

[श्री श्रीकांत वर्मा]

तो उसको केवल उन्हीं सिफारिशों को स्वीकार नहीं करना चाहिए जो कि सुविधाजनक हों या जो उसे सुविधाजनक लगती है, बल्कि उन सिफारिशों को भी स्वीकार करना चाहिए जो उसे असुविधाजनक लगें क्योंकि इसमें बहुत सी ऐसी सिफारिशें हैं जिनको कि शायद सरकार स्वीकार करना नहीं चाहेगी। मैं चाहता हूँ, आज ही आडवाणी जी यह आश्वासन दें कि वे वर्गीज कमेटी की मुख्य सिफारिशों की अवहेलना नहीं करेंगे।

REFERENCE TO ALLEGED DEMOLITIONS IN SUBZI MANDI AREA, DELHI

श्री सीताराम केसरी (बिहार) :
उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं एक बात की ओर सदन का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): No, no. This discussion is going on.

श्री सीताराम केसरी : बहुत सीरियस बात है। सब्जी मंडी एरिया में मकानात गिराए जा रहे हैं, लाठी चार्ज हो रहा है—पुलिस कर रही है। इस पर सरकार का ध्यान हम अपनी ओर से आकर्षित करना चाहते हैं। जनता सरकार ने जिस आधार पर वोट लिए, अब सरकार में आकर वही काम नहीं कर रहे हैं क्या। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी सारे मकान गिराए जा रहे हैं और लाठी चार्ज हो रहा है।

DISCUSSION UNDER RULE 176

Report of the working group on autonomy for Akashvani and Doordarshan—contd.

DR. SARUP SINGH (Haryana):
Sir, I agree with many things that

Shri Shrikant Verma has said. In fact I am greatly impressed by quite a few things that he has said. I think the Opposition parties always feel that if the Prime Minister has a hand in nominating anybody or recommending somebody's nomination, perhaps that would be a political decision. However, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, there is a difficulty here. How are some of these people appointed? Take the Chairman of the University Grants Commission, Chairman of the Union Public Service Commission, Judges, Vice-Chancellors of certain Central Universities, etc. I have been giving a lot of thought to this. I personally feel that the appointees must be free as far as possible; they must not be under the pressure of anybody. I hate and resent political pressure. And I can assure Shri Verma that I will not be a partisan at all in a matter like this, because it is a national matter. After all, the All-India Radio and Doordarshan are very sensitive areas, very vital areas of our national life. Firstly, I am of the opinion that in all matters, not merely in the case of All India Radio but in most matters at any rate, it should be possible for us to take non-party decisions.

In a multi-party system, in a plural society, it is absolutely necessary that we rise above politics. I am not a politician myself. I have come to politics very recently and I feel that it is bad politics, unhealthy politics, which invades all aspects of our national life. Unfortunately, some of the fear of Mr. Verma may not be baseless. But then I would like to say this to him, universities were given autonomy and slowly and gradually that autonomy was eroded. Who was responsible for this erosion? I have been Vice-Chancellor myself. I can assure him that it is not the Government alone that erodes the autonomy of an institution. There are so many areas from which the attacks come. They come from, I am sorry to say, Mr. Vice-Chairman, essentially from the political parties in the country. I

do not blame one political party; I blame all political parties. They were responsible for the erosion of autonomy in our universities in the country, and we have reached a stage where university education is becoming difficult. In fact, we have reached a stage where we cannot even get Vice-Chancellors.

Now, what system could be evolved whereby the best possible man in the country might be made the chairman of this kind of a trust, which has been proposed. I have seen the Verghese Committee Report. It has said a very sensible thing, choose three man or women, constitute them into a panel, they themselves should be non-political, national figures like the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, the Chairman of the Union Public Service Commission and the Lokpal, when you have a Lokpal; and then something remarkable, that when the names have been received by the Prime Minister, the Prime Minister does not just say that it goes to so and so, because it is politically more convenient; not at all. The recommendation is that the Prime Minister should also consult the Leader of the Opposition. In fact, I am surprised that such a Report should have not made them feel very enthusiastic. I agree with him entirely that autonomy depends on national ethos. It is very true that without that kind of a national ethos we cannot reach anywhere. But how do you create national ethos? Unfortunately, what can one do when everything becomes politically motivated.

I was surprised, for instance, to learn the other day that Mr. Advani was being attacked for having removed somebody from the Bombay Television Centre, or something like that, because she was a Muslim. Later on somebody told me that she was a Hindu. Yes, she was a Hindu. Now, I was puzzled and later on I was amused that she was not removed at all. The point is that we will always continue quarrelling. Unless you take it out of the area of quarrel, nothing

can be done. If nothing else can be done, at least narrow the areas of disagreement. If you start narrowing the areas of disagreement, sooner or later we might be able to reach some kind of a national consensus. Unless we do that, I am afraid we will continue quarrelling and national causes will suffer.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, he said something else also. He said the trustees will become super-bosses. He also mentioned look here, at one time Mr. Bukhari said this thing. Incidentally, I know Mr. Bukhari personally. I was in Delhi and he was in Delhi. In those days things were different. But, then, when the war started, he does not know how the All India Radio was used by the British Government. It is not that the Radio was free then; not at all. It is, however, true that some artistes were attracted, some poets came in, some musicians came in. The All India Radio became, in fact, the only agency whereby talent could be attracted, talent could be encouraged and talent could be brought to the notice of the whole country and I think that was done during those early years and I think it continues to be done even today. This in fact guarantees the prominence of these artistes and poets. In fact, the object on against Government controlling such a medium is precisely this. You know the Government rules and regulations are very different. Seniority becomes sacrosanct. They have recommended for the first time lateral entry. I know lateral entry will create difficulties but I come from a profession where there are always lateral entries. In fact in a university first you become a Lecturer; you do not become Reader automatically. You have to compete and then you might become a Reader. Again there is competition and you might become a Professor. In the Government service, you join as an I.A.S. or as whatever else you join and seniority gives you a kind of status so that some day you might go to the top. This has

[Dr. Sarup Singh]

meant that talent sometimes gets neglected. But, lateral entry is not to be utilised to demoralise the workers. I am not saying that talented people are not there. No, many of them are quite good. In fact, you have got a lot of talent in the All-India Radio and even in the television. I must confess that I do not agree with Mr. Verma that television is in search of only pretty women. I think the television is also in search of good plays, it is in search of good discussions, it is in search of good music, it is in search of all kinds of things, and if it comes to pretty faces, I do not know. Probably he and I would disagree in our tastes!

Mr. Vice-Chairman, the point is that Mr. Verghese Committee has faced this problem in a frontal way. On page 38,—because what do you do in a country like ours of a multi-party system—they say: Broadly speaking, there are two approaches that can be adopted for the creation of a broadcasting institution. One is to depoliticise its governance and the other is to allow political and other forces to be so represented on it that no single political party can have a position of complete dominance within it. So, the Verghese Committee recommended depoliticise it. However, depoliticising it is not easy. In fact, it is extremely difficult. One of the dangers, that Mr. Verma noticed partly, will come from the workers themselves, will come from the establishment today, from those who are employed by the All-India Radio and by the television, because they are used to a certain kind of functioning. What has been recommended is a different kind of functioning; they are not used to it. But I hope that sooner than later the AIR and the television centre will emerge as, shall I say, the correct reflectors of our national aspirations, our national objectives, and so on and so forth.

I would like to say one thing more and I hope it is understood in the

proper spirit. Unfortunately, whatever the system that you may avolve in a developing country, the Government has to play a very important role. What about the developmental programmes? What about our educational programmes? What about reaching everybody in the country? We are told that we can reach 90 per cent of them. Yes, we can probably, technologically; but do we really reach 90 per cent? I am not sure. In fact, I have a feeling that in the villages, the percentage of population that is actually listening to the radio is very small indeed. It is not really 90 per cent or anywhere near it. I am not sure even if it is 50 per cent. I presume it should be more than 50 per cent. In some areas; it might be extremely low in others.

Therefore, you see in a developing society where there are areas scattered far away, backward areas and there are all kinds of difficulties, the Government has to play a very prominent role. Therefore, when you take a decision, Mr. Advani, you kindly remember this. This word 'autonomy' sounds extremely well. You must guarantee absolute impartiality in the dissemination and interpretation of news. This is very necessary. Let no party feel that injustice is being done to it. At the same time the Government just cannot walk out. Therefore, I do not agree with the Committee's report that there should be self-abnegation by the Government. Self-abnegation you are not in a position to accept today. It is the demand of the country that you expand and give us quality programmes, educational programmes and create national character. After all, what are the people programmes today? They are either films or film music. It is one of the responsibilities of this media to create a national taste, to create a national awareness. Now, for instance, they have talked of abjectives. The two basic objectives according to me are national integration and also the cause of national integration or for the

demand of national integration reflecting the composite culture, reflecting the urges of the people who are scattered all over the country, in the rural areas, in the backward areas, women, minorities, Harijans and so on, all the people, who feel neglected, and to create ultimately a sense of harmony. After all, this is one country. India does not consist of two countries. They have made a very good suggestion that there is no need for having separate programmes like women's programmes and so on. In fact, women should also listen to men's programmes. There is nothing like men's programmes and women's programmes. The programmes are common. Of course, you must have farm programmes. But I have a very strong feeling on this question. Why should the rural people be treated as something separate from the rest of the country? After all, they are a part of the country. Do not give them the feeling that they are a separate sections altogether. They are a part of the country like anyone of us. In fact, you must have mixed programmes so that you can raise imperceptibly the intellectual level of the people who listen to the radio or who watch the TV. Not many people watch TV anyway. Many people cannot afford it.

Therefore, I would plead that we, as Members of Parliament, must recognise this because the report has come to us. The Government may accept the report. The Government may take a decision on this. The trust may be created. The trust's budget will then come to us. The trust will also send the complaints that it will receive. This will all come to us. The report says that Members of Parliament have the inherent right to ask questions. But it also says that it hopes that they will use self-restraint while asking questions. Well, I cannot comment on this. I am not competent to comment on this. I have been here only for a short time. But I have been depressed. What are we trying to

achieve? This is really the tragic aspect of the situation. Unfortunately, the political parties cannot control their own Members. National discipline depends on the discipline that this Parliament shows. The discipline of Parliament will depend on the discipline of the political parties. If the political parties lack discipline, then, of course, we should all sit together and examine this. I think Mr. Advani would agree that the more you consult, the better. The more you call all these friends, the better. Ultimately, all of us are one. After all, none of us is an enemy of the people. None of us is anti-patriotic. We all wish the country well. We have differences here and there. But it is important that we call all of them and then accept those things which are feasible. If something is not feasible, it is no use accepting it. Pandit Nehru said in 1948 'I want the BBC model'. But it was not feasible. He also said 'I want corporations'. I think we should also have corporations in most areas. But this Parliament has an effective role to play. The Members of Parliament have an effective role to play. In fact, I have a feeling—I am an outsider more or less—that once the political parties come to be consulted in a very genuine way and a new climate of harmony generates between the Government and the opposition parties, then the extremist elements on all sides will also feel subdued; the responsible, reasonable elements will come on top and then it will be a happy day for all of us.

Well Mr. Vice-Chairman, I deliberately chose to take fewer minutes than my colleague has done. It is partly because he is an accomplished parliamentarian. It is the first time in my life that I have spoken in this kind of august House. I have spoken in smaller places, class-rooms and so on. I was feeling very nervous when I came to speak, but I am grateful to my colleagues who have not make

[Dr. V. P. Dutt]

me more nervous than, in any case, I was. Thank you.

DR. V. P. DUTT: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have a problem. In the university, when the Vice-Chancellor spoke, the pro-Vice Chancellor did not speak after that. Now I have a problem because when my Vice-Chancellor has spoken, how do I then continue speaking after him! But I hope he will forgive me for having followed him rather than preceded him which had been our normal practice in the university. And if I may say so, Sir, if you allow me a minute or two to start from where he ended, I also wish to share my sense of anguish with him and with other Members of the House about the recent happenings. Unfortunately it appears to me, that the parliamentary graces are dying out, rather vanishing. Sir, I accept and I am going to do that myself that the business of the opposition is to point out the mistakes, the drawbacks, the non-performance, as they say, of the Government. It is the business of the opposition to attack and it is the business of the treasury benches to defend. And it has been a game—shall I say that the 'game' is a bad word, but I use it in a good sense—of parliamentary practice that we appreciate the sallies, the finer points, the debating skills and certainly whatever constructive points are made. But unfortunately, I find that we are going rapidly towards a point where we are forgetting the basic norms. I said it by way of joke, I am saying it and I say it in a lightened view, it should not be taken so seriously that when Shri Rajnarain was present in the morning I said, why does everybody want to imitate Mr. Rajnarain when he was in the opposition here? I think we ought to adhere to some of basic norms and codes even when we differ a great deal. I also like to appeal to the Treasury Benches that they too should not sit in stony and unperturbed silence. I will particularly

appeal to the Leader of the House that such situation ought to be, should be diffused by his taking the lead, giving the guidance, seeking advice from the leaders of the opposition parties and discussing matters with them and I hope the leaders of the opposition parties will also co-operate so that no matter how hard we are in our criticism and how hard you are in criticising us, we will conform to that spirit of parliamentary democracy, without which democracy cannot flourish. I am sorry I have said that, but for the last two days I have also had a tremendous feeling of depression, if I may say so, as to where we are trying to go.

Sir, I would like to say that to my mind the Verghese Committee's Report or the exercises that they have made in making the recommendations are related to the larger problem of what a communication policy should be and to whom a communication policy should serve. That to me is the basic question. Who is this communication policy to serve? Now the Verghese Committee has outlined many commendable, laudable objectives that would guide from this kind of Trust that they have recommended. These are not new ideas. Many of us have been talking about it for the last 30 years or so. In fact, if I may be modest in pointing out, in 1976 I had the privilege of being the Co-Chairman of a Committee on Doordarshan about the direction that should be given to Doordarshan and some of the recommendations that we made at that time were that the communication policy should be related to the basic goals of our society—i.e. democracy, secularism, socialism, socio-economic transformation. That we said about Doordarshan, but it is equally true about broadcasting that it should be taken to the masses; that it should not be of the elite, by the elite and for the elite; that it should project itself to the rural areas; that it should promote national integration; and that it should both educate

and entertain. Unfortunately, that report was pigeon-holed because it was prepared in 1976 although there is no politics in that report at all and there were many eminent educationists on that panel. However, the question is not who said what. These are laudable objectives which were mentioned earlier and which are there in the Verghese Committee Report. My difficulty is that I find that we say these things—I am not talking of this regime alone; I am talking in general—but in actual practice, there is no movement forward in our media for socio-economic transformation. Unfortunately, if I may say so, broadcasting—whether AIR or Doordarshan—is of the elite and by the elite. It is not for the elite, of course, because the standard is too low so far as the elite is concerned. But, as I said, it is of the elite and by the elite. And that is why there is such heavy reliance, as we have today, on film programmes as that only seems to hold the attention of the people. This is because we have not been able to give a proper orientation and direction. I would like to submit to the hon. Minister of Information that this is one of the most serious problems that ought to attract the attention—and deep attention—of every body.

Sir, as I said, there are many points involved. First of all, many people have raised this question here and outside also. I have been reading the articles that all the newspaper people and the media people have written on this subject. The question is: is there serious intent, is there any earnestness of purpose and is it actually going to be done? The second question, which I am raising because I have been associated with this media—both radio and TV—for a long time is about the structure that has been recommended by the Verghese Committee. This structure, to my mind, is complex, cumbersome and unwidely and, I am sure, it might be unmanageable too. I am not talking of the idea behind it. That we have all welcomed and we do welcome it—that is, as Dr. Sarup Singh has

pointed out, the idea of depoliticalisation. I shall put it in a different way. That is what the Committee itself has said—fair and balanced reporting, reflecting the composite culture of this country. On that, there is no difference of opinion. But the question is, what kind of a structure is to take shape, replace the present structure? I find that the structure that the Verghese Committee has recommended has created layers, or will create layers of divided authority. First of all, there will be a wholetime Chairman of the NBT. Then there will be three fulltime Members. Then there will be a Controller-General. Then there will be Directors. Then there is the Central Executive Board. Then there are Zonal Executive Boards.

Now, four Members of the Trust will be full-time Members of the Trust. What will they be doing? After all, they are not going to sit idle. You have then the Central Executive Board. You have the Controller-General. You have Director, All India Radio, Director of Doordarshan. The question that has been raised by many people is whether or not this would lead to bureaucratic controls. After all, when you have four full-time Members, it might inevitably lead to day-to-day interference with the working of the Akashvani and the Doordarshan. And I am afraid the very commendable idea of decentralisation given by the Verghese Committee will be nullified in practice by this kind of structure that is being suggested. In fact, it is a departure from the model that they had given to themselves. I do not necessarily hold it as an ideal one like the B.B.C. The B.B.C. has no whole-time Member of the Board of Governors. I do not know whether I should call them part-timers. But there is no whole-time Member. There only the Chairman really functions as a co-ordinating kind of agency between the various segments and it is also true that there is one chief person for the Radio and Television

[Dr. V. P. Dutt]

together. But after that there is complete division between the Radio and the Television. In fact, what Mr. Shrikant Verma said I would like to take it forward that the problem is not only that the Radio spoken-word is like the written word, but that the Television's visual word, shall I say, is like the spoken-word of the Radio. And unless we give proper attention to professionalism in the two organisations, it will not be possible for us to take appropriate steps.

This question of depoliticisation was taken out of purview. I would seriously suggest to the hon'ble Minister to consider the question of selection of the Members of the Trust because the present method being suggested by the Verghese Committee, to my mind, is not conducive to real depoliticisation. I know the problem that Dr. Sarup Singh raised. We have been facing this problem, namely, how do you select? The selection by the Prime Minister, even in consultation with the Leader of Opposition, I think will not keep that air, that atmosphere, that aura of depoliticisation that we want to do away. And, therefore, I would like him to consider this question carefully. What should be the procedure because I have a feeling that the present procedure, not only the question of our Prime Minister, not a question of which Prime Minister, may not suit because it is a question of system that you create. One Prime Minister may be good and another Prime Minister may be better. But you once give authority to a particular person, then other consequences follow. I would like to say that my real fear is—it is not a question of Prime Minister—that the kind of panel that the Verghese Committee has suggested is inherently conservative. It is conservative-oriented. It is pro-establishment in the sense of capital ESTABLISHMENT. My fear is like the press. Just as it has happened in the press, this powerful media will also go into

the hands of private vested interests. How do you avoid that? In a country where we see a clash of social ideas, we have not yet found our path of economic development and when there is a clash of social ideas, in that clash of social ideas, like the press we will be giving this media also into the hands of private vested interests. This is my biggest fear and therefore, I would like the hon. Minister to consider the suggestion of creating a Joint Select Committee of Parliament when the proposed legislation comes for going into all these various aspects. After all, I was sorry to say—and I am sorry to refer to it—Mr. Minister, that I am sorry to see that this morning your statement on the Press Commission mentioned only two kinds of interference in the press. One was Government control and the other was trade union pressure. Now, Sir, in this country there is no trade union pressure on the newspapers. If the newspapers are captive newspapers in any sense of the term, they are captive because of private control, family control, over newspapers. It is not a question of trade unions.

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI LAL K. ADVANI): May I interrupt for a moment, please?

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN (Kerala): Before the hon. Minister gives a reply....

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: What I had read out this morning was not the terms of reference of the Press Commission. It was the issues that were to be examined, and among the various pressures, Government control, trade unions, etc., had been referred to. I may tell you that I have gone through the terms of reference and they mention commercial advertising, ownership, trade union, etc.

DR. V.P. DUTT: I accept what you say but the statement that we got this morning mentioned Government control and trade union pressure. When we are having the representation of so many private interests on all these bodies,

why not trade union representation also? After all, the working class is as important a segment of our society as any other. I am not talking, as I said—and I am following the cue from my predecessor—as a politician. If I were talking as a politician, I would be saying different things. But I am talking as, shall I say, as a sensitive, thinking member of the society which is struggling to find the path for socio-economic transformation. You are going to hand over your powerful media of radio and television into the hands of conservative establishment. Why should not people who hold different ideas from that—different ideas about transformation—find representation on these forums? Therefore, I suggest in all humility and in all seriousness that this question should be considered carefully.

Sir, I would also like to say that while these are my conceptual problems which I have mentioned to the hon. Minister, what has been sadly lacking so far is professionalism and it is not going to be helped by making inter-changeable the cadres of television and radio by mixing up the two. Sir, personally, I would have preferred there were two control agencies, one for radio and one for television. But even if you want to have one control agency, then you have well-defined authority of the television and of the radio separately. And professionalism of the television is of an entirely different dimension from the professionalism of radio, and both require, in fact, an intense emphasis on professionalism which has been lacking so far. Therefore, I would suggest that this aspect should also be looked into.

Finally, Sir, there are one or two points that I would like to mention. I do not want to say much about the Franchise Stations because many points have already been made. But I would like to say, I welcome the idea of Franchise Stations. But then, Franchise Stations should not be limited just to the broadcast of educational lessons but should become

centres for lively discussions of issues if you really want to decentralise, and that is why I have been emphasising that you build up a core of professional broadcasters, professional television people and give them encouragement. If you are going to have franchise stations, they should be allowed freedom to discuss the issues before the country.

Lastly, Sir, it does not give me much happiness about what I am going to say. I find that there is, shall I say, a Persian Gulf between the reality and the ideal that we are striving for. The ideal we are striving for is an autonomous de-politicised frame-work of institution but the reality today is heavy politicisation—by today I do not mean only today; it has been there and it is continuing. After all, we do not have to wait for legislation, we do not have to wait for formal implementation for the present structure, for the present Radio and Television, to start practising what is there in the Verghese Report.

What is the situation? I am sorry to say that the situation is that the frightened little men of the broadcasting media are as frightened today as they were yesterday. I am told that there are black lists today also of the people who are banned from being called on the Radio and Television. Now, Sir, the hon. Minister may say: No. There is no such black list. But, you know. Mr. Vice-Chairman, the invisible black lists can be as effective as the visible or the written black lists. And I make bold to say that there are banned lists and I would like the hon. Minister to give this House the information as to who are the people who have been banned, who are not supposed to be called to the Radio and Television. This should not be considered in any personal context. If I may use the English phrase, I care two pence whether you, he, she or I am called or not to Radio and Television. But is it not a fact that even eminent editors are on the suspicious list? Even a

[Dr. V. P. Dutt]

person like Gird Lal Jain for the last many months you may say he is in Bombay, though he is coming here very often—is not being called for Radio and Television programmes, generally speaking, because he appeared in 1975-76. (Interruptions) I will come to others also. I do not know many, of these people personally, but there are many such cases. For example, there is one Mr. Bhatnagar, I do not know whether I personally recognise him or not. But he was doing the Shah Commission proceedings. Then somebody discovered that he was probably quite close to the previous ruling family and therefore he was dropped. Or, I mention the case of Salma Sultan. It was a pleasure to see that here is a Muslim girl speaking such chaste Hindi and reading news in Hindi; and yet she was shunted off because it was thought that her family was close to the Nehru family. Sir, this is the kind of thing happening. Then there was a programme of Yamini Krishnamurthy and by mistake somebody discovered that there was a photograph in the background, either of Mrs. Indira Gandhi or somebody, and that lady was suspended. I do not know whether I have seen her or not—whose name is Kamlini Dutt. She was illegally suspended. After six weeks the suspension order was served on her. For what? Because there was some slip. Do you want to create counterterror in the country, counterterror in the media? This kind of thing should not be there. I was hoping that my hon. esteemed, elderly colleague Mr. Advani would not like this kind of obvious building up of an atmosphere of fear. That is why I called them the little frightened men in the Broadcasting establishment, who are afraid that somebody may have been associated with so and so, somebody may have been known to this family or that family or somebody may have said something earlier. So, they drop them and put them on the banned list and they are not taken back. I am not saying

it and in a carping and cavilling spirit. I am saying that we should be serious about getting national consensus. What does that mean? The Verghese Committee Report itself says that there should be fair and balanced reporting, promotion of national integration of the country, reflecting the composite culture of the country and giving a variety of programmes both to enlighten, entertain and uplift. With this objective, I would say, we should start practising it right now. Secondly we should seriously think of and should create a suitable structure. I broadly welcome the suggestions that have been made. We should look carefully into the kind of structure that would be created so that our purpose, objective, of creating an instrument for the welfare of the people is achieved. Thank you.

*SHRI E. R. KRISHNAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I welcome the debate on Akashvani and Doordarshan based upon the Verghese Committee recommendations. We had occasion to debate on the recommendations of the Chanda Committee. But those recommendations have not been fully implemented.

Only by changing the name of the A.I.R. as Akashvani, I am afraid, other recommendations were put in cold storage. The Janata Government has changed the names of the hospitals in Delhi, and this change has been broadcast now and then, although no improvement was visible in the working of the hospitals. In the same way, the Government should not keep mum only with the change of name as 'Akashvani'. I request that the Government should take necessary steps to implement the recommendations of the Verghese Committee. I do not find any big transformation in the functioning of Akashvani after the Janata Government took over charge. The previous Congress Government had been broadcasting its activities over the AIR

*English translation of the speech delivered in Tamil.

from time to time. I regret to note that the present Government is also following the same pattern. I may refer to the statement of our Tamil Nadu Chief Minister supporting the Banking Commission Bill placed before the joint session recently. This news has been thrice broadcast, but the views of our Chief Minister regarding the use of Hindi as an official language in the Union Territories were never broadcast. On the basis of the assurance given by our late Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, our Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, Shri M. G. Ramachandran has been repeatedly telling that Hindi should never be imposed on non-Hindi speaking people, so long as they do not like to accept it as official language; but I regret to say that his views were not broadcast over A.I.R.

It is a funny thing that Mr. Sanjay Gandhi was referred as Rashtropati when Malayalam news was broadcast a few days back. Persons not acquainted with the latest political trends were appointed to broadcast the news. One Sushil Jhaveri commits a lot of mistakes whenever he reads the news in English. The accent is not at all correct one. The news broadcast over A.I.R. at 9 p.m. is the most important one. I regret to say that that is not properly broadcast. I think persons in charge of news broadcasting should be given the necessary refresher-cum-orientation training. Whenever Shrimati Pramila Singh reads the news it is not all audible.

For Tamilians settled in the South-east Asian countries, a programme in Tamil has been arranged over A.I.R. at 5 a.m., I am to point out that news covering only the Government of India activities is given importance; no news covering the important activities of our Tamil Nadu Government is broadcast, even though the Tamilians settled in those countries are very eagerly expecting this news. Everyday songs are broadcast in the evening, but it is very funny that those songs are not of the present time but relate to the earlier period. say 20

years or so back. The Tamilians residing in North India are very eager to listen to songs and news. I request the hon. Minister to take the necessary steps in the matter. He may see that Madras A.I.R. gives importance to the news concerning the activities of the Tamil Nadu Government. Whenever our Prime Minister visits Madras, it is announced repeatedly. At the same time, the news of our Chief Minister's visit is repeatedly ignored. In regard to other Ministers in Tamil Nadu also, no importance is given. It is regretted that even the Madras A.I.R. station does not broadcast the visit of our Tamil Nadu Ministers to Delhi. I may point out that whenever a Central Minister visits Trivandrum or any other place via Madras, it is given more importance. I therefore, appeal to our hon. Minister, Mr. Advani, to see that A.I.R. does not become the mouth-piece of the Janata Party.

It is not sufficient that A.I.R. and T.V. become a public trust; he should also see that the representatives of broadcasting approach not only the Central Ministers but also the State Ministers for their views on various matters and broadcast them. I appeal to the Minister that at least two hours a week should be allotted for Tamil programme at A.I.R. Delhi station.

Mr. Advani had, when he was functioning as the Opposition leader, said once that the Jana Sangh could install its own radio station and arrange for its own broadcasting system. He should now see that the same statement is not repeated by the Opposition leaders.

I would like to stress one important point that A.I.R. should also give necessary warnings to the people, particularly those residing on the sea-shore and river banks, whenever there is any change of weather or when one or the other natural calamity is expected. The news should be repeatedly broadcast in the interest of the nation. Community sets should be given freely to the people settled on the sea-shore.

[Shri E. R. Krishnan]

The Public Undertakings Committee has pointed out, whenever it submitted reports on Autonomous Bodies, that there were a number of irregularities. The Minister should see that the proposed Trust functions properly.

I request that powerful transmitters should be installed at all stations for making news and songs audible. For example, AIR may see how Radio Ceylon broadcasts its songs, news and advertisements and how it is becoming popular.

I have already requested the House that necessary steps should be taken to install a powerful T. V. relay station which could easily cover all the eight districts in Tamil Nadu State, which are 4,500 M. above sea-level. I repeat this request on behalf of the people of my State, Tamil Nadu.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Mr. Mahapatro, you will have fifteen minutes.

SHRI LAKSHMANA MAHAPATRO (Orissa): You are a reasonable man; I am a reasonable man. Sir...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): No, I want to make it clear, you have to observe the time-limit.

SHRI LAKSHMANA MAHAPATRO: But you have allowed half an hour to doctors.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): There are three major parties. They take their time. The Congress-I has taken 28 minutes. The Janata has taken only 20 minutes. The speaker who has just concluded has taken less than 10 minutes. So I request you kindly to finish in 15 minutes.

SHRI LAKSHMANA MAHAPATRO: I will be reasonable.

Sir, this report of the working group, called the Verghese Committee Report, does not in any way enthuse me. Of course, the outward colour of

the two volumes is very attractive, the Lower volume is not a volume of appendices but a volume of appendicitis. I have some reservations as far as this document is concerned. I am not accusing the members of the working group. They have not done anything wrong. I say that the Government has done something very seriously wrong. That is why the whole thing has got derailed from the very beginning. What does autonomy for broadcasting media mean? Should broadcasting media have autonomy only in name? Is it only for administration? Should it not for anything else? Is it only to see that certain officers are sent to fill in offices and call themselves trustees of it? Or should it have objectives which we have set for ourselves in the Constitution?—the objective of democracy, the objective of socialism, the objective of secularism. These things are not entrusted to be gone into by the working group. On the other hand, what was entrusted to the working group was to find out how far broadcasting media could be made autonomous. Naturally, the group got so much obsessed by this concept of autonomy that they did not pay any attention to the objectives enshrined in our Constitution. In the order which the Government issued constituting the working group there was nothing to suggest what the concept of these media should be. There was nothing to suggest that the media should be geared in such a way that they are able to achieve the national objectives enshrined in our Constitution. That is the reason why the working group did not say anything about the media aiming at achieving our objectives.

When this report came, I am told—I do not know if I am correctly informed and I will be one of the saddest persons if what I am told is true—an implementation cell has already been created without the matter being discussed, while to the whole world it is being said that wide-ranging persons will be allowed

to speak on this and give their comments on this. Yet, Sir, there is the Implementation Cell and many of these recommendations are going to be implemented without the other House discussing it, without the professionals talking about it and without the employees, who are working in these two media, having been permitted to have their say. Now, Sir, this is what is going to happen. Some implementation is going to be there and that is what I am worried about and if it is going to be done, let it be stopped at this stage and let it not go further. Therefore, Sir, I have this to say: I strongly protest against the move to implement some of the recommendations prior to the acceptance of the whole Report, because the whole Report is a concrete whole and it is something which is an integral whole and you cannot separate it. Of course, they have said at some places contradictory things. But, on the whole, they have maintained consistency and it is this that the whole thing has to be an autonomous body and they have also given a model Bill which can be placed before Parliament and passed. So, I am opposed particularly to this and I am opposed to what is called the provision for functional Trustees, three in number, the whole-timers. And, Sir, as far as the franchise stations are concerned, I think it is a subtle way of making the big houses come into the picture and make them get hold of these media. Therefore, I am opposed to the concept of franchise stations also. As far as the private programme agencies are concerned, I think some of them could be there because they are only required to have taperecordings prepared by them. But you can examine this aspect and if it is suitable to your programmes, you can accept them, otherwise not. Therefore, this is something about which I would like to say much. But now I do not want to go into details. As I said earlier, Sir, the colour of the Report is good. But, as many have remarked, I also join them in saying

that it is very long on the objectives, but it is too short on the practicals. Therefore, I would say that nothing has been said about how in practice these objectives could be achieved and you do not have an inkling of that in this Report. Therefore, my request to the honourable Minister is this: You have to see that, instead of having what you have got in the Report, in the greater national interest, these broadcasting media, the AIR and the Doordarshan, maintain quality. These two organisations, whatever be their names, whether they are called Akashvani and Doordarshan as they are called now, or as Akash Bharati as has been suggested by the Committee, because name does not matter, as the earlier speakers have said, since they do not change things, they should maintain quality. You must see that they really maintain quality and this is very important and this is something about which I am very much concerned. I would also ask whether you would please see, that the coverage by the AIR at the moment is raised to a hundred per cent. I think there is an Appendix to this Report in Vol. II which says that there are many States where the coverage is very low and the coverage is the maximum in some States—it is 99 per cent in some States—while in some other States it is very low. Then, as far as the people who are listening to it are concerned, it is only 15 or 16 per cent. The percentage of the AIR listeners is so bad. Therefore, the question is this: What is your programme, what is your perspective programme, for having more and more listeners, for having more and more of coverage? What is your programme from the listeners' angle? That is the question and that is one thing.

The second thing is television. It has a greater advantage in that it is not only something which is aural, but is also something visual. Therefore, the visual quality, the audio-visual quality, of television is something that attracts more persons to it

[Shri Lakshmana Mahapatro]

and it has a greater value, greater educative value, greater informative value, etc. and it is only for these purposes and for these reasons that we are having the television. Therefore, I am interested in seeing that at least one station should be there in each State. As yet, Sir, we do not have like that and, as far as the satellite stations are concerned, more of such satellite stations are to be created, if need arises, and this is what I am interested in. Sir, you have only this black and white channel in the Television. As a result of that, no foreign country is prepared to have your programmes. In fact, the smallest countries, etc. have what you call colour channels. Therefore, that is also very essential. I would request the hon. Minister to look into this.

Then, Sir, I have to say one of the important things which has already been referred to by Dr. V. P. Dutt. You do not seem to take account of people who have been there all these years—staff artistes or engineers, etc. On the other hand, the recent days have been days of undeclared Emergency as far as they are concerned. You hound them, you do not attend to them, you threaten them, you treat them as 'casuals', and so on. They do not have security of job, they do not have security of continuity. You pick up a person for a particular area a staff artiste precisely because he or she speaks the language that is prevalent there. But you will send that person somewhere else and you hold up their transfers. There are instances galore about such things.

The last thing that I want to say is this. Is it not true, Sir, that on the national programme you had on the All India Radio you had very brilliant people—vocalists, etc? Is it not a fact that one Mr. Dilsood Khan, who belongs to a minority community, a young man, a Marine Engineer—Chief Engineer of Marine—who was on the list of National Pro-

grammes, was dropped simply because he belonged to the Mohammedan community? What is happening? He has been giving programmes that were very much appreciated everywhere. He has sent me a letter; he has sent letters to other Members. Because he was a Mohammedan...

AN HON. MEMBER: Why do you bring in this consideration that because he was a Mohammedan;..

SHRI LAKSHMANA MAHAPATRO: But this is the main consideration, as far as I am aware. You may push in any consideration. He is no longer there. I have these things to submit.

Then, as far as the national Press is concerned, I think what the hon. Members have said earlier is not very much incorrect in that way. Dr. Singh has said that even a University, an autonomous body, was not free from politics. You cannot avoid it. Therefore, you have to take life as it is. Therefore, my suggestion is that you can develop a better machinery, make it free from politics and also make it very much an autonomous body. You have to bring in people who are worthy, trade unionists, engineers and other people. They have also to do something with this media. Therefore, I am opposed to these full-time people. They should be persons with professional knowledge—engineers, musicians and others. Those people will be doing a great harm. After you take in these three whole-timers, they are persons without any qualifications prescribed for them. Therefore, they will be in the nature of political appointments for these people. I am opposed to it. Rather I am in favour of an electoral college, which will be sending the representatives of these people who are in the profession.

The second thing that I want to point out is that there are many programme agencies in the country.

There are feature programme agencies also and they have been doing very useful work. In fact, I think, that they could be encouraged and for that necessary tapes and some films also could be provided to them. (*Time bell rings*). Therefore, Sir, this is something which should receive the Government's attention and encouragement.

The last thing that I want to point out is that so far as the TV is concerned, it has to be extended much more than where it has been left.

Before I conclude, I take this opportunity of thanking all those people who have been able to bring this broadcasting media, both the AIR and the TV, to this level, because history is full of haphazard management of the whole thing. This has been taken note of by the Committee itself at page 15 where they have said that if the broadcasting media in India has grown haphazardly, it is because their role, as that of the media generally, has not been perceived as part of a well-defined national communications policy which embraces everything to do with articulation, including education, culture and physical movement. They were helpless and they could not do anything in that regard because the terms of reference did not contain anything about that. They were much concerned about autonomy as though if autonomy was provided it would take the nation to the attainment of social, political and cultural goals. Therefore, before others think of it and before others get an opportunity of saying it, I say that do not go in for the implementation of this Report. Instead, you try to have this Report processed by professionals. As I said earlier, these functional trustees, these full-time trustees, this lateral entry, then inter-changeability in the name of promotional prospect is something very bad and this false sense of parity and developing it into an unprofessional organisation, you should try to avoid.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, we are discussing the Report of the Working Group on Autonomy for Akashvani and Doordarshan. At the outset, we should pay a tribute to the Working Group of Mr. Verghese and his friends for having produced a comprehensive Report in a record time. Sir, this is not for the first time that the idea of making the All India Radio an autonomous institution or an autonomous corporation was mooted. Earlier, we had the Chanda Committee Report, which was given in the year 1966. For ten long years it was gathering dust. Implementation was nowhere to be seen. The hon. Member who preceded me, complained that the Ministry is already making preparations for implementing the Report. There was a Government which took ten long years but never touched the core of that Report, given by the Chanda Committee. Sir, Dr. Singh who initiated the debate from our side, gave the scope of this powerful and expanding media. Sir, there are as many as 84 radio stations and 13 T.V. centres covering an area of 76 per cent in the land and also 88 per cent of the population. This is what they can cover as he correctly put it; but if we take the number of sets in this country, there are 17 million licensed radio sets. If you give 5 persons for each set, about 85 million people can be covered who make use of this media, which is about 15 per cent of the population. Therefore, there is a vast scope for improving the utility of this powerful media.

Sir, one of the pet discussions raised in this House everyday is about the coverage in the radio of the proceedings of the House, the coverage given for the opposition parties, and other incidents. Sir, everybody may agree now that during the times of emergency, especially in December, 1976. AIR bulletins are reported to have devoted as many as 2207 lines to the spokesmen of the Congress and only

[Shri Lakshmana Mahapatro]

about 34 lines to the opposition during the year 1976. During the election time, the proportion was 8.5:1 between the ruling party and the opposition. Sir, for the past one year, I had a respite from the Parliamentary activities and I was confined to my home town of Madras. I regularly used to go through the bulletins and I painfully agree that there is a slant in the reporting, slant in the reporting against Janata because you all complain that the ruling party is getting a major share. I may tell you honestly that the party that was in power during the days of emergency, still continues to have a lion's share in the reporting. That is my impression. I think, of course, the Minister may contradict me if I am in the wrong. I think one of the Members who spoke before me, Mr. Krishnan referred to the case of — a news announcement coming from Trivandrum in Malayalam wherein they were covering the visit of the President Sanjiva Reddy and the announcer said by a slip of tongue of course that President Sanjay Gandhi is visiting first time as President. It indicates so much impregnation of the Government, of the mind of the T.V. and radio announcers that they still think of Mr. Sanjay Gandhi and Mrs. Indira Gandhi and they do not consider Mr. Morarji Desai or Mr. L. K. Advani....

श्री कमल नाथ झा (बिहार) : संजय गांधी और इंदिरा गांधी का नक्शा जनता पार्टी के सिर पर बैठ गया है।

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: That is the news announcer in the AIR....

SHRI SHRIKANT VERMA: Three lakh words have been used against Mrs. Indira Gandhi. How is it possible that people may remember Rashtrapati and forget Mrs. Indira Gandhi?

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: A person who has been groomed and brought up, who has been educated and who has been committed during the emer-

gency days, still remembers those dark days.... (Interruptions). What I say is about what has happened during one year. This is one reporting of the President's visit to Trivandrum and there the name of Mr. Sanjay Gandhi has been mentioned....

SHRI KALP NATH RAI (Uttar Pradesh): Please talk properly.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Therefore, Sir, I would advise or request the hon. Minister to make a thorough study because day in and day out, this slant is being given. I want to know how much time is given for the Janata Party and how much time for the opposition parties. This is my impression. And if the Minister has got statistics with him, let him give this information here and if there is any correction to be made, let them make it. Sir, regarding autonomy, I will be the first person to welcome autonomy. But autonomy should not go to the extent of getting a licence. You may depoliticise it. You may take it out of the grip of the Government. But the autonomous corporation should not be left to do things by itself. Of course, this report says how the autonomous corporation will be constituted, how the budget will be presented to this House and so on. Of course, discussion would take place in this House. But once a year, discussing it on the floor of this House for one or two hours is not going to help in regard to the accountability of the corporation to Parliament. Therefore, I would like to know: what are the checks and balances the Government is going to have? There should be some inbuilt checks and balances so that it does not get distorted; it does not get distorted for the Janata Party and it does not get distorted for anybody else also. Therefore, how is the inbuilt system going to be created in the organisation? This is the first question I would pose to the hon. Minister. There should be some inbuilt checks and balances. This is very vital to create an organisation. A certain expanding monolithic organisation may do more havoc than the one which

is there now. Once it is made an autonomous corporation, the Minister is bound to say 'This is an autonomous corporation; we will not be able to interfere in its working'. We cannot give a free rein to such an organisation. Therefore, I would like to know from the hon. Minister: how is he going to set up this inbuilt system? It may be freed from the Government and political control. How is it going to be freed from the bureaucratic control which has already been created? A biased person may get into it, may entrench himself there and may distort the entire view. How are you going to check it? We cannot do this unless there is a watchdog penal which can have supervision over it.

Sir, in regard to one of the recommendations made by the Verghese Committee, I find it very difficult to accept it. It is very difficult even to imagine. They have suggested that the broadcasting receiver licence fee should be increased. They have suggested that the radio licence fee should be increased from Rs. 15 to Rs. 25 and the TV licence fee should be increased from Rs. 50 to Rs. 75. This is a very retrograde step. I would appeal to the Government to see that the radio licence fee is not increased. It should be the other way. I would like it to be reduced. If you want the rural population to listen to the radio, you should make it less costlier. There should not be any tax on information. Therefore, I would appeal to him not to raise the radio licence fee. On the other hand, if it is possible, it should be reduced. Regarding economic viability, the commercial time that is going to be sold can be adjusted. But this radio licence fee should not be increased. If at all you want to increase the fee, it should be done in the case of TV sets. The radio licence fee should not be increased.

Regarding the organisation itself, it has not been spelt out very clearly. It has been left to the corporation which is going to be set up. Of course, the policy decision may be taken at

the apex level. But the organisation should not be kept as a monolithic one. It should be decentralised. We should have a decentralised organisation. There should also be the involvement of the people in the broadcasting programmes. They should be heard also. Not only the people should hear, but they should be heard also. We have got only 83 stations in the whole of India. I would appeal to him that this should be expanded. Each district should have a transmitter of its own. This will enable the local flavour and the local conditions to be broadcast and the people in that particular area will be able to participate in the broadcasting programmes. Not only the people should hear. They should also be enabled to participate in the programmes. For this, we should have a transmitter in each district to start with. It will not be a very costly affair. To set up a transmitter, I think it may cost about Rs. 3 to Rs. 5 lakhs. It may not be a powerful one. A medium one will not cost much. Therefore, we can have a transmitter station for every district so that the local talents, the local flavour, the culture, the language, the song and drama of the particular locality get better attention through the decentralised system. Regarding the strengthening of the regional languages and all the national languages, attention, nowadays, is being given, of course, to English and Hindi. All the other languages media also should get equal, if not more, importance in the matter of allotment of time. Equal time should be allotted for them.

The Akash Bharati or the National Broadcasting Trust that is going to be established should be put on a very strong basis financially. Now they are going to be given Rs. 75 crores initially. Afterwards, after five years they are going to show a deficit. What is going to happen then? If they come to the Government again and again, the Government and the Finance Ministry may have the tendency to control because they are going to supply the finances. Therefore, it should be put

[Shri Era Sezhiyan]

on a better viable basis than the one that has been contemplated.

More than that, as I said earlier, the monolithic character cannot do for a pluralistic country like India where multi-lingual, multi-cultural and all other groups are there. It should be highly decentralised. Each district should be able to have a transmitter so that a highly decentralised one will reflect not only the mood, but also the educativeness of the people in this country.

With these few words I welcome the Working Groups Report and I also record my appreciation for the earnest action because the other Member said that the Government has already started implementing the Report. Yes, I want this Government to implement the Report at the earliest possible, without allowing the time to run. In the case of the Chanda Committee Report a decade was allowed to run through without any result being produced. Here is a Government which should implement it as early as possible, without further time being lost.

SHRI LAKSHMANA MAHAPATRO: The whole approach is to make inroads into this media. That is why the implementation is so late.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: With these words I conclude. Thank you.

श्री कल्प नाथराय : आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जो वर्गीज कमेटी की रिपोर्ट प्रस्तुत हुई है मैं उसकी अधिकांश सिफारिशों से सहमत हूँ और सरकार को वर्गीज कमेटी की रिपोर्ट की सिफारिशों को लागू करना चाहिए और आकाशवाणी और दूरदर्शन को एक आटोनामस वाडी बनाना चाहिए। हिन्दुस्तान जैसे बड़े देश में पिछले एक साल में जिस तरह से आकाशवाणी और दूरदर्शन का इस्तेमाल सरकारी पक्ष में हुआ है, जिस तरह से आकाशवाणी और दूरदर्शन को चरित्र हत्या का एक हथियार बनाया गया है, वैसी घटना हिन्दुस्तान के इतिहास में आज तक कभी नहीं हुई है। आज आकाशवाणी और दूरदर्शन के

माध्यम से जो देश का काम होना चाहिए जो हमारी सरकार के उद्देश्य हैं—जनतंत्र, समाजवाद, धर्म निरपेक्षता, राष्ट्रीयता, जो हमने अपने संविधान में घोषित किये हैं उनके अनुकूल काम होना चाहिए था, उन के लिए काम होना चाहिए था, लेकिन ऐसा हुआ नहीं। आकाशवाणी और दूरदर्शन को आटोनामस वाडी बनाने का प्रश्न बहुत समय से विचाराधीन है। चन्दा कमेटी की रिपोर्ट जब प्रस्तुत हुई थी जिस की सिफारिश थी कि आकाशवाणी को एक आटोनामस वाडी बनाया जाए, उस जमाने में श्री मोरारजी देसाई एक मिनिस्टर थे। उन्होंने, जब यह प्रस्ताव आया डा० लोहिया के द्वारा कि इस को आटोनामस बना दिया जाय तो इस प्रधान मंत्री ने, जो उस जमाने में मिनिस्टर थे, इस बात को अस्वीकार किया। लेकिन जब पिछले पांच, छः साल तक 1969 के बाद यह विरोधी दल के नेता रहे, तब उन्होंने बराबर यह मांग की कि आकाशवाणी को आटोनामस वाडी बनाया जाए। फिर जब यह जनता सरकार सत्ता में आई तो इस ने अपने चुनाव घोषणा पत्र में यह वायदा किया कि इस को आटोनामस बनाया जाएगा। लेकिन उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आकाशवाणी और दूरदर्शन को जिस तरीके से इस सरकार ने अपने नियंत्रण में करने की कोशिश की है, इस प्रकार का प्रयत्न पहले कभी नहीं किया गया। यह सरकार का सूचना मंत्रालय विलकुल फासिस्टी और नाजी हथकंडों को अपना रहा है। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आकाशवाणी के अन्दर, दूरदर्शन के अन्दर वही लोग, जो एक विचार के समर्थक हैं, जो राष्ट्रीय स्वयं सेवक संघ की विचारधारा के समर्थक हैं, ऐसे लोगों को ही प्राथमिकता दी जा रही है। ऐसे ही अखबारों को प्राथमिकता दी जा रही है। ऐसे लोगों को प्राथमिकता दी जा रही है जो कि फासिस्टी विचारधारा के समर्थक हैं। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप जानते हैं कि एक बार न्यूज मीडिया को नियंत्रित करने की हिटलर ने कोशिश की थी। उस के मिनिस्टर्स गोबेल्स और गोयरिंग ने कोशिश की थी और उस का परिणाम हुआ कि सारे जर्मनी

का सर्वनाश हो गया, उसने इसके माध्यम से दुनिया में फासिज्म को बढ़ाने की कोशिश की थी और जनता सरकार ने आकाशवाणी के माध्यम से केवल चरित्र हत्या का काम पिछले एक साल से किया है। इन्होंने कोशिश क्या की है—शाह आयोग। पिछले तीस साल के अन्दर एक आयोग नहीं, सैंकड़ों आयोग बिठाए गये—बीजू पटनायक के खिलाफ आयोग बिठलाया गया, एच० एम० पटेल के खिलाफ, बड़े-बड़े मंत्रियों के खिलाफ आयोग बिठाया गया। लेकिन कभी भी किसी आयोग की रिपोर्ट रोजमर्रा हमारे जो बयान होते हैं, उन बयानों को रेडियो के माध्यम से और उनको आकाशवाणी के माध्यम से प्रसारित नहीं किया गया। यानि अब कितने आयोगों में भ्रष्टाचार में मंत्री जो पकड़े गये जिनके ऊपर भ्रष्टाचार साबित हुआ और आज जनता सरकार में मंत्री हैं। जवाहर लाल के जमाने में कई कमिशन बिठाए गये, लेकिन उनके माध्यम से कभी भी आकाशवाणी और रेडियो के माध्यम से 15 मिनट शाह आयोग की रिपोर्ट आकाशवाणी चित्र के लिए दिखाया गया। लेकिन शाह एक मामूली सा जज है, जिसके ऊपर 200 से 300 संसद् सदस्यों ने भ्रष्टाचार के आरोप लगाये, जिसकी कोई हैसियत नहीं।

अगर श्रीमती गान्धी की जांच मोरारजी देसाई या आडवाणी करते तो मेरी बात समझ में आती कि एक पब्लिक मैन की जांच पब्लिक मैन कर रहा है। लेकिन एक मामूली सा नौकर शाह, जज जो एक विशेष विभाग से सम्बन्ध रखता है, उसके माध्यम से पूरे देश के अन्दर आकाशवाणी और दूरदर्शन के माध्यम से एक देश की महान नेता और देश के भूतपूर्व प्रधान मंत्री के चरित्र हत्या का काम करने का पिछले एक साल से लगातार प्रयत्न किया गया। दिन-रात, सुबह-शाम 12 बजे, 11 बजे, 9 बजे लगातार चरित्र हत्या का काम किया गया। यह फासिस्टी तरीका है, नाजीवादी तरीका है। फासिज्म झूठ पर आधारित है। मौ बार एक झूठ बोली तो वास्तव दिखालाई देगा।

यह विशेष मंत्रालय के द्वारा फासिस्ट तरीके पर काम किया।

आज मेरा कहना है इस सरकार से और प्रधान मंत्री से अपील करता हूँ कि वे अगले सेशन आने तक सूचना मंत्रालय, श्री आडवाणी के हाथ से तुरन्त लें और इनको मंत्रालय से बर्खास्त करें। जब तक आडवाणी सूचना मंत्रालय के मंत्री बने रहेंगे तब तक हिन्दुस्तान में इस मोडिया का इस्तेमाल नहीं हो सकता। मैं माँग करता हूँ सरकार से और विशेषकर प्रधान मंत्री से कि आडवाणी साहब को तुरन्त मंत्रालय से बर्खास्त करें। सूचना मंत्रालय उनके हाथ से लें और सूचना मंत्रालय किसी ऐसे व्यक्ति के हाथ में दें जिसके मन में देशभक्ति हो, जिसके मन में राष्ट्रीयता हो, देश को आगे बढ़ाने का सपना हो।

आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, वर्गीज कमेटी ने जो रिपोर्ट पेश की है, इस सरकार ने ही कहा था अपने चुनाव घोषणा पत्र में कि रेडियो को स्वतन्त्र बनायेंगे। वर्गीज कमेटी की रिपोर्ट आ गई है। तो इसको तरन्तु लागू करना चाहिए और उसमें यह कहना कि फिर मैं विचार करूंगा, नहीं करूंगा। एक बार आपने देश की जनता के सामने यह शपथ-पत्र लिया है, देश की जनता की अदालत में आपने एफिडे-विट दाखिल किया है कि यदि हम सत्ता में आयेंगे तो आर्टोनामस बाडी रेडियो और आकाशवाणी को करेंगे। तो मैं समझता हूँ कि फिर इस काम को लागू करने में क्यों देर की जा रही है। वर्गीज साहब ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में कहा है कि सुप्रीम कोर्ट का एक जज और लोकपाल दोनों की सिफारिश से जो ट्रस्ट के मेम्बर बनाये जायेंगे। वह रिपोर्ट प्रधान मंत्री के पास जायेगी। मेरा कहना है कि सुप्रीम कोर्ट का जज और लोकपाल जो ट्रस्ट बनायेंगे और ट्रस्ट बनाने वाली कमेटी की सिफारिश सीधे राष्ट्रपति को करनी चाहिए न कि प्रधान मंत्री को क्योंकि राष्ट्रपति निष्पक्ष होगा और राष्ट्रपति के माध्यम से जो ट्रस्ट होगा वह निष्पक्ष ट्रस्ट बनेगा।

[श्री कल्प नाथ राय]

दूसरी बात वर्गीज कमेटी की रिपोर्ट के बारे में यह कहूंगा कि यह आटोनामस बाडी पूर्णरूपेण फाइनैन्शली इंडिपेंडेंट होनी चाहिए। इस पर सरकारी नियंत्रण कोई नहीं होना चाहिए। जब इन दोनों बातों को रखा जायेगा, तो हमारी निष्पक्ष आटोनामस बाडी होगी। कितना विचित्र आल-इंडिया रेडियो है। श्रीमती इन्दिरा गान्धी पिछली बार अलोगढ़ गई थीं, मीटिंग में भाषण देने के लिए। वहां उनके साथ दो एम० पी० भी हम लोग गये। वहां अलोगढ़ से लौट कर के आए। सुबह रेडियो पर आया कि श्रीमती गान्धी के साथ यात्रा करने वाले दो व्यक्ति पकड़े गये और उन पर जुर्माना किया गया। इस तरह का झूठा प्रचार इस तरह की चरित्र हत्या, इस तरह का गन्दा प्रचार जिसके रेडियो के माध्यम से किया जाता है जैसा गन्दा प्रचार सूचना मंत्री की देखरेख में किया जाता है, जो फासिस्टी तरीके अपना कर गन्दा प्रचार किया जाता है, मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूं कि देश की जनता इस फासिस्टी और नाज़ी हथकण्डों को अच्छी तरह से समझती है और एक साल के अन्दर यह साफ साबित हो गया है कि जितना ही आपने इस देश की महान् नेता के खिलाफ प्रचार करने की कोशिश की, चरित्र हत्या करने की कोशिश की उतनी ही इस देश की करोड़ों-करोड़ जनता उस नेता के समर्थन में उठ खड़ी हुई। आप में यदि हिम्मत है तो दक्षिणी भारत के अन्दर आपन सारा देख लिया और आप चुनाव हार गये। चौधरी चरण सिंह ने 9 प्रांतों की विधान सभाओं को इसलिए भंग किया कि जनता का विश्वास वह खो चुकी है, पार्लियामेंट के चुनाव में, इसलिए उनको भंग किया जाना चाहिए। इसलिए दक्षिण भा. त के अन्दर जनता पार्टी जनता विश्वास खो चुकी है, इसलिए अभी पार्लियामेंट को भंग करना चाहिए और हिन्दुस्तान में मध्यवधि चुनाव करने चाहिए। क्यों नहीं आप चुनाव कराते ?

आदरणीय सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, दक्षिणी भारत में जनता से कहा गया कि उत्तर भारत में इंदिरा गांधी का समर्थन नहीं है। आज उत्तर भारत के अन्दर आजमगढ़ का चुनाव हुआ। आजमगढ़ के अन्दर जनता पार्टी ने 50-60 लाख रुपया खर्च किया। 5-6 सौ जीपें दौड़ाईं। इनके पचास मंत्री उत्तर प्रदेश के और केन्द्रीय मंत्री तथा विश्व के महान वक्ता श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी भी वहां गये।

..... (Interruptions.)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Listen to me. Your time is up. Please confine yourself to the Verghese Committee Report and finish.

श्री कल्प नाथ राय : इसलिए उत्तर प्रदेश में चुनाव बुरी तरह हारे। इसलिए जहां 1 लाख 72 हजार से जनता पार्टी चुनाव जीते थी, वहां पर इनकी गहरी पराजय हुई और उत्तर प्रदेश, मध्य प्रदेश, राजस्थान, उत्तर भारत, दक्षिण भारत की जनता में आज हाहाकार मचा हुआ है। जनता सरकार ने उनका विश्वास खो दिया है। जनता से, सरकार से, जनता का विश्वास उठ चुका है और इस चरित्र हत्या, इस आकाशवाणी, रेडियो से जनता का मन ऊब चुका है। ऐसी स्थिति में सरकार अपने मानदण्डों के अनुकूल ही चुनाव कराये और जनता का मेन्डेट ले कि हिन्दुस्तान की जनता इंदिरा गांधी के पीछे खड़ी है या हैट्रोजीनियस या चू-चू का मुरब्बा जनता पार्टी के पीछे खड़ी है। (Time bell rings)

इसलिए, आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस पर बोलते हुए फिर कहना चाहता हूं कि वर्गीज कमेटी की सिफारिशों को तत्काल लागू किया जाए। आकाशवाणी, दूरदर्शन को तुरन्त एक आटोनामस बाडी बनाया जाए और देश के प्रधान मंत्री, मोरारजी देसाई से अपील करता हूं कि 17 जुलाई से पहले हिन्दुस्तान की जनता सरकार के गोवेलस, आडवाणी

साहब को मंत्रिमंडल से बर्खास्त करे और ऐसे व्यक्ति को सूचना मंत्रालय दे जिस पर देश को विश्वास हो सके ।

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU (Orissa): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, many brilliant speakers have preceded me. At the outset I would like to tell you that this Report has pointed out very emphatically that the autonomy of the Radio and Television must be maintained.

The principle of autonomy has already been enunciated by the Chanda Committee. This is a very brilliant ideology which must be accepted. There is no doubt about it. While going through the Bill which they have reproduced in the Report we have many doubts about its implementation which I should be very humbly point out before this House.

The first and foremost question is autonomy of Doordarshan and All India Radio because, apparently, these massmedia are to be influenced by the Government party in power and departmental regimentation is expected. Sir it is very fundamental that we have to examine how far this autonomy can be expanded. Until the A.I.R. and the Doordarshan have their own economic allotment, until they are self-sufficient in their finances, so long as they go with a begging bowl to the Government how far the proposal can be implemented is a moot question. Sometimes we criticise in the House that there is politicising. It was earlier, it exists today also. When a national perspective is emerging, if we compare the questions, we will see that when they approach the Government for money and when the service is regulated by the Government, it is expected that they act according to the whims of the departments and the authorities concerned. While we are going to have such a change, we see in this Report what is reported to be happening in other countries of the world? Only

very recently France has enacted a law which has been reported in this book on page A-31 where they have said that the Parliament in France has made an Act on July 28, 1974. And what are the cardinal principles they have accepted? They have accepted that a reorganisation be made and established a service. The service is controlled by a Board of Governors comprising half from the State, two from Parliament, representatives of the Programme Companies and two representatives of the staff elected by the unions. Now when we come to this problem of reorganising our structure by giving more autonomous powers, we will have to consider the fact that India is not only a country but that it is equated to the status of a continent where multi-cultural people exist, where multi-lingual problems are there and where the States have been recognised on linguistic basis. So, Sir, I fundamentally say that when organisation of a national trust is considered, these points must be very basically considered. These three points are very vital and I think they must be considered at the national level. The first thing is, if you make a centrally organised national trust, how can it preserve the cultural heritage of a multi-lingual country like India and how can it develop the regional languages in this country which is necessary for national integration? Sir, while forming the zonal committees we see that the interests of the smaller States are suffering. If you analyse what is given in this Report, you will notice that though All India Radio is there for the last fifty years, the coverage is still less than cent per cent. In my State of Orissa I know that even now the coverage is less than 70 per cent. So we have been seeing what are the problems before the nation.

Radio and television are accepted in the world as mass media of communication with great values. We cannot transform our technology and we cannot go in for modern methods of agriculture which are there in more

[Shri Santosh Kumar Sahu]

developed countries of the world because there, though they are not educated in the expertise of science and the different faculties, but they see things on the television and practise them in the field so that they could achieve the highest goals. So here the fundamental question is—and they have said it in this Report also—that this autonomy cannot be poured from above, from external sources of organisation if we create such a structure. It must be evolved from within. Then, what is the source for evolving from within? We have created trustees. Many Members have said that there are part-time trustees, there are whole-time trustees, we see discrimination and so on. What do we expect of the trustees? What is their qualification? There will be nominated trustees amongst them there will be a man of eminence in science and another of culture. These are the only two qualifying clauses in forming the trust. But the most fundamental thing is, if you want to increase the efficiency, if you want professionalism to grow so that you have a powerful media of radio and Doordarshan, then should we not recognise people who have worked for thirty or forty years, professional people who are recognised in the field, the workers and artistes who have suffered immensely and who have worked for the success of this thing? Should they not be recognised?

Then the other most important thing is, we see that in France and other countries they have accepted people from journalism in the trusts. But we have ignored this aspect. This should also be given consideration.

Then the other most important point is, we are creating a top-heavy administration. It is said that every trustee should have a salary equal to that of a Supreme Court Judge. Then will this not create heart-burning in the people who work there in the lower cadres? They are suffering as one of

my hon. friends has pointed out. Many of the staff artistes do not get pension, they do not get a proper pay and no sound personnel policy has not been established for thousands of artistes who are working in this country. How can you preserve the cultural heritage of this country? These are fundamental and basic questions.

Then, Sir, coming to another aspect, you will also have to consider that if we do what the Committee has suggested, that there should be two agencies of AIR and Doordarshan amalgamated into one National Trust, it is not the policy followed in any democratic country of the world. What I have quoted is found in the book here. Two separate organisations are functioning every where. When today we are thinking of restructuring the mass media, why not conceive of two National Trusts? What is the difficulty? The question is not that of finance. If we can have 11 trustees, in place of 22 trustees. Why can't we have two National Trusts? The problems of both are different. We require radio in remote villages. That is the first priority in the broadcasting programme. This must be taken into consideration because in remote villages they do not see a newspaper. What the national events are, they learn from the radio. So this must be given wide coverage. Suppose the National Broadcasting Trust is formed, it has to be given some fixed representation in the policy of the Government, these things must be given consideration. The national priorities in the mass media need to be considered, in providing the coverage Radio all through out country in shortest possible time.

And then about Television, I see, Sir, that we have not been following a very consistent policy. On the one hand, for the benefit of the backward areas, the tribal people, we wanted community television centres to be set up. But then the old centres are closed and the new ones are opened. What is the value of this if you do not

have a continuous programme? You make a very strong programme for it. We cannot go on haphazardly. If we continue it for some time at some places in backward areas and forget about the other areas, how can it grow? These are very fundamental questions.

The most important question, I humbly feel, is that we must consider the development of other countries. We may not copy them because we have our own problems. What I was saying is that not only should there be zonal committees but also there must be some sort of State level committees. I feel that if at least there are State level autonomous bodies, it will be ideal for the country with multi-lingual problems. A Central Trust would be controlling the National Service. Today also, in the new structural set-up, foreign programme is proposed to be controlled by the Government of India. Nobody denies it. All the countries in the world follow this policy. And it is not a small State where one language is there or some thousands of people are there. So we should think of having a wide coverage and the national goal being achieved. If we think of centralising, it is in effect what we have said in the zonal committees, where the Director will be coming to the Executive Body, it does not solve all the problems. Sir, as pointed out by Mr. Barua, I say with all humility, that a language expert in a station like Cuttack has not been appointed for the past 5 years, how can it develop the language, how can it develop the vocal language? These are very fundamental questions. About Television I must say that if one goes to other countries of the world, one finds how far television has developed and progressed there—even in Pakistan. We know the people of Amritsar day in and day out view the Television of Pakistan. Can we not think of some bold programmes? Should we only think of autonomy and with a begging bowl this autono-

my be held a piece? Until the man with right earnestness and devotion becomes the Chairman or Trustee, it cannot create a new vigour and sense of responsibility by only introducing trusteeship, things cannot improve. Pious wishes are there. There is a proverb: If wishes were horses, beggars would ride. This is our position. I strongly feel that there must be two separate Trusts, one for the All India Radio and the other for Television. And the third thing is that not only at the zonal level but also at every State level there must be a committee so that we can decentralise and look into the development of the regional languages and promotion of the backward regions for the greater national goal. These are the most important points. The way the trusteeship is selected is another thing I do not understand. There must be some representation of the people who have professionalised in the All India Radio for the last thirty years.

7.00 P.M.

We must think of the employees who have contributed their mite for the development of the All-India Radio. Its autonomy cannot be built at the top of the administration until we improve the condition of service. These are fundamental points.

Then, before creating the Trust, the Government must also come out with a plan for having cent per cent coverage of the areas of the country by the All-India Radio, whatever the cost may be, so that it can serve the backward people. This coverage should not be blocked in the name of financial difficulty. So, Sir, I may humbly submit that before taking a decision by the Government there must be national consensus.

Then, Sir, whoever he may be he may be a Justice, he may be the best legal person in the country, the Lok Pal might also be a judicial man, how can he be the best ma-

[Shri Santosh Kumar Sahu]

for running the All-India Radio? Do you think that they are the experts of everything? I do not believe in that. This requires specialisation. The man who has worked for the promotion of the Radio and who has worked for the cultural development of the country, must be recognised. They are different factors of life. The legal mind and the cultural mind do not always combine in one person. It might be unique in certain persons. Rabindra Nath Tagore contributed a lot for the introduction of Indian music instruments in AIR because he had that superb national spirit and great artistic talent.

Then, there is the question of accountability, Sir. We must have seen many public undertakings. We have seen Coal India. Every day we discussed about it. We thought of the Durgapur Steel Plant; we discussed it. Accountability, we discussed once in Parliament. Is that sufficient, Sir? These organisations when they become independent, they create a hell, exploit the labourers and there is a lot of corruption. Is that a sufficient remedy? Sir, this mass media is not only to impart news to the countrymen, but it should spread a new revolution, scientific and cultural in the country. We must consider this in right earnest, with proper thinking. It requires a national dialogue of the artistes and workers of the Radio and the Television and all the political parties. Instead of saying that we do not want to politicalise, it is better that all the political parties are taken into confidence. This is a democratic way. What is wrong? A wrong slip may further deteriorate situation to the worst.

I humbly submit that these things should be considered by the Government.

SHRI PATTIAM RAJAN (Kerala): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it is a widely recognised fact that the radio and the television constitute the most im-

portant communication media, particularly for a country like India where more than two-third of the total population have no access to our printed media due to illiteracy.

Sir, the radio network of India has been expanded during the last three decades, but there has been no qualitative change brought out during this period. When the British imperialism was ruling India, it used this mass media to suppress and oppress the freedom struggle. After independence, when the former Government came into power, that Government also used the same policy of the British imperialism to suppress and oppress the common people of India, and the naked administrative control of the radio came into being. When Mrs. Gandhi took charge of the Broadcasting Ministry, the AIR was reorganised administratively. Since then, the AIR and the TV have come to earn the reputation of a legalised liar by virtue of the persistent suppression of the news during the Emergency that came at the end taking all the past experience of the misuse of the communication media.

I welcome the present Government's decision to restructure the Radio and the TV administrations into an autonomous body. But if the communication media are to be treated as an infrastructure for development, then the representatives of the people and their organisations must have an important voice in it.

As far as I am concerned, autonomy can be ensured only if the following conditions are satisfied. Firstly, there should be a guaranteed source of funds for the new organisation so that it does not have to depend upon the Government directly for its funds. Secondly, there should be an organisational structure with people's representatives and their organisations in order to ensure the formulation of a democratic policy of broadcasting and its implementation. Thirdly, Sir, there should be an effective constitutional guarantee for the people's rights, with

a constitutional provision that the new organisation is a creation of the Constitution and not an ordinary Act of Parliament. And lastly, proper allocation of powers and functions to State-level counterparts of the new broadcasting organisation should be made so that on subjects that fall under the State or Concurrent List, the States get full operational autonomy to present views and assessments of the different situations.

Regarding the Report of the Committee, the broad principles of the charter of broadcasting prepared by the Committee are welcome. As you know, a charter as such does not mean anything unless it is backed by institutional provisions to translate it into practice. Here the committee gives the power of the NBT to the Government through the backdoor. The composition of the organisation has not been defined in this report. It is not also mentioned as to what categories of people should constitute the NBT. On the other hand, the right to appoint the Trust members has been given to the Prime Minister after consultation of some others. That means, the Prime Minister can select the Trust members at his or at the Government's will. This amounts almost to surrender of autonomy. Therefore, Sir, I would suggest that the right of appointment of members should be given to a selection committee consisting of leaders of recognised political parties, after getting the report from these judges and other persons.

This report has given a vague idea of the two-party system. It has already been proved that the two-party system is a bogus concept. Therefore, all party leaders should be invited and the board members have to be selected from that conference. Then instead of regional bodies, State bodies should be constituted because each State has its own custom, language and culture.

Again, whenever an important issue is broadcast by a spokesman of the ruling party, all the political parties and Opposition leaders should also be given an opportunity to express their view on that matter. When an important issue arises, the NBT authorities should interview the different political party leaders and broadcast their views also.

Then there are so many demands put forward by the employees. They should be taken into consideration. Especially the contract employees should be made permanent.

Then some provision should be made for broadcasting in languages of the linguistic minorities like Nepali and other languages.

Regarding TV, we the people of Kerala are having no TV at present. Therefore, I would request the Minister to introduce TV not only in Kerala but in all other States which do not have TV at present.

With these words, Sir, I support this proposal brought forward by the Verghese Committee. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Mr. Madhavan, just five minutes.

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN: I agree; I always make short speeches unless my time is wasted by interruptions.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): No, there will not be any interruptions now.

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN: Sir, one is reminded of a story, wherein a person engaged a butler to cut vegetables with an axe. He gave the table-knife to the barber. And the razor was given to the wood-cutter. So the point is the three instruments were there, but none of these instruments was useful to persons concerned. I am reminded of this story because Mr. B. G. Verghese is a distinguished journalist, who could have

[Shri K. K. Madhavan]

easily headed the Press Commission, but he happened to head this Akash Bharati business. It is like placing the unwanted instrument into the unwanted hands. That is the whole tragedy of this business. I did not actually want to talk now. But I have certain ideas to put across to the House. Now, Shri B. G. Verghese was victimised, they say. I do not want to enter into the controversy. But Shri B. G. Verghese, it is a fact and a tragic fact at that, was defeated at the polls to the Lok Sabha. He was supported by the Janata Party, the Marxist Party and those others, in Kerala. That is a fact. So, the chairmanship of the committee was a consolation prize to a politically defeated person. After all, Government has powers. But then, why not use those powers for useful purposes? That is my first point.

Then about this report. It looks very beautiful, as handsome as my friend, Mr. Advani; but appearances are deceptive. That is the whole trouble. What is the guarantee that this autonomy will not be misused? The body of persons constituting the board have got perpetual succession. About those, who have been placed—I say ‘placed’, I repeat—In these positions, where is the guarantee that they will not misuse their positions? This institution, built up at the cost of the public, this built-in organisation, is being handed over peacefully to this body of persons. This is a public property. What is the guarantee that in the near future or in the remote future this body of people will not restructure the body itself, the organisation itself, to the detriment of the country?

Another point is, many friends were saying about foreign news agencies, and all that. These are just carbon copies of the materials obtained from the embassies in India. Nothing else; nothing original. Of course, they have acknowledged it. I give that credit to them.

Another thing is this. I will read from page 21, Volume I. This may be recorded for whatever it is worth, and it should be recorded. I may be permitted to read this out:

Sir, I quote from page 20 of Vol. I:

“Akashvani and Doordarshan combine in themselves the characteristics of marketplace, newspaper, university, national extension agency, and cultural academy. As such, a unique institution must enjoy a unique autonomy....”

I agree that it is unique and, therefore, it has been said that it must enjoy a unique autonomy. The unique character of this institution has been brought in here just to give it justification for a unique autonomy. That is the purpose and that is the propriety or the mischievous wisdom of the usage of the word “unique”. Then again, it goes on to say:

“The broadcasting organisation could be a company like the HMT or BHEL.”

But the HMT is a profit-making company.

“...or BHEL; a statutory corporation like the LIC; or a Commission like the Atomic Energy, Space or Electronics Commissions. It could be a Board like the Railway and the P&T Boards; or a registered society like the ICAR and CSIR. Or it could be like a university, governed by its own statute;...”

This is very important. It has been said here “governed by its own statute” and I underline these words. It means that they are free to have their own statutes.

“...or a constitutional entity like the UPSC or the Election Commission...”

I do not understand this; and I have my own doubts. Then, it says:

“Broadcasting entails no manufacturing or trading function...”

That is the strange thing about it. They say that it can be like the LIC or the BHEL or the HMT or anything like that. In the same breath, they say that it has no manufacturing function. "Every actual and potential listener,"—what potential listener, every helpless listener—I am a very helpless listener—"is a consumer ...".

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): I think you must make your last point now.

AN HON. MEMBER: His time is over.

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN: Who are you to say that? You are not to decide that. Sir, I will take only the minimum time that is required. Now, it goes on to say:

"...Every actual and potential listener or a viewer is a consumer and every citizen is a shareholder..."

I do not know how a citizen is a shareholder in that. That is also a doubtful thing.

"...There is no product that can be priced in the market..."

That is true, because it does not reach the market. It melts away through the ears. But it captures the mind and enslaves the mind, heart and head of the listener.

"...nor any raw materials other than ideas and creative talents..."

Creative ideas are there, of course. But the ideas can be mischievous also.

"...The services rendered are again difficult to quantify..."

"Services" means probably services rendered by Mr. Verghese.

"...awareness; knowledge; information; pleasure. There is no regulatory function to discharge in the main".

Then again Sir, in the last paragraph, it has been said:

"Broadcasting is different. The broadcasting organisation is best seen as a National Trust, a non-profit making body, an essential public service licensed to operate under a Parliamentary Charter and accountable to Parliament."

Sir, every minute, every hour, every day, every week, we are listening to a variety of programmes in so many languages covering so many things. But the mischief is done very minute. Every minute the mischief is done and we cannot correct it also. If it is a newspaper, we can write to the editor of the newspaper and say, "Here is a mistake. Get it corrected in the next issue if possible." But, in this case, we cannot do that. So, Sir, radio can be a good instrument, an instrument of creation of culture, an instrument for nurturing culture and everything that is good in the human civilization. But radio and television can also become instruments of destruction, cultural destruction, total destruction, totalitarian destruction...

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: Very good.

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN: That is why I say that those people who want to stage a coup to capture power, capture the radio station first, and then they capture the transport system and then they capture the communication system. These are the three essential things. If you capture the radio, you can enslave the entire people because nobody will know anything about what is happening in the next village or in the next district. That is the position. Mr. Advani, I congratulate you for the clever manner in which you have taken over this wonderful instrument which can eventually become very dangerous. I say, gradually, steadily, but in a well-defined and planned manner, things are being done. 'Samachar' was slaughtered. Then Press Council

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Please conclude.

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN: I am concluding in two sentences, Sir. What I see is a dictatorship. They must have said it in so many words. I do not welcome the idea. But instead of one dictatorship which they have condemned, I think a crude type of dictatorship is round the corner. I say, this as I see, the emergence of dictatorship.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Please conclude now.

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN: I do not wish to cast any reflection on anyone. I say this part of the country was once ruled by the chapel of a king...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Please wind up.

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN: I am winding up. So the position is this. A cultural instrument is being created and cultural conditions are being created, congenial to the emergence of a potential feudal type of fascism, and chaotic conditions are being created here purposefully, deliberately, at the cost of the poorest men in this country, killing the masses and hundreds and hundreds of Harijans, exploiting the working class and shooting them down. I see in the near future, within 5 years' time—in less than 5 years—the ugly face of a dictatorship of a feudal type raising its ugly head, this is a dismal warning, a dangerous warning, to the country, Sir. Thank you.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मैं केवल एक मुख्य बात जिसकी तरफ किसी का ध्यान नहीं गया कहना चाहूंगा। मैंने दो विद्वान प्रोफेसर, डा० दत्त और सरूप सिंह के अति उत्तम भाषण बड़ी ही तन्मयता से सुने। मैं इनके बारे में थोड़ी देर कुछ बात कहूंगा। लेकिन मुझे दुख है कि मेरे साथी कल्पनाय

राय जी ने कुछ बातें कही हैं। इस पर मैं एक ही बात कहना चाहता हूँ :—

हम ग्राह भी भरते हैं तो हो जाते हैं बदनाम, वो कत्ल भी करते हैं तो चर्चा नहीं होता।

चर्चा की जा रही है कि कांग्रेस पार्टी की चुनाव में जीत हुई। मैं इसकी चर्चा भी नहीं करता। इस समय मेरा यह विषय नहीं है। लेकिन एक बात अवश्य कहता हूँ। दूसरा विश्व-युद्ध जब हो रहा था, तो चर्चिल ने कहा था :

Let the German win the battle: we will win the war. मैं कहता हूँ : Let them win the battle. We have won the War, and we will win the War.

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : यह हिटलर ने कहा था कि ...

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : जी नहीं, चर्चिल ने। अब मैं दूसरी बात पर आता हूँ। दोनों प्रोफेसर साहब ने दो-तीन बातें कही हैं। मैं उनसे सहमत हूँ। ढांचा जटिल है। दूसरे सन्देह है कि वैस्टिड इन्स्ट्रुमेंट उसको अपना हथियार न बना लें। मैं बिल्कुल सहमत हूँ। सन्देह सत्य है। तीसरी बात डा० सरूप सिंह ने कही थी कि सरकार के बहुत से प्रोग्राम की आवश्यकताएं, सामाजिक, आर्थिक ऐसी हैं जिनके उपयोग के लिए आवश्यक होगा कि कुछ न कुछ सरकार की, दखलअन्दाजी तो नहीं कहूंगा लेकिन उसका हाथ है। मैं इस बात से सहमत हूँ। मैं मंत्री महोदय का जो मेरे वरिष्ठ नेता भी हैं, साथी भी हैं, उनका ध्यान इस ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि कहीं हम अपनी उत्सुकता में एक ऐसा आटोनामस बाड़ी न बना दो जो हम बनाना भी नहीं चाहते, कहीं ऐसी मशीन तो खड़ी नहीं कर देंगे जो कल भूत बन कर खड़ी हो जाए और जो चीज हम चाहत हैं, उसके विपरीत बात खड़ी हो जाए। श्री माधवन जी ने यहाँ सन्देह प्रकट किया

डा० दत्त ने भी यह सन्देह प्रकट किया है इस सन्देह की ओर मैं आडवाणी जी, आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ, और चाहता हूँ कि इस प्रकार का कोई निर्णय नहीं लें कि जिससे हम जो चीज चाहते हैं वह पैदा न हो, उल्टे दूसरा भूत खड़ा हो जाये। एक आटोनोमस बाडी बननी चाहिए, इस उत्सुकता में एक विचित्र बात इस रिपोर्ट में कही गई है। उन्होंने कहा कि कंस्टीट्यूशन में परिवर्तन करके कारपोरेशन को एक कारपोरेट सिटीजन आफ दि कंट्री निगमात्मक नागरिक घोषित किया जाए। "To say the least, it is fantastic." कारपोरेशन को नागरिक के अधिकार से संविधान की 19 ए धारा में दी गई सुविधा उपलब्ध की जाए। रिपोर्ट में कही पर भी किसी देश का उदाहरण नहीं दिया गया है। किसी भी देश में इस प्रकार के कारपोरेशन को नागरिकता का अधिकार दिया गया होता तो शायद उस पर विचार करने के लिए अपने आप को बाध्य मानता। लेकिन मेरे साथियों ने, वर्गिस साहब ने या जे० डी० सेठी साहब ने, जो मेरे मित्र भी हैं और विद्वान भी हैं, किसी देश का हवाला नहीं दिया। अगर एक निगम को हम नागरिक घोषित कर दें तो कल जितने भी देश में कारपोरेशन बनेंगे उनकी भी मांग नागरिकता देने की हो सकती है। नागरिकों को सम्पत्ति रखने का अधिकार है, संगठन बनाने के अधिकार भी है। यदि कारपोरेशनों को यह अधिकार दिया जाए तो कल उनका संगठन खड़ा होगा संविधान के मौलिक अधिकार के अन्दर तो क्या स्थिति होगी? मेरे मित्र ने आटोनोमस बाडी को नागरिक बनाने की जो सिफारिश की है उसका मुझे कहीं सिर पैर दिखाई नहीं देता।

दूसरी बात यह कही गयी है कि इसकी आमदनी के ऊपर टैक्स नहीं लगना चाहिए। चित भी मेरी पट भी मेरी। मैं चाहता हूँ कि ऐसा दिन आये कि आटोनोमस बाडी बने, स्वतन्त्र रूप से कार्य करे और हमारे जो सन्देह हैं

हमारी जो आशंकाये हैं उनको वह दूर कर सकें, और वह आमदनी भी करे। लेकिन आमदनी करें तो टैक्स क्यों न लगे? हाँ टैक्स लगे और उसके बाद सरकार को उसको दोबारा पैसा सहायता के रूप में दे दे यह आवश्यक है।

आखिरी बात कहूंगा मैं लंबा भाषण नहीं करना चाहता। जो बातें और लोगों ने कही हैं उनको दोहराने का कोई अर्थ नहीं। तीसरी बात यह कही गई है कि संसद् के सामने इसकी एक वार्षिक रिपोर्ट आये। हर कारपोरेशन की रिपोर्ट आती है। उस पर सवाल किये जाते हैं। लेकिन उन्होंने यह भी कहा है कि हम आशा करते हैं कि संसद् सदस्य दिनों दिन उस पर सवाल नहीं करेंगे। यह एक बात कह कर रूप ही बदल दिया गया है। इसका अर्थ यह है कि जो जनता के प्रतिनिधि हैं उनका कोई सम्बन्ध इस तरह की संस्था के साथ नहीं रहेगा। आप कल्पना कीजिए कि आटोनोमस बाडी बने, पार्लियामेंट का उससे लेना देना नहीं हो, टैक्स लगे नहीं, कैसा बोर्ड खड़ा होगा? मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि संसद् के सामने एक वर्ष में रिपोर्ट आने के पश्चात् कोई दिन-दिन की शिकायतों की सुनवाई नहीं हो सकती। केवल एक औपचारिकता मात्र होती है। एक उदाहरण देता हूँ, मैं नहीं कहता कि यह बात इसी रूप में ठीक होगी, केन्द्र में और प्रदेशों में जन प्रतिनिधियों की कमेटी बन सकती है जिसका यह काम हो कि वह दिनों दिन की जनता की जो शिकायतें हों उनको सुनें। स्वतंत्र निगम बनेगा, उसे सरकार धन देगी, उसकी आमदनी पर टैक्स नहीं लगेगा। यदि यह पूर्ण स्वतन्त्र निगम ऐसी चीजें करना आरम्भ कर दे जो अशोभनीय हों तो उनको कौन रोकेगा? यह रोक लगनी चाहिए।

एक अन्तिम बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ। वह यह है कि इसमें एक घोषणा पत्र दिया गया है, जिसमें बहुत सी बातें कही गई

[श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर] ---

हैं। उनमें कोई बात ऐसी नहीं है जिससे किसी का विरोध हो। अछूतों के लिए कही गई है, अल्प संख्यकों के लिए कही गई है, लेकिन एक मूल बात छोड़ दी गई है। हिन्दुस्तान में हमारे कुछ नैतिक मापदण्ड हैं मोरेल स्टैंडर्ड्स भी हैं। इस चार्ट के अन्दर इसकी कोई कल्पना नहीं की गई है। एक चीज अन्य देशों के अन्दर स्वीकार हो सकती है, लेकिन हमारे देश में, समाज में, वह चीज हो सकती है स्वीकार नहीं की जाए। सिनेमा पर सेंसर है। परन्तु सेंसरशिप टेली-विजन पर लागू नहीं होगा। मैं कहता हूँ कि चार्टर के अन्दर हमारे हिन्दुस्तानी नैतिक मापदण्डों के संरक्षण का भी समावेश किया जाना चाहिये।

अन्त में मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि जो संदेह हमारे साथियों ने प्रकट किये हैं उन सन्देहों से बच कर हम वास्तव में एक स्वतंत्र निगम बना सकें, और जो हमारी इच्छाएं हैं उनको हम पूरा कर सकें। इस दृष्टि से मंत्री महोदय विचार करें! शीघ्रता न करें। मैं शीघ्रता न करने को जो कह रहा हूँ वह इसलिये नहीं कह रहा हूँ कि बात टाली जाए लेकिन शीघ्रता करते करते जो चीज नहीं चाहते वह न हो जाए। डा० सरूप सिंह और दूसरे हमारे साथियों ने जो सन्देह प्रकट किये हैं वे पूरे नहीं होने चाहिए। यह सावधानी आवश्यक है इतना कह कर मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, 3 मार्च, 1978 को वर्गीस कमेटी ने अपना प्रतिवेदन सरकार को दिया और 9 मार्च को यह प्रतिवेदन संसद् के दोनों सदनों में रखा गया। तब से लेकर विगत ढाई महीने में देश भर में इस विषय पर चर्चा हो रही है। जो मीडिया से संबंधित लोग हैं वे, और अन्य लोग भी कई संस्थाओं के, इस पर सेमिनार का आयोजन कर चुके हैं।

मैं अभी सूची देख रहा था जिन-जिन संस्थाओं ने इस पर चर्चाएं आयोजित कीं। मैंने देखा उनमें से कई प्रमुख संस्थाएं हैं, जैसे— हैदराबाद का एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव स्टाफ कालेज, उस्मानिया यूनिवर्सिटी, पब्लिक रिलेशन सोसाइटी आफ इंडिया, मद्रास इंडियन इंस्टीट्यूट आफ मांस कम्यूनिकेशन जो दिल्ली में है और प्रेस इंस्टीट्यूट। मैं समझता हूँ कि बाकी संस्थाओं ने जो चर्चाएं आयोजित की हैं उसमें राज्य सभा की आज की बहस का अपना योगदान रहेगा। मैं कह सकता हूँ कि सामान्यतः आज जो चर्चाएं हुई हैं वह अच्छे स्तर की हुई हैं। सामान्यतः मैंने जान बूझ कर कहा है। मुझे अधिक खुशी होती मैं अगर यह कह सकता कि हर एक ने बहुत अच्छा योगदान दिया है, लेकिन जो वेदना, जो क्षोभ मेरे साथियों ने व्यक्त की, डा० सरूप सिंह ने या डा० बी० पी० दत्त ने भी व्यक्त की, मैं भी उसको दोहराना चाहूंगा और आपके माध्यम से, उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, सदन के सभी सदस्यों से, सदन के सभी दलों से अनुरोध करना चाहूंगा कि यह जो राजनीति है इसकी कुछ मर्यादाएं हैं और उसमें संसदीय शालीनता एक बहुत बड़ी मर्यादा है जिसे हमें पालन करना चाहिए। आज की बहस सामान्यतः बहुत अच्छी रही है। हरेक ने अपने-अपने मुझाव दिये हैं एक रचनात्मक दृष्टिकोण से। मेरे मित्र श्री श्रीकान्त वर्मा ने इस बहस का आरम्भ किया। विरोधी दल के सदस्य हैं। शायद उनका दल हर बात में सरकार का विरोध करना ही उपयुक्त समझता हो लेकिन उन्होंने उप-युक्तता नहीं समझी। उन्होंने एक रचनात्मक दृष्टिकोण से अपने प्रस्ताव रखे, अपने कुछ मुझाव रखे और आलोचना की। मैं उसका स्वागत करता हूँ। यह जरूर कहूंगा कि हम किसी को दोष दे या न दें कि स्वायत्तता दी या नहीं दी लेकिन यह तथ्य है कि पहली बार ए०आई०आर० को आटोनोमस कारपोरेशन बनाने की बात 1948 में कही गई थी। पंडित नेहरू द्वारा कही गई थी।

उन्होंने उस समय कहा था कि यह तुरन्त संभव नहीं लेकिन सरकार के मन में वह बात इतनी थी कि मुझे भी जानकर ताज्जुब हुआ इस वर्गीज कमेटी की रिपोर्ट के माध्यम से मुझे इस बात का पता लगा कि जितने भी लोग आकाशवाणी में भर्ती होते हैं उनको जो एपाइन्टमेन्ट आर्डर मिलता है उसमें यह बात कही जाती है कि आपको अगर किसी दिन पब्लिक कारपोरेशन में काम करने के लिए कहा जाय तो आपको यह बात स्वीकार करनी पड़ेगी। अर्थात् हमेशा से यह बात मन में रही है कि सरकार यह चाहती थी कि आकाशवाणी को एक पब्लिक कारपोरेशन में कनवर्ट करने की संभावना है और वह ऐसा हो जाएगा। लेकिन सन् 1966 में चन्दा कमेटी बनी। चन्दा कमेटी ने इस बात को फिर से मूर्त रूप दिया और स्पष्ट रूप से यह सिफारिश की कि इसको एक आटोनोमस कारपोरेशन बनाना चाहिए। दो या तीन साल तक जब इस विषय पर सवाल पूछे जाते रहे तो यही कहा जाता रहा कि इस पर विचार हो रहा है। लेकिन बाद में एक समय ऐसा आया कि जब सरकार ने यह कहा कि इस विषय पर विचार करके हम इस निष्कर्ष पर पहुंचे हैं कि आकाशवाणी को स्वायत्तता या स्वायत्त संस्था के रूप में परिवर्तित करना सरकार नहीं चाहती है और इसको एक सरकारी विभाग के रूप में ही रखना चाहती है। इसलिए यह कहना कि कोई भी इसके खिलाफ नहीं था, उचित नहीं है। यह वास्तविकता नहीं है। वास्तविकता यह है कि जिस समय जनता पार्टी शासन में आई तो उससे पहले उसने जनता से यह वायदा किया था कि हम आकाशवाणी को स्वायत्त संस्था का रूप देंगे। जनता से हमने जो वायदे किये थे उनमें यह एक प्रमुख वायदा था। आपने देखा होगा कि जिस समय वर्गीज कमेटी गठित की गई और जिस वक्त उसके टर्म आफ रेफरेन्स तैयार किये गये तो उसमें इस बात का उल्लेख नहीं था कि आकाशवाणी को स्वायत्तता का रूप दिया जाय अथवा नहीं। शुरू से ही यह कहा

गया कि सरकार की यह मान्यता है कि आकाशवाणी की सरकारी नियंत्रण से मुक्त करके एक स्वायत्त संस्था का रूप दिया जाय इसलिये हमारे सामने प्रश्न यह था कि इसकी पुनर्रचना कैसे की जाय, इस पर विचार करके सिफारिश की जायें। मैं समझता हूं कि वर्गीज कमेटी ने बहुत बढ़िया काम किया है। मैं उसकी सब सिफारिशों से सहमत हूं, ऐसी बात नहीं है। सरकार इन सिफारिशों पर अपना निर्णय करेगी और इसमें कुछ समय लगेगा लेकिन मैं यह कह सकता हूं कि जिस पृष्ठभूमि में जिस परिश्रम के साथ, जिस तन्मयता के साथ और जिस लगन के साथ एक-एक शब्द, एक एक वाक्य, एक एक परिच्छेद इस रिपोर्ट में रखा गया है वह प्रशंसनीय है और उसमें उस कमेटी की निष्ठा और प्रतिबद्धता स्पष्ट टपकती है। वह कह सकते हैं कि

They are long objectives and short impracticability. जैसा कि हमारे

भाई महापात्र जी ने कहा कि हमारा जो उद्देश्य हो उसको हमें पूरा करना चाहिए। मैं समझता हूं कि अगर उद्देश्य को पूरा नहीं किया जाता है तो उसका कोई मतलब नहीं है। वास्तव में स्वायत्तता की बात तो मुनने में आती थी, लेकिन जेनिविन आटोनोमी की बात हमें बहुत कम मुनने को मिलती थी जेनिविन आटोनोमी शब्द का प्रयोग सबसे पहले हमने अपने मैनीफेस्टो में किया था। इसमें कोई संदेह नहीं कि किसी भी संस्था की आटोनोमी हो सकती है और वह केवल नाम की भी हो सकती है और व्यावहारिक भी हो सकती है। इस स्वायत्तता को वास्तविक कैसे बनाया जाय, यही हमारे सामने प्रश्न था। वर्गीज कमेटी ने जिस समय अपना काम शुरू किया तो हमारे मन में यह इच्छा थी कि इसको वास्तविक कैसे बनाया जाय। मेरे एक मित्र ने यह कहा कि दुनिया के किसी भी देश में ऐसा नहीं है कि कोई कारपोरेशन जो होती है उसको स्वायत्त संस्था का स्टेटस दिया गया हो या उसको अलग स्वायत्त संस्था के रूप में माना जाय।

[श्री लालकृष्ण आडवाणी]

लेकिन इस संबंध में कमेटी ने अपनी सिफारिश करते समय निष्ठा और प्रतिबद्धता दिखाई है। यहां पर जितने सदस्यों ने अपने विचार व्यक्त किये, चाहे वे इधर के हों या उधर के हों, उन्होंने व्यावहारिकता के अभाव की शिक्षायत्त की है। दोनों तरफ से इस मामले में राजनीति नहीं लाई गई है। डा० बी० पी० दत्त ने यह कहा है कि कहीं ऐसा न हो कि इस संस्था में सम्पत्ति वाले लोग अपना कब्जा कर लें। डा० सरूप सिंह ने सेल्फ एड्जीवेशन की बात कही है। लेकिन मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि इसका क्या मतलब है? The Government cannot withdraw from the scene. पिछले दिनों में कुछ विदेशी प्रसारण संबंधी लोगों से मिला था। उन्होंने कहा कि इतिहास में ऐसा कोई उदाहरण नहीं है कि किसी सरकार ने जिसके पास आकाशवाणी और ब्रोडकास्टिंग का इतना बड़ा नेट-वर्क रहा हो और जिसके हाथ में 30 साल तक सत्ता रही हो, उससे हम इस माध्यम को छोड़ने की कल्पना कर सकें। प्रसारण के इतने सशक्त माध्यम को आसानी से नहीं छोड़ा जा सकता है। इस प्रकार का उदाहरण इतिहास में नहीं मिलता है। मैं इस बात को मानता हूं कि कोई भी इस माध्यम को छोड़ने का लोभ संवरण नहीं कर सकता है। मैं समझता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान में रेडियो की तुलना में जितने भी अन्य माध्यम हैं वे सब नगण्य हैं। आखिर जो प्रेस है वह कितने लोगों तक पहुंच सकता है। जो पढ़े लिखे लोग हैं। लेकिन रेडियो जो पढ़े-लिखे नहीं हैं, जिनकी संख्या हिन्दुस्तान में बहुत है, बहुमत जो पढ़ा-लिखा नहीं है उन तक रेडियो पहुंचता है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : और टेलीविजन ?

श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी : टेलीविजन तो नहीं पहुंचता, रेडियो पहुंचता है। घर-घर

पहुंचता है। दुर्भाग्य से पिछले दिनों में रेडियो की चर्चा भी बहुत हुई। कुछ बात सही तौर से कही गई और बहुत सी बातें राजनैतिक संदर्भ में कही गईं। रेडियो जो है वह शिक्षा का, सोशल इकानामिक रिफार्म का एक सशक्त माध्यम है। मैं अभी दक्षिण में गया था। मुझे यह जानकारी बहुत प्रसन्नता हुई कि तमिलनाडु में, केरल में वहां का जो किसान है वह एक प्रकार का धान उपजाता है, एक प्रकार का चावल उपजाता है। उसका नाम उनसे पूछो तो वे कहते हैं कि दिस इज रेडियो राइस। रेडियो राइस है क्योंकि वे कहते हैं कि हाई ईलडिंग बरायटी आफ राइस कैसे ग्रो करें, यह हमें रेडियो से पता चला। इसलिये इसका नाम हो गया रेडियो राइस। यह जो चीज है वह अच्छी है। छोटी है लेकिन रेडियो, रेडियो की सार्थकता और रेडियो की उपयोगिता देश के निर्माण के लिये, देश की कृषि के विकास के लिये इसका कितना डिवलेपमेंटल परपज है, यह इसको उजागर करता है। इन बातों को ध्यान में रख कर हमको इसके बारे में निर्णय करना पड़ेगा। मोटे तौर पर मैं समझता हूं कि जितनी सिफारिशें वर्गोस कमेटी ने की हैं, आटानामी के सम्बन्ध में, मोटी सिफारिशें, उससे किसी व्यक्ति को मतभेद नहीं हो सकता। हम उसके मकेनिज्म में जायेंगे, उसकी डिटेल्स में जायेंगे। फुल टाइम ट्रस्टीज होने चाहिए या नहीं हाने चाहिए, यह प्रश्न यहां उठाया गया। सही है, इसकी आलोचना हुई है। कई लोगों ने आलोचना की है। यहां पर बी० बी० सी० का उदाहरण दिया गया। यह बात सही है कि बी० बी० सी० में फुल टाइम ट्रस्टी है और जो बोर्ड आफ डाइरेक्टर्स है वे आर नाट फुल टाइम। इसकी आलोचना हुई है। इन बातों को देखना पड़ेगा कि एक बाड़ी हानी चाहिए, एक कारपोरेशन होना चाहिए या दो कारपोरेशन होने चाहिए। मैं आफ

हैंड कुछ नहीं कह सकता। हमारे मित्र श्री साहू जी और डा० वी० पी० दत्त ने कहा कि रेडियो और टी० वी० दोनों अलग अलग प्रकार के हैं, इसलिये दोनों के लिये अलग-अलग कारपोरेशन हो तो अच्छा हो। शायद इसी कारण पिछले दिनों में चंदा कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में भी यह बात कही गई। चंदा कमेटी की रिपोर्ट के आधार पर दूरदर्शन को रेडियो से अलग किया गया। दोनों पहले बिल्कुल एक साथ थे। बाद में दूरदर्शन को रेडियो से अलग किया गया, उस सिफारिश के अनुरूप। ये सारी चीजें जो हैं, ये सारे मुद्दे जो हैं ये बहुत डिटेल की चीजें हैं। महत्वपूर्ण हैं। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि महत्वपूर्ण नहीं है। लेकिन यह चीज डिटेल की हैं। मूल सिद्धान्त जो है, उस मूल सिद्धान्त के बारे में मुझे यह देखकर बहुत खुशी हुई कि जितने भी सदस्य बोले उन सबने उसका स्वागत किया। सारे लोगों में इश्टियाज दिखाई दिया परन्तु मेरे मित्र श्री महापत्रों में यह नहीं दिखाई दिया। मैं नहीं जानता कि उनमें क्यों नहीं दिखाई दिया। विशेषकर मेरे मित्र श्री कल्पनाथ राय ने आरम्भ में इसका स्वागत किया। लेकिन उसके बाद उस वर्गीस कमेटी से उनका कोई संबंध नहीं दिखाई दिया और बाद में उनको अपनी बातें जो कहनी थी वह कही।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, क्योंकि यह सवाल यहां पर बार-बार किया गया है और इसके बारे में बाहर भी कहा गया है और यहां पर आज डा० दत्त ने स्पेसिफिकली कहा अब्राउट अरनेस्टनेस, अब्राउट सिनसेरिटी बाहर के लोग क्यों कहते हैं? इसका एक कारण यह है कि कुछ लोग कहते हैं यह राष्ट्रीय बहस क्यों हो। नेशनल डिबेट की क्या जरूरत है। आपको करना है तो करिये। एक साथ कर ले। लेकिन दूसरी तरफ दूसरे लोग हैं जो राष्ट्रीय बहस की बात करते हैं। मैंने अपनी तरफ से नहीं कहा। इस वर्गीस कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में कहा है कि

There should be a national debate and I think that this is a part of national debate.

दुर्भाग्य की बात है, खेद की बात है कि हमको दूसरे सदन में इस विषय पर चर्चा करने का मौका नहीं मिला। लगता तो यह था कि यहां भी ऐसी हालत हो जायेगी। आज जैसा चल रहा था और कल तथा परसों से ऐसा लगता था कि यह नहीं हो पायेगा। लेकिन आज हमें यहां पर चर्चा का मौका मिला। क्योंकि उस सदन को इस विषय पर चर्चा का मौका नहीं मिला इसलिये मैं नहीं कह सकता कि सरकार क्या करेगी। इस पर सोचना होगा विचार करना होगा कि लोक सभा में चर्चा नहीं हुई इसलिये इस पर फैसला अभी ले या न लें

Is it dragging its feet, is it having second thought?

मैं इस अवसर पर स्पष्ट करना चाहूंगा कटेगोरीकली और अनेक्युवोकली कि गवर्नमेंट ने इस मामले में संकल्प किया है, वह उस पर दृढ़ है।

There is no question of going back.

आटोनामी कारपोरेशन बनाने की कल्पना को हम कार्यान्वित करेंगे। उसके डीटेल्स के बारे में जरूर मतभेद हो सकते हैं, दो मत हो सकते हैं। यहां पर दिखाई दिया बारिंग आल पार्टीज यहां पर पार्टियों का सवाल नहीं है। मैं इस बात से सहमत नहीं हो सकता कि श्रीकांत जी ने कहा कि इसमें प्रधान मंत्री जी को क्यों लाया गया है और प्रधान मंत्री जी को लाते ही उसकी आटोनामी खत्म हो गयी यह तो वैसे ही बात हो गयी जैसे कि चीफ जस्टिस की इंडिपेंडेंस खत्म हो गयी क्योंकि उसे गवर्नमेंट नामीनेट करती है, जजेज की भी इंडिपेंडेंस खत्म हो गयी क्योंकि गवर्नमेंट उसे एप्वाइंट करती है।

the appointing authority is the Government. There can be some other way also not that there can be no other way.

लेकिन मुझे खुशी होती अगर श्रीकांत जी इतना न कहकर अपनी तरफ से सुझाव देते

[श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी]

कि यह होना चाहिए। जैसे आपने सुझाव दिया, जैसे कि सी० पी० आई० (एम) के मित्र ने सुझाव दिया कि पोलिटिकल पार्टीज की (Interruptions)

आपने सुझाव दिया था राष्ट्रपति का लेकिन आप मैं समझता हूँ कि संविधान से इतने परिचित हो गये होंगे कि संविधान की पहले की जो धाराएं थी उनके अनुसार भी राष्ट्रपति का मतलब सरकार था अब जब से 42वां संशोधन पास हुआ है और जिस संशोधन के बदलने के बाद जो प्रस्ताव सामने आया है उसमें ऐसा कोई परिवर्तन नहीं किया गया है और राष्ट्रपति का अर्थ सरकार ही है इसलिए राष्ट्रपति का कोई डिस्कीशनरी अधिकार नहीं है ना पहले संविधान में था न 42वें संविधान के पास होने के बाद संविधान में आया है न ही हमारी तरफ से बिल रखा गया जिससे उसके बाद कोई परिवर्तन होता?

श्री श्रीकान्त वर्मा : राष्ट्रपति के पद की ज्यादा क्रेडिबिलिटी भी है ऐसे मामलों में दूसरे मैंने यह कहा था कि उसमें ज्यादा बड़ी लम्बी सूची न भेजते। जितने नाम है उनमें से फाइनल करके राष्ट्रपति को भेज दिये जाए? प्रधान मंत्री के लिए क्यों इतनी मैनेजिलेशन की गुंजाइश छोड़ी जाय। प्रधान मंत्री को क्यों इतने नाम भेजे जाय कि वे उनमें से सिलेक्ट करें।

श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं बिल्कुल स्पष्ट करना चाहूंगा कि हमारे संविधान में इसके लिए कोई गुंजाइश नहीं है। पहले अगर थोड़ी बहुत थी तो अब बिल्कुल नहीं है कि राष्ट्रपति That he is the constitutional Head. It does not mean anything else.

और मैं कहता हूँ कि कोई प्रावधान देना हो, कोई सजेशन देना हो it should be more precise and concrete. Take for example...

जैसे मेरे मित्र ने कहा कि सभी पार्टियों की एक समिति होनी चाहिए और वह ट्रस्टीज को नामीनेट करे। मैं इससे सहमत नहीं हूँ। मैं मांटे तौर पर इसलिए सहमत नहीं हूँ क्योंकि अगर हमें आकाशवाणी और रेडियो को डिपॉलिटिकलाइज करना है this is certainly not the way to depoliticalise it.

और पालिटिकलाइज करना है तो जो जितना कुछ ले आ सकते हैं ले आइये। इसीलिए उन्होंने जो सुझाव दिया है कि यू०पी०एस०सी० में हो, यह हो वह हो तो उसमें भी यह है कि डी-पालिटिकलाइजेशन होना चाहिए और इसके अलावा भी अगर सुझाव होंगे तो हम निश्चित रूप से उन पर विचार करेंगे।

SHRI LAKSHMANA MAHAPATRO: How about the electoral colleges? That was my suggestion.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Your proposal was for electoral colleges. But off-hand I would say that I am not inclined to agree to this proposal.

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं इस बात से भी सहमत हूँ जो डा० दत्त ने कहा लेकिन जिसके विरुद्ध महापात्र जी ने कहा कि जब तक पूरा का पूरा फैसला नहीं करते तब तक कुछ मत करिये। ये कहते हैं कि हमने सुना है कि एक इम्प्लीमेंटेशन कमेटी बनी है मैं कहता हूँ कि कोई इम्प्लीमेंटेशन कमेटी नहीं बनी है। अलबत्ता मैं यह बता सकता हूँ कि मैंने मंत्रालय को कहा कि इस कमेटी की रिक्मेंडेशन में कई रिक्मेंडेशन ऐसी हैं जिनका मीडिया के रीस्ट्रक्चरिंग से संबंध है कि आटोनामी कैसे की जाय, यह ढांचा कैसे बदला जाय लेकिन कई सुझाव ऐसे हैं जिनका संबंध प्रोग्राम से है, न्यूज से है, फार्म प्रोग्राम, फार्म ब्राडकास्टिंग से है उसको कैसे सुधारा जाए, अच्छा किया जाय। ऐसे प्रोग्राम जिनका कानून से संबंध है उनको आप बैठ कर छांटिए कि उन में से कौन कौन से ऐसे सुझाव है

जिन पर हम विचार करके उसे ठीक कर सकते हैं। क्यों नहीं करें, जरूर करना चाहिए। तो वह जो कमेटी बनी है वह प्रोसेसिंग के लिए है। उसमें से कौन कौन से सुझाव हैं जिन सुझाव को आज के ढांचे में—और जो हमारी जवाबदारी है कि आकाशवाणी को सशक्त माध्यम बनाया जाय सोशियो इकनामिक चेंज का, सोशियो अयल गयेशन डेमोक्रेसी को मजबूत बनाने का यह जो उद्देश्य है—टु इन्टरटेन एण्ड टु एजुकेट—मनोरंजन करना और शिक्षण करना, इसको कैसे किया जाए ? इस दृष्टि से जो सुझाव हों, आप बताइए, वे छांट रहे हैं और मैं नहीं समझता इस पर किसी को आपत्ति हो सकती है। आपने कहा वह तो आज ही हो सकता है। अगर आज पार्टिजन है—यह हमारी वर्गीज कमेटी कहती है कि फेयर रिपोर्टिंग होनी चाहिए पार्टिजन नहीं होनी चाहिए—और मुझे कोई बात दिखाई देती है कि वास्तव में पार्टिजन है तो फेयर क्यों नहीं करता चाहिए; जरूर करेंगे। मुझे इस बात का खेद है कि उस आटानामी शब्द के व्याख्या की, आटानामी शब्द की स्वीकृति तब हो जब हम सब लोग स्वीकार करेंगे। आज ता —

I am the scapegoat here whom you will accuse. Tomorrow you will not be able to accuse any one.

DR. V. P. DUTT: You will accuse Dutt.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: No, I will not.

क्योंकि मैं समझता हूँ—पिछले साल भर मे मेरा अनुभव है और मे प्रामाणिकता से कहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की सारी रचना में—cultural autonomy has not grown.

यह जो शिकायत हमारे वाइस चांसलर कर रहे थे, सही है, और उन्होंने कहा कि जो दबाव आता है वह सरकार की तरफ से नहीं आता है, पोलिटिकल पार्टीज की तरफ से, पोलिटिकल सेक्शन की तरफ से आता है और आज कम से कम मैं अपने अनुभव से कह सकता

हूँ, आकाशवाणी की न्यूज कवरेज के बारे में जितनी शिकायतें होती हैं उनमेंसे अधिकांश की जड़ में यह होता है कि—

that political parties have not come to reconcile themselves to even editorial autonomy and I am talking of political parties. I have not said Opposition parties. "Political parties" I have said.

क्योंकि फिर लगता है कि अगर मिसेज गांधी के बारे में न्यूज आ गई तो इसलिए, क्योंकि पुराने लोग उनके बैठे हुए हैं, हमें लगता है इसलिए आ रही है कि मिसेज गांधी की वह आलोचना करना चाहते हैं। उन्होंने शब्द गिनाए कि इतने शब्द कहे और इतने शब्द कैरेक्टर असैसिनेशन के थे, जब कि वास्तविकता यह है कि इससे ज्यादा कैरेक्टर असैसिनेशन नहीं हो सकता है अगर मैं उन को कहूँ कि भई, मिसेज गांधी के बारे में कुछ न कहो। तो इससे ज्यादा नुकसान पोलिटिकल लीडर का नहीं हो सकता है। लेकिन मैंने नहीं कहा। आज हमारे मित्र कहते रहे ऐसी खबरों के आने से उनकी पब्लिसिटी होती है, फायदा होता है, हमें लाभ नहीं होता है। मिसेज गांधी के कई भाषण रिपोर्ट होते हैं—मिसेज गांधी ने यह कहा, जनता पार्टी के खिलाफ कहा। उस में मिसेज गांधी की आलोचना कैसे हुई ? नहीं होती। मैं स्वयं भी किसी एडिटोरियल बोर्ड में होता तो क्या करता, यह बात अलग है। मैं कई बार ऐसी बात से सहमत नहीं होऊंगा। लेकिन मैं कह सकता हूँ, पिछले 14 महीनों में जितनी सपादकीय स्वायत्तता आकाशवाणी में रही है, पिछले 30 साल में कभी नहीं रही क्योंकि मैं इसको मानता हूँ कि स्वायत्तता केवल ढांचे की नहीं होती है, स्वायत्तता

has to be something with which we have to reconcile. The people have to be reconciled.

आपने कहा कि वहाँपर भय का वातावरण है, शुरू के 4 महीने कोई भय का वातावरण नहीं था और यह भय का वातावरण, जिसको आप कहते हैं वह भय नहीं है।

[Shri La! K. Advani]

It is the sense of nervousness and nervousness arises because of the debate here, because of the debates that are going on among political parties.

वे फैसला करने में असमर्थ होते हैं कि ये क्या हैं। उस दिन यहां तीन चार उदाहरण जितने हुए हैं—एक एक के बारे में विस्तार से कह सकता हूँ—एक दिन तो यह हुआ कि यहां आगरा के इसीडेंट पर चर्चा हुई और अगले दिन यहां पर हमारे मित्र श्रीभूपेश गुप्त जी ने सवाल उठाया और कहा कि पिछले दिन को जो संसद समीक्षा थी—टुडे इन पार्लियामेंट वह बिलकुल डिस्टार्टेड और ऐसी ही न्यूज थी, उसमें कुछ नहीं दिया गया। मेरे पास उस समय तथ्य नहीं थे। मैंने खड़े होकर इतना ही कहा कि भई, संसद समीक्षा और टुडे इन पार्लियामेंट, यह आकाशवाणी के अधिकारी नहीं करते हैं यह तो पत्रकार हैं, व्यावसायिक पत्रकार, जा करते हैं। जिनके बारे में उन्होंने कह वह कोन थे उस वक्त मैं नहीं जानता था। लेकिन वह जो इस काम को करते हैं उनको इंडिपेंडेंस है, वे जो फेयर रिपोर्टिंग समझें कर लें। कुछ नाराजगी हुई, विरोध हुआ, सब कुछ हुआ; मैंने अपना जवाब दे दिया। बाद में जाकर मैंने कहा, दिखाओ तो सही क्या है? मैंने रिपोर्ट पढ़ी, रिपोर्ट बिलकुल सही थी, उसमें कोई दोष नहीं था और फिर मुझे आश्चर्य इस बात पर हुआ कि जब मैंने जाना कि उस दिन की संसद समीक्षा लिखने वाले कोन थे? श्री बिपिन शर्मा। कोन वह बिपिन शर्मा। “जनयुग” के जन युग का प्रतिनिधि। जनयुग किस का पत्र है इसे तो भूपेश जी ही बता सकते हैं। वह मुझे बतलायें। कहते हैं कि बिपिन शर्मा हमारे योगेन्द्र शर्मा जी के पुत्र हैं। लेकिन इसका देख कर मुझे लगा कि

this kind of reaction that makes everyone there feel jittery. क्या हो रहा है।

अगर हम फेयर रिपोर्टिंग करेंगे और अगर वह किसी को पसन्द नहीं आयो

ता वह खड़ा होकर कहेगा कि यह तो आडवाणी जी का रेडियो है। आडवाणी सेंसर करता है। पहले क्लियर सेंसरशिप थी, अब अप्रत्यक्ष सेंसरशिप है। पहले विजिविल ब्लैक लिस्ट थी अब इविजिविल ब्लैक लिस्ट है। मैं पूछ रहा था कि वह कोन सी इविजिविल ब्लैक लिस्ट है।

I will take him to task.

बल्कि मैंने तो एक निर्देश दिया था, सार्वजनिक रूप से दिया था कि जिन लोगों ने इमरजेंसी का समर्थन किया था, जोरजोर से समर्थन किया था, जोरजोर से किया था

they were too deeply involved in the Emergency propaganda.

आज अगर वह खड़ा हो कर कहें कि चूंकि प्रिवेंशन आफ पब्लिकेशन आफ ट्रान्जक्शनबल मैटर्स एक्ट आपने रिपील कर दिया इससे बढ़ कर और कुछ नहीं हो सकता था और अगर वह ऐसा कर सकते हैं तो आडवाणी से बड़ा देशभक्त नहीं हो सकता, तो यह सब मुझे नहीं चाहिए। यह प्रेज मुझे नहीं चाहिए।

I do not want those same people who have been praising the Emergency to the skies to come and praise the new Government to the skies for having revoked the Emergency. I do not want it. It destroys the credibility of the radio, it destroys the credibility of those individuals also.

(Interruptions)

श्री श्रीकान्त वर्मा : वही लोग आज टी० वी० और रेडियो का कार्यक्रम चला रहे हैं।

श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी : आप दूसरी आलोचना कर रहे हैं। यह दूसरी आलोचना है। इधर से कहते हैं कि उनको करने नहीं दिया जाता, आप कहते हैं कि वही लोग कर रहे हैं। मैंने उन को कहा। लेकिन अगर वह व्यक्ति कोई अच्छा प्रोग्राम करता है, वही व्यक्ति चिल्ड्रेन प्रोग्राम अच्छा करता है और वही व्यक्ति कोई दूसरा अच्छा प्रोग्राम करता है तो हम ने कहा कि करने

दो । हमारी तरफ से कोई मनाही नहीं । आप डिस्कशन में देखिये । आप दो, तीन प्वाइंट आफ व्यू रखना चाहते हैं, तो रखिये । उसमें मुझ को आपत्ति नहीं । हमारी तरफ के कोई ब्लैकलिस्ट नहीं, न विजिबिल और न इन्विजिबिल । यह एक अप्रोच, एक स्पष्ट निर्देश मैंने सब को दिया है और उसी के आधार पर काम हो रहा है । कही पर कोई गलती हो सकती है । कही पर किसी कारण से कोई बात पैदा हो जाती है और वह बात मेरे ध्यान में आती है तो मैं उसे देखता हूँ, दुरुस्त करता हूँ । इतना बड़ा आर्गनाइजेशन है आकाशवाणी और दूरदर्शन का । वहाँ पर जो कुछ होता है सब ठीक हो जाता है यह मैं नहीं कहता, लेकिन कही पर भी जिस को विडिक्टिवनेस कहते हैं, नहीं है, कहीं पोलिटिकल अप्रोच हो, ऐसा नहीं है ।

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: Point of order. Point of order.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I am not yielding.

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : मैं प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर पर खड़ा हुआ हूँ । मैं एक बात पूछना चाहता हूँ । आदरणीय सूचना मंत्री जी ने कहा है कि आकाशवाणी और दूरदर्शन के अप्रोच में कोई पोलिटिकल विडिक्टिवनेस का अप्रोच नहीं रहता । मैं आप से केवल एक प्रश्न करना चाहता हूँ (Interruptions) मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि अभी जो मिस्टर सिंह का बच्चा दिलीप सिंह जीप से कुचला गया तो क्या आप ने उस में इन्दिरा गांधी और उनके पुत्र और उन के परिवार को विडिक्टिवनेस की दृष्टि से इन्वाल्व करके रेडियो के माध्यम से 60 करोड़ जनता को गुमराह नहीं किया । क्या इस से बड़ कर, इससे बड़ा आप राजनीतिक मैलाफाइडी इंटेशन का कार्य कोई और कर सकते थे ? इससे बड़ा पोलिटिकल विडिक्टिवनेस का काम और क्या हो सकता है ।

श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी : मैं समझता हूँ कि यह जितने उदाहरण दिये जाते हैं, they only expose the hollowness of the charge.

कितना ग़रब्स चार्ज है । कल मैंने विस्तार से उसका जवाब देते हुए कहा था कि सारे देश के अखबारों ने जिस चीज को 13 तारीख को कवर किया, आल इंडिया रेडियो ने यह समझा कि यह दिल्ली की एक लोकल घटना है, we should not project it, and they decided not to do it on the 13th, not to do it on the 14th. It was only on the 15th, when the matter was raised in the Lok Sabha and when the Prime Minister made a statement saying that investigations were being made.

इस में कोई इंसीन्युएशन नहीं था । नाट ए सिगिल बर्ड । क्योंकि कुछ है नहीं इसलिये यही बोलो । यह भावना थी । एक चीज और आप ने कही । (Interruptions)

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर । हल्ला कर दुगुना हल्ला होता है । सवाल पूछने — हल्ला मत कीजिये । मैं कह रहा हूँ हल्ला मत कीजिये । मुझे सवाल पूछने दीजिये । क्या उस बुलेटिन में नहीं कहा गया कि किस्सा कुर्सी का की जांच करने वाले के पुत्र की जीप से हत्या कर दी गई है ?

श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी : हां, यह कहा गया । मैंने पढ़ कर सुनाया था ।

SHRI NARSINGHA PRASAD NANDA (Orissa): For our information, I request the hon. Minister of Information and Broadcasting to explain to us one simple point. Does he understand the autonomy of Akashvani and Doordarshan as we understand the independence of the Judiciary? In spite of all his elucidations, I have not been able to make up my mind

[Shri Narsingha Prasad Nanda]

about it. Let us hear about it. What exactly does he understand by autonomy? Because the Verghese Report did not satisfy me. I had to participate in the debate. So it is disturbing my mind. Do they understand the autonomy of Akashvani and Door-darshan to be like the independence of the Judiciary, as under any system of parliamentary democracy? He should kindly explain to us.

श्री बृद्ध प्रिय मौर्य : (ग्रांध प्रदेश) :

माननीय मंत्री, अगर आप इजाजत दें, तो सबसे बड़ी आजोदी है धन की आजादी। यह जिसको कि आटोनोमस आरगन-इजेशन बनाने की बात कर रहे हैं, इसकी आर्थिक तौर पर, इकोनामिक तरीके से इण्डिपेन्डेंट हो जभी आटोनोमस हो पायगी। तो उसकी कोई व्यवस्था की है क्या? उसके बारे में प्रकाश डालें क्योंकि अगर धन सरकारी खजाने से जायगा तो वे आपके चाकर होंगे, आटोनोमस नहीं होंगे। अ... का... पर प्रकाश डाल दें।

श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी : श्री मौर्य जी ने जो सवाल पूछा है, लग भग वही आशकाएं और सदस्यों ने भी व्यक्त की हैं। Can autonomy go with lack of financial viability.

क्योंकि हिन्दुस्तान में फाइनेन्शियल वायबिलिटी की गुंजाइश अभी तो कम दिखाई देती है और फिर आटोनोमी कितनी हो, यह प्रश्न ऐसे है कि जिससे प्रेरित होकर शायद वर्गीज कमटी ने सिफारिश की, शायद लायसेन्स फीस बढ़ा दें। लेकिन हमारे माननीय सदस्यों ने बात की लायसेन्स फीस बढ़ाने की। मैं भी उस बात से व्यक्तिगत रूप से सहमत हूँ कि शायद इस बात को देखना पड़ेगा कि लायसेन्स जो है, वह वन-टाइम लायसेन्स क्यों न हो, बार-बार हर साल लायसेन्स लेना पड़ता है। और कम से कम छोटे ट्रांसमिटर को राहत दी जाए इस की

व्यवस्था देखनी पड़ेगी। लेकिन मैं एक और बात कहना चाहूंगा कि हिन्दुस्तान में बहुत सारी इन्स्टीच्यूशन्स हैं, कान्सटीच्यूशनल, स्टेच्यूटरी कि जो फाइनेन्सली वायबल नहीं हैं। लेकिन गवर्नमेंट और ला, ला बेसिकली और उसके साथ गवर्नमेंट पर स्वयं ही सैल्फ एबग्नेशन वृत्ति उसके कारण वे वायबल होती हैं, उसके कारण इण्डिपेन्डेंट होती हैं। ज्यूडिशरी है, वह फाइनेन्सली वायबल है क्या?

Courts are not financially viable, but they are given guarantees under the Constitution, under the law, and plus, there is a tradition. What is more important is...

एक परम्परा बन गई है न्यायापालिका के आदर करने की जिसका पिछले दिनों में कहीं कहीं पर उल्लंघन भी होता रहा। चाहे जिस समय किसी का नाम लेकर कुछ भी कहते रहना परम्परा के खिलाफ है। संसद की विशेषकर परम्परा रही है कि न्यायापालिका के बारे में, न्यायाधीशों के बारे में कोई अपशब्द नहीं कहे जाते। इसलिये यह प्रश्न जो है उचित है। यह प्रश्न भी री-स्ट्रक्चरिंग करते समय ठीक प्रकाशन लेने का है।

मैं इस बात को दोहराना चाहूंगा कि सरकार आकाशवाणी को दूरदर्शन की स्वायत्त बनाने के लिये कृत-संकल्प है और इस दिशा में विलम्ब नहीं करना चाहती। लेकिन at the same time कोई hustle भी नहीं करना चाहती। एडवाइजरी बोर्ड भी नहीं लेना चाहती और उसमें इसको अच्छी तरह से देख कर आगे बढ़ रहे हैं। जब तक आकाशवाणी और दूरदर्शन स्वायत्त संस्थाएं न हो पायेंगी तब तक हमारा निश्चय है जिसका मैंने अभी उल्लेख किया है। आकाशवाणी और दूरदर्शन में काम करने वाले लोग जितनी भी आटोनोमी वहां पर इजाजत कर सकते हैं, मीडिया को कर सकते हैं विद इन दि फ्रेमवर्क, उनको करने के लिए हम स्वतन्त्र करना चाहते हैं और उस दिशा में आगे बढ़ रहे हैं।

मैं अपने सदन के सभी सदस्यों का धन्यवाद करना चाहता हूँ जिन्होंने इस चर्चा में भाग लिया। फ्रेंचाइज स्टेशन के बारे में या इसकी स्वायत्तता के बारे में या इसकी भाषा-नीति के बारे में जो भी बातें कही गईं उन सब के बारे में निर्णय किये जायेंगे। धन्यवाद।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Hon. Members, we have had a very exciting and strenuous session and a long day. Let me wish you a very happy and restful inter-session period. The House stands adjourned *sine die*.

The House then adjourned *sine die* at five minutes past eight of the clock.