

THE MINISTER OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION (SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI): (a) Yes.

(b) to (e) As soon as possession is given by the Central Public Works Department allotment is made. Out of 103 houses only one house is lying vacant at present and house rent in this case is not being paid. The loss on account of rent not received is very small.

(Dr. Bhai Mahavir stood up)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Even on this you want to put a question?

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: Yes, Sir. It is not an unimportant matter. I only want to know how long it usually takes between the houses getting ready and their being allotted. How much time usually is taken? How much red-tapism is involved in the process of allotment of houses? Because in view of the shortage of houses it should be done as expeditiously as possible.

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI: I fully agree that it should be done as expeditiously as possible. I will give you the dates on which the houses were handed over to us and on which they were allotted: 12th April 1968 and 14th April 1968; 1st May 1968 and 1st May 1968; 30th September 1967 and 1st October 1967; 30th June 1967 and 1st July 1967 to 6th July 1967. You will find there is no delay.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: How long the C.P.W.D. takes to make them ready and deliver them? Have you any idea?

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI: That goes beyond my jurisdiction. When they hand over and when they are ready, the next day we allot.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: For once you are prompt and you are to be congratulated.

*607. [The questioner (Shri Suraj Prasad.) was absent. For answer vide col. 5156-5157 infra.]

'SPOT LIGHT' PROGRAMME OF A.I.R.

*608. SHRI PITAMBER DAS†:
DR. BHAI MAHAVIR:
SHRI J. P. YADAV:
SHRI PREM MANOHAR:
SHRI RATTAN LAL JAIN:
SHRI MAN SINGH VARMA:

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

(a) the number of times persons or correspondents from 'Patriot' and other newspapers were called for the 'Spot Light' programme broadcast from All India Radio during 1967 and 1968 and the total amount paid to them;

(b) whether it is a fact that the ratio of the persons called from 'Patriot' is higher as compared to the rest of the newspapers; and

(c) if so, what are the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING AND IN THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI I. K. GUJRAL): (a) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

(b) The number of persons from the 'Patriot' who were invited to participate in the 'Spotlight' programmes was not larger than those invited from some other papers. But the total number of bookings of these persons was larger than that of persons from any other newspaper.

(c) The 'Spotlight' is a forum of discussion in which all points of view are freely expressed. The selection of persons for participating in this programme depends on the controversial nature of topics and the availability of persons who can express different points of view irrespective of the newspapers to which they belong.

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Pitamber Das.

STATEMENT

Number of times journalists belonging to Newspapers/News Agencies were given Spotlight programme in 1967

Name of the paper to which the journalists belonged	No. of journalists belonging to the paper to whom programmes were given	Total No. of bookings	Total amount paid
			Rs.
Patriot	5	19	1,155
Statesman	7	14	1,155
Indian Express	5	9	670
Times of India	3	7	540
Hindu	4	8	520
Hindustan Standard	1	5	375
National Herald	1	3	300
A.F.P.	1	5	300
Hindustan Times	3	3	250
Eastern Economist	1	2	200
Commerce	1	2	135
Financial Express	1	2	120
Africa Diary	1	1	75
Assam Tribune	1	1	75
I.N.F.A.	1	1	75
Blitz	1	1	60
Economic Times	1	1	60

Number of times journalists belonging to Newspapers/News Agencies were given Spotlight Programme in 1968

Name of the paper to which the journalists belonged	No. of journalists belonging to the paper to whom programmes were given	Total No. of bookings	Total amount paid
			Rs.
Patriot	6	38	2,280
Times of India	10	26	1,715
Indian Express	5	13	1,085
Statesman	9	16	1,080
Hindu	5	13	915
Eastern Economist	2	7	620
Commerce	2	10	600
Financial Express	2	7	460
Economic Times	1	6	450
Hindustan Times	5	7	425
Tribune	1	7	420
Hindustan Standard	3	5	330
Assam Tribune	1	3	225
P. T. I.	2	2	120
A. F. P.	1	2	120
Organiser	1	1	100
I. N. F. A.	1	1	75
Amrita Bazar Patrika	1	1	75
Vishwamitra	1	1	75
U. N. I.	1	1	60
Africa Dairy	1	1	60
Shanker's Weekly	1	1	60

(Some hon. Members stood up.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have got six names here, and I must go according to some rules. Those who have put the question should be given preference. In fact they are all there from the same party, but unfortunately I cannot make any distinction as to whether it is put by the same party or not. Therefore, I must follow some procedure. You will help in by not getting up till that thing is exhausted.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS: So far as my party is concerned, we keep it in mind. I am not putting any question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no complaint against you at all, Dr. Mahavir.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: From the statement that has been handed over to us I find that Patriot had 19 bookings in 1967 and 38 bookings in 1968, whereas in the case of certain other papers like Times of India and Statesman and Indian Express, the number continues to be much smaller. In the case of Times of India it was the highest next to Patriot. May I know what is the criterion by which this selection is made? Does it mean that Patriot has some staff with a calibre or with a competence which no other paper in the country has? Or is it particularly because of the desire to placate some people who are the loudest in condemning or criticising or imputing motives to the Government or the Ministry concerned? Is it some sort of a lollipop to keep them silent or is it based on some principle or some criterion?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: One thing I would like to clarify. From the very beginning, when somebody is asked to speak on a Spot Light subject, the idea is not to which paper he belongs. We do not balance the papers; we always look for people who have some different points of view so that the different aspects of a controversy

can be discussed. I would request the hon. Member to draw a line between journalists and the newspapers because only then will the perspective become clear. The main idea is not give this to this newspaper or that; the main idea is to call a person who on that very subject may have some view. If the hon. Member will look at it from a different angle, for example, the Times of India or the Indian Express, he would see that this is a group with a particular set of opinion. The main idea while allotting this job is that we ask the people with different points of view to come; whether they belong to one paper or to no newspaper or to the Government Department; all types of people are invited to participate in this.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: I do not see how the hon. Minister has tried to wish away or wash away the question which I was putting. He says that it is based on the competence or the points of view of the journalists concerned. Does he mean that the Patriot has a set of journalists who are far and above others in respect of this programme?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: That is correct, Dr. Mahavir.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: Is it correct? Anyway, let the Government come out with a statement that it is correct and we shall know what the Government's criterion or judgment is in this.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: The criterion I have already stated. The criterion is not to provide a balance between newspapers but to bring to bear different points of view on a subject. Therefore, it is not a question whether one agrees with that point of view or not. The Government or the All India Radio has no point of view in that. Our main approach on all subjects is that if we want to strengthen democracy, then dissension must be accommodated. Therefore, we must be in a position to accommodate all

those different points of view. Only then will this democracy become robust. We want the All India Radio to continue to be a forum of free, frank and independent discussion.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: Sir . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I cannot go on allowing you.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: If there is one point of view . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Sir, he has put two questions. Only two questions are allowed.

(Interruptions)

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: I can understand your soft corner. But you need not interrupt others.

श्री मान सिंह वर्मा : डा० भाई महावीर के बार-बार पूछने के पश्चात् श्री माननीय मंत्री महोदय ने यह बताने की कृपा नहीं की है कि क्या "पेट्रियाट" में ही इस प्रकार के केलिबर के लोग हैं किसी दूसरे पत्र में नहीं हैं ?

श्री प्रभुनंदन अरोड़ा : वह तो हो गया ।

श्री मान सिंह वर्मा : आप बीच में क्यों बोलते हैं ?

(Interruptions)

You are not the Minister.
इस तरह से इन्ट्रूट मत कीजिए ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to request the hon. Members not to interrupt the questioner when he is putting the question. The answer has to be given. If other Members who have nothing to do with the questioner unnecessarily interrupt him it is impossible to conduct the business of this House. I shall give an opportunity to you if you are lucky.

श्री मान सिंह वर्मा : माननीय मंत्री महोदय ने डेमोक्रेसी के नाम पर अपने उस कृत्य को छिपाने की कोशिश की है । यह

मानना पड़ेगा कि आपके डिपार्टमेंट में इस प्रकार के एनी टिम्स मौजूद हैं जो खुल्लमखुल्ला "पेट्रियाट" और उसी प्रकार की विचारधारा के पत्रों को प्रश्रय दे रहे हैं । क्या यह सही नहीं है ?

श्री आर्यो के० गुजराल : यह सही बिल्कुल नहीं है । पिछले वर्ष में हमने जितने लोगों को बुलाया, उन में से 62 जनरेलिस्ट्स थे और 53 नान-जनरेलिस्ट्स थे । पहला तो बैचैम यह है । दूसरा बैचैम यह है कि जो 62 जनरेलिस्ट्स थे उनको गर आप देखेंगे तो पाएंगे कि तकरीबन सब न्यूजपेपर्स के ऊपर एक बात फैलाई गई है, इसलिये नहीं कि वे किसी न्यूजपेपर्स से बंधे हुए थे बल्कि इसलिए कि किस्म-किस्म के लोग थे जो ठीक तरह से इस बात के ऊपर नुक्तेनज़र रखते थे । उनको दावत दी गई है कि वे आकर बात करें । अब इज़र, एक बात की तरफ ध्यान रखा जाये । सवाल यह है कि किस जनरेलिस्ट को बुलाया जाये या किम अखबार वाले को बुलाया जाये । बुनियादी सवाल तो यह है कि अगर इस तरह की कन्ट्रोवर्सी वाली कोई चीज होगी तो जाहिर है कि कुछ लोगों का नुक्तेनज़र कुछ होगा और कुछ का दूसरा होगा । आल इंडिया रेडियो में हम चाहते हैं कि ऐसे लोगों को बुलाया जाए जिनका नुक्ते निगाह दूसरा हो, उससे चाहे सरकार सहमत न हो । मसलन हमारे यहां एक फोरम है "टु डे इन पार्लियामेंट" । इसमें अगर आप लिस्ट देखें तो आप देखेंगे कि हिन्दी में जो समय होता है, उसमें ग्राम को दूसरे किस्म के जनरेलिस्ट भी आते हैं । उसमें मेर कहना यह है कि बराबरे मेहरबानी जनरेलिस्ट की निगाह से अनग करके देखिये तो आपका दृष्टिकोण ठीक होगा ।

(Several hon. Members stood up.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do not be anxious. I will come one by one. I try to please everybody, but I am not in a position to please everyone of you. Mr. Dharja.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, a wrong impression is likely to be created because of the reply of the hon. Minister. If a journalist from a particular Press is invited it is not as if it agrees with that Press or that journal or the views of that journal; it should not be the criterion. I entirely agree with the hon. Minister that several views should come and from that point of view, may I request the hon. Minister to examine the whole policy of the All India Radio? I will not call it a charge, but I would like to say that it is my feeling that most of the time is consumed by the vested interests in the country and the voice of the common man is not getting that much prominence which it should get from the All India Radio. Will the hon. Minister revise this policy and assure this House that there will be an impartial treatment from the All India Radio?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I can assure my hon. friend only one thing, and that is that the All India Radio's forums are used only to encourage free, frank and democratic discussion.

श्री राजनारायण : चेयरमैन साहब, मैं सरकार से यह जानना चाहूंगा कि श्री मोहन धारिया के इस अंश का समर्थन करते हुए कि निश्चित रूप में आल इंडिया रेडियो को कुछ निहित स्वार्थों की पूर्ति के लिए इस्तेमाल किया जा रहा है जनमत की उपेक्षा करते हुए। उसके तो रोज ही हम भुक्-भोगी हैं। जो एनाउन्समेंट होता है यहां की परफोरमंस का, उसमें हमारा नाम ही छोड़ दिया जाता है। जहां हमारा नाम कॉनिंग एजेंशन में आएगा, हमारे नाम को रेडियो छोड़ देगा। देखिये 1968 में "पेट्रियाट" से 6 आदमी बुलाए गए और 38 बार बुलाए गये, यानी एक आदमी का अगर औमत निकालें तो 6 गुना 6 = 36 करीब साठे छ. बार बुलाया गया। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि किन-किन

विषयों पर किन-किन आदमियों को बुलाया गया? वे कौन से विषय थे और उन विषयों के कौन पारंगत थे जो एक आदमी को छः बार बुलाया। और उसी तरह से 1967 को देखिये। 1967 में "पेट्रियाट" के कुल 5 आदमी बुलाये गये मगर 21 बार बुलाये गये। 5 गुना 4 = 20 यानी सवा चार बार और दूसरे अखबारों का औमत किसी का एक आता है, किसी का दो आता है और किसी का पौने दो आता है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : किसी का कुछ नहीं आता है।

श्री राजनारायण : हां, किसी का कुछ नहीं आता है। तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इनके विषय बताए और "पेट्रियाट" के उस विषय के जो पारंगत हैं, उनके नाम बताए और दूसरे अखबारों के उस विषय के जानकार दूसरे लोग हैं या नहीं और किन-किन विषयों के लिए बुलाया गया है, यह सब बताएं, तब इस समस्या का समाधान हो सकता है?

श्री आई० के० गुजराल : यह तो एक लम्बा स्टेटमेंट है जो अगर चाहें तो मैं सदन की टेबिल पर रख सकता हूँ, लेकिन मैं यह बतला सकता हूँ जो आपने पूछा कि "पेट्रियाट" के लोग, "पेट्रियाट" से जिनका ताल्लुक है किस-किस मजमून पर बोले...

श्री राजनारायण : हम सभी चाहते हैं।

श्री आई० के० गुजराल : सबका मैं स्टेटमेंट रख दूंगा आन दि टेबिल आफ दि हाउस, लेकिन एक बात का जिक्र जो राजनारायण जी ने किया कि रेडियो पर इनका नाम नहीं आता है। बदकिस्मती यह है कि राजनारायण रेडियो जब सुनते हैं जब इनका नाम नहीं आता है, मगर परमो जब आपने यहां पर कुछ मामला उठाया, तो रेडियो पर "टु डे इन पार्लियामेंट" सारा का सारा

राजनारायण में भरा हुआ था और वे शिकायत करने हैं ।

श्री राजनारायण : आन ए पर्सनल एक्सप्लेनेशन, देखिये, रेडियो में यह आया हमने रेडियो पर सुना । रेडियो पर यह आया कि फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद साहब ने यह कहा कि राजनारायण ने हमको एप्रोच किया *Interruptions* आप कृपया सुन ले ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do not bring in other matters. I do not want you to bring in other matters

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, आपने कल हमको एक्सप्लेनेशन देने का मौका दिया वह अलग चीज है लेकिन हमने उसी दिन कह दिया था कि फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद साहब यह गलत बोल रहे हैं, झूठ बोल रहे हैं, मैंने किसी को एप्रोच नहीं किया और वह अपनी कालिमा को धोने के लिये यह बात कहना चाहते हैं, तो यह बात न तो अखबारों में आई और न रेडियो में आई कि राजनारायण ने फौरन उठ कर कहा कि फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद साहब झूठ बोल रहे हैं ।

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Sir, I would not have normally replied to this question but lest a wrong impression should go out, I would like to correct one thing. "Today in Parliament" and its counterpart in Hindi is covered by one journalist or the other every day. We do not tell the journalist as to what he should cover and what he should not cover. He covers the whole thing in ten minutes. Let us understand the limitations of the journalists. He has to cover in ten minutes what happens in both Houses during the whole day.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Five minutes for the Ministers and five minutes for the rest of the House

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Because Ministers speak more sense some time.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Sir, we protest when he says that Ministers speak sense.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Everyone speak sense. There is no question. On behalf of this whole House I say everyone tries to speak sense.

श्री राजनारायण : मिनिस्टर ने हमारी इस बात की सफाई नहीं दी । श्रीमन्, जरा ख्याल किया जाये । मिनिस्टर इस बात की सफाई दे कि जो संसद् समीक्षा होती है उसकी प्रक्रिया क्या है क्योंकि हमें जानकारी है कि संसद् समीक्षा भी कुछ अखबार के लोगों को दी जाती है कि तुम करो और उस अखबार के लोग जिस दल से संबंधित होते हैं उस दल के लोगों का नाम लेते हैं बाकी लोगों को छोड़ देते हैं । यह हमको जानकारी कराई गई है हैड आफ दि डिपार्टमेंट से ।

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: May I draw the attention of the hon'ble Minister to the fact that the hon'ble Minister has assisted, if I may say so with respect to him, in giving the impression as if the leftist voice is getting a predominant share in "Spotlight programmes" in the A.I.R. May I ask from him whether it is or it is not a fact that in 1967 out of about 70 bookings only 10 were given to the "Patriot" which is regarded as a journal representing the leftist voice. Worse is the situation in 1968; it is not even 20 per cent of the bookings that the leftist newspapers got. May I, therefore, know, Sir, whether he will remedy the situation which he has so glaringly put forward in the statement laid on the Table of the House. Why not such weeklies as the 'People's Democracy' which represents a particular point of view given bookings whereas we find that the 'African Bureau', 'The Economic Times' or the 'Financial Express', the big bourgeois bulletins and the big bourgeois points of view get the bookings?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I make it clear that no journal is given a

booking. The bookings are given to journalists whenever we come across them.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, प्वाइट आफ् आर्डर ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: No point of order, please.

श्री राजनारायण : जरा सुन लें । इस बात की जरूर सफाई होनी चाहिये कि कौन लेफ्टिस्ट है और कौन राइटिस्ट है । देखिये, मंत्री को इस बात की सफाई करनी पड़ेगी कि कौन लेफ्टिस्ट है और कौन राइटिस्ट है क्योंकि माननीय सदस्य कह रहे हैं कि लेफ्टिस्ट अखबार जो है । लेफ्टिस्ट भी बहुत रिएक्शनरी कहे जा सकते हैं इसलिये लेफ्ट और राइट का जो डिस्टिंक्शन है वह गलत है ।

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Sir, to clarify Mr. Rajnarain's doubts about leftist or rightist, although I do not have personal views as to who is a rightist and who is a leftist—I am not supposed to decide it—the natural thing that I can say in respect of Mr. Rajnarain after listening him from time to time is that I think him to be a leftist.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: Shrimati Indira Gandhi is also a leftist.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Coming back to the question, Sir, I want to repeat one thing. (*Interruption by Shri Rajnarain.*) He does not let me speak, Sir. Let Mr. Rajnarain keep quiet. The point basically is that we do not give bookings to any journals. We give bookings only to journalists or other competent persons. The main point is that we decide on an issue which comes up during the day or the previous day as to what should be discussed on that day on the Radio and then we book a person who is readily available and who can have a point of view on that.

*609. [The questioner (Sardar Ram Singh) was absent. For answer, vide col. 5157 infra.]

MONOPOLY OVER PRESS

*610. SHRI ARJUN ARORA:†
SHRI GULAM NABI UNTOO.

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

(a) whether the question of growing hold of monopoly over the press in the country was referred to the Press Council of India;

(b) if so, whether the Council has made any recommendation in regard thereto; and

(c) what action has been taken by Government on those recommendations?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING AND IN THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI I. K. GUJRAL): (a) Under section 12(2) (j) of the Press Council Act, 1965, one of the functions which the Press Council may perform is to study developments which may tend towards monopoly or concentration of ownership of newspapers, including a study of the ownership or financial structure of newspapers, and if necessary, to suggest remedies therefor. They have undertaken such a study.

(b) No, Sir, not yet.

(c) Does not arise.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: The Minister has only referred to a section of the Press Council Act which was passed by this House also, and we are aware of it. I wanted him to tell us what are the steps that the Press Council has taken to study the growing hold of monopoly over the press in India. If it has done anything whatsoever, the Minister may please give us the

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Arjun Arora.