

के लिए जो प्रतिबन्ध लगे हुए हैं, वे हटा लिये जायें और यदि हां, तो सरकार ने इस सुझाव पर क्या कार्यवाही की है ?

†[CHILDREN'S FILMS

82. SHRI B. N. BHARGAVA: Will the Minister of INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING be pleased to state whether the film industry has suggested that the restrictions on the length of the children's films should be removed for purposes of giving State awards; and if so, what action Government have taken on this suggestion?]

संसद-कार्य मंत्री (श्री सत्यनारायण सिंह): जी, हां। इस सुझाव पर फिल्म सलाहकार समिति ने दिसम्बर, १९६२ में विचार किया था और उस की सफाई पर राज-पुरस्कार के लिए बालफिल्मों की अधिकतम लम्बाई ३५ मिलीमीटर में २,५०० मीटर से बढ़ा कर ३,४०० मीटर और १६ किलोमीटर में १,००० मीटर से बढ़ा कर १,३६० मीटर कर दी गई है।

†[THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA): Yes, Madam. The suggestion was considered by the Film Consultative Committee in December, 1962 and, on its recommendation, the maximum permissible length of Children's films for purposes of giving State awards has been increased from 2,500 metres to 3,400 metres in 35 mm. and from 1,000 metres to 1,360 metres in 16 mm.]

बाल फिल्म सोसाइटी का निर्माण कार्यक्रम

८३. श्री भगवत नारायण भागवत : क्या सूचना तथा प्रसारण मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या सरकार ने बाल फिल्म सोसाइटी के निर्माण के कार्यक्रम और बच्चों के लिए सजीव कार्टून फिल्मों के निर्माण की कोई जांच पड़ताल की है और यदि हां, तो उसका क्या परिणाम निकला; और

(ख) क्या ऐसी कोई जांच की गई कि बच्चों के दिमाग पर इन फिल्मों का क्या प्रभाव पड़ता है ?

†[PRODUCTION PROGRAMME OF CHILDREN'S FILM SOCIETY

83. SHRI B. N. BHARGAVA: Will the Minister of INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have made any investigation in regard to the production programme of Children's Film Society and the production of animated cartoon films for children; and if so, what was the result thereof; and

(b) whether any investigation has been made as regards the effect of these films on the minds of the children?]

संसद कार्य मंत्री (श्री सत्यनारायण सिंह): (क) और (ख) जी अभी नहीं।

†[THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA): (a) and (b) Not yet, Madam.]

SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS FOR EXPENDITURE OF CENTRAL GOVERNMENT (EXCLUDING RAILWAYS) FOR 1963-64

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT AND FOR PLANNING (SHRI C. R. PATTABHI RAMAN): Madam, on behalf of Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, I beg to lay on the Table

a Statement showing the Supplementary Demands for Grants for Expenditure of the Central Government (excluding Railways) for the year 1963-64.

REFERENCE TO CORRECTION IN
 THE NAME OF ONE OF THE
 ACCUSED IN THE HAZRATBAL
 HOLY RELIC THEFT CASE

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Madam, before I raise my point, I should like to have your permission to express our deep satisfaction and happiness that the Prime Minister is back amongst us. I think the entire House will agree with me when I express the deep sentiments of our best wishes to him and wish him the speediest and fullest recovery. That is all that I would say on that.

Madam, I have sought your permission to raise a matter of rather great importance. I would invite your attention in this connection to the two Press releases of the Press Information Bureau yesterday on the proceedings of the House. As you know, Madam Deputy Chairman, yesterday immediately after the Question Hour the Union Home Minister, Shri Gulzarilal Nanda, made a statement in this House giving the names of the accused in the Hazratbal sacred relic theft case, and he gave three names. The third name in the serial which he gave was Ghulam Mohd. Butt. Following this announcement in this House the P.I.B. issued its Press release No. 416/1 in which it was correctly given. Mention was made of Ghulam Mohd. Butt. The Proceedings of Parliament were correctly given there. Later on, four hours afterwards in the afternoon, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs, Mr. Hajarnavis came and made a correction and said that it was not Ghulam Mohd. Butt but it should be Kadir Butt, or whatever you spell it—anyhow being a Bengali and that too from East Bengal it is rather difficult for me. Anyhow the point is this. We do not know the

circumstances to which and the reasons why the mistakes were committed.

In this connection we would like to know from the Government now whether any of the accused made a statement and many names were given in the statement. That is very relevant because only then we can have some idea as to why suddenly a change was made that it was a different Butt. After the statement of the Minister of State in this House making the alleged correction the P.I.B. issued another Press release No. 436/1 in which—I would just read out a few lines: "In the hand-out on the theft of the sacred relic three accused persons' named issued by the evening delivery, for the name of the third accused in serial 3 please read Kadir Butt instead of Ghulam Butt". Now Madam Deputy Chairman, the point I want seriously to raise before the House is, is it permissible for the P.I.B. to issue a Press release in regard to the proceedings of Parliament suppressing the material fact that the amendment was made on the floor of the House? The mistaken statement of the Home Minister was corrected by Mr. Hajarnavis four hours later, that was how the change was made, and this is not at all suggested in the second P.I.B. release. It would give the impression that some typing error took place in the first release. Therefore, the Government of India itself, in this matter the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, is guilty of violating its responsibilities with regard to reporting the proceedings of the House. Whereas all the papers have reported how the change came to be made, who committed the mistake and who corrected it, the P.I.B. which is supposed to brief all newspapers did not do anything of the kind but on the contrary tried to suppress the most relevant fact that another name was given in the place of one name by the Minister later on on the floor of the House on the same day in a matter of four hours. The fact itself is serious that after so many days the hon. Home Minister should have committed such