also joined, they may spill over there. Then again I checked it up. I found that when the world rights or ICC rights are distributed, they are not distributed to a company alone. The company also immediately engages its clients in respective parts of the country who will take their feed, this and that, etc. Yes, there can be a risk. Then I again talked to the Technical Section. They said, "We have 1,400 transmitting points. We need 1,400 decoders. The moment we encrypt the 1400 decoders in our prime terrestrial channel, during that period the entire screen would go blank. If something goes wrong in the country and I am to send a message to Pakistan or China or Bangladesh, if something goes wrong or the Parliament debated something, or the Prime Minister said something, that will be missed on that day, at that point, because cricket has encrypted the entire thing. Then I got technical answer, "No, if that situation prevails, you can switch on something and then instantly the encryption will be again delinked and things can come. I heard all these things. Sir, I am waiting for the outcome of the last meeting on 16th because the gentleman who is very much involved in this Committee, the BCCI representative, Shri Bindra, requested to have the last meeting on 16th.

After the 16th meeting is over--I have an open mind — I will come back with proper provisions with regard to rules and guidelines, or, by own arrangements. But I can assure the House that the Government's intention is not to cripple somebody whose money is at stake or to cripple somebody as a prisoner. No; that is not our intention. Our intention is limited for the public viewers in the terrestrial environment.

Now I come back to DTH. Ravi Shankarji and Digvijayji rightly said that the DTH is almost to those who can afford the money. But Arunji or Ravi Shankarji will agree with me that the DTH concept of Sun or Tata or Zee may be for profit and commercial purposes. But when the DTH concept was conceived, — Ravi Shankarji was the Minister then -- the whole approach was not made thinking of Delhi and Kolkata. The whole approach was made keeping in mind some vulnerable parts of India, where even the Cable Operators cannot operate, like the North-Eastern State, Jammu and Kashmir and some remote areas from where the Army operates, and the only instrument is DTH. In these areas, the DTH is very much required and is very much essential. I will tell you; the one part of India, where television link cannot reach and which is supported only by DTH, is Nicobar Island. There was also a query as to what would happen if we take total recourse to DTH. But I fully assure that if sports players and stakeholders do not get a flexible operation system, for their revenue generation point, to support their contract bid, it will be difficult. My mind is open. I am waiting only up to 16th when the rules will be framed. Before the Budget Session comes to an end, we will come back with all the details. I am again talking to then stakeholders, on my own, not leaving everything to Prasar Bharati because I feel that the sports bodies, sports supporters and sports sponsors should not be treated as our enemy or devil. They are our friends. And I like to take that spirit into account always.

Sir, I would now answer a few queries that were put. Jothiji asked as to who would specify the terms and conditions. Section 2 defines specifically all the areas, with specifications under the guidelines issued in Section 5. Like, he asked: On the Penalty I code, who should compensate? And, why should someone compulsorily compensate? The answer is this. Section 4 clearly states about penalties including suspension or revocation of licences, which will be an effective deterrent. Ravi Shankarji asked, "Why are you keeping it with the Central Government? Why are you not keeping it with a regulator?" Since regulation has not been done by a

comprehensive law, the concept of a regulator is yet to materialise. We are keeping it open. You know,— you were the Minister — that uplinking and broadcasting licenses are not applied to Prasar Bharati; it is applied to the I&B Ministry, and the Ministry gives the registration; the Ministry gives the licences. That is why I say, the moment a comprehensive Bill comes, we will pass it on to the regulator. That is what I would say in response to this query.

Again, as for Jothiji's apprehension, he should be happy to know that guidelines were made on the direction of the Court. But if he asks why we had it on downlinking and uplinking, it is because we did not have a guideline, and it is not that the guideline was stayed or quashed by any court of law. Only the petitioner failed. Sir, why am I bound to a guideline? The BCCI did not say that. The BCCI said, "Respect all the regulations of the country. The party, the individual companies, said, "I am not bound by it. I am the Ten Sports. I am not bound by it." The ESPN said, "I am not bound by it. Bring a Law." And we brought a law. I, therefore, feel that the Government has no intention to undermine the importance of any game. Sir, I am not talking of sports issue now since it is not the subject of mine today; it is the subject of the Minister of Sports. When we discuss it, I will join him. But, for God's sake, don't compare cricket with football, with such casual comments because one is a complete professional game, called cricket, limited to 12-14 nations, and the other has three nets, namely, amateur net, semi-professional net and professional net. You play with 12-14 countries; we have to play with 204 nations, more than the Members of the United Nations. You have to compete with Sri Lanka, Pakistan and Bangladesh. We have to compete at every stage with 45 countries or so. I do admit that we are amateurs. We are trying to become semi-professionals. When we can become professionals depends on the market economy. And the game that we used to play, Ravi Shankarji, in your youth days, it was a 70-minute game of football. Cricket timings have not been changed. But football timings have gone from 70 to 90 minutes. Now, the direction is, if there is a draw, you have to play for 120 minutes. The whole dimension has changed. The whole approach has changed. We are trying our best. We did not get that much market support which we wished to. But I again say that Government's intentions are that we should not pay any heed to any sports body, any sponsor or any right-holder but to try to ensure, through this Bill, that public viewing is guaranteed to the terrestrial audience.

[9 March, 2007]

RAJYA SABHA

I am grateful, Sir, to all the hon. Members who have given their valuable suggestions. I purposely did not bring my notes today because I told my office that, after the debate, all the suggestions will be compiled and incorporated in the rules which will suit the basic purpose of the sports bodies and the Government.

Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Now, the question is:—

That the Bill to provide access to the largest number of listeners and viewers, on a free to air basis, of sporting events of national importance through mandatory sharing of sports broadcasting signals with Prasar Bharati and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto, as passed by Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration.

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): We shall not take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 2 to 10 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI PRIYARANJAN DASMUNSI: Sir, I move:—

That the Bill be passed.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): The Bill is passed.

SHRI SHARADANANTRAO JOSHI: No.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Why? You did not object to any clause. How can you... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI: Sir, I will only request you to... *(Interruptions)* ... the Bill has been struck down by the court. *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): But I have already announced that the Bill is passed.

The House is adjourned to meet again at 2.30 p.m.

*The House then adjourned at
eighteen minutes past two of the clock.*

*The House reassembled at thirty three minutes past two of the clock,
Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair*

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS—RESOLUTION

Inflation and steep rise in prices of essential commodities of mass consumption

SHRI SYED AZEEZ PASHA (Andhra Pradesh) Mr. Deputy Chairman,
Sir, I move the following Resolution—

"That this House expresses its serious concern over failure of the Government to check the run away inflation and steep rise in the prices of essential commodities of mass consumption and urges upon the Government that—

- (iii) the procurement and public distribution system be enhanced and strengthened;
- (iv) measures be taken to stop forward trading and
- (v) a detailed plan of action to check the growing inflation and price rise be placed before this House."

Sir, through this Resolution, I am impressing upon the Government to take some effective measures because the common man is already in real trouble. We are seeing that these skyrocketing prices are creating havoc for the common man as his real income is getting eroded due to this high inflation and price-rise. We are seeing that the rural folk are spending about 50 per cent of their income on their food bill, and the urban people's family budget has increased between 25 per cent to