

RESOLUTION RE THE APPOINTMENT OF A COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE WORKING OF THE ALL INDIA RADIO

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Basavapunnaiah has authorised Shri Bhupesh Gupta to move his Resolution.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, I move the following resolution:

"This House is of opinion that Government should appoint a Committee consisting of 45 Members representing both Houses of Parliament to conduct a general review of the working of the All India Radio and to make recommendations for its improvement."

I notice that some hon. Members have been good enough to table a number of amendments. All these are reasonable amendments. We can consider them when that stage comes. But my proposition is simple, that I want a proper review of the activities and the working of the All India Radio so that proper recommendations could be made for its improvement. As you know, Sir, the All India Radio disseminates news and in a way, is a means of propaganda. But what is more, radio plays an important part in the cultural life of the country in modern times. Especially in a country like ours where literacy is small, the radio has an added responsibility attached to it. It is necessary, therefore, for Members of Parliament and the country always to watch over the functioning of the radio and its behaviour and its role in the life of the country. Today I know the hon. Minister is responsible to this House about the activities and the working of the All India Radio and a kind of constitutional right we have got that way. But that is only a formal thing and whatever we have got is rather fictitious in this matter because the show is run by a small coterie of officials who preside over the affairs of the All India Radio with a super-lord sitting in the Council of Minis-

ters. As you know, we hardly see Dr. Keskar present; he is hardly seen either in this House or in the other House. Probably he is very busy travelling all over the country. I found from a reply to a Starred Question in Lok Sabha that in 1958-59, his travelling allowance came to Rs. 45,979, the highest of all the Ministers. Next came Shri Ajit Prasad Jain with Rs. 37,769. It is thus seen that Dr. Keskar does a lot of travelling and though the All India Radio centres are few, his travelling seems to be quite a lot. What he is doing, we do not know. We do not know where he goes, what he does and how he handles the complaints and grievances that are accumulating in Calcutta, Bombay and in other places, even in Delhi, about the work and the administration of the All India Radio. It would not be bad if we are enlightened a little about the subject when the All India Radio undertakes to enlighten the whole country. Charity begins at home and I think Dr. Keskar would be well advised to throw a little more light here because enlightenment should begin at home, namely, in this Parliament.

Sir, the All India Radio is not an autonomous body. The B.B.C. is an autonomous body and similarly other autonomous bodies are there in European countries. I do not say that just because it is not an autonomous body it is bad, I do not say this thing at all. But it is not an autonomous body, it is an appendage of the administration. Because it is an appendage of the administration, it is all the more the duty of the hon. Minister to give personal attention to it and have a line of communication with Members of Parliament as to how things should be run. I would ask how many Members of Parliament have been approached by the All India Radio to offer criticisms, comments and suggestions with regard to the broadcasts, personally. I have never been asked. I do not know whether anybody in this House in the non-official Benches has ever been asked to come

out with his comments, suggestions and criticisms for the improvement of its work. I do not care which side of the House was approached. I believe that none of the non-official Members was ever approached. We do not receive such communications at all. I do not know what happens in the Consultative Committee. But there are many who are on the Consultative Committee, who might be interested in offering opinions and suggestions. They are not approached by the authorities concerned. As you know, Sir, we get news, talks, music and so on from the All India Radio. All these programmes are determined by the authorities, that is, those who run the various centres of the All India Radio under the general over all guidance, I believe, of the hon. Minister. What we get on the air we all know; at least, we can know it. But what goes on behind the scene at the various centres of the All India Radio would not be normally known until we, Members of Parliament, take upon ourselves the responsibility of bringing to light certain instances of mismanagement, nepotism, corruption, malpractice, favouritism and the like, and I propose to do so here in the interests of the public and for the enlightenment of the public. As far as political matters are concerned, the All India Radio is abysmally and highly partisan and they do not hide it. Sometimes when I hear their political broadcasts, I wonder whether I am listening to the Jantar Mantar Radio where the office of the A.I.C.C. is situated or the All India Radio for which we in Parliament, from both sides of the House, sanction money. I wonder if it would not be possible for the All India Radio to ask the Jantar Mantar Radio to relieve them of this heavy burden and themselves start a broadcasting station at the Jantar Mantar Road. I should welcome it provided we get similar facilities. But why the All India Radio should be used as an instrument of Congress propaganda, of partisan transmission of news in broadcasts, for the life of me, I cannot understand. Now, Sir,

you see some of the broadcasts. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru—well—he is given good coverage and I do not grudge it, because people are interested in listening to what he says. Well, he made a statement after the Kerala election, in which he criticised the Muslim League and the manifesto of the Muslim League. And he said that he had not seen the manifesto and added that, had he seen that manifesto, he could not say how he would have reacted to it then. I listened to that broadcast, and that portion of his reference to the Muslim League in the manifesto was discretely cut out. Thus even the Prime Minister came under the censorship of the authorities that run the show in Delhi. I do not know how the Prime Minister felt about it. But I was not happy, and my unhappiness, I believe, was shared by many in the country.

Then, Sir, when the Commonwealth Ministers' Conference took place, someone gave a talk in Bengali in Calcutta—I exposed these things in the House—in which he gave the impression that the British Empire no longer existed and that we were still a part of the British Empire. Such erudite and learned men are requisitioned to write scripts to be put on the air for the enlightenment of the public.

Then again when the Kerala elections took place and the situation in Kerala developed, All India Radio broadcasts were highly partisan; one side was practically blacked out and the other side was given exaggerated importance and prominence in the broadcasts, naturally that side to which Dr. Keskar is happy to belong.

Then, Sir, when the strike took place—the Government employees strike—last year in July, what happened? The All India Radio became an instrument of—well, I do not know—almost an instrument of strike breaking, that is to say, its broadcasts were highly coloured; and it was full of distortion and suppression of truth. The *Hindustan Standard* of July 17 wrote:

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

"When the people of Delhi are told that all is more or less well except in a few areas like Calcutta and Bombay—as if Calcutta or Bombay was just like any other place—and when little is said about the extent of the dislocation of those 'pockets' a very unbalanced and misleading picture is darwn. Let anybody compare the A.I.R., and also the Delhi papers, say, on Calcutta, with the reports published in the Calcutta papers, and he will be shocked by the difference between them."

It is well known how the All India Radio treated the strike news. According to them Howrah trains were running normally. People went to the station and returned home. Photographs appeared in the Congress papers. I do not know if you paid compensation to those who came to the station by listening to your broadcasts, and having discovered the lie had to go back home. So here also similar things were done. Now such a thing happened because they had set up their own machinery, some kind of machinery; some officers got together and started broadcasting. They never broadcast what the workers were saying; they had collected some tape-recorded statements from the authorities in the various railway stations and other places in order to show how in other places things were fine. That is how misleading propaganda was carried on against their own employees—Government employees—but the greatest casualty there was truth itself. Dr. Keskar is a doctor after all—in many things—but he should not hit hard against truth; truth should not so easily be made a casualty in public life. That is how he behaved in this matter.

Then, if you listen to the All India Radio broadcasts, you never understand that in the country there are trade union organisations, hardly you will feel that there are opposition parties which are active, or other popular organisations or other people belonging to no party carrying on whole-

some social, cultural and public activities. They are left out, but whenever a tiny Deputy Minister makes somewhere in a remote corner of the country, say, in Kanyakumari, a futile statement on an unimportant and insignificant subject, you find the All India Radio blaring forth in its broadcast the whole thing. That is how things go on.

Then about the parliamentary coverage, and I would ask the hon. Minister to listen to the portions covered and broadcast—I do. I generally do not listen to very much, but I do sometimes, and I ask others also to listen to it. What is it that they hear? From both sides of the House very wholesome and constructive criticisms are made against Government policies and actions. But what do you see there? There—you see—they pick up from the speeches that are made in the course of the day the praises for the Government, and, in addition, one or two criticisms too, and then broadcast it as if only paeans of praise are sung in this House by all sides of the House as far as the Government is concerned—let alone the Ministers' speeches. That is how we are treated. Sir, I am a critical person as you know, and I generally make critical speeches and, as I said, sometimes I listen to the All India Radio broadcasts, and I feel I had better not make my speech at all because, if I say a good word of the Government, that alone becomes the subject-matter of my speech in the broadcast. Well, Sir, I was wondering why I should at all make any speeches if Dr. Keskar would treat my speeches in this manner when I am paid by the public to criticise here the Government, and whether it would not be in the public interests to save the public funds spent on me if my speeches should continue to be distorted this way. That is how Dr. Keskar distorts news; he makes light into darkness and darkness into light. He is a great . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: If he does that, he has learnt it from you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, Sir, he has not learnt it from me, because he would be the last person to learn anything from me. Now this kind of thing goes on.

Now take for instance the administration. Let me start with the Calcutta centre, because about that I know a little bit more. First of all I take up the audition system, where you have testing of voice, presentation, etc. The present system is not at all satisfactory. It is the audition board of three persons that chooses the artistes, but the supervisors of different branches—light music, classical music, drama, etc.—are not consulted at all in the selection of artistes although these supervisors are experts in their respective lines. The upshot of the whole matter is that it is the administration that dictates. Naturally there is wide scope for nepotism and corruption. There are many instances of undesirable and incompetent artistes getting through through the recommendation of one or the other of the board members. It is left to the board, and the supervisors are ignored. The board should be therefore enlarged to include supervisors of different branches. These are the key-men and why they should be kept out, I do not understand. There are two grades of radio artistes, one old hands and another new entrants. As regards the old artistes, in view of the lengthy and complicated process involved in the removal of the registered artists, several old artists, who have deteriorated and are worthless but had managed to get into ten or twelve years ago, still continue. They keep old people even when they are not very useful. Even when the recommendation for removal is made from Calcutta, the artiste concerned may have somebody high-up in the A.I.R. directorship in Delhi, and the recommendation for his removal is turned down. That is how things happen. To cite an instance, the Calcutta Station recommended the removal of Aparna Chakravarty, a singer of classical music, because she had become incompetent, but she

managed to pull wires in Delhi and she still gets the bookings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just avoid these personal references.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Avoid personal names? All right, Sir. Because I am very precise . . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You need not be so precise; leave the names out.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: All right, Sir.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): It is objectionable to mention names.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then as regards new entrants, they are graded A and B on the basis of the marks obtained in the audition test—Nobody is taken in if he or she gets less than 50 per cent, B grade—50 to 59 per cent, A grade—60 per cent. and above. Normally no one is graded A initially. The minimum fee for a new entrant in Calcutta is Rs. 30 per 3, 6 or even 9 songs sung at one or more sittings. The amount paid elsewhere in the country is much higher. Some new entrants who are not at all up to the mark also get through through the recommendation of the board, but once they are enlisted, it is difficult to eliminate them. The producers, that is, the supervisors in different branches, cannot do anything. All that they can do is to reduce the frequency of bookings of the not very useful and effective artists. At present there is no regular basis for the increment or reduction of fees. It is done at the discretion of the authorities, and naturally there is much scope for corruption and nepotism. There is also no rule regarding the frequency of bookings of different artistes. Cases of favouritism therefore happen very frequently, and everyone in Calcutta knows how some people get frequency of bookings while others do not. In the terminology of the A.I.R. songs are called lyrics and composers are called lyricists. There is no special depart-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

ment for contacting lyricists, examining lyrics and buying suitable ones. As such lyrics are not normally bought in Calcutta. Songs of composers enlisted in the past are repeated again and again. In other States there is a regular system of buying lyrics, I am told, but not in Calcutta. New lyricists hardly get a chance in Calcutta.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He cannot hear the radio and he is making comments on it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is the trouble with me, Sir. Without hearing many things I can comment. It is good that I do not hear the All India Radio. Dr. B. C. Roy once said that he wished he did not hear the All India Radio. He observed 'What kind of things Dr. Keskar puts across the AIR'.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is trying Divide and Rule.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The normal rate here is Rs. 5 per song whereas the amount paid elsewhere varies from Rs. 40 to Rs. 50 per song. Some time ago 50 songs of a lyricist were bought for a pittance of Rs. 100 i.e., Rs. 2 per song. I do not know how much it takes if I go from here in a scooter to my place. It is nearly a rupee. The Calcutta station authorities try to take advantage of the poverty and distress of poor but competent artistes and that is how they get them to do their job at such poor rates.

Then, Sir, if an artist does not happen to be related, even in a remote way, to a permanent employee of the Calcutta station of the A.I.R. he or she is penalised through being booked less frequently. They do not get much bookings and so on. Nepotism goes on. But, Sir, I know of a lady—I do not want to name her—a cousin of the Assistant Station Director there, whose frequency of bookings increased as against being reduced because she was fortunately related to the

A. S. D. As you know, Sir, relationships in this regime do not count.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any of your relations in the A. I. R.?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would ask them not to go there.

Then, Sir, there is a system of tape-recording of every song but the arrangements at Calcutta are not satisfactory.

Then, Sir, the strength of the engineering personnel at Calcutta is extremely meagre. At present there are 27 transmitting stations in the country and I am told the Government will increase the number to 100. I do not know what will happen then.

Then comes mismanagement because the personnel is not effective and adequate. Take the case of test matches, how they were covered. According to the rule laid down by the A.I.R., no commentator is permitted to broadcast on more than two occasions. But I do not know how that gentleman—I do not know who he is . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do not say that you do not know.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If you want me to name him, I can give you the name. He was allowed to broadcast in four test matches, Kanpur, Calcutta, Madras and Delhi. Whereas Mr. Puri, if you like the name, the best Indian commentator, got only two chances. Mr. Vizzy's commentary was the worst. He gave wrong scores and wrong names of the players.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: They may question anything. Then, Sir, what happened in the Bombay test? They were talking amongst themselves about the prospects of results of horse races and the listeners heard it. You can well imagine the feelings of the listeners in this matter. That is how they go on.

Then, Sir, in Calcutta again, they issued a circular sometime in April asking every one of the musicians there to send at least 30 songs of the composers with whom the A. I. R. had already entered into contracts. The artistes took very serious exception to this. It caused unnecessary harassment to them because it is difficult, rather impossible, to procure 30 songs at a time from the composer approved by the A.I.R. For every song sung the composer gets nearly 25 to 75 nP. Take the case of a well-known composer, Mr. Pronob Roy, who received Rs. 11/- for his songs for the entire period of 1959. The gracious Information and Broadcasting Minister gave Rs. 11/- for his songs sung during the whole year of 1959.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why are you again using a name?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is no reflection. The Director General of the A. I. R. came to Calcutta on the 20th of June last year to investigate into a serious complaint, but all that he had to do was to hush up the matter, and the person who was aggrieved was removed to some other position and the matter was hushed up. There, in the Calcutta station of the A. I. R. the trinity rules. I will not give the names because I need not give the names. They are the Station Director, the Assistant Station Director and the Assistant Director of Classical Music, called by the people of Calcutta, the trinity of the All India Radio, who run the show with the blessings of Dr. Keskar.

Then, Sir, I come to the Delhi Station of All India Radio, nearer home. Here again, according to my information, there is peaceful co-existence. They flourish and thrive on nepotism and corruption. Nobody touches them. A sort of code has been evolved. Therefore, you do not hear much that way. Friendship and nepotism run riot there; what sort of friendship I need not go into it here.

Then, again, when you have such things, you have rivalry, frustrations

and bitterness. These are also there in the All India Radio, Calcutta. I am told that grass worth Rs. 400 from the All India Radio lawns was sold to somebody. I do not know much about that. Because it is a delicate matter I need not dilate upon it but the hon. Minister would please enlighten us on the subject.

Then, Sir, here is the text of a printed letter dated the 7th September, 1960, addressed to the Director General, All India Radio, by Mr. G. C. Avasthi, Programme Executive. In this letter he said that he felt disappointed after long years of service in the A.I.R. He joined the All India Radio in 1945. In his letter he makes serious allegations. He says that people with high salaries, Rs. 300 to Rs. 1,000 a month, are somehow or the other appointed without going through the Public Service Commission, and he makes a very specific statement about this thing. He points out to insecurity of service. People are retrenched at will and asked to quit their job at will. He points out further that on another occasion a batch of 30 people was saved because of Parliamentary intervention. I do not know if the hon. Minister has read the text of this letter which Mr. Avasthi wrote to the Minister. There is a lot to be said on the subject.

Again, in the matter of selection of artistes, musicians and singers and so on, well, who does it? We do not know. I am prepared to concede the right of the members of the Congress Party provided I know who they are, so that I can go and talk to them. They are not there. The job is given to a set of officials and advisers who are there in order to cover up what the officials are doing. That is how Dr. Keskar runs his show.

Again, Sir, an article appeared in the Free Press Journal. It seems he also meets pressmen.

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (DR. E. V. KESKAR): The hon. Member is probably not aware that I have to be in charge of the press also.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am coming to that. That is another tragedy. He is in charge of the Press Information Bureau.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, your half an hour is over.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Just a few minutes. Therefore, it is true that cultivation goes on here of people, of favourites, of friends, of relations at the All India Radio where you see the persecution of qualified and eminent artistes and other people who will be more suitable for the All India Radio and the whole thing is directed on lines of family ties, friendship ties and favouritism.

Finally, Sir, I suggest that this is a matter which should be gone into by Members of Parliament. We want to rescue this important vehicle of cultural life and propaganda from the hands of the hon. Minister and his officials. It should be a body above approach, above suspicion, above partisan consideration, which should be run in the larger interests of the country and for the cultural enlightenment of the people and for the dissemination of truth and nothing but truth. Presently it is full of people who stand for suppression of truth, for suggestion of falsehood. It has become a flourishing trade in an all-India Radio centres. About this Dr. Keskar, our eminent Minister, should do something.

*The question was proposed.*

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, I move:

1. "That for the words 'consisting of 45 Members representing both Houses of Parliament' the words 'consisting of Members representing both Houses of Parliament and representatives of cultural interests' be substituted."

2. "That for the words 'and to make recommendations for its improvement' the words 'and examine the desirability or otherwise

of converting the All India Radio from its present set-up into an organisation, managed by a public corporation, and to report thereon' be substituted."

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE (Gujarat): Sir, I move:

3. "That for the words 'Committee consisting of 45 Members representing both Houses of Parliament' the words 'Commission consisting of Members of Parliament and others' be substituted."

4. "That for the words 'for its improvement' the words 'in the light of their review' be substituted."

(These amendments also stood in the names of Shri M. S. Gurupada Swamy and Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha.)

*The questions were proposed.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: A little more tolerance and a little more laughter will make the situation better.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: A little more music also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No music. Your voice is very musical; we all know it.

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN (Madras): Mr. Chairman, I came into the House with some expectation of hearing a powerful argument from Mr. Bhupesh Gupta for the setting up of a committee of parliamentarians to go into the working of the All India Radio. But I must straightway point out that I am much disappointed, because he has taken this opportunity to make just a political diatribe here on 7, Jantar Mantar Road or Windsor Place, whichever place it might be. He has not given any concrete instance or any cogent argument for the setting up of a parliamentary committee. He himself, in his initial remarks, said that the A.I.R. was an appendage of the Administration. What does it mean? When he made that statement—appendage of the Administration—

did he go into the full meaning of it? Even if it is any kind of appendage, Sir, it is under the full control of Parliament. What has been Parliament doing all these eight years? What has been Mr. Bhupesh Gupta doing all these years? What have they been doing all these years? They could have asked these things in the form of questions, in the form of Half-an-Hour discussions, in the form of resolutions, etc.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I gave my resolution once, but it was blocked and it did not come.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN: Well, Sir, I am only saying that there are all kinds of avenues for the discussion of these things in Parliament and Parliament is a supreme authority to control the administration of the All India Radio. If there has been anything wrong, it has been because of the improper functioning of Members themselves. I would say that the Opposition has not taken care to see whether the All India Radio has been properly functioning or not. If it had not been properly functioning, they could have brought these things to the notice of Parliament. Then, Sir, we have got this Informal Consultative Committee and Members can suggest things and offer criticisms. Then we have got the general debate on our Budget and also the Appropriation Bills. These are the various stages where such things can be discussed and grievances redressed. Instead of that, what is it that they want? They want a committee of parliamentarians to go into the administration of the All India Radio. What are we doing here? There is the Lok Sabha and there is the Rajya Sabha. They get so many opportunities of discussing these things there. They can discuss these things either in the form of committees or in the open House itself or they can have informal discussions. Leaving all these things, Sir, just for fancy's sake they want a parliamentary commit-

tee. This has become a fancy nowadays. What is it that such a commission or a committee can do, which Members of Parliament cannot do? Is it our feeling that we cannot do anything in this matter? If we have a mind to do it and if we have got constructive criticisms to offer, we can do many things.

Then, Sir, the one point which he has made is that it is making propaganda for a political party. I would humbly request the hon. Minister to place before the House the number of hours and the number of news items covered for each party. He was complaining, Sir, that there were, what he called political broadcasts. Well, I have been for some time a Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry and I can say that I have not heard of any item as 'political broadcast' and when he uses the words 'political broadcasts', I think what he actually means is that in the news bulletins there is a tinge in favour of one party or the other. After all, Sir, these news items are meant for the listening public. They listen to the news to know about things that happen; they cannot listen to things that do not happen. And it depends on the quantum of work that each political party puts in. If we have a conference or a Congress session or anything of that sort, our doors are open to the public, our doors are open to the press; they come and take down these things. Even our quarrels are reported. But that does not happen in the party of my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. They have been meeting for eleven days. Still nobody knows what is happening there, because nobody is allowed. Even their members are not told these things, leave alone the press. Under such circumstances, Sir, how can the A.I.R. give any coverage? Can it say that they were just meeting? In that case, Sir, who will listen to such empty things? Can it say that the Communist Party has been meeting in Windsor Place and they have been sitting and sitting and discussing and discussing things? In



[Shri G. Rajagopalan.]  
 that case, Sir, the public will close down the radio; they will not listen to such things. They can listen only to those things which are happening. Whenever there is any official briefing or whenever the Communist Party gives anything, it is naturally broadcast on the radio.

Then, Sir, he gave two instances, one about the Commonwealth Conference and the other about the Prime Minister's remarks pertaining to Kerala. These two questions have been answered in this very House, if I remember aright. At that time, Sir, he had the right to ask for a Half-an-Hour discussion. Did he ask for it or did any Member of his party ask for it? Nobody asked for it. When we have got the powers to function, we must function properly and not just for fancy sake ask for a commission or a committee to be set up. What is that committee to go into?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: To examine if Mr. Rajagopalan can be appointed as an artiste of the A.I.R.

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN: Thank you very much for the compliment. I think you would also join me.

Sir, I will again request the hon. Minister that he should place before this House the number of periods, the number of items or the number of news broadcasts, etc. for all parties. That itself will make the position clear, Sir. Well, Sir, if the Prime Minister makes any speech he is making it as a Prime Minister; he is not doing it as a Congressman. Even Mr. Bhupesh Gupta will remember that when Mr. Namboodiripad was the Chief Minister of Kerala and when he was making speeches, over A.I.R. we never complained against them. Therefore, Sir, I do not see any reason for the setting up of a parliamentary committee. If, however, they can advance any strong reason for it, then I can welcome it. But these are the things which can be controlled by Parlia-

ment and Members themselves can control them. But just to satisfy some Member's fancy that a parliamentary committee should be set up, I am afraid that is not the function of Parliament—to set up such committees.

I am happy to find that my hon. friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, has heard the test commentary and he is taking interest in cricket. Because the Russian Ambassador in Australia also saw some cricket match recently in Australia between Australia and West Indies, he too thought that he should listen to the test commentary. Whether he really listened to these test commentaries or whether somebody asked him to make a speech, I do not know. But I take it that when the hon. Member makes his speech here, he has heard the commentary and he makes criticism on the commentary after hearing it not because somebody tells him something.

I must say that he made a reference to the Delhi Station of the All India Radio and said that there was co-existence of all sorts of things, which he always uses and which I do not want to use but I would humbly ask him that if it is co-existence, it is co-existence between two sections of ideologies and two parties. If what he has said is about crime and corruption, if he owns one, of course the other is owned by the Government, because there can be co-existence only between two sections and it cannot be co-existence on one's own . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We do not exist in the All India Radio.

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN: You do not exist in Government. When he mentioned about co-existence of crime and corruption, he must be owning one of the two. I will close in a minute because I do not see any reason and he has not produced any reason or argument for the setting up of a commission. I do not feel

any necessity for a commission. The Parliament has full powers to control the administration of the All India Radio and if it exercised a little more vigilance, if it feels that this is not functioning properly, it will serve the purpose and there is no necessity for a special commission.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY (Mysore): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am happy that this resolution has come before this House for discussion as it will enable us to see some of the aspects of the working of the A.I.R. I have moved an amendment to this resolution. It is a small amendment and I have said that a Commission consisting of Members of Parliament and others may be appointed to make recommendations in regard to the working of the All India Radio. I have moved this amendment with a view to associating members who are not Members of Parliament but who are greatly interested in the development of the A.I.R. I think my hon. friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, will accept this amendment.

Criticisms have been made in the past about the working of the A.I.R. I am not interested in indulging merely in attacks against the Minister but I want to show now whether there is any case for an enquiry and if there is a case for enquiry, then should it not be done quickly? My friend who spoke just now said that no attempt was made by Members of Parliament in the past to focus the attention of the House on some of the aspects of broadcasting. May I point out to him that there were many instances in the past where Members had taken considerable interest in focusing the attention of the Houses of Parliament and also of the public on various important aspects of broadcasting. In 1955, I remember, and I think the Minister is also aware, a very important resolution came up for discussion in the other House while I was a Member there and the resolution was for the setting up of a

Committee to investigate into the question of finding out whether it is necessary or advisable to have a Corporation or whether the *status quo* should continue and very lively discussion took place and Members of Parliament at that time advanced many suggestions for improvement. So interest is not lacking. Besides, I must say that there is a considerable case existing for investigation into the working of the A.I.R. I say this not because I belong to the opposition party and that I must say that. I say this because various opinions have been expressed by the press and the public in the past for the setting up of such an enquiry. I might draw the attention of the House to some of the criticisms levelled by the Indian press in the past about the working of the A.I.R. for instance, the Hindusthan Standard on November 14, 1959, while pointing out the ills of the A.I.R. referred to the particular case of Shri Satyendranath Bose. He was asked to deliver a series of lectures in the A.I.R. but he refused to deliver those lectures because, according to him, there was too much of official supervision which came in the way of an independent expression of views. So he refused to participate in the series.

Again, The Hindu of Madras, on November 1959, made a number of suggestions and, among other things, it suggested that emphasis should be on the dissemination of useful technical information pertaining to agriculture, animal husbandry, rural health and sanitation rather than matters political, as it would enable the programmes to cut across party and group prejudices and to play an effective role in improving village life.

The Statesman has come out with a bitter attack on the A.I.R. in its issue of April 26, 1960—very recent—and according to the paper, the standard of A.I.R. news broadcasts has deteriorated because of official interference with the work of the News Division of the A.I.R. In a forthright criticism, the paper says:

[Shri M. S. Gurupada Swamy.]

"Want of policy, of foresight and of judgement are the banes of the News Division. A vital department, which could be the eyes and ears of scores of millions of people, in India and outside, is treated as a minor appendage, an instrument of Ministerial publicity and of bureaucratic necessity as understood by junior civil servants . . ."

So here are certain criticisms levelled, not by the Opposition Parties but by the responsible press. Apart from these criticisms of the press, may I point out that whenever one switches on the Radio, what he hears mostly is not the voice of the nation. It is the voice of a particular political party. There is a lot of truth in what Mr. Gupta said. Mr. Rajagopalan was very eloquent and said that the volume of publicity given by the A.I.R. depended on the volume of work done by the political parties. That is not true. It is not my opinion or the opinion of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta but it is the opinion of many people. I think my friends in the Congress also would appreciate that the A.I.R. should be above political parties and if there is a continuous criticism about its working, the Minister should have an enquiry made into the working of the A.I.R. with regard to that matter and also about other matters. What is wrong in that?

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY (Maharashtra): Would it not be better to have facts rather than sweeping remarks?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: Mr. Gupta came out with so many facts and I also gave one instance . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Dr. Barlingay, I would include you in the Enquiry Commission.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: I am grateful to you.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: I can give a lot of facts but unfortunately there is no time.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: If there is time for making sweeping remarks, there is time for giving facts.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: There are criticisms levelled by responsible papers. They are not my remarks or my opinions.

Some time back, in the Lok Sabha a resolution for setting up a corporation for managing the All India Radio came up for discussion; and it was pointed out that in view of the necessity to have the efficient and impartial functioning of the All India Radio, it would be desirable to have a broadcasting corporation instead of having it run as a part of the Government, as a limb of the administration, as an instrument of the official policy. Sir, there are two systems which are prevalent in the world. One is the system obtaining in America and the other is the system in England. The American system represents one extreme, namely, that of commercial broadcasting where the broadcasting is managed and run by private people. We do not go by the American method. There is another system followed in Great Britain where the B.B.C. is a corporation which is government-controlled; and it has got the advantage, of having no day-to-day interference by the bureaucracy. Though it is constituted by the government, it stands apart from the ordinary machinery of the government. That is a great advantage that the B.B.C. is having and the net result is that the B.B.C. has been able to work impartially and has been able to satisfy various shades of opinion in the country. Sir, I hope it will be seen that there is a great deal of substance in my argument that the A.I.R. should not be run as a department or limb of the Government, but it should be separate, and be a corporation. Even if it is a corporation, the control of the Government will not be diminished. The Government's supervisory powers and

powers of control will continue; but the corporation will have the additional advantage, namely, the advantage of being autonomous and thus we may avoid the day-to-day interference by the Government.

Now I come to some of the suggestions which I want to put forward before the House. I have two or three important suggestions to make. I feel that the quality of the material is important in all transmissions. In all broadcastings the quality must be top-priority, not quantity or quantitative expansion. I feel that the A.I.R. has not been giving sufficient attention to this important question of quality. The A.I.R. programmes are usually dull. Even educative broadcasts are not good. Not only music, plays, dramas, but even educative programmes can be made lively and more interesting. So we have to pay more attention to quality. Unfortunately, so far, inspite of expansion of the A.I.R. and its branches, no adequate attention has been paid to this important aspect. If there is any dearth of broadcasting talent, I would even say, you need not increase the broadcasting hours. Cut down the broadcasting hours; but produce quality material. Put up the best programme to the nation so that the people and the country at large may have certain standards, may get good enlightenment, though it is small or limited.

In the annual reports produced by the Information and Broadcasting Ministry, it is made out that significant progress has been made in various aspects of broadcasting and it is good to hear of all this progress. But unfortunately in all this there is no indication of the progress in the number of listeners. I feel that listeners are dwindling. Why is their number dwindling? That has to be enquired into.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How do you expect the Ministry to keep count of the number of listeners?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: But that is the most important part of managing broadcasting. Take any

country for that matter and you will find that they have evaluation reports and . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: They can count the number of radios in use, but not the number of listeners.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On the basis of the number of radios they can evaluate.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: They have got a basis for that. I think you are aware that they have got a basis for working out the number of listeners also. They have statistics collected and they have got evaluation reports of the number of listeners.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Here when they listen to the radio, some people shout at the radio.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is over. You may conclude now.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: The number you get from the licences. But it does not mean that everyone living in a house actually listens to the radio.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: And everybody who has a radio need not be a listener.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: I feel there is great scope for improving and reorganising the All India Radio and therefore there is a good case for setting up a commission. The hon. Minister may not accept all what we say. He may be partially correct and we may be partially wrong. But there is a case for the setting up of a commission to enquire into the whole setup of the All India Radio and so I feel this proposition must be acceptable to the hon. Minister. I feel that by accepting this proposal he would be taking a step in the matter of meeting the various criticisms and allegations that are levelled against the Ministry from time to time by people from various quarters.

SHRI B. V. (MAMA) WARERKAR (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, let me first of all introduce

[Shri B. V. (Mama) Warerkar.] myself as the first broadcaster in India. I was not only the first broadcaster, but I was there for the first three years when the radio station was conducted by a commercial company.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL (Andhra Pradesh): We are not able to hear the hon. Member. It will be better if he will come nearer the mike, or raise his voice.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You may stand in front of the mike.

SHRI B. V. (MAMA) WARERKAR: Very well. I hope hon. Members can hear me now. I was practically conducting the radio station when it was being managed by a commercial company for the first three years, from 1927 to 1930 before it was taken over by the Government. As the company was not in a position to carry on, the Government was approached to take over the radio station.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE (Maharashtra): When did you conduct it? Not to my knowledge.

SHRI B. V. (MAMA) WARERKAR: In the year 1927.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He says he was the first broadcaster.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: I know all about it.

SHRI B. V. (MAMA) WARERKAR: Yes, he was also there. Shri Lalji Pendse was also there. I was practically an adviser to the company. As an adviser I had to collect the artistes and at that time it was very difficult to do that and the artistes were not willing to come and had to be coaxed into coming to the radio station. After that, for a long time no improvement was there. Only the programmes were going on in the usual way. Since Dr. Keskar took over in 1952, the first thing he did was to appoint an advisory committee for programmes and for music. He did not do it as a super

lord, as Shri Bhupesh Gupta suggests. He was being advised by people who were artistes and at the same time there were also Members of Parliament on those Committees. There are also the consultative committees which are being consulted in respect of the programmes. Programmes are recommended by these committees as well as improvements. It appears that Shri Bhupesh Gupta has based his speech more on hearsay evidence than actual listening to the programme. I doubt whether he has got a radio set; if he has one, I doubt whether he is listening to it regularly. I am a regular listener and as such I can say that in five years from 1951 improvements which had not been made during the last twentyfive years were effected. Even after that, many improvements have been effected, for instance, the national programme of music, national programme of talks, national programme of opera, national programme of plays and national programme of classic literature. There are programmes for the labour population and for the villagers. There are farm forums. Lessons are also given for the learning of Hindi at stations like Bombay, Madras and Calcutta. The national programme of music was introduced first in 1952 and so far about 444 classical music concerts have been broadcast. The national programme of music features classical music artistes of the Hindustani and the Carnatic schools. Had it not been for Dr. Keskar, I am afraid classical music in India would have been annihilated altogether. Folk music is also given in the national programme. The national programme of talks was started in 1953. These are given in English and so far we have had 340 such talks which included some thought-provoking subjects like 'The contribution of the South to the heritage of India', 'Looking at ourselves', 'Some problems of University Education', 'Bastions of Democracy', etc. The national programme of drama was introduced in 1956 and so far 58 plays have been broadcast in different languages of India. The technique is of the master

script, the play in the original language is translated into Hindi and then it is translated into the language of the particular station. Broadcasts are on Thursdays. The national programme of opera was started in 1956 which has been broadcasting traditional operas as well as new ones and in this way has kept alive a dying tradition. The national programme of classics which was introduced in 1959 seeks to introduce to the listeners some of the famous classics in the Indian languages. The method is the same, that is, the preparation of the master script in the regional language, its adaptation in Hindi and further adaptation in other regional languages. So far twenty classics have been broadcast. The national programme of contemporary literature which was introduced last year is a new undertaking which endeavours to present selected items from contemporary writings in different languages. The national programme of documentaries features development and other nation-building activities in different parts of India. These programmes may be in English and in the Indian languages and these have not only encouraged this technique of documentary feature but have also acquainted the listeners with the constructive activities in different parts of India. The national programmes provide a forum and in this way have contributed towards mutual understanding of cultures in India and have promoted emotional integration. At the same time, the national programmes seek to satisfy the taste of the serious listeners and in this way perform to some extent the function which the Third Programme of the B.B.C. does. The big difference between the A.I.R. and the B.B.C., however, is that while the B.B.C. has to broadcast programmes only in English, the A.I.R. has to do so in sixteen languages for the home service. Listeners of the B.B.C. may be more but the listeners of the A.I.R. are not less. The number of licences was about 7 lakhs in 1951 and now it is nearly 21 lakhs. The programmes are also popular. They are seeking popularity every time and

the advisory boards and committees are giving their advice every now and then, whenever it is needed. I do not see any reason why a Commission should be appointed in order to improve the radio programmes of the A.I.R.

श्री भगवत नारायण भार्गव (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपीध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने प्रस्तावक महोदय और जिन्होंने अमेण्डमेंट पेश किया उन माननीय सदस्यों को बड़े ध्यान से सुना। अगर हम प्रस्ताव पर ठंडे दिमाग से विचार करें तो मालूम होता है कि कोई केस किसी कमेटी को कायम करने का है ही नहीं। यह तो जाहिर ही है कि इन्फार्मेशन और ब्राड-कास्टिंग डिपार्टमेंट एक गवर्नमेंट डिपार्टमेंट है। हमारे सामने अनेक डिपार्टमेंटों के सम्बन्ध में रोज ही कुछ न कुछ काम सामने आता ही रहता है और हम सब लोग उन पर अपने अपने विचार प्रकट करते ही रहते हैं। मुझे यहाँ आये हुए करीब एक साल हुआ है और तब से मैं बराबर यह देखता हूँ कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की तरफ से जब भी प्रस्तावों के नोटिस दिये जाते हैं—चाहे वे बैलट में आयें या न आयें—उन प्रस्तावों में प्रायः यही मांग रहती है कि फलां चीज के लिये कमेटी मुकर्रर की जाय, फलां चीज के लिये ३० मेम्बरों की कमेटी मुकर्रर की जाय, फलां चीज के लिये ४० मेम्बरों की कमेटी मुकर्रर की जाय। प्रस्तावक महोदय ने सदन में जो प्रस्ताव पेश किया है यह भी उसी तरह का है और इसमें कोई नई बात नहीं है।

आप सब लोगों को पता होगा कि एक तरफ तो हम इकोनॉमी सब डिपार्टमेंट में चाहते और दूसरी तरफ हम इस तरह का प्रस्ताव लाते हैं जिसमें हजारों और लाखों रुपया बर्बाद हो और फिर अन्त में कोई नतीजा न निकले। हम लोगों को देखना यह है कि इस तरह की कमेटी बनाने के लिये कोई केस है भी और इस तरह की कमेटी बनाना आवश्यक भी है या नहीं? अगर इस तरह की

[श्री भगवत नारायण भर्गव]

कोई कमेटी बन भी जायेगी तो उससे कोई लाभ हो सकता है या नहीं ? जब हमारे सामने ऐसे आंकड़े नहीं हैं, कोई कंक्रीट केस नहीं है जिसको देख कर हम इस बात का निश्चय कर सकें कि इस तरह की कमेटी बनाई जानी चाहिये तब इस तरह का प्रस्ताव लाने से क्या लाभ होगा ? केवल एक जनरल-वे में कह जाना कि कर्प्शन है, नैपोटिज्म है, रिश्तेदारों के साथ तत्फदारी होती है, जो अयोग्य आदमी है उसको बड़ी फीस दी जाती है और जो योग्य हैं उन्हें कम फ्रीस दी जाती है। एक आदमी को चार पांच दफा ब्राडकास्ट करने के लिये बुलाया जाता है और एक आदमी को केवल एक ही दफा बुलाया जाता है, ये इस तरह की बातें हैं जो चलते फिरते आदमी रास्ते में कहते हैं। क्या इस तरह की बातें कहना इस सदन की डिगनिटी के योग्य है और हम इस तरह जनरल वे में अपने डिपार्टमेंटों के बारे में आक्षेप करें हमारे माननीय सदस्य ने जिन्होंने संशोधन पेश किया है, लोक मभा के एक प्रस्ताव का जिक्र किया जो सन् १९५५ में आया था। परन्तु उन्होंने बड़ी बुद्धिमानी की जो हाउस को यह नहीं बतलाया कि उसका परिणाम क्या हुआ। अगर कहीं वह पास हो गया होता तो वे ऐसा अवश्य कहते कि वह पास हो गया था। या तो वह विद्वद्वा हो गया होगा या रिजैक्ट हो गया होगा। इसका मतलब यह है कि हाउस नहीं चाहता था कि ऐसा कार्पोरेशन, ऐसी कमेटी या ऐसा कमीशन बिठलाया जाय और उसके हाथ में यह काम दिया जाय। हाउस इस राय से सहमत नहीं था तभी वह प्रस्ताव पास नहीं हुआ।

आज इस सदन में यह कहा गया कि हम लोगों को मौका नहीं दिया जाता, मिनिस्टर साहब हम से मजेशन नहीं मांगते। मिनिस्टर साहब हम से क्रिटिजिज्म आफर करने को नहीं कहते। इन बातों से क्या लाभ है ? क्या हमारी गवर्नमेंट ने किसी का हाथ रोक लिया है ? क्या हमारी गवर्नमेंट ने किसी का मुंह

रोक लिया है ? क्या हमें यह सुविधा नहीं है कि हम जो मजेशंस चाहें, जो क्रिटिजिज्म चाहें, मिनिस्टर साहब के पास भेजें ? अगर यह कहा जाता कि हमने क्रिटिजिज्म भेजे, मिनिस्टर साहब के पास हमने मैकड़ों मजेशंस भेजे, परन्तु मिनिस्टर साहब ने जवाब ही नहीं दिया, कोई ध्यान ही नहीं दिया, तो एक बात होती, तो मैं मानता कि मिनिस्टर साहब बड़े हठधर्मी हैं, किसी की मुत्तने नहीं हैं, इस लिये कमेटी बिठलानी चाहिये। परन्तु ऐसा एक भी उदाहरण नहीं दिया गया। हमारे प्रस्तावक महोदय ने सब से ज्यादा जोर इस बात पर दिया कि इस रेडियो विभाग का जो मुख्य कार्य है वह यह है कि हमारे सांस्कृतिक जीवन की उन्नति हो। उन्होंने दो तीन बार अपने भाषण में—जब आरम्भ किया, बीच में और जब समाप्त किया—इस बात पर जोर दिया। मैं यह कहना हूँ कि वास्तव में हमारे सांस्कृतिक जीवन में कोई महायत्ना आल इंडिया रेडियो दे रहा है या नहीं, यह देखने की बात है। छोटी छोटी बातों से ऐसा प्रभाव नहीं पड़ता कि हम यह निश्चय करें कि कमेटी बनाई जाय। संशोधक महाशय ने यह कहा कि बहुत नीचे दर्जे की बातें उनमें आती हैं, क्वालिटी नहीं है, क्वांटिटी है। मैं कहता हूँ कि अगर वे ध्यान से रेडियो को सुनें तो उनको मालूम होगा कि हमारे यहां प्राचीन लेखकों, माध्यमिक लेखकों, आधुनिक लेखकों और कवियों के सम्बन्ध में ऊंची ऊंची दर्जे की आलोचनाएं आती हैं और जो शिक्षा के प्रेमी हैं वे उसको अच्छी तरह से समझ सकते हैं।

देखना यह है कि हमारा आल इंडिया रेडियो जनप्रिय है या नहीं, लोकप्रिय है या नहीं। यह इससे मावित होता है कि सन् १९४७ में जहां दो लाख ७५ हजार लाइसेंस थे वहां आज सन् १९६० में २० लाख से ऊपर लाइसेंस हो गये हैं। अगर यह जनप्रिय न होता तो इतने अधिक लाइसेंस नहीं लिये जाते। कोई पागल नहीं है कि खामख्वाह

रेडियो लाइसेंस ले। जब रेडियो में कुछ आता नहीं, रेडियो में कुछ समझ में नहीं आता, रेडियो में केवल कांग्रेस का प्रोपेगंडा होता है, तो २० लाख जो रेडियो सेट लिये गये वे क्या सिर्फ कांग्रेस वालों ने लिये और किसी आदमी ने लाइसेंस लिया ही नहीं? यह कहना बिल्कुल गलत है कि यह एक पार्टी की मशीन है। एक पार्टी का टूल है। हर पार्टी को उसमें बोलने का मौका मिलता है, हर पार्टी के लोगों को उसमें अपनी कविताएं सुनाने का मौका मिलता है और गाने का अवसर मिलता है।

अगर सांस्कृतिक जीवन की ओर देखा जाय तो वास्तव में यह सभी मानते हैं कि हमारा देश ग्रामों में रहता है। देखना यह है कि इस आल इण्डिया रेडियो ने ग्रामों के लिये क्या किया है। ग्रामों में हमारे आल इंडिया रेडियो के द्वारा ७० लाख कम्युनिटी सेट्स बांटे गये हैं। इसमें से आधा खर्चा गवर्नमेंट आफ इण्डिया ने दिया है और आधा खर्चा जो राज्य है वे और जो वहां के देहात के लोग हैं वे देते हैं। ग्राम सभाओं को तमाम सस्ते रेडियो सप्लाई हुये हैं। ग्रामों की उन्नति के सम्बन्ध में ग्रामवासियों के सुनने के लिये उसमें अनेकों प्रोग्राम रहते हैं। पशु पालन के सम्बन्ध में और कृषि के सम्बन्ध में जो आधुनिक चमत्कार हुये हैं वे उसमें बताये जाते हैं। सहकारिता के सम्बन्ध में तमाम उसमें भाषण होते हैं। इसके अनिरिक्त ग्रामवासियों को किस प्रकार से अपने जीवन में उन्नति करनी चाहिये, किस प्रकार से शिक्षा की उन्नति करनी चाहिये, ये बातें उसमें बतलाई जाती हैं। यही नहीं, आल इण्डिया रेडियो में बच्चों के लिये अलग कार्यक्रम रहते हैं, स्त्रियों के लिये अलग कार्यक्रम रहते हैं। नियत समय पर ग्रामों की तमाम स्त्रियां रेडियो सुनने के लिए आकर बैठती हैं। छोटे छोटे पांच पांच और सात सात वर्ष के बच्चों को छोटेपन से यह सिखाया जाता है कि किस प्रकार बड़े होकर उनको देश का नेता बनना है। अनेक प्रकार

के प्रोग्राम उनके लिये रखे जाते हैं। तो मूल तत्व देखने का यह है कि आल इंडिया रेडियो अपने कर्तव्य का पालन करता है या नहीं। यह कहना कि हमारी पार्टी को उसमें प्रोत्साहन नहीं मिला, या फलानी पार्टी को अधिक प्रोत्साहन मिला, यह पार्टीबाजी की बात है और इसको जब चाहे तब कह सकते हैं। मैं यह कहता हूं कि गुणों की ओर देखना बड़ा कठिन है और दोषों को निकाल लेना बड़ा आसान है। चन्द्रमा के ऊपर जो दोष आरोपण करना चाहते हैं वे कालिमा पर ही ध्यान देंगे और वे चन्द्रमा की ज्योति और प्रकाश की ओर ध्यान नहीं देंगे। लोग बड़े से बड़े गुणी में भी दोष निकाल लेते हैं। क्या लोग हमारे प्रधान मन्त्री के ऊपर आक्षेप नहीं करते? क्या लोग हमारे पूज्य पन्त जी के ऊपर आक्षेप नहीं करते? यह संसार है। इसमें आदमी अपने दोष छिपाने की कोशिश करता है और दूसरे में दोष न भी हों तो गुणों को ही दोष बताने के लिये उद्यत हो जाता है। ग्रामों के वास्ते एक स्पेशल फोरम बना हुआ है जिसके द्वारा अनेक कार्यक्रम चलते हैं। वहां क्लब भी हैं और उन क्लबों के मेम्बर उन भाषणों को, उन प्रोग्रामों को सुनते हैं और सुन कर के उन पर आपस में परामर्श करते हैं, वाद विवाद करते हैं और उसमें जो उनकी शंकाएं होती हैं वे सब आल इंडिया रेडियो में भेजी जाती हैं और उनका आल इंडिया रेडियो जवाब देता है। तो सारे देश में शिक्षा का कार्यक्रम इसके द्वारा चल रहा है। इस बात को हम देखते नहीं हैं, ओवरलुक करते हैं। सन् १९४७ में सारा प्रोग्राम जो ब्राडकास्ट होता था, उसमें कुल साल भर में २६ हजार घंटे खर्च होते थे। अब १ लाख १८ हजार घंटे साल में इस काम पर लगाये जाते हैं। हमारे आल इण्डिया रेडियो ने, जो छोटी छोटी भाषाएं हैं, जो ट्राइबल भाषाएं हैं, जो छोटे छोटे तबकों की डाइलेक्ट्स हैं, उन सब में प्रोग्राम ब्राडकास्ट करना आरम्भ कर दिया है। इससे हम देख सकते हैं कि हर ट्राइब के



[श्री भगवत नारायण भार्गव]

छोटे छोटे कलाकार और लेखकों को कितना अवसर मिलता है कि वे अपने ज्ञान को उसके द्वारा ब्राडकास्ट करें और देश को उससे लाभ पहुंचें। सन् १९४७ में केवल ८ विशेष भाषाओं में और चार डाइलेक्ट्स में प्रोग्राम ब्राडकास्ट होता था। आज १६ प्रिंसिपल भाषाओं में, २९ ट्राइबल भाषाओं में और ५१ डाइलेक्ट्स में प्रोग्राम ब्राडकास्ट किया जाता है। यहां की जो खबरें हम दिया करते थे, वह न्यूज बुलेटिन सन् १९४७ में २७ थीं और अब ४७ हो गई हैं। हमारे आल इण्डिया रेडियो के स्टेशंस की संख्या क्यों बढ़ती जा रही है? क्योंकि वह लोकप्रिय है, लोगों को उससे बड़ा लाभ हो रहा है। पहले ६ स्टेशन थे, अब २८ स्टेशन हो गये हैं। ट्रांसमीटर १९ से ६६ हो गये हैं। और अधिक आंकड़ों को आपके सामने रखने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। निष्पक्ष भाव से और बिना किसी पार्टीबन्दी को ध्यान में रखे हुये जो देखने हैं वे जानते हैं कि आल इंडिया रेडियो में लोकप्रियता दिन पर दिन बढ़ती जा रही है। उसके कार्यक्रम न केवल देहातों को बल्कि शहरों को भी लाभ पहुंचाते हैं। हमारे यहां के बड़े बड़े कलाकार और बड़े बड़े लेखक उसमें आ कर भाग लेते हैं। अगर हम चाहते हैं कि हम उसमें भाषण दें तो हम को कोई बुलाने नहीं आयेगा। आप चाहें कि हमारी पार्टी के लीडर को बुलाया जाय, तो उनको ऐसी कोई गरज नहीं पड़ी है। अगर हम किसी बात को रेडियो के द्वारा ब्राडकास्ट करना चाहते हैं, अगर हम अपने विचारों को उसमें रखना चाहते हैं तो हम उसके बारे में बराबर लिख सकते हैं और अगर हम वहां से ठुकराये जायें या हमारी मांग स्वीकार न की जाय और हम बड़े महत्व के आदमी हैं, इम्पार्टेंट आदमी हैं, पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर हैं और हमारी बात नहीं सुनी जाती है, हम ब्राडकास्ट करना चाहते हैं लेकिन हमारी आवाज लोग नहीं सुन पाते हैं तो हम उस और मिनिस्टर माहब का ध्यान दिला सकते हैं।

तो मैं संशोधनों का भी विरोध करता हूँ और प्रस्ताव का भी विरोध करता हूँ और मैं आशा करता हूँ कि हाउस इस प्रस्ताव को हर्षित पास नहीं करेगा।

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, while according support to the resolution moved by my friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, I should like to explain briefly the scope of the amendments which stand in my name. In the first amendment I have asked that there should be a committee consisting of Members of Parliament and representatives of cultural interests. From the resolution which was moved it would appear that there would be some sort of a grand inquisition into the shortcomings of the All India Radio. The All India is manned by people who are working under great pressure and I think a word of tribute is due to them on the floor of this House that they have been doing a remarkably good job all these years. I felt that a smaller committee consisting of Members of Parliament and representatives of cultural interests would be a better working group than a big committee of 45 Members. I would not be able to agree to it with all the shortcomings of the All India Radio which my hon. friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, mentioned in his speech. It is perhaps true that there are cases of nepotism, favouritism and corruption in the All India Radio, but by and large working as a Government organisation all these years, it has set up a remarkable standard of performance not only in the matter of entertainment, but also in the matter of presentation of news. I would like to qualify this statement by saying 'in a fair measure', because there are points on which the objectivity of the All India Radio has been considerably disturbed.

Much has been said that there is no need for a committee to go into the matter and this view was put forward by the first speaker in this debate, my

friend Shri Rajagopalan. And it has been followed by other speakers who have said that there is no need for an enquiry into the All India Radio. It has been said that Parliament gets an opportunity of having a debate on the All India Radio whenever Members want it. But unfortunately the time at the disposal of Parliament is short and we have never had an opportunity of having what I might call a full-dress debate on the All India Radio. Further, there have been many Commissions of Inquiry into broadcasting . . .

**SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN** (Andhra Pradesh): The debate has not been asked for.

**SHRI A. D. MANI**: The debate has not been asked for because it is not possible to get adequate time in the parliamentary schedule for a full-dress debate on the All India Radio. We have been more or less following on the lines of the BBC. I find that neither the Minister of Information and Broadcasting nor any representative of his Ministry is here.

**THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF RAILWAYS** (**SHRI S. V. RAMASWAMY**): I am here.

**SHRI A. D. MANI**: We would like to have a representative of the Ministry.

**SHRI S. V. RAMASWAMY**: I am taking notes.

**SHRI A. D. MANI**: I would like to say this that in the matter of going into the need for a change, while I have said that the All India Radio has set up a very good standard of performance, there is need for a change at the present time. In the matter of entertainment, the All India Radio is out of step with the new generation and it is a fact that the Radio Ceylon gets a much better and a more appreciative hearing than the All India Radio. The B.B.C. also in its time had to face similar problems when the Radio Normandy and

the Radio Luxembourg were broadcasting better entertainment on Sundays when the BBC devoted its service to the transmission of religious views. Today the entertainment part of the All India Radio is not attractive to the new generation and the most fatal thing in broadcasting is to get out of date. And I am sorry to say that in the very big field of entertainment, our idea of trying to push what is called classical music has not received widespread response.

There is one other aspect of broadcasting and that is nobody can say what is the purpose and what are the aims of broadcasting in this country. In every other country there is a preamble set up for the broadcasting instruments and we know exactly what the broadcasting stands for. For example, in the United States in the Federal Communications Commission they have accepted the principle that broadcasting should serve the interests of a majority of people, and that in the matter of minority interests there should be also services to them in order that the majority may absorb a new interest in the matter of entertainment. What we are trying to do is to try to push some minority point of view in the air in the form of classical music.

In the matter of presentation of news, I would agree with my friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, that the transmission of news at the time when the Kerala Ministry was pushed out of power led many of us to feel that the presentation was not objective. There has been too much of publicity for the Congress Party on the air, though I must record that in regard to the Bhavanagar session of the Congress and the Raipur session of the A.I.C.C., the publicity has not been as much as it was in the past. I do not know whether it indicates any change in the policy. But on the whole quite a number of people have come to feel that the Congress Party gets a much better deal on the air.

There is one other aspect to which my friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta,

1065 Resolution regarding [ RAJYA SABHA ] to review the working 1066  
*appointment of a Committee of the All India Radio*

[Shri A. D. Mani.]

referred and that is the presentation of news at the time of the Government servants' strike. As one who listened to the All India Radio constantly during that period, I must say that the broadcasts were not objective and the Calcutta Radio Station was forced to the necessity of mentioning that the broadcasts it was putting out were not written by them but by the All India Radio at Delhi. It was quite contrary to the facts of the situation as it existed.

The House should consider one other aspect about broadcasting. Considering the fact that the All India Radio has got 21 lakhs of licences, which means that the Government of India owns the biggest newspaper in the country, and considering the fact that the listeners of the All India Radio broadcasts take their news from the All India Radio, I think we should now consider changing the set-up of the All India Radio. It is not merely tinkering with the All India Radio, trying to have individual defects rectified. We are not interested so much in that as in changing the basis of the All India Radio. The BBC, which has been working more or less on the same lines, went through all these problems which we are facing now. The Government of India has accepted a heavy responsibility in the matter of development of television. It requires wholtime effort to develop television in the country and with the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting as it is constituted today I am not sure whether the Government would be able to give full-time attention to television. Perhaps a new Ministry for television may have to be set up and I would like to welcome the day when the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting itself is bifurcated, leaving 'Information' to a separate Minister and 'Broadcasting' to another Minister. This may perhaps provide more jobs, but I am not looking at it from that point of view. The BBC went through all these problems. They had these matters investigated . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do not provoke them to enlarge the Ministry.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I think the expansion comes naturally, Mr. Gupta. I think that the BBC was investigated by the Sykes Committee, the Ullswater Committee and last but not least by the Beveridge Committee. I would like to mention that there is one other aspect about broadcasting. Today there is a Government at the Centre which is run by the Congress Party. Tomorrow the pattern of Government may change in our country. There will be a Congress Government at the Centre and some non-Congress Governments functioning in the States and at that time we may not get the same objectivity from the All India Radio in the matter of transmission of news.

Secondly, there is another aspect and that is the development of the national language. While we are interested in developing the national language at the Central level, the All India Radio is giving more and more emphasis to local languages. This has got to be harmonised and integrated. Further the search for new talent must continue, and I am not sure whether the governmental set-up offers the best opportunities for finding out new talent. On all these grounds I feel that we must now accept that broadcasting has become a national subject, and Government and the people should consider broadcasting of news as being a matter which should be under a trustee. It should not be assumed that the setting up of a Broadcasting Corporation would mean that Government would lose its powers of control. We all accept that Broadcasting should be ultimately responsible to the State. But a Corporation would have a much wider field for initiative free from day-to-day interference from the ministerial level and probably will be able to unearth new talent. The B.B.C. Directors are appointed by the Governors today. They can be removed at will. The Government in the United King-

dom can compel the B.B.C. to push through any announcement of any Ministry which it considers to be in the national interest. It can also take over powers of control of the B.B.C. whenever the national interests demand it. These are very wide powers, and Parliament too has got an opportunity of debating the reports of the B.B.C. and probably of moving an adjournment motion whenever it is called for. The parliamentary powers of control are always there. But what the Broadcasting Corporation in England enjoys which the All-India Radio does not enjoy is independence of ministerial criticism. There have been cases as in 1926 when Mr. Baldwin wanted a certain statement issued by Church leaders on the occasion of the general strike not to be broadcast on the radio. The B.B.C. took the decision to broadcast it. We are expanding our State enterprises, and at least the Government servants' strike showed that in a matter of Government being the employer we cannot expect any objectivity from the All India Radio. The Beveridge Committee which went right into the matter—as Sir William Beveridge was a person of great reputation for sobriety—said that broadcasting should have an independence of criticism in Parliament greater than that possessed by authorities concerned with national industries such as coal, electricity and transport. that is to say, without any Minister being able to give directions in normal times as to the conduct of the broadcasting authority. This is what is wanted in regard to broadcasting. Perpetual criticism and scrutiny will stifle initiative. I feel, Sir, that we have come to a stage when the broadcasting system in the country has assumed the dimensions of a national problem, and no Minister, however capable he may be, will be able to give his time to the development of broadcasting in the country.

Sir, I may mention in passing that the Board of Governors of the B.B.C. meet twice a month, and the Board of Governors consists not only of people associated with Government but also

representatives of cultural interests. Mr. Harold Nicholson was a member of the Board of Governors for some time. We would like this cultural instrument to be developed by people who have a very adequate cultural background, not merely Government officials, and we would like to have participation of the public at various levels. The B.B.C. has a Central Advisory Council which consists of about 45 members. We might get representatives of the various States to sit on an Advisory Council of that kind which may meet four times a year as it does in Great Britain, and try to bring effective public participation at all levels in the working of the All India Radio.

Sir, I think that the Government must accept the position today that broadcasting has become a matter which should be placed in the hands of a trustee, and at the present moment the entire broadcasting system is run by Government officials. I know that the recent move of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting to give security of service to the employees of the All-India Radio has been welcomed by them, but from the public point of view today broadcasting is done by Government officials, and we should like the position to change. We should like a Corporation to come into existence which will take up this matter and will try to run it as a national institution in which the public will participate both at the Central and at the local levels. I hope that this matter would engage the attention of the Government. I am not suggesting that this is the only solution of the problem. In my second amendment I have said that the desirability or otherwise of the matter should be examined, and I trust that Government would appoint such a committee forthwith. I am not very fond of the word commission because commission means delay and no action, but committee means some action and perhaps a little delay. I am of the view that whatever the name may be, an enquiry into the broadcasting system of the country is immediately called for.

प्रो० रामधारी सिंह दिनकर (बिहार):  
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, भूपेश भाई बहुत अच्छे  
आदमी हैं . . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: We all  
agree.

PROF. R. D. SINHA DINKAR: You  
will also agree that his harangue has  
been a music to this House and we  
have all enjoyed it and also profited  
by it. He is a fluent and at that an  
extempore speaker.

लेकिन आज कुछ ऐसा देखा कि भूपेश भाई  
रड़ रड़ कर अपने नोट्स पढ़ रहे थे। इस पर मेरा  
दिमाग दौड़ा तो मैंने सोचा कि भूपेश भाई  
रेडियो कम सुनते हैं, लेकिन सरकार की निन्दा  
करने वालों की कहानियां सुनने को उनके  
कान बराबर खुले रहते हैं।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You are  
speaking things against me.

प्रो० रामधारी सिंह दिनकर: नहीं नहीं,  
मैं आपके विरुद्ध नहीं बोलता हूँ। मैं ने यह  
कहा कि इधर हाल में कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी के  
बड़े बड़े सदस्य बहुत बड़ी बड़ी बातों पर विचार  
करने में लगे हुए थे। भूपेश भाई के यहाँ जितने  
असंतुष्ट लोगों ने अपनी अपनी कहानियां  
पढ़वाई उन कहानियों को भूपेश भाई पढ़  
नहीं सके, जाच नहीं सके—पार्लियामेंट में  
बोलने के पहले उन कहानियों के बारे में उनका  
कोई मत नहीं बन सका। उन कहानियों को  
यहाँ आकर उन्होंने पढ़ दिया। और, उन्हें  
सुनकर विचार करने के बदले मुझे तो हंसी ही  
आई।

उनके भाषण से जो चीज़ में समझ सका  
वह यह है कि वे इस बात को बर्दाश्त नहीं कर  
सकते कि जिस सरकार को हम उखाड़ देना  
चाहते हैं उसके हाथ में रेडियो क्यों है। उनका  
दूसरा दुःख यह है कि जब सरकारी कर्मचारियों  
ने हड़ताल की तब रेडियो ने रोज हल्ला क्यों

नहीं मचाया कि सरकार उखड़ गई, रेलें  
बन्द हो गई, तार टूट गए, देश में पूरी बगावत  
है, और अब सारा देश भूपेश भाई की शरण  
में जाये। रेडियो ने यह क्यों कहा कि स्थिति  
काबू में है। भूपेश भाई कहते हैं कि उस समय  
रेडियो से गलत बातों का प्रचार किया गया।  
उन्हें मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि Truth  
has many facets मेरा ख्याल है,  
अगर आपको कृपा पूर्वक मिनिस्टर साहब  
साथ ले जायें तो रेडियो के न्यूज़ विभाग में जो  
बुलेटिनें आप देखेंगे उनमें एक भी  
समाचार आप ऐसा न पाइयेगा जिसको आप  
गलत कह सकें। यह दूसरी बात है कि हल्ला  
करने वालों की हां में हां रेडियो ने नहीं  
मिलायी।

एक बात और है। अपने यहाँ बजट की  
बहस कम होती है। लेकिन, दूसरे सदन में यह  
बहस ज्यादा होती है और हर साल रेडियो के  
बारे में सदस्यों का विचार हमारे सामने  
आता है। कुछ लोगों की बराबर एक शिकायत  
रही है कि रेडियो से शासक दल के लोगों का  
प्रचार अधिक होता है। मेरा ख्याल है, उससे  
ज्यादा नहीं होता जितना प्रचार दूसरे अखबार  
करते हैं।

شری فرید الحق انصاری - (اُتر)

پرديش) کس کا پرچار -

† [श्री फरीदुल हक अन्सारी (उत्तर प्रदेश):  
किमका प्रचार ?]

प्रो० रामधारी सिंह दिनकर: कांग्रेस के  
नेताओं का प्रचार रेडियो से ज्यादा होता है,  
यह एक शिकायत रही है। मेरा ख्याल है कि  
ऐसे अखबार जो कांग्रेस के अखबार नहीं हैं वे  
अखबार पंडित जी को जितना महत्व देते हैं,  
मंत्रियों की बातों को जितना महत्व देते हैं, उम  
अनुपात से ज्यादा महत्व रेडियो में नहीं दिया  
जाता है। रह गया यह कि पार्लियामेंट के  
समाचारों का जो हाल सुनाया जाता है उसकी  
क्या स्थिति है। तो उनमें भी कम्यूनिस्टों को

कोई शिकायत नहीं होनी चाहिए; क्योंकि उनकी बातें बहुत काफ़ी रेडियो पर आती हैं। पांच मिनट का तो वह बुलेटिन होता है। मैंने अक्सर सुना है, कम्यूनिस्ट वक्ताओं की बातें वहां आ जाती हैं।

मगर, अगर कहीं रेडियो को हम सिर्फ यह समझ लें कि यह समाचार की एक एजेंसी है और सभी राजनैतिक पार्टियों की ही दृष्टि से रेडियो पर विचार करने लगे तो यह रेडियो के साथ इन्साफ नहीं होगा रेडियो का ब्राडकास्ट साल में एक, सवा लाख घंटे का है। उनमें से समाचार बीस, बाईस हजार घंटों का होता होगा। बाकी इसके सार काम सांस्कृतिक हैं। ७००० संगीतज्ञ इस देश में हैं जो देश के विभिन्न भागों में बिखरे हुए हैं और जिनका रेडियो से सरोकार है। यह तो मैं नहीं कह सकता कि रेडियो से उन की पूरी रोज़ी चलती है, मगर, रेडियो उनकी जीविका का आधार है। १५०० ऐसे दूसरे लोग हैं जो साहित्य में, नाटक में, संगीत में अच्छा नाम किए हुए हैं—वे रेडियो से संबद्ध हैं स्टाफ आर्टिस्ट के रूप में। रेडियो का सालाना बजट पांच छः करोड़ रुपये का होता है। उसमें से एक सवा करोड़ इन कलाकारों की जेब में जाता है।

और, एक दूसरी दृष्टि से भी देखिये कि रेडियो ने कितना बड़ा काम किया है। मैं जब से यहां का सदस्य हुआ, यानी १९५२ से, तब से एक बात मैंने बराबर कही है और बहुत से मान्य सदस्यों ने भी कही है कि सरकार के जो भी विभाग संस्कृति का काम कर सकते हैं वे देश की एकता को मजबूत करें। मैं किसी मंत्रालय की निन्दा नहीं करना चाहता, तब भी यह सच है कि यह काम सिर्फ आल इंडिया रेडियो ने किया। और किसी के बहां से यह काम शुरू नहीं हुआ। रेडियो 'सोलह' मुख्य भाषाओं में ब्राडकास्ट करता है, उन्तीस आदिवासी भाषाओं में ब्राडकास्ट करता है, अड़तालीस ३९ भाषाओं—dialacts—में ब्राडकास्ट करता है। बहुत सी क्षेत्रीय भाषाएं और संस्कृति मर रही थीं, वे रेडियो में संजीवनी

पाकर उठने लगी हैं। मैं आपको सूचना दू कि काश्मीर का गद्य बहुत कुछ रेडियो की देन है, रेडियो को पाकर काश्मीर का गद्य उभरने लगा है—।

दूसरे, हम लोग जो विभिन्न भाषाओं के साहित्यकार हैं, बहुत दिनों से इस आशा में थे कि कोई राष्ट्रीय मंच निकले जहां हम सभी भाषाओं के साहित्यकार एकत्र हों और देश को समझें। यह फ़ोरम भी रेडियो ने उत्पन्न किया। हर साल २५ जनवरी को सब भाषाओं के कवि यहां रेडियो पर, एक मंच पर जमा होते हैं। यहां तो सभी भाषाओं की कविताओं का अनुवाद साथ साथ हिन्दी में सुनाया जाता है, बाकी प्रत्येक क्षेत्र में सभी भाषाओं की कविताओं का अनुवाद उस क्षेत्र की भाषा में उसी दिन सुनाया जाता है। इसी प्रकार, नाटक का नेशनल प्रोग्राम उन्होंने निकाला है, ओपेरा का निकाला है, क्लासिक्स का निकाला है, समकालीन साहित्य का निकाला है। ये विभिन्न मंच उन्होंने पैदा किये हैं जिनसे देश की एकता में वृद्धि हो और मैं समझता हूं कि रेडियो ने यह बहुत बड़ा काम किया है। ऐसे काम क्या शिक्षा मंत्रालय नहीं कर सकता है, सांस्कृतिक मंत्रालय नहीं कर सकता है? सब कर सकते हैं, लेकिन उत्साह केवल रेडियो वालों ने दिखलाया। इसलिये मैं कहता हूं, रेडियो की निन्दा करने की बजाय हमें रेडियो का अभिनंदन करना चाहिये। रेडियो का देश की एकता को बढ़ाने की दिशा में बहुत बड़ा योग है।

एक और बात मैंने भूपेश भाई के भाषण से नोट की। किसी प्रोग्राम एक्जीक्यूटिव ने इस्तीफा दे दिया, और उन्होंने गश्ती चिट्ठियां घुमाई सारे देश में। मुझे भी वह चिट्ठी मिली थी। वह मुकद्दमा क्या है, उसमें किसका कसूर था, ये तो मंत्री जानें, और मेरा खयाल है कि मंत्री महोदय को इस पर कुछ प्रकाश डालना चाहिये। लेकिन,

[श्री० रामधारी सिंह दिनकर]

एक बात मैं आप को कहूँ कि रेडियो में थोड़ा असंतोष है। असंतोष फैलने का कारण क्या हुआ ? पहले ऐसा था कि एक तरफ तो प्रोग्राम एसिस्टेंट, प्रोग्राम एक्जीक्यूटिव,— ये लोग थे। दूसरी तरफ स्टाफ आर्टिस्ट होते थे। मगर इसमें शायद कुछ कठिनाइयाँ रेडियो वालों को अनुभव हुईं। उन्होंने प्रोड्यूसर्स बहाल किये—संगीत के प्रोड्यूसर्स, नाटक के प्रोड्यूसर्स, साहित्यिक वार्ताओं के प्रोड्यूसर्स। और प्रोग्राम एक्जीक्यूटिव, प्रोग्राम एसिस्टेंट्स के ग्रेड को एक कर के प्रोग्राम एक्जीक्यूटिव बना दिया। मुझे तो प्रोग्राम एक्जीक्यूटिव पर भी श्रद्धा है। अपने देश में चाहे तो आफिसर होते हैं, चाहे क्लर्क होते हैं, लेकिन ऐसे आफिसर सेक्रेटेरियट में मिलते ही नहीं हैं जो क्लर्क भी हों और आफिसर भी हों, जो काम भी करें और फ़ैसला भी लें। लेकिन, प्रोग्राम एक्जीक्यूटिव का रेडियो के अन्दर ऐसा पद है कि वह काम भी करता है और फ़ैसला भी लेता है। ये सभी अच्छे लोग हैं, यह मुसकृत लोग, पढ़े लिखे लोग, बहुत ही अच्छे लोगों की जमात है। मगर जब प्रोड्यूसर आया तब एक द्वेष निकल पड़ा। प्रोग्राम एक्जीक्यूटिव और स्टेशन डाइरेक्टर के मन पर यह प्रभाव पड़ा कि यह तो मेरा हक था जो छीना जा रहा है क्योंकि प्रोड्यूसर आये हैं तो सम्पर्क वे करेंगे, आर्टिस्ट वे लायेंगे, और लोगों को भी वही देंगे। प्रोड्यूसर भी घबड़ाया कि मेरी तो इज्जत जा रही है जो मुझे इन लोगों के बीच में ला कर बैठा दिया गया है। कुछ इस तरह का भाव रेडियो में चल रहा है। लेकिन, मैं समझता हूँ कि यह भाव ज्यादा दिन ठहरेगा नहीं। रेडियो भी बहुत कुछ थियेटर कम्पनी के समान है। थियेटर में एक दल मैनेजर्स का होता है जो पर्दा खींचने का इंतजाम करे, जो हर चीज़ का प्रबन्ध करता रहे। और दूसरा दल उन का होता है जो नाचते हैं

जो गाते हैं। तो प्रोड्यूसर और आर्टिस्ट साइड, ये असली काम करने वाले लोग हैं। प्रोग्राम एक्जीक्यूटिव रेडियो का मैनेजर है और मैनेजर्स को प्रोड्यूसरों से द्वेष नहीं करना चाहिये। यह जरूर है कि जो बोलने वाला है, रेडियो का मुख्य काम वही करता है। लेकिन इसका इंतजाम प्रोग्राम एक्जीक्यूटिव करते हैं और उनकी उन्नति का रास्ता भी अलग खुला है। वही लोग स्टेशन डाइरेक्टर होने की राह पर हैं।

एक बात भूपेश भाई ने तो नहीं, लेकिन दूसरे लोगों ने कही है कि रेडियो का कारपोरेशन बना दिया जाये तो अच्छा होगा। कई बार संसद् में यह विचार आया है, लेकिन इससे अच्छाई क्या होगी यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। इंग्लैण्ड में कारपोरेशन है, कॅनेडा में कारपोरेशन है, आस्ट्रेलिया में कारपोरेशन है, जापान में कारपोरेशन है। लेकिन फ्रान्स और इटली में कारपोरेशन नहीं है, मिश्र आदि देशों में कारपोरेशन नहीं है। प्रत्येक देश में वहाँ की स्थिति के अनुसार वहाँ का रेडियो कारपोरेशन अथवा सरकार के अधीन है। हम अपने देश की ही स्थिति की दृष्टि से इस पर विचार करेंगे। अभी रेडियो का बजट पांच, छः करोड़ का है लेकिन आमदनी इसकी ढाई करोड़ से ज्यादा नहीं है। २० लाख या २१ लाख के करीब रेडियो सेट हैं, इनसे दो, ढाई करोड़ रुपया आता है। तो ढाई करोड़ या तीन करोड़ का जो घाटा लगेगा वह कारपोरेशन कहां से लायेगा ? स्पष्ट ही, यह रकम वह सरकार के पास से लेगा और पार्लियामेंट में उसको आना ही पड़ेगा। पार्लियामेंट का उसमें नियंत्रण रहेगा। तो फिर इसकी क्या जरूरत है ? जब रुपया राष्ट्रीय कोष से जा रहा है तब उसको कारपोरेशन बना देने से क्या फायदा हो सकता है ? फिर वह कारपोरेशन पड़ेगा किसके हाथ में ? आज तो लोग यह समझते

कि कांग्रेसी लोग राज कर रहे हैं और कांग्रेसियों के हाथ में रेडियो है, यद्यपि यह बात नहीं है। रेडियो तो सारे देश के हाथ में है, पार्लियामेंट के हाथ में है। पार्लियामेंट सिर्फ कांग्रेस की ही नहीं है, सब दल के लोग इसमें रहते हैं और जिस तरह से चाहें उसका नियंत्रण कर सकते हैं। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि कारपोरेशन बनने पर जो मुसीबत निकलेगी वह आज की मुसिबत से छोटी होगी या बड़ी होगी? और कम्युनिस्ट विचार वाले, मार्क्सिस्ट विचार धारा वाले लोग कारपोरेशन का सुझाव दें, यह भी मुझे गड़बड़ मालूम होता है। आप तो हर चीज का राष्ट्रीयकरण चाह रहे हैं, तो फिर राष्ट्र के हाथ में जो चीज है उसको कारपोरेशन में फेंकने की इच्छा आप को क्यों होती है? इससे भी मालूम होता है कि छोटे द्वेष में पड़ कर आप बड़ी चीज को खराब करना चाहते हैं।

दूसरा सुझाव जो कमीशन का है, मैं उसके बारे में भी सन्देह करता हूं। अगर रेडियो में ऐसा कोई अन्याय हुआ है जिस का केस आप के पास हो तो उस काम के लिये कमीशन बहाल किया जाये। इस में मुझे कोई उज्र नहीं है। लेकिन, कमीशन बैठाने का कोई केस नहीं हो तो कमीशन बैठाने से क्या लाभ? इससे तो अच्छा काम पब्लिक अकाउण्ट्स कमेटी करती है, एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी करती है। एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी और कमीशन में फर्क तो यही होगा कि एक में एम० पी० रहेंगे, एक में एम० पी० न रहेंगे, या हो सकता है एक में एम० पी० और नान एम० पी० दोनों रहें। लेकिन इससे कोई बात बनती नहीं है। मेरा तो खयाल है कि पांच छः वर्ष के भीतर रेडियो का जो विकास हुआ है उसका श्रेय पब्लिक अकाउण्ट्स कमेटी को ही जाना चाहिये जिसने १९५३-५४ में डेढ़ सौ, दो सौ पेज की रिपोर्ट दी और बहुत से सुझाव भी दिये।

**सूचना तथा प्रसारण मंत्री (डा० बी० वी० केसकर) :** एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी ने दिये थे।

**प्रो० रामधारी सिंह दिनकर :** हां, एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी ने। उन्हीं के बताये मार्ग पर रेडियो का विकास हो रहा है। इसलिये मैं कमीशन के प्रस्ताव को भी सही नहीं मानता हूं। यह फालतू जैसी बात है। जो काम छोटे कदम से हो सकता है उसके लिये बड़ा कदम उठाने की जरूरत नहीं है।

एक बात मुझे और कहनी है। मैं ने कहा कि रेडियो में असंतोष है। उस असंतोष का ज्यादा हिस्सा हम को स्टाफ आर्टिस्ट लोगों में देखलाई पड़ता है और उन लोगों की कुछ मांगें बहुत ही जायज हैं। जिन लोगों ने रेडियो में अपना जीवन अर्पित कर दिया, चाहे वे रेगुलर सरविस में हों या स्टाफ आर्टिस्ट ही, उनको छुट्टी की सुविधा मिलनी चाहिये, उनको प्राविडेंट फंड की सुविधा मिलनी चाहिये, उनको रेल यात्रा की सुविधा मिलनी चाहिये। और, मेरा एक यह भी सुझाव है कि जो आदमी ठाँक पीट कर देखा जा चुका है कि वह रेडियो के क्राबिल है, उसको तीन वर्ष का काण्ट्रेक्ट क्यों देते हैं? ३ वर्ष के काण्ट्रेक्ट देने के मानी यह है कि दो वर्ष के बाद वह खुशामद शुरू करेगा। दो वर्ष के बाद उस दल के भीतर शासन के दूसरे प्रकार के रुख प्रकट होंगे। इसलिये अच्छा है कि जिनको आप ने समझ लिया कि वे अच्छा कार्य करते हैं, उनसे रेडियो का लाभ हुआ है, उनको दस साल का काण्ट्रेक्ट देना चाहिये ताकि वे निश्चिन्त रहें और उस बीच में उनके वेतन में वृद्धि भी होती जाये। धन्यवाद।

**SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh):** Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to oppose the resolution moved by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. As a matter of fact I had some inclination to consider favourably the resolution, but Mr. Bhupesh Gupta spoiled a good case by a bad speech. I do not know



[Shri Arjun Arora.]

who prepared the brief for him and why Mr. Bhupesh Gupta departed from his usual practice of delivering extempore speeches and read a speech written by a member of some junior cell of the Communist Party. All the same he has not made any case for a Committee. As a matter of fact, there is a case for some sort of review of the activities of the All India Radio. All India Radio is more than thirty years old and its activities should be reviewed by competent persons; a committee of technically competent people should review them, just as the Press Commission reviewed the working of the press in the country. There has been no review of the working of the All India Radio, and a review now will not be out of place. But a roving committee like the one Mr. Bhupesh Gupta had in view, enquiring into why Miss so and so was paid only Rs. 2 per song, is not what requires to be looked into. The importance of broadcasting has to be realised. It is increasing day by day. Broadcasting has come to play a very important part in our life. Now that we in this country are expecting television to be introduced, it is time that we examine the social impact of broadcasting and television. In the countries of the West, broadcasting has changed the pattern of entertainment; the introduction of television has affected the whole life there. People there do not go out in the evening. Even the football matches in England, which were very popular and dragged crowds to the field before the advent of television, now feel its impact, and people like to sit in their homes and watch the play through their television sets rather than brave the winter and go and watch the football players in action. That sort of thing is bound to come to our country, and before we introduce it, a regular review of the way the All India Radio has functioned, the way it has influenced our lives and the way it should be patterned must be undertaken. So, while opposing the resolution for a committee of 45

members, I shall suggest that the Minister of Information and Broadcasting should appoint a small committee of experts to review our experience of the last thirty years, because a new thinking and a new vision on broadcasting are the need of the hour. I must concede that during the last few years Dr. Keskar has introduced some very good features in the All India Radio. Ever since he became the Minister of Information and Broadcasting the All India Radio has made a significant contribution to the revival of our interest in our own culture. There is so much talk of the All India Radio being handed over to an autonomous corporation. I am not sure whether we want to hand over such a powerful vehicle of communication to an autonomous corporation. That matter must be thought of, and before any decision in the matter is taken, the country should know what sort of corporation the people who advocate it have in mind. Listening to the speeches of the gentlemen of the Opposition, I find they have no conception of the autonomous corporation that they have in view. All that was said was that the B.B.C. had been handed over to an autonomous corporation. Now all that is done in Britain is not good for us here, and we should not slavishly copy all that the people in the United Kingdom do. Broadcasting is a very powerful vehicle of communication and we should see to it that there are no risks of its being exploited. As a matter of fact, I find that the All India Radio does not indulge in politics. For example, I was in the Soviet Union in 1955, and day in and day out I heard there the name of 'Bulgandin', 'Bulgandin' Bulgandin', every minute the name of 'Bulgandin' was repeated. No such thing is ever found on the All India Radio. As a matter of fact, my complaint is that the All India Radio ignores politics too much.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: Was Bulgandin's name mentioned on Moscow Radio after his liquidation?

**SHRI ARJUN ARORA:** Well, I said it was in 1955. Now it must be Khrushchev or Mikoyan or somebody else. All the same my complaint is that the All India Radio neglects politics. Our people are interested in politics, and in a democracy they should be interested in politics. Look at our newspapers. Our newspapers in the country are full of political news, and they compare favourably with the newspapers of any other democratic country. While our newspapers are full of political news, the All India Radio barely devotes an hour on all news, including news of sport, and in that one hour we get to know very little of our politics. So I would urge upon the Minister to re-orientate the policy of the All India Radio in this respect, give us more news, give us news many times in the day, and please ensure that at least that proportion of politics and other news is maintained in the All India Radio which is the feature of the press in the country.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** You can continue in the afternoon.

The House stands adjourned till 2.30 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half-past two of the clock, Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

**SHRI ARJUN ARORA:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, when we adjourned I was complaining that the All India Radio does not give politics its due place. I urge upon the Minister to ensure that the right type of politics is given its due place in the broadcasts of All India Radio.

**DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND:** Who is to decide about the right type.

**SHRI ARJUN ARORA:** The Parliament is there. If the Minister or the All India Radio deviates, the Parliament can pull it up. We are a democracy a new democracy, and as Lord Attlee said yesterday, "Democracy is finding Asia not a very fertile ground." We are the hope of democracy in Asia. We should, therefore, educate our people and initiate them into the right type of politics, and a means of communication like the All India Radio should be utilised for that purpose. There is, of course, the type of politics which we should not encourage. This national institution of All India Radio should not be utilised for party politics.

Sir, All India Radio's contribution to the revival of our cultural heritage has been most remarkable. I find there are ignorant people in the country who criticise the All India Radio for its efforts at the revival of interests in classical music. Actually that is something for which the All India Radio should be praised and complimented. We know, Sir, that young minds are strayed; they like the vulgar music of Radio Ceylon. The All India Radio, by its persistent adherence to classical music, the right type of Indian music which is a part of our cultural heritage, has provided an alternative. We know, Sir, that we cannot decide our policies according to what the young minds want. We want to provide them educative programmes and entertainment of a high order, and in that respect All India Radio's contribution has been most remarkable.

Sir, the All India Radio has also brought the cultural heritage of different parts of the country nearer to the residents of other parts. It has made the people in the North interested in Karnatak music and the people in the South interested in the music of North India. That is also a significant contribution. Then, the way the All India Radio has helped to popularise our national language, Hindi is also remarkable.

[Shri Arjun Arora.]

There is another aspect of our lives in which All India Radio's contribution is praiseworthy, and that is its efforts at promotion of interest in sports. But I find that as far as sports are concerned, the All India Radio is partial to cricket. Our national game is hockey, a game in which we have been world beaters at Olympics for 32 years. I find that hockey hardly gets a mention in the All India Radio. What the All India Radio does in the matter of sports is to inflict on us dull, drab, monotonous commentaries on cricket. These commentaries are rambling in nature and sometimes one finds that a particular person, very much patronised by the All India Radio, a prince, does not talk of what is going on on the field but what is in his mind and what he thinks he would have done had he been young. I do feel that the time has come for the All India Radio to give up the patronisation of senile commentators who can only talk of the past and fail to give a ball to ball commentary. When our cricketers hit the ball he does not say whether the ball has been hit hard or not. He only tells us what he was 35 years ago or what a particular gentleman was 35 years back. It may be interesting to him, but it is not likely to promote interest in the game. I do hope that the All India Radio and the Ministry will listen to people's criticism. Sportsmen in the country are tired of him, cricket fans in the country are tired of dull, drab reminiscences of this particular commentator whom the All India Radio has made it a practice to patronise. We do want commentaries on cricket, but our patronage of cricket should be commensurate with the part that it plays in the life of the country.

Sir, what we find is that the A.I.R. does not give due place to what our workers and peasants do in the country. Workers find a mention only when

they strike or when they fail to strike. In this matter the All India Radio has a lot to learn from the Moscow Radio. The radio in the Soviet Union has played a significant part in bringing to the fore the workers and the peasants who are heroes of labour. Our country is making remarkable industrial progress but I find that the workers, the toilers, who are the real heroes of industrial production, never find any mention on the All India Radio.

In brief, Sir, I oppose the motion of Shri Bhupesh Gupta, but I do feel that a review of the thirty years of All India Radio has been long overdue and it should be taken up in hand.

SHRIMATI SAVITRY DEVI NIGAM (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I stand here to oppose this motion. In spite of my best efforts I have not been able to understand the motive behind this resolution . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: It is very clear.

SHRIMATI SAVITRY DEVI NIGAM: . . . had it been about any other Ministry or organisation, this proposal might have been worth some consideration. But, Sir, in the case of All India Radio this suggestion about the formation of a committee is not only ridiculous but shows an utter lack of awareness about the fundamental and basic functioning of All India Radio.

Sir, All India Radio, unlike many other Ministries and organisations, has all its cards open all the time on the table. From the highest in the State to the lowest in the village, everyone comes to know everything about the achievements of the organisation every day. It is all the time under test. I have not been able to understand what type of enquiry the hon. Member had in mind when he formulated this Resolution. All India Radio is not only all the time under test but is also all the time under the scrutiny

of not only a few specialised people but under the scrutiny of the real masters, I mean the people. The House will be surprised to know that every day hundreds of letters are received by different departments or sections of A.I.R. in which people from various parts of the country send suggestions and give opinions about the various programmes. I would also say that all these letters are always welcomed by A.I.R. They are not at all allergic to suggestions. They are the only group who have welcomed these suggestions with smiles on their faces and who have adopted the suggestions, as far as they are worth adopting with thanks. It would be the greatest set-back to our democracy, rather it will be a day of doom if such an independent means of mass instruction, mass education, and information is guided and controlled or influenced by any political party whatsoever, not to speak of the Communist Party. Not only this, A.I.R. will not only lose all its significance and usefulness but also, in a way, our democracy will suffer a lot. I do not approve of the suggestion of Mr. Arora that A.I.R. should ever be used for any type of even constructive political propaganda, because it will be a double-edged weapon. First of all who will decide that this propaganda is of a constructive type? I am afraid that gradually it will lead to the policy of Peking Radio. You listen to the broadcasts made by Peking Radio. All the time they want to disgrace our country. Even if two bulls fight somewhere, they twist the news in a sensational way and they make all sorts of disgraceful propaganda against India. They surpass even Pakistan in this. But look at A.I.R. It has never even tried to reply to such criticisms. It has got its independent character and that is the most important feature or the policy of A.I.R.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN. So you do not agree with Mr. Arora?

SHRIMATI SAVITRY DEVI NIGAM: I do not agree with him at all. I would humbly like to say that because the Communist Members judge everything and see everything with coloured glasses, they have brought forward this resolution, otherwise there was neither any occasion nor any necessity for bringing forward such a resolution. If we look at the charges made by them from time to time, either individually or by their group, it is almost like that. They say: The Communist propaganda and the Communist activities have not been taken into the news bulletins and the news favourable to the Communist Party has not been broadcast, etc. Look at the charges made by the Communist Member here just now. They are similar in nature. Most of them have been motivated not by the national interest nor by the interests of A.I.R., or its functioning. These suggestions have been motivated only by pure and simple party interests. I would request hon. Members and also the hon. Minister that if any interest is to be kept before A.I.R., it should neither be any Party's interest nor the interests of any group but it should be the national interest hundred per cent. and that is what A.I.R. is doing now. Thank God A.I.R. has not yield to these Party challenges and the Communists' pressure tactics. I feel like paying a tribute to A.I.R. and its administrators, for they have stood firm against all sorts of pressure tactics and also threats. The challenges given from time to time have revealed that those were always given by some type of party interests and with some inferior type of motives. I would also like to say that A.I.R. has kept a very high standard of independence, integrity as well as national interests and in no case has it shifted from its position.

[Shrimati Savitry Devi Nigam.]

Take the case of the last strike. Though for such a big nation like ours it was a minor thing but had this strike succeeded, it could have brought the whole national life to a standstill and we would have suffered a lot. Unfortunately whatever news the newspaper give, was always coloured by views. We hardly got any news and there was such a great confusion that people did not know what was happening in the country and what they should do but because A.I.R. and its administrators all the time kept, during the strike, only the national interests before them, and they were neither influenced by the Congress Party nor by any other Party, so they could give the whole country correct and reliable news. I can tell you that only that news was dependable, which we got during the strike. So I say that for all time to come, A.I.R. should be kept above all these and such challenges and suggestions which are being made by the Communist Party or any other political party should never bring about any change in their policy, to which they have been sticking.

There can be no two opinions—I do not want to repeat many of the things already said—that during the last few years programmes such as drama, music, children's programmes and programmes on rural and school sections have made considerable progress. Take the case of the news services of the A.I.R. It is rendering a most remarkable service to our country and to other parts of the world. It is also doing a very gigantic work. The News Services Division of A.I.R. is responsible for the broadcast of news bulletins, news reviews and commentaries, parliamentary commentaries, radio newsreels and other topical broadcasts. Ninety-seven news bulletins ranging in duration from 5 to 15 minutes in 29 Indian and foreign languages are broadcast every day for listeners in India and abroad. Of these, 47 central news bulletins in 16 languages are broadcast each day from Delhi and are

relayed by the Stations according to their requirements. To supplement the coverage of national and international news broadcasts from Delhi, there are regional news bulletins broadcasts from State capitals. At present there are 17 regional language bulletins, including four in Hindi from Bhopal, Lucknow, Jaipur and Patna stations. In the External Services 33 news bulletins are broadcast in 16 languages every day. Two news bulletins were added during the year, one in Nepali and the other in Indonesian.

Apart from the quantity and complexity of having to direct news bulletins to various areas, the maintenance of accuracy, objectivity and balance test the professional proficiency of our news editors. This was particularly evident during the strike, as I have already mentioned.

Another very praiseworthy feature is the newsreel and current affairs broadcasts. Newsreels in English and Hindi are broadcast from Delhi and in all regional languages from all Stations. The Central Newsreel Unit in Delhi, established in 1957, now prepares two English newsreels and two Hindi newsreels every week, in addition to special newsreels and documentaries on various topical matters

A special broadcast is always arranged for visiting dignitaries either at the beginning or at the end of the visit. Recently the Prime Minister attended part of a session of the U. N. General Assembly at New York early in October and the important speech that he made before the General Assembly was relayed directly from New York over the entire network of All India Radio. This was a memorable experience and achievement for A.I.R. The speech was being clearly heard here while it was being delivered before the world assembly. The technical arrangements that made this possible included having radio and telecommunications between New York and Delhi via London and various other places.

As regards sports, I do not agree with the remarks of Mr. Arora as far

as the commentaries on games and sports are concerned. Especially about cricket, these commentaries are getting very very popular. It is just a matter of likes and dislikes. One person may like a commentary on hockey, another may like it on some other game and so on. But an organisation like A.I.R. will have to see to the majority interests. Sports and sport events of national and international importance occupy a very sizeable part of the A.I.R. programme. They are very very popular.

Neither do I suggest that All India Radio is perfect, nor that there is no further scope for improvement in the work of A.I.R. I want to assure the House that the people connected with A.I.R. are never allergic to criticism or suggestions. They are the only people who are always ready to welcome criticism. If any hon. Member does not believe me, he can lift the telephone now and give A.I.R. any suggestion he likes and I am sure every constructive suggestion made by the hon. Member will be welcomed by them. They take notice of it. Therefore, there is no necessity to have a review of the situation as was suggested by Mr. Arora or to examine the working of A.I.R. for the last thirty years or so. It is being reviewed every day by the listeners.

Many suggestions have been made for improving A.I.R. still further, constructive suggestions, and I too would like to make one or two such constructive suggestions. Though all the other programmes have been making very significant improvement, I may be forgiven for saying that women's programmes have not made that much progress that is required. In a way it has become almost a conventional thing and rather of a stale type. So this programme could be improved and . . .

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANANDA: Why did you not send this suggestion also through the telephone?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I suppose that is the privilege of ladies only.

SHRIMATI SAVITRY DEVI NIGAM: I would like to make it here also. Of course, I have already made it and I want to repeat it here just to remind the hon. Minister about it. If women social leaders like Dr. Parmanand and others were associated at the proper stage with the preparation of women's programmes, when they are chalked out, then I am sure a lot of improvement could be brought about in these women's programmes also. Sometimes we see that very topical subjects which are very essential for our people and for the nation are not included in the women's programmes in the way they should be. (*Time bell rings.*) I want to keep to my time, Sir, and I will finish just now. I would repeat that I oppose the resolution and I would request the hon. Mover to gracefully withdraw it because it has no backing in the House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You should have supported it with grace.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am not very much given to defending my friends of the party in season and out of season, nor am I particularly allergic—to borrow the phrase of my hon. friend here—to a resolution of this sort. If a case could be made out for a review of the working of the All India Radio, then there could be no particular difficulty in accepting a resolution of this kind, and I suppose Government would welcome a review of its activities for over thirty years. But the question is whether a case has been made out for a review of this kind at the present juncture. When one of the hon. Members of the Opposition was speaking, I persistently asked for facts. But the gentleman concerned only said that the Hindu had said this, that some other paper had said something else and so on. Well, it is open to anybody to make sweeping remarks. But sweeping remarks do not carry us anywhere. It is facts that count and it is very unfortunate that neither the mover of

[Dr. W. S. Barlingay.]

the resolution, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, nor any of those who have supported this resolution have brought forward any facts in support of this resolution. If facts are there, then I do not see why a resolution of this sort cannot be accepted.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What type of facts does the hon. Member want?

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Well, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has been a parliamentarian of long standing . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: He is also a lawyer.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: He knows very well what facts are needed to support a resolution of this sort. I need not go into the logic of a parliamentarian like Mr. Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: . Sir, you may know the Chairman asked me not to mention names. Therefore I did not mention the names of artistes who have been favoured and others who have wrongly not been favoured. I only indicated. I did not give names and I did not mention various other things because they involved names.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta knows very well that there is no question of giving names of particular persons, that facts can be given without mentioning names, apart from sweeping remarks. That is enough answer to Shri Bhupesh Gupta. When sweeping remarks are made, Sir, I would say that it is open to others on this side of the House, at least to say some complimentary things about those persons who have been responsible for the growth of the All India Radio and about the Government's policy generally. Sir, in these circumstances, I feel I must take this opportunity to compliment both the hon. Minister for what he has done for the All India Radio and also compliment the late Mr. P. M. Lad who was the Secretary of this important Department. I do not want to say many things about

Mr. Lad. He was a man of vision. As a matter of fact, most of the progress that we find in the All India Radio is due to him.

3 P.M.

So far as the hon. Minister is concerned, many good things have been said about him by many speakers who have preceded me and I do not want to add a mere empty compliment. But I would say this, and I feel I have got a right to say something with regard to the musical programme of the A.I.R. Sir, one of our friends over here, the erstwhile Editor of the *Hitavada*, probably he is the Editor even now, Mr. Mani . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Don't make him erstwhile.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: Why erstwhile?

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: He was saying that the musical programme of the A.I.R. had got to keep pace with the times. I hope I have understood him correctly; probably he thinks that the programme put out by Radio Ceylon and from other stations conforms to today's taste.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: That might be to his taste.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: That might be.

SHRI A. D. MANI: That is liked by the people.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: All the things liked by the people are not necessarily good, and there is such a thing as good taste and there is such a thing as bad taste, and I may say that the kind of music that the cinema has produced in this country cannot be said to be good in any way. Music, to be good music, has got to have certain basic characteristics. It must, to say the least, be tuned to the times, but if Mr. Mani thinks that rock and roll music and jazz music is good music, then, all that I can say is that I beg to differ from him.

SHRI A. D. MANI: It is in tune with the times.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: It may be in tune with the times, but one of the most important functions of the A.I.R. is education.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Also entertainment.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Also entertainment, but in good taste, not in bad taste.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Ceylon is in good taste.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: I may differ from you. This is all that I can say, I may say further that a time will come when the history of the development of radio in this country will be written and there you would find the hon. Minister in charge of this Ministry being particularly mentioned, if for nothing else, for one thing that it was particularly due to his efforts that classical music in this country has survived and developed. I think no other man in this country has done so much for classical music as Dr. Keskar and if he is remembered for anything, he will be remembered particularly for this. As I said in the very beginning, I am not given to making empty remarks, giving compliments and so on and, therefore, I will leave these compliments here, and turn to facts.

Sir, the resolution says that a committee should be appointed to go into the working of the A.I.R. Now, I am one of those who believe that it is possible to hold that this department, instead of being manned by the Government, should be managed by a national corporation like the British Broadcasting Corporation. That is a matter which could be examined. It is possible to argue on either side, namely, for the corporation and against the corporation, and if the whole thing is argued without any kind of sting, without any kind of censure of the Government's activities, there would be no objection to that sort of resolution at all. The question first of all is whether Government has acted in such a manner or whether the administration of this particular Minis-

try has been such as to invite a sort of rebuke that is asked for in the resolution. Let facts be produced. It is said that there is corruption there, that there is nepotism there and all sorts of things have been said. It is said that the A.I.R. is partial to the Government and the Congress Party. Well, I ask for facts. One of the things that I wish to say, so far as the Government is concerned, is that generally it has throughout been fairer to the other side than to its own side. If a Communist Government had taken the place of this Government, what would have happened to the A.I.R.? Would there be freedom of speech? Would we get any news about the opposite party? The opposite party would have been suppressed long long ago. There will not be any opposition; it would have been liquidated.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Where?

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: They would all have gone like Mr. Lumumba. They would have gone to the heaven.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The trouble is that where the Opposition goes, people like you would follow.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: If there is a Communist Government, headed by Shri Bhupesh Gupta, I am sure I would be in heaven very soon.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We shall be sharing the glories of heaven.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: You would be ruling and I would be in heaven. I am quite sure about it.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: If the opposition Members go to heaven, I am sure you would not like to go to heaven.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: With your presence, we shall make hell into heaven, too!

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: One thing is sure, the artistes will be somewhere in hell.



SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We would not like to go anywhere without Mr. Akbar Ali Khan.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: The resolution entirely ignores one basic fact, namely, the working of the department is being reviewed from time to time by various committees of Parliament, namely, the Estimates Committee and the Public Accounts Committee. When the work is being reviewed by these Committees, I do not see any reason why another committee of Parliamentarians or even of non-Parliamentarians should go into the whole question. In 1954-55, the Estimates Committee of the Lok Sabha examined this organisation in detail. This Committee went into the various aspects of the matter and made many suggestions for its improvement. I am not one of those who think that this Ministry is incapable of improvement; I do not suppose even the Minister would say that; of course, it is capable of improvement and if any suggestions are given for its improvement, they surely would be welcomed by the Government and especially by the Minister, but to spend so much money and so much of time by appointing a committee to go all over the country is not good. If it is necessary to do so, by all means appoint a committee but then there must be certain fundamental facts brought on record. As soon as we ask for facts, the wind is taken out of the sails of the resolution because actually he has no facts to give. If he thinks that this Ministry has been unfair in this or that particular matter, surely he could bring all that to the notice of the hon Minister and the matter could be gone into but so far as this resolution is concerned, facts have got to be taken into account and up to the present moment I have listened with great attention to Shri Bhupesh Gupta and his supporters but I am sorry to find that no proper facts have been forthcoming on account of which there is necessity for this resolution to be accepted by this House.

SHRIMATI RUKMINI DEVI ARUNDALE (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, there are very few opportunities in this House to really express much opinion about cultural matters and I would therefore take advantage of this opportunity to say a few words. I do not entirely agree with Mr. Rajagopalan when he said that Members of Parliament have every chance to express themselves in connection with the All India Radio. I have never found many chances of that kind. Besides, I do not see what Parliament can do in managing a particular Ministry or Department. Certainly I do not agree that there should be a committee or a commission appointed to go into matters connected with the All India Radio, firstly because Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's suggestion obviously comes from the fact that he is a politician and I am not a politician. Therefore I do not think that I should have anything to do with such a committee which is perhaps mostly meant from a political point of view. But there are certain important things which I would like to say.

As has been said by the previous speaker, there can be improvements and everybody does the best that he can. I would like very much to speak with great feeling in regard to classical music. The hon. Minister himself is a musician; he is not merely the head of the Broadcasting Ministry.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Musician?

SHRIMATI RUKMINI DEVI ARUNDALE: Certainly.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I did not know that.

SHRIMATI RUKMINI DEVI ARUNDALE: He has studied classical music and he understands and knows it very well. Indeed if it was not for that, he could not have . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It would be an excellent thing if once at the Consultative Committee we could have the pleasure of hearing his music.

SHRIMATI RUKMINI DEVI ARUN-DALE: Perhaps we can arrange such a concert at some time.

Anyway he understands it and that is why he has promoted classical music not only with enthusiasm but with understanding.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: And is facing Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's music now.

SHRIMATI RUKMINI DEVI ARUN-DALE: Mr. Mani was saying how the Ceylon Radio has become more popular and our programme of classical music has not won the popularity of our public. That is quite true but I think without realising it, if I may say so, he has paid the biggest compliment that could be paid because every department should be a leader. It is not merely for appealing to popular taste that we should have all these programmes because if that is the case, we must degrade ourselves gradually in every department and I do not see why we should not try to elevate the taste of the people and improve their knowledge also. I consider the All India Radio not only an instrument for giving information and knowledge but also an instrument for generally raising the cultural level of this country. So from that point of view I am very glad that in spite of the lack of popularity there is a continuous effort to promote the appreciation of classical music.

Now, I would like to make one or two other points which may not be so complimentary. I have always felt—I was at one time a member of the Music Advisory Committee and I have expressed my view there also—that it is very unfortunate that so much energy and money is spent on the promotion of what is called popular music in the form of what they call *vadya vrinda*. It seems to me it is a

kind of a mongrel music which is neither Indian nor Western and this orchestration of Indian music is definitely a travesty according to me. I do not think that it has succeeded and from that point of view it can be dropped because no such effort towards popularising music of that kind is really going to win the public. They do not want merely cinema music. They would like to hear their favourite stars. They do not really care much about the music; they care more about the stars just as in the case of dancing people would like to see the cinema stars on the stage whether they know anything about dancing or not.

Coming to the subject of dancing, I find that even the All India Radio does strange many programmes, and . . .

DR. B. V. KESKAR: Not many.

SHRIMATI RUKMINI DEVI ARUN-DALE: . . . sometimes for foreign visitors too.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: That is done on behalf of the other Ministry, not for ourselves.

SHRIMATI RUKMINI DEVI ARUN-DALE: I do not know but I have seen some programmes and when I enquired as to who had arranged those I have been informed that the Broadcasting Ministry was responsible for those programmes.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: Only as manager, not as broadcaster.

SHRIMATI RUKMINI DEVI ARUN-DALE: Anyway if any voice could be raised about that matter, I would like to recommend to the Broadcasting Ministry that they might put a stop to this kind of cheap dancing which often takes place in the form of Bharata Natyam and other classical art. If they call it cinema art then it calls itself by its own name. It is

[Shrimati Rukmini Devi Arundale.]

a very sad thing to see that such programmes are arranged when distinguished guests come from foreign countries. Very often our Indian people seem to think that these are the only things that Western people appreciate. I think by showing such things they show their complete ignorance of the West because in the West classical art is a living tradition. It has not died there as is the case here and therefore people there have got a much better taste in their own classical art in their country than we have in our country and because of that they are able to perceive what is good and what is bad in the art of other countries. If you have a good knowledge of your own art, you automatically have an intuition to appreciate good art of other countries. That has been my experience with dozens of really fine foreign people who have come to our country. Besides I would also like to suggest that we should not arrange only that which is bound to be appreciated by foreign persons. We should show what is true and real and the best of our country whether it is liked or not. And that is what everybody wants to see. If I go to another country I do not want them to show me what they think I will appreciate. I only want to see what they appreciate. I do not care even if I do not appreciate it; I want to know what they appreciate and I am sure this is how many of them feel. In fact, many of them have expressed this feeling to me personally. They have felt sad that they had not been shown the authentic art. I would therefore like that the same taste that we have for classical music should be expressed in the field of Indian art as well.

There is one other point. I do not know the actual facts; I have only heard but I also see what is happening. I sometimes feel that there is not enough coordination between the different institutions and bodies that

organise cultural programmes. I find that the Sangeet Natak Academy is arranging a music conference and the Broadcasting Ministry also arranges one. I do not understand why there should not be much better co-ordination between all these bodies and better co-operation by which there could be something well thought out, because what we are interested in is Indian art and not the fact whether we do it or somebody else does it. I do not know the reason for it but I do find that sometimes there are clashes in this matter. That is one point which I wanted to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister. I know that there are Advisory Committees. I do not know what the role is of the Advisory Committees, whether they are merely to advise and whether their advice is often followed or not, and whether they have approved some of these programmes or not. I am not aware of it. But whatever it is, I wish to express my own views in regard to these matters. I do think that the All India Radio is a very important body, because it is one of the biggest channels by which we can promote Indian culture and can do so much in our country in that direction.

One last word. I do not know whether television is going to come under the same Ministry. Something was mentioned the other day. My only hope is that television will not really come to India. I know that in many countries they are considering it a menace. We are now considering the cinema to be a menace. We do not know what to do with our young people who are continually wanting to go to the cinema.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh):  
They think that it is the joy of life.

SHRIMATI RUKMINI DEVI ARUNDALE: The cinema is the evil of the day in the whole country. We will have to find a solution for that also. I am afraid it is going to be a very serious danger to our society and

will do much harm to our younger generation as well as to the ordinary people of India.

These are just a few viewpoints that I wanted to express, but it does not mean that I do not appreciate whatever has been done by the All India Radio for the good of the country.

**शाह मुहम्मद उमेर (बिहार) :** जनाब वाला, मेरे दोस्त की यह स्वाहिश है कि मैं उर्दू में बोलूँ। ज़ाहिर है कि ऐसे मामले में हम सब लोगों को वक्तन फ़वक्तन अपनी ज़बान में बोलना चाहिये जबकि हम रेडियो के बारे में बहस कर रहे हैं। जनाब वाला, मैं आनरेबिल डाक्टर केसकर और उनके स्टालवर्ट डायरेक्टर जनरल को जिन्होंने रेडियो में इतनी तरक्की की है, मुबारकबाद देना चाहता हूँ। मैं यकीन के साथ कह सकता हूँ कि पिछले कुछ वर्षों में रेडियो ने जो तरक्की की है, जिस तरक्की की शोहरत सब जगह है, वह आगे भी जारी रहेगी और जिस तरह से उसका प्रोग्राम चल रहा है वह निहायत काबिले तहसीन है। जो ज़िम्मेदार लोभ हैं और जो ज़िम्मेदारी के साथ सोचते हैं वे इस बात को अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं कि आज़ादी के बाद हमारे मुल्क में रेडियो ने जितनी तरक्की की है वह निहायत हैरतअंगेज़ है। आज हम देखते हैं कि रेडियो के जितने भी प्रोग्राम होते हैं वे बहुत ही खूबसूरत और सुन्दर होते हैं और उनकी आवाज़ हमें सब जगह सुनाई देती है। आज हमें रेडियो के ज़रिये तरह तरह की चीज़ें सुनने को मिलती हैं जिनके ऊपर हम सब लोगों को गर्व करना चाहिये। हमारे केमकर साहब और उनके स्टालवर्ट ने जोकि अपनी जगह पर एक सुप्रीम आथॉरिटी हैं, उन्होंने जिस दिलचस्पी से रेडियो का काम किया है उसमें उन्होंने चार चांद लगा दिये हैं। मुझे इस बात का फ़ख़ है कि हमारे आल इंडिया रेडियो के डायरेक्टर जनरल माथुर साहब बिहार से दिल्ली पहुंच गये और उन्होंने डाक्टर केमकर साहब की लीडरशिप में रेडियो के काम में जो एफिशियन्सी ला दी है

उसका हम सब लोगों को गर्व है और उम्मीद करते हैं कि आगे भी रेडियो का काम इसी रफ़्तार से आगे बढ़ता चला जायेगा। मुझे यह भी उम्मीद है कि उन्होंने रेडियो का काम जिस तरह से चमका दिया है बाक़ी काम को भी उसी तरह से पूरा करेंगे।

लेकिन मैं इन तमाम चीज़ों के साथ साथ अपने दोस्त श्री भूपेश गुप्त की यह बात नहीं समझ पाया जो उन्होंने रेडियो में इन्क्वायरी करने की बात कही है। हमारे अपोजीशन के भाई बहुत मर्तबा इस तरह की बातें पेश करते हैं जो कि बहुत खूबसूरत होती हैं और जिन्हें हुकूमत को मंज़ूर कर लेना चाहिये। बाज़ वक्त अपोजीशन वाले अक्ल की बात करते हैं और बाज़ वक्त बदअक्ल की बात करते हैं। बाज़ वक्त अपोजीशन वालों को अक्ल आ जाती है और वे अक्ल से बातें करते हैं और उस समय कुछ जान लेने का मौका मिल जाता है। मेरे दोस्त श्री भूपेश गुप्त इस बात को अच्छी तरह से समझ ले कि हिन्दुस्तान की जवाबदेही सिर्फ़ कांग्रेस और कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट की नहीं है बल्कि हिन्दुस्तान की तरक्की की जवाबदेही उन लोगों के ऊपर भी है जो अपोजीशन के समझे जाते हैं। मेरी बहिन निगम ने अपनी स्पीच में यह कहा था कि भूपेश गुप्त ने जो रिजोल्यूशन रखा है वह किसी मोटिव को अटेच करके रखा है। मैं अपनी जगह पर इस चीज़ को नहीं मानता हूँ कि वे जो कुछ भी यहां पर कहते हैं वह किसी मोटिव से कहते हैं। अपोजीशन की तरफ से जो बात भी कही जाती है उसमें हमें कोई मोटिव अटेच नहीं करना चाहिये। अपोजीशन को भी अपना व्यू प्वाइंट रखने की पार्लियामेंट में इजाजत है। श्रीमती निगम ने जो बात कही मैं उससे इतिफ़ाक़ नहीं करता हूँ। लेकिन मैं अपने दोस्त श्री भूपेश गुप्त से यह बात ज़रूर कहूंगा कि उन्हें रेडियो में जिस चीज़ की कमी दिखलाई देती है उसे वह साफ़ नक्शे में बतलावें। सिर्फ़ यह कह देना कि रेडियो में इस चीज़ की कमी है और इस तरह की बातें हो रही हैं मुनासिब

[शाह मुहम्मद उमर]

मालूम नहीं देता है। उन्हें साफ़ तौर से उस कमी को दिखलाना चाहिये कि यह कमी है ताकि हम सब लोग जान सकें कि हां यह बात ठीक है। सिर्फ़ यह कहना कि आल इण्डिया रेडियो में बहुत सी कमियां हैं और उन कमियों को दूर करने के लिये एक इन्वॉयरी कमेटी बिठलाई जानी चाहिये मुनासिब मालूम नहीं देता है। इसके मानी तो यह हुए कि आल इण्डिया रेडियो ने जो स्प्लैडिड एचीवमेंट किये हैं वह सिर्फ़ आश-आफ़ हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस चीज़ के बजाय उन चीज़ों की इन्वॉयरी की जानी चाहिये जो उसके अन्दर होती हैं। मेरी समझ में यह बात नहीं आती है कि इस तरह की इन्वॉयरी से हमें आल इण्डिया रेडियो के काम में और एफ़िशिएन्सी लाने में कोई मदद मिलेगी। लेकिन हमें इस तरह की इन्वॉयरी से भी घबराना नहीं चाहिये और न इस बात से ही घबराना चाहिये कि इन्वॉयरी की जो मांग आई है वह अपोजीशन की तरफ़ से आई है। मैं भूपेश गुप्त की यह बात मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ कि आल इण्डिया रेडियो में कोई अचीवमेंट ही नहीं हुआ है और इसमें बहुत सी कमियां हैं जिनके लिये वह इन्वॉयरी कराना चाहते हैं या कोई कमीशन बैठाना चाहते हैं। लेकिन मैं भूपेश गुप्त से इस बात में इत्तिफ़ाक़ करने के लिये तैयार हूँ कि कोई ऐसी कमेटी बिठलाई जानी चाहिये जो उसकी अन्दरूनी कमियों की जांच पड़ताल करे वे लोग जो अपने अफ़सरों के मातहत काम करते हैं, अगर उनकी कोई ग़िवान्स हैं, कोई कमियां हैं, शिकायत हैं, तो इन सब चीज़ों की जांच की जा सकती है। अगर उन लोगों को प्रमोशन न मिला हो, किसी तरह का लिफ़्ट न दिया गया हो, अगर किसी को सुपरसीड कर दिया गया है, कोई काफी पढ़ा लिखा है उसको ठीक नौकरी न दी गई हो, इस तरह की बहुत सी बातें हो सकती हैं, इन बातों की वह कमेटी जांच कर सकती है। जो लोग अपनी काब-

लियत के लिहाज़ से किसी जगह के मुस्तहक़ नहीं हैं और वे दूसरे के हक़ को मार कर आ गये हैं तो इस तरह की बहुत सी चीज़ें हैं जिनके बारे में सिर्फ़ आल इण्डिया रेडियो में ही नहीं बल्कि दूसरे डिपार्टमेंटों में भी जांच करने की ज़रूरत है। मैं भूपेश गुप्त से कहूंगा कि वह अपने रिज़ोल्यूशन को वापस लेने के बाद हुकूमत से यह दरख़वास्त करे कि इस तरह की सब बातों की जांच पड़ताल करने के लिए एक कमेटी बनाई जानी चाहिये। इस समय मुक्त में २८ रेडियो स्टेशन हैं और उनमें लाखों आदमी काम कर रहे हैं। उन लोगों के कामों की जांच करने के लिये अगर कोई इन्वॉयरी कमीशन बैठाया जाय तो वह ज्यादा हैल्पफुल होगा, यह बात मैं महसूस करता हूँ। यह बात साबित हो चुकी है कि आल इण्डिया रेडियो ने उसके स्टालवर्ट डाइरेक्टर जनरल के मातहत स्प्लैडिड अचीवमेंट हासिल की है। अब जो नीचे के लोग हैं, जो अफ़सरों के मातहत काम करते हैं उनकी हालत की जांच की जानी चाहिये ताकि उनकी हिम्मत अफ़जाई हो और उनको एनकरेजमेंट मिल सके। आल इण्डिया रेडियो में और दूसरे दफ़तरों में बहुत से ऐसे लोग हैं जो एम० ए० और एल० एल० बी० है और छोटी छोटी जगहों पर रीट कर रहे हैं। आज देखने में यह आता है कि बड़ी बड़ी जगहों में नान-मैट्रिक और मैट्रिक पास शुदा लोगों को सुपरसीड करके रख दिया जाता है और इस तरह से वे लोग एन्जॉय करते हैं जो उस जगह के हक़दार नहीं हैं। तो मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि हर एक डिपार्टमेंट में इस तरह की चीज़ को रोकना निहायत ज़रूरी है ताकि स्टाफ़ के अन्दर आपस में बददिली पैदा न हो। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे ब्राडकास्टिंग मिनिस्टर साहब का यह फ़र्ज़ है कि वह इस बददिली और इस तकलीफ़ को दूर करने के लिए तजवीज़ करें। चाहे यह तजवीज़ वे खुद करे या अगर किसी ज़रिये से यह इन्वॉयरी कमेटी या कमीशन बनाने की सूरत में आती है तो उसको उन्हें मान लेना चाहिये।

मुझे उम्मीद है कि मिनिस्टर साहब इस तरह की शिकायतों को, तकलीफों को रिमूव करने, का कोई तरीका ज़रूर अस्तित्व कर देंगे।

अब मैं डा० केसकर साहब को इस मुल्क में टेलीविजन लाने के लिये मुबारकबाद देता हूँ। मैं उनको दिल से मुबारकबाद देना चाहता हूँ कि जब टेलीविजन दूसरे मुल्कों में प्रिवलेंट नहीं हुआ उन्होंने यहां लाकर उसको चालू कर दिया है। मेरी दिली इच्छा है कि टेलीविजन हमारे मुल्क में घर घर फैलेगा और यह सस्ती कीमत में लोगों को वहम पहुंचेगा। इस मुल्क में टेलीविजन को लाना आपका ब्रैस्ट अचीवमेंट है और इसके लिये मैं आपको और आल इंडिया रेडियो के डायरेक्टर जनरल श्री माथुर साहब को मुबारकबाद देना चाहता हूँ।

**डा० श्रीमती सीता परमानन्द :** यह जो टेलीविजन का अचीवमेंट कहते हैं वह एक कर्स होने जा रहा है।

**शाह मुहम्मद उमर :** नो, व्हाई कर्स। यह तो वह चीज है कि अगर इसका इलाज किया जाय तो वह कर्स नहीं होगा। यह तो किसी चीज को यूज और मिसयूज करने पर डिपेन्ड करती है। मैं फिर यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि खाली आल इण्डिया रेडियो में ही इस तरह की बातों की जांच करने के लिये कमेटी या इन्क्वायरी नहीं बनाई जानी चाहिये बल्कि जो दूसरे डिपार्टमेंट हैं उनके बारे में भी यह काम किया जाना चाहिये। मैं भूपेश गुप्त से फिर यह कहूंगा कि वह इस रिजोल्यूशन को तमाम डिपार्टमेंट के उन लोगों के लिये लायें जिन्हें किसी न किसी किस्म के प्रिबिलिज हैं। अगर सरकार ने इस तरह की कोई कमेटी बनाई तो इससे उसको अपने अचीवमेंट में ही मदद मिलेगी और उसके अचीवमेंट ज्यादा से ज्यादा मल्टीप्लाय हो जायेंगे। अगर भूपेश गुप्त की इस तरह की बात मान ली जाती है तो यह डिपार्टमेंटों के खिलाफ कोर्ट सेंसर (censure) नहीं

होगा और मैं इस तरह की तजवीज को सपोर्ट करूंगा। आज हमारे मुल्क में नये नये पब्लिक महकमे खुल गये हैं और वहां पर लाखों आदमी काम कर रहे हैं। अगर हमने इस तरह की कमेटी मुकर्रर की तो उन महकमों में जो लाखों लोग काम करते हैं उनके बारे में अच्छी तरह से जांच हो जायेगी। मुझे उम्मीद है कि हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब इस तरह की तजवीज के ऊपर गौर करेंगे। मैं फिर आनरेबिल मिनिस्टर साहब और उनके लीडरशिप में आल इण्डिया रेडियो के डायरेक्टर जनरल साहब जिस तरह से काम कर रहे हैं, जिस खुद-सूरती से उन्होंने आल इण्डिया रेडियो में तरक्की की है, उसके लिये मुबारकबाद देता हूँ।

**DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, I had no intention of participating in this discussions, but certain observations that have fallen from some of the speakers make it necessary for me to speak, and I feel that in addition to taking this opportunity I should put forward one or two things on the floor of the House for the information of the Minister.

Sir, it is quite unnecessary, as Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, who is a seasoned parliamentarian should know, to have a commission for going into the few points that he has made. I do think some of those points require attention. I do not say that they are all minor points, but a commission is not the thing that is necessary to go into those few points because that would be tantamount to your making a review or an enquiry into or a kind of censure of what has been done.

I am one of those people who feel that the All India Radio has done a good service to the country within this short time that is within ten years, and it has emulated the good things of Western countries by bringing in all their good features, and that must be a pleasant surprise to many. Sir, the hon. Member, Shri

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand]  
 Bhupesh Gupta, should know that we have not only the Questions, Half-an-hour Discussions, Short Notice Questions, and so on, for pointing out anything untoward happening, but there is the Estimates Committee. He can ask the Estimates Committee to take up the question and call for evidence. That is the most important method to adopt. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has got his friends in the other House. He gave here some information about the cricket commentary, and when the Chairman asked him if he could hear it in the radio, he said that the information was given to him. So, apart from all that, if there is any other defect, the Public Accounts Committee is there.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Corruption.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Above all that I feel that, seeing the fate of no less a Report than that of Dr. Radhakrishnan Commission on University Education and the reports of many Commissions, nothing good will come out of such an enquiry. Such enquiries are very discouraging and disheartening to such people who work hard. Everybody is not of the type who is guilty. A few may have done some of those things—I do not say must have done, but may have done.

While dealing with that aspect of the All India Radio's working which the hon. Member wanted to bring to the notice of the House through this resolution, I would like the hon. Minister to go into the grievances which quite a number of women members on the staff have and which had been sent to me several times in writing. But as I had no time to go into the correctness or otherwise of those things, I did not forward them to the hon. Minister. I do not say that there is truth in every complaint that was made, but there may be something, and these things are bound to happen in a department of that type where the women have to re-

main at work at odd hours. And there are people of different kinds. I do not say that all women are not to be blamed. Anyway, that aspect also has to be seen, because day by day we do not want women and their guardians in particular to feel that public services like nursing, the medical profession, All India Radio, and so on, are not very safe places for women to enter. I would incidentally mention a profession about which people have started entertaining doubts, and that is the profession of the telephone girls who have to be in their offices at any hour. Anyhow, Sir, the point I wanted to make here—and incidentally I pay the All India Radio a compliment on this—was about the education side of the All India Radio's programmes. I want to request the Ministry to see how it can devote more time for education, particularly the workers' education. It is no use trying to come to the help of the Government during general strikes, etc., by giving the correct information, but it is also necessary through talks to give proper information about the duties of workers. The hon. Members sitting on the opposite side would say that ideas of workers' duties may vary, that information about the correct procedure of unions etc., may vary according to the political parties, but if they will go deep into the question, they will see that, according to accepted international conventions, the running of unions or the principles of unions should not be affected by political or party affiliations at all. So, there could be educational programmes on subjects like workers' participation in management, workers' duty and the greater role which workers will have to play day by day. Our socialist pattern of society will be mainly for these workers and farmers, and in our country 80 per cent. are agriculturists. So, it is necessary for the All India Radio to have a complete programme which will be beneficial to these people. The programme may be late at night when the workers are free, perhaps after 10 o'clock or after 11 o'clock on one or two or

three days a week. That would benefit the workers. In fact our friend, Shrimati Rukmini Devi Arundale, did refer to the need of co-ordination between the Ministry of Cultural Affairs and the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. I would go a step further. I think there ought to be co-ordination between the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, the Education Ministry, the Ministry of Cultural Affairs and also the Ministry of Railways, if I may include that, because I have always felt that while passengers are waiting for late-coming trains and while passengers not having watches and coming hours in advance wait for hours together in waiting halls, if documentary films, etc., could be shown to them, the tedium of their waiting would be taken away, and they would come to know Government's plans and programmes, what it is doing for the people.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Does this come under the All India Radio?

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: I am asking for co-ordination. If your earphones are put properly, you will be able to hear. That particular part was mentioned by the hon. Member. Unless there is co-ordination between the Ministries, there will be a lot of wastage of expenditure.

One point I want to deal with and for which I have stood up is the point made by the hon. Mr. Mani, our new Member. He referred to the commercial aspect of television and broadcasting. I, for one, have seen what commercial television is in England and its effect, and as a result of competition, the B.B.C. television also is not always above par. I feel that it would be a mistake to have commercial television in our country and the question is not yet ripe for the appointment of a commission in this respect. An hon. Member of this House happened to say in the Lobby that he believed in taking the country towards progress along Western lines. Progress along West-

ern lines is all right, but it is not yet suitable for our country in every respect. It looks very fashionable to be called modern and it may look rather not so fashionable to be called conservative. But at the same time I would like to point out that we have to cut our coat according to the cloth. We have to take our country towards progress according to the conditions of our country. Our people are very cultured as our civilization is the oldest and they are not receptive to the impact of modern progress along those lines and it would be an absolute mistake—I do not want to use the word folly—to do things here in the same hurry as they are done in the West. I would here join in the plea made by Shrimati Arundale that though television may not exactly be a part of it, it is a part of the All India Radio and we should not have television in our country for some time. In England, where women have no servants and have to do their motherly duties along with other work, just strap their children on to baby-chairs and seat them in front of television. From the age of eight or nine months, children begin to take interest in music and other items shown on television and watch it while the mother is busy with her duties. I had experience myself. I was watching a television programme where there was some sort of murder, shouting and rushing and horrible things were going on. There was also a child of ten years. For three months, it had been watching it from six o'clock in the evening to nine o'clock at night. Believe it or not, that child pushed me aside so that it could watch what was going on. What would be the effect of this? It is bad enough to go through the sensational titles in newspapers every day about some constable murdering a student or a student doing something or a man running away with somebody's wife and so on. But it is worse still to view these things on television. On the one hand, we plead that visual education is the most effective and the quickest way of giving social education to our



[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.]  
 people. But on the other hand, we cannot afford to forget that we will not be able to control this type of television. Once you have home television sets, you will not be able to stop these things and it will be difficult to have control over our younger generation. In England, the hiring charge for a T.V. set is 1 sh. 6d. per day—which is equal to Re. 1-2-0—for a television set from six o'clock in the evening to nine o'clock at night and the whole family watches it. People even do not stop to think whether they can pay this. Those bad effects should be a warning to the Ministry. It may look very fashionable, very modern and very progressive to be told that India is marching ahead along the path of television. About two months ago I was watching a programme of television put up by this Ministry and there were scenes of a village market squabble, some marriage ceremony pandemonium was going on. I do not know what educative value it has got. There were some weird scenes also there.

So, what I would say is that I would not like to associate myself with this resolution because I feel that a committee or a commission would not have the desired effect. If the hon. Member is anxious to fulfil the object behind this resolution as a Parliamentarian, he has various other ways left to him to pursue the Ministry and make it incumbent upon the Minister to accept his suggestions. It is not also right as was pointed out by Mr. Mani or Mr. Gurupada Swamy and somebody else that this House does not have enough opportunities to discuss such matters. The Rajya Sabha has had enough time and opportunity to discuss such subjects of importance and that is why so many important Bills on social subjects have been introduced in our House.

While I thank the hon. Member for focussing the attention of the House on these points, I am sorry I cannot

agree to this suggestion for the appointment of a commission or a committee for this purpose.

**श्री नवाबसिंह चौहान (उत्तर प्रदेश) :**  
 श्रीमन्, मैं ज्यादा समय नहीं लूंगा। इस बहस के दौरान मैं केवल एक दो बातें कहना चाहूंगा।

इस प्रकार समस्याओं के सुलझाव के लिये जो कमीशन बनाने का सुझाव होता है वह समस्याओं को सुलझाने वाला नहीं होता। हमें बहुत से कमीशन्स का तजुर्बा है कि जिन समस्याओं को सुलझाने के लिए कमीशन नियुक्त किये गये वे समस्याएं सुलझाने के बजाय और उलझ गईं। वैसे मैं यह नहीं समझता कि यहां कोई उलझाव है। लेकिन जिस तरीके से यह कमीशन की बात रखी गई है, उसका क्या मकसद है, यह मैं समझ नहीं पा रहा हूं।

मैं यह निवेदन करूंगा कि हमारे मित्र जिन्होंने यह प्रस्ताव रखा है, वे पहले आल इण्डिया रेडियो के प्रोग्रामों को और उसकी वकिंग को देखें। वे शायद इसको राजनैतिक कामों का एक अंग बनाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। लेकिन जिस तरीके से वे राजनैतिक कामों में लगे रहते हैं, उससे मुझे शक है कि उनको बड़ी मुश्किल से समय मिलता होगा रेडियो के बारे में जांचने का सिवाय उन चीजों के जिनका सम्बन्ध राजनीति से है। इसलिये मेरा निवेदन है कि इस चीज को ज्यादा राजनीति में लाने की कोशिश नहीं करनी चाहिये और इस प्रस्ताव को वापस ले लेना चाहिये।

इस प्रस्ताव में कमीशन या कमेटी मुर्कर करने की मांग की गई है। इसके माने यह हुये कि आल इण्डिया रेडियो में ठीक ढंग से काम नहीं हो रहा है। अब आप देखिये कि जब भारत का विभाजन नहीं हुआ था उस वक्त आल इण्डिया रेडियो की क्या

हालत थी और उसमें कैसे और कौन लोग आ सकते थे । हमारे समाज की जो निम्न स्तर की स्त्रियाँ हुआ करती थीं या और ऐसे ही दूसरे लोग हुआ करते थे उन्हीं का उसमें गुजर हुआ करता था । लेकिन आज वायुमण्डल बिल्कुल बदल गया है । इसी चीज को करने के बाद अगर डाक्टर केसकर और उनका विभाग और कुछ न करे तो मैं इसी को बहुत ज्यादा समझूंगा । राष्ट्र के चरित्र को ऊंचा उठाना एक बहुत बड़ी चीज है । साथ ही साथ गायन, वादन और ऐसी ही चीजों में जिस तरीके से परिवर्तन किया गया है, वह भी कम तारीफ़ की चीज नहीं है । रजवाड़ों के समाप्त होने के बाद यह ख्याल किया जाता था कि हिन्दुस्तान से ललित कलाओं का जनाजा निकल जायगा और नृत्य और संगीत मृत्यु को प्राप्त हो जायेंगे । लेकिन आज हम सब देखते हैं कि राजाओं के जमाने में तो गिने चुने आदमी उससे लाभ उठा सकते थे, पर आज वह एक सार्वजनिक चीज हो गई है । कौन जानता था कि इस जमाने में जितने ये लोक नृत्य हैं या लोक गीत हैं, वे जनता को ऐसे देखने या सुनने को मिलेंगे । यह हमारा ऐसा खजाना है, ऐसी निधि है, जिसका सबके सामने आना बहुत जरूरी था । डाक्टर केसकर और उनके विभाग ने इस चीज को जनता के सामने लाकर एक अद्वितीय काम किया है । इतिहास में यह चीज स्वर्ण अक्षरों में लिखी जायगी । मैं छूटी छूटी चीजों पर नहीं जाता । इन्हीं दो चीजों को मैं बहुत बड़ा समझता हूँ क्योंकि इनका आधार नैतिक है ।

जहाँ तक गानों का सम्बन्ध है, गानों को सुन कर लोगों का जी प्रसन्न होता है । लेकिन होता यह है कि जब यहाँ गन्दे गाने बन्द हो जाते हैं तो लोग मीलों का रेडियो खोल लेते हैं और चरित्र को बिगाड़ने वाले गाने सुनते हैं । मुझे वह समय याद है जब सिनेमा एंजिनिस्ट्स ने एक तरीके से हड़ताल कर दी थी भिन्नता गीतों को देने के सम्बन्ध में क्योंकि आल-इंडिया रेडियो यह नहीं चाहता था कि सिनेमा के गन्दे गाने लोगों को सुनाये जायें । क्या यह

बुरा काम हुआ ? हमारे आल-इंडिया रेडियो ने उस चीज को बर्दाश्त किया, उस लड़ाई का मुकामिला किया और आज हम देखते हैं कि जो लोग पहले उसकी नृत्ताचीनी करते थे वे भी ऐसे गानों को नहीं सुनते हैं और जब प्रातःकालीन प्रभाती होती है तो उसको सुन कर वे प्रसन्न होते हैं । इस तरह जो पहले रंग डंग था उसको डा० केसकर ने बिल्कुल बदल दिया है, यह एक बहुत बड़ी बात है । मैं यह समझता हूँ कि वह इसको करने के बाद और कुछ न करे तो भी बहुत कुछ किया है और सोचने वालों के लिये यह बहुत है और न सोचने वालों के लिये और भी कुछ कर दें तब भी कुछ नहीं होगा ।

इसलिये धन्यवाद देते हुए एक, दो बातें और कहना चाहूंगा । एक बात यह है कि जो आर्टिस्ट्स लगातार आल-इंडिया रेडियो में काम कर रहे होते हैं वे कांट्रक्ट पर चलते हैं, किसी का कांट्रक्ट सालाना बदल जाता है और किसी का तीन साल में बदल जाता है । मेरी माननीय मंत्री जी से प्रार्थना यह है कि जो मंत्रालय की नज़र में ठीक साबित हो जायें, जिनका वाकई ठीक ढंग से काम चल रहा हो और जिनको दो या तीन साल से अधिक काम करते हुए हो जायें उनका किसी न किसी तरह से स्थायीकरण हो जाना चाहिये । उनका इस तरह से अस्थायी रूप से चलते रहना कुछ ठीक नहीं है क्योंकि वे समझते रहते हैं कि उनका यहाँ पर रहना अनिश्चित है और न मालूम किस वक्त उनका कांट्रक्ट खत्म हो जाय । इसलिये स्थायीकरण की योजना को वहाँ पर चालू करना चाहिये ।

अन्त में यह प्रार्थना जरूर करूंगा कि रेडियो ने बहुत से प्रोग्राम चलते हैं किन्तु मैं देखता हूँ कि हिन्दी के सम्बन्ध में हालांकि बहुत कुछ कोशिश हुई है लेकिन अभी हिन्दी को उसका उचित स्थान आल-इंडिया रेडियो में नहीं दिया गया है । संसद् के पिछले अधिवेशन के समय जो संसद् समीक्षा हिन्दी में होती थी वही बन्द कर दी गई

### [ श्री नवार्बसह चौहान ]

श्री । बड़ी खुशी की बात है कि माननीय मंत्री जी ने मेहरबानी करके इसे फिर से चालू किया । जब मैं हिन्दी का नाम लेता हूँ, जब मैं हिन्दी के बारे में कहता हूँ, तो उससे मेरा तात्पर्य यह भी होता है कि दूसरे रेडियो स्टेशनों से जितनी रीजनल लैंग्वेज, क्षेत्रीय भाषाओं के प्रोग्राम प्रसारित होते हैं—चाहे वह बंगाली हो, तामिल हो, तेलगू हो, जो भी हो—जहाँ जहाँ भी स्थानीय स्टेशन हैं वहाँ वहाँ अधिक से अधिक इनको स्थान मिलना चाहिये और खाम तौर से हिन्दी को भी स्थान मिलना चाहिये, जो कि यूनियन की, हमारे देश की, राज-काज की एक मात्र भाषा होने वाली है और जिसके लिये कुछ काम प्रारम्भ भी हो गया है ।

मैं इन चीजों के डिटेल्स में, व्यौरे में नहीं जाऊंगा कि कहाँ क्या है, कहाँ क्या नहीं है और किस तरह से हिन्दी का वही स्थान नहीं है, जैसे कि हिन्दी के लिये जो स्टाफ है, उसकी वह तनख्वाह नहीं है, जो कि उसी श्रेणी के अंग्रेजी के लिये जो स्टाफ है, उसकी है । बहुत सी चीजें हैं, लेकिन मैं उनको नहीं कहूंगा; क्योंकि मैं जानता हूँ कि मंत्री जी उन समस्याओं को बहुत अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं और मैं उनसे यही कहूंगा कि उनको हल करना शुरू कर देना चाहिये । उसमें बहुत ढील हो रही है और इससे बहुत नुकसान हो रहा है ।

फिर एक बार आपको धन्यवाद देते हुए, मैं अपनी बातों को समाप्त करता हूँ ।

DR. B. V. KESKAR: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have heard very carefully the speeches of hon. Members regarding the resolution proposed by Shri Bhupesh Gupta. Many Members have taken this opportunity to speak on the All India Radio in general, as to what it has done, what it has not done and what it should do. It is quite instructive and I appreciate whatever they have said, whether it is a criticism of or whether it is a compliment to the All India Radio. But that makes my

task a little more complicated because, Sir, it is difficult to reply to all the points raised here. For example, Shri Bhupesh Gupta has given a list; practically every department is mentioned in his list, and if I have to speak on each one of the departments here, it will be really taking too much time of the House. But I shall certainly mention briefly some of them—the more important ones among them. I would like more to stick mainly to the fundamental point raised by my hon. friend here, and also some other hon. Members, and that is the demand for a commission or a committee of enquiry. Now there can be two grounds on which such a demand can be made and has been made. One demand is based on the bad working of the All India Radio, and many allegations have been made in support of the so-called bad working of the All India Radio. Sir, it is easy to pick holes in anything. Also a number of points with names have been mentioned, and it saddens me to find that in judging a department or an institution no effort is made to see as to the overall working of that particular institution or department but rather there is a tendency to try to pick out its faults; they are so-called faults, because some of the allegations are not correct, nor true, but I would like here to draw the attention of hon. Members to the last dozen years. At the time of partition we inherited a truncated institution called the All India Radio, which had four or five stations and a small staff. All efforts at building up this institution, which was started in the British days, have been mainly after 1947, and I make bold to say that, judged by the standard of any other department of the Government of India, the All India Radio does deserve the good word of the country and of Parliament. I challenge anybody to compare its work with the work done and the progress and development made by any and every other department of Government. Now here, Sir, I would like to mention very briefly not only the physical progress made—there is immense physical progress. We had

five or six stations then; now we have twenty-eight stations. We have increased our programmes and expansion has taken place in many other things, and I would like to point out some of the radical changes that have been brought about in the working of the institution. My friend, Shri Nawab Singh Chauhan, just now made a very brief passing allusion, but I would like to expatiate upon that, and it is this. Our anxiety all along has been to see that this department, which was founded probably as an experimental measure—to start with as a very small institution—should begin to work as an institution on certain fundamental and well laid down rules, that it should not work at the whim and fancy of various officers placed in the department. I do not want to say anything in favour of those officers that went wrong, but hon. Members must be aware that when the institution was started by the British Government it was under an executive head, the Director-General, who was responsible to the Viceroy, and he was all in all in the department. Later on that tradition was inherited and continued but in a diminished form for many years. The result of the British system was that the various heads of Stations and the Director-General were left free to judge and decide as to what they think should be done. Now naturally, if the Director-General is a very talented person, he does good things, but he does what he feels is good. Now we felt that if this is to be a national institution imparting culture and education to the people, it must transform itself into a manner that it works as an institution, that it should not be run by a single head and that it should be run conforming to certain well laid down principles. Now from that point of view I would like to mention a few things. First of all, Sir, the All India Radio had limited programmes. Now these programmes consisted very largely of music and drama and features, and a very small percentage, a still smaller percentage, of talks. Now all these programmes

were planned by the Director-General and his staff, and when I had the privilege of taking this over and my predecessor also took it over, we found that there were many complaints that all these things were done in a very erratic manner. There was no rule or criterion laid down as to how this should be done. In fact, this is the work that was taken over. To build up an institution is not an easy job and this job was taken up. So in the selection, whether of artistes or of performers, a certain criterion is laid down. The selection is not done by the staff but by regular selection committees made up of competent people.

Now, everywhere an effort has been made to see that persons to be recruited have got a certain minimum qualification. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta quoted the case of some artistes having been treated badly. Well, he might have his opinion. Why should I agree with his opinion that an X artiste is fit enough to be called? I will leave it to a competent committee to judge whether an artiste is good or bad. I cannot pass an opinion about the qualities of a particular artiste. My point is whether it is Mr. Bhupesh Gupta who directs the All India Radio or I do it, neither he nor I will be able to do it; I will entrust the work to a competent committee. It is for them to carry it out.

Now, it is possible that such committees might commit mistakes. That is possible everywhere. Even in very rigid examinations mistakes are committed. A person who might deserve 75 marks is given 50 or 40 marks. That might happen, and for that reason we have tried to lay down that in the matter of such mistakes the person aggrieved has got some opportunity, he has a right of appeal. I have myself sometimes looked into such appeals so that artistes do not have any grouse. But where thousands of persons are involved, it is possible that in the judgment of merits we might make a mistake. But when my-

[Dr. B. V. Keskar.]

friend accuses the All India Radio of having unjustly dealt with a particular person and that is a matter of nepotism, by what standard am I to judge it? By the standard of my hon. friend? I myself refuse to judge any X, Y, Z by my own standard. I will see that selected persons, who are competent in that line, sit and tell me whether X, Y or Z is competent enough or not. I will base my judgement on that. For me to have my personal opinion is not proper. That is not proper for an institution to do.

I make bold to say that as many as possible programme sections of the All India Radio are being built up on this fundamental principle. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta was complaining about the Audition Board, namely, that the Audition Board is bad. If he has any complaint about any particular artiste, I am prepared to look into the complaint. He gave a particular name but he never took the trouble of passing the name of that particular artiste to me or saying that X artiste has been treated unfairly. I myself get one or two complaints and I make it a point to listen to all these things, however small they might be, because such checking and control always keep the machinery up-to-date. But by and large what I would suggest is that in the matter of judging an individual merit it is not possible either for me or for Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to pass an opinion. It is also possible that the committee might have judged a particular artiste in a right or a wrong way. It is a matter of opinion. Difference of opinion is bound to happen more especially in artistic matters, but we try to see that the largest possible amount of justice is done and equity plays its due part in judging artistes.

Here, Sir, I will take the case of staff when the All India Radio was taken over. The staff here was recruited in every possible way. There were people who were selected by the Public Service Commission. There were

people, doing the same type of work, who were selected by selection boards and there were people appointed on *ad hoc* basis. We had also people doing the same work in permanent posts. And ultimately we found that this was a wrong way of doing things. Things had accumulated from pre-1947 days and it took us a very long period and hard work to integrate all these people in collaboration with the Public Service Commission into one service and to see that regular rules were laid down for the staff that were already there and also for the staff that would have to be recruited thereafter. But I will not go into this matter.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Are all the appointments made through the Public Service Commission?

DR. B. V. KESKAR: Yes, all permanent or temporary appointments of whatever nature are made through the Public Service Commission. I am coming to the staff artiste question. But I am saying that even these permanent posts were filled up by people recruited in different ways and the whole thing had to be completely reorganised with the help of the Public Service Commission. It took a long time. This is, of course, in connection with the permanent staff.

Sir, I have mentioned these things to indicate to hon. Members that we have to proceed through a system and if there are individuals who have a grievance, certainly that grievance will be looked into. To say that because a particular individual or artiste has not been called or has been overlooked, it is a case of nepotism, I am not prepared to accept. Well, there might be cases of nepotism here and there. After all, it is an organisation of thousands of people working in that department but I am prepared to look into all these cases. But to make a sweeping allegation of this type and quote a few cases and say that there is nepotism, with that I do not agree because in many of these cases it is a matter of opinion. It is a matter of

opinion about the merit of an artiste rather than a case of nepotism.

Sir, the main thing is this. This department was a department where there was a lot of nepotism, and I do not blame anybody for that because when you leave things completely in the hands of staff, without any rules, without any check or without any control, that is bound to happen. What has happened, Sir, unfortunately is the contrary of what the hon. Member has said because for the last decade we have made efforts to see that more and more controls and checks are placed on the work, so that every thing is done according to rules. There has been a lot of reaction, which I will call petty reaction, official reaction, and I am sorry that my friend joined hands with such forces of corruption and nepotism. I call them forces of corruption and reaction because they do not want controls, forces who do not want checks but who want everything to be left. Please remember that a radio station is a peculiar sort of centre. There are radio stations in different parts of the country. The officer incharge there has a great latitude in matters of distribution of money, of contracts and in many other things and we must not expect too much. After all, there is human nature. And unless we have got rules and regulations, checks and controls, things cannot function properly. They used to be without checks and controls before and now that there are checks and controls some people do not like it. I am sorry that my hon. friend should take sides with such people. In fact, there has been an effort to see that things are put under proper check and they are properly done.

Now, Sir, the hon. Member mentioned many things. Take the case of News Services Division. It is not a question of organisation; it is a question of what is to be there. Sir, I would like to say that I do not agree with my hon. friend. He says that the News Services Division puts out things only regarding the party in power or things concerning the party in power.

There is nepotism and there is also bias, as the hon. Member put it.

Now, when the hon. Member tabled his resolution, in order to check and see myself whether my department was committing some mistake, I called up for all news items from the 25th December, 1956 to the 18th February, 1958 to see what type of news or what parties they dealt with. I will just read out the items and the political parties to which they concerned. The largest number probably is about the Akali Party 36, items, Congress 26, P.S.P. 7, Jan Sangh 5, Swatantra 2, Communist Party 4, Hindu Mahasabha 2, Ganatantra 2. Of course he might say that the Communist Party should have got a few more items, but my point is it depends on the fall of news and not on the relative position of parties. The Akali Party has the largest publicity. Does it mean that the News Division is inclined to the Akali Party? I do not think so. It is a question of events happening and news coming in. The main point about the News Services Division to be borne in mind is this that the News Services of the A.I.R. cannot be compared to a newspaper completely because in fifteen minutes he has to give a selection of news items. Now that is not like a newspaper because a newspaper has got plenty of time and plenty of space. So they can give many things. It is not possible in a news bulletin to give as much as can be given in a newspaper but strict Orders have been issued to see that they cover as much and as large a variety of news as possible and the news of political parties is given fair coverage. In fact all important conferences of all parties are particularly covered. It is possible that my hon. friend will say that all that the Government say is party news. I am not prepared to agree. If we live by a democratic constitution in this country—and I hope the hon. Member will agree at least here that we live by a democratic constitution—then activities that are carried on in Parliament, the pronouncements made by the Government and the pronouncements

[Dr. B. V. Keskar.]

accepted by Parliament, if they are always considered to be party news, then the country is permanently divided into parties and there is no country as such. The democratic convention is, I would like to submit, that once the Parliament approves of something, it is no more a party thing. Supposing a resolution is accepted here or a Budget is accepted or a Bill is accepted, then it becomes something above parties, and in that, if the Government says something, I regret I cannot agree that it should be considered to be purely party news. That is what probably my hon. friend is driving at because no doubt in the India of to-day, a democratic country and a country which is trying to build up a socialist welfare state, large numbers of non-political types of activities have to be carried out by the Government and those activities will get publicity. They have got events and they have got to be given in the news and therefore unlike many other countries where the Government is only carrying out purely political work mostly, we have to give news of items of work which here the Government is carrying out but which are not of a purely political nature, which might be of an economic nature or industrial nature, and that is one of the reasons why we get in the news bulletins many items, which probably in other countries would not be really Governmental items. Take the steel plants. It is a Government concern but that news about steel might be of a non-political nature but my hon. friend might like to dub it as political news because it concerns a Government concern. So, generally speaking, the functioning of the News Services Division, is such—and they have orders, that they must exercise their judgment as newsmen and select items of news value according to their importance. Many a time important news which we would like or we think important is left out but we leave it to the judgment of the News Editors because they have to take the fall of news quickly and decide according to the value of the news . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How many experienced journalists you have there in that Department?

DR. B. V. KESKAR: I cannot say. In that particular Department for the people who are recruited by the U.P.S.C. one of the qualifications is that they must have journalistic experience. I cannot judge the journalistic experience of every one of them but they are recruited by them and I think they would not have been recruited unless they have had journalistic experience. In fact they have to function very much like a newspaper newsroom. They cannot function in any other way.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Should they not give priority to Government news even among important items?

DR. B. V. KESKAR: If there is any Government news which is of national importance, naturally it will have to be given.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Can you name anybody there who has five years' journalistic experience in any newspaper in India?

DR. B. V. KESKAR: The hon. Member is putting questions as in the Question Hour, but I am prepared to give him all news about the journalists there and if he disagrees and says that they are not good, I will certainly pass it on to the U.P.S.C. and say that my friend does not agree with the selection of the Commission.

SHRI A. D. MANI: May I know whether it is the invariable rule that instructions are given to the news section about putting out the items?

DR. B. V. KESKAR: No, excepting in very grave national cases. There was a case where the Government asked that a particular item—and it was even mentioned in the Parliament, it came up here—should not be put out in the evening but might be put out in the morning because they had not yet got it confirmed that the position was correct and it had come in the papers that it was so but it was

not very sure—it was about the Chinese event . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It was said that the Government gave instructions but we found out that the Government did not give instructions.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: I have got the particular thing here and the Prime Minister issued orders and I said it on the floor of the Lok Sabha that instructions were issued that it should be issued after a few hours because we had to get verification of that. I do not say that Government does not. Let me tell even my friend Mr. Mani, who is fond of the B.B.C., that B.B.C. sometimes gets instructions from the Government regarding these matters but they are matters of national importance, but by and large such cases are so reduced that I do not think that they can be considered to be the rule. They are very very rare exceptions.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore you suppressed the truth on the Prime Minister's instructions for some hours at least.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: My hon. friend, who is the repository of truth, has his own definition of what is truth and what is untruth but generally I might inform hon. Members that I have very rarely received any complaints about any bias in the news that have been put out. I know that hon. Members like sometimes that we should put out more news of this type or more of that type. There, I am afraid, the smallness of the bulletin precludes us from doing that; otherwise the News Division would be very glad to do it.

Only one thing about which I myself am not very satisfied is the coverage of Parliamentary proceedings. The difficulty arises, not because of the newsroom's any want of intentions but the difficulty is, there are two Houses sitting and at the most they can give 5 or 6 or 7 minutes' coverage and it is not possible to compress into that space all the important things and also all the speeches. It is worth and I am

seriously considering whether we should have something separate and a longer one in order to cover Parliamentary proceedings adequately so that hon. Members have no complaints that their point of view has not been fully covered but as far as important points by hon. Members are concerned in any debate, they are certainly mentioned and where it is not possible to mention the points made by all hon. Members, instructions have been issued that the names of hon. Members should be mentioned.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I make one little suggestion? I suggest, let the scripts that you have on Parliamentary coverage every day, let copies of these things, come to this House and the other House so that Members can see them in the Library and the Secretaries can see . . .

DR. B. V. KESKAR: The News Division cannot function that way. It is a better thing then to make it into an encyclopaedia so that it can be issued after some days.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: You should consider Mr. Gupta's helplessness. His radio set is permanently tuned to Peking.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: I think that is not a practical suggestion but I am prepared to listen to any practical suggestion that any hon. Member can give in order to make the news as varied and as objective as possible but it must be a practical type of suggestion.

Now I will take up the other important point which has been mentioned here. This is regarding a commission. My friend, Mr. Mani, who is a very widely read and experienced person, has been very particular in digressing on this question that we must have a commission on the lines of the commissions appointed . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: He said committee, not commission.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: Well, he quoted very extensively from the various



[Dr. B. V. Keskar.]

commissions appointed by the B.B.C. and probably his quotations were very interesting and I think many of the points from the commissions' reports that he mentioned are very interesting. The only point that I would like him to bear in mind regarding this is that we need not follow in everything the British procedure, because please remember, in Great Britain, a commission is appointed because there is there a completely autonomous corporation which functions in a way in which the day-to-day working of that corporation does not come before Parliament. And when Parliament provides the money, just as many hon. Members have made the demand here that we must have a committee in order to look into the working of autonomous bodies under the Government of India, in the same way, the British Parliament has laid down that because there it is an autonomous body, they must have, every few years, a commission or committee which will go into its working and look into many details and make a report. The main point is that the convention of having a commission has been established because of the nature of the British Broadcasting Corporation, not because a commission by itself is a very essential or beneficial thing. Here I would like to invite the attention of the hon. Member that broadcasting in India is a government department. There is nothing derogatory or bad about it. The hon. Member mentioned Canada. It is not the case in Canada. In Canada broadcasting is not entirely done by a corporation. There there are different broadcasting concerns. Some are government run and some are privately run. The same thing happens in Australia. Barring these two or three, and leaving out the U.S.A. where it is a commercial business, in all the other countries it is a completely Government controlled body. The rules are different in different countries. Even in a country like Switzerland it is Government controlled. There are rules and in some places there is much stronger government control than here. In France it is government controlled.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNAND: It is a torture to listen to the U.S.A. commercial broadcasts.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: And countries like the U.S.S.R. and Poland I need not mention what procedure they follow. My point is this. I am not supporting any particular type or procedure. I am saying this that each country has its own requirements and its own history of development. Here broadcasting began in a small way, as a small unit established by Government. It was a very small one. Only after partition and after independence we have begun to develop it. And a lot of these developments had to be financed heavily. If you had a type of independent body, then certainly you would have to think how you would like to finance it. No doubt, some money would come from the Government, a little here or there. But when a body is working as a department of government and it is able to work for the public good, the question of how it is going to make up its balance of expenditure, does not come up. That is the reason why we have been able to invest large sums of money in the development of broadcasting here. That would not have been possible otherwise. Otherwise it would have gone on lines which I do not think would be, from the cultural point of view, the educational point of view or any other point of view, up to the standard that we would like it to be. My point is, it has developed in a particular way. It is still in the stage of development here and for us to say that because in England there is an autonomous corporation, here also we should have an autonomous corporation is not an argument which convinces me. I am prepared to listen to independent reasons for this brought forward. Frankly, I am not able to understand what vital difference it will make. Let me make it clear. Some hon. Members think that by corporation they mean an independent body, a body that will be completely away and Government will have nothing to do with it. Parliament will,

from time to time, pass some grants of money to it and the corporation will look after itself.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your half an hour is over.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: I will take only five more minutes, Sir. We have to be clear about this fact, that even when there is a corporation, it will be a completely government controlled corporation, because in the circumstances as they exist today, when we have invested some Rs. 15 to Rs. 20 crores in this national institution, it is not possible either for Parliament or for the Government to let it be run badly or be exploited or be mismanaged. Parliament has the right to see that everything is working properly. Therefore, at this stage, to say that we should hand over this national organisation to a so-called independent body is, to me, not a practical proposition. And Sir, may I ask, which is this so-called independent body? Who are the independent persons? What person is there who has not got political views or inclinations? I would submit that the control and scrutiny of Parliament, where every Member has the right to criticise even the smallest thing, is a much better thing and is much more effective control than the handing over of it to a corporation, because in these circumstances, let me tell the House, the corporation will work exactly as the All India Radio is working, except for one big difference and the difference is that Members of Parliament will not be able to criticise its working except once a year and they cannot raise all sorts of questions.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The L.I.C. is there.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: If Members themselves insist that it should be under their eyes night and day, then in the present stage, that kind of corporation will not serve the purpose, a corporation like the one that Mr. Mani would like to be set up, like the B.B.C. The B.B.C. is all right, because,

if I may say so, the political differences there are not many and broadly they agree in many fundamentals. The differences are superficial. But here we have very vital differences. There is no such independent person. Mr. Mani, for example, may be one, an independent person, though I doubt even that, because he too has his own political views. I cannot hand it over to Mr. Mani. I feel at present there are distinct advantages from the point of view of Members of Parliament in having it as a department.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: We should develop first the civic sense as they have done in the U.K.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: Yes, when the developmental stage is over, we may consider it. When the developmental stage is over, then a long-range and more stabilised programme for the All India Radio can be thought of. But at present, I do not think it is a practical proposition. I sympathise with Mr. Mani's point of view; but I think he is too much under the glamour of the B.B.C. Let me tell him that even in the B.B.C., if he reads the English newspapers he will find that there are severe criticisms made as severe as on the A.I.R. in India. But then he is passing over it for the moment. My point is, when there are big organisations working, there are bound to be many points on which there can be criticisms.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Will the Government be prepared to consider the setting up of an expanded advisory apparatus for a periodical review of the performance of the All India Radio, just as they have the Central Council for the B.B.C. with 43 members? We could have an expanded advisory apparatus and we could have representatives from the States and representatives of cultural interests. Will Government consider that?

**DR. B. V. KESKAR:** I am sorry there are still a number of points which I was not able to mention. We have a Central Advisory Committee for programmes and we have other committees too. We have instituted these bodies. I am prepared to consider Mr. Mani's suggestion and we can think of an expanded programmes committee or other advisory committees also where participation of cultural and other interests will be there. In that way every constructive suggestion is welcome. But I am sorry that in the form in which this resolution has come and the amendments as they are, I am unable to accept.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Sir, we have listened to the hon. Minister and he has spoken in favour of what is being done. Nobody will deny that some improvement has taken place. But is this the right way of doing things? Is it the right thing to just recall the standards that prevailed some thirteen years back? We would like to know whether we are doing what could be done and should be done now. Sir, I am also of the opinion that many artistes are making good contributions over the A.I.R. and we do acknowledge the services rendered to the country in that way. But that is not the point. This is not the point; the point is whether we are handling the matter properly, adequately and with a clear perspective and in the right direction. This is what I was trying to make out, that we are not doing so far as the present administration goes. Well, I am not enamoured of the B.B.C. That also is a propaganda weapon in the hands of the ruling class there. The question is whether in our conditions we can have an autonomous corporation subject to Parliamentary supervision and control in the same way as many others are. I would not like to give up the right of Parliament to supervise and direct the affairs of such a corporation. It has to be integrated with Parliamentary control. That is the point. Now, as was made clear,

the Prime Minister sent a chit and the news are suppressed. Why should it be like that? Important news came into the hands of the A.I.R. and it should have been put across the air. We heard it in the B.B.C. but did not hear in the A.I.R. and began to wonder. People were left in doubts as to why such a thing happened and now the hon. Minister tells us how it came to happen. Such things should not happen in the future. Apart from this, many other points were raised and some of them were answered by Dr. Kesar. There are grievances amongst the artistes, amongst the staff and among others who are associated with the management of the A.I.R. centres. The purpose of the committee should be to go into them; it is not a question of individual cases. If it were so, I could have written a letter to Dr. Kesar and would have left the matter at that but grievances have accumulated. Take, for instance, even Delhi. The casual drama artistes have very many grievances and the matter is pending. It seems that the Station Director takes advice from a gentleman called Shri Chiranjit of the Programme Department and does not listen to others. The result is that confusion prevails. Such things should be gone into. I can give you another example. In Calcutta the photograph of Ashima Bhattacharjee was published in the *Betar Jagat* after she took her audition test but before she sang any song over the Radio because she happened to be a relative of Mr. N. Bhattacharjee who is the producer of classical music there. Such things happen. I can give you many names. Shri Rajat Roy, a qualified engineer and who went through the police enquiry was appointed but suddenly he was dismissed because certain police report came.

**DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND:** Is it proper to bring in individual cases?

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Yes, yes, we can; otherwise you would not

have caught Mr. S. P. Jain and Mr. Dalmia. I am not making any particular complaint that he always ignores such things. These are typical of the manner in which things are being handled there. I have mentioned all these because he wanted facts. I give facts but if one would not listen to facts what can I do? Then there are the officers. Who are they? Who are the various Stations Directors? Here is the Director-General. In other countries we have men of particular accomplishment in the cultural field. I do not say that they are men of no culture. They have their own lines, administrative officers and so on. A few may be I.C.S. men and also I.A.S. men but are they suitable for running such an institution? If you get a hockey player to play football, he does not do well necessarily; if you get a cricketer to play badminton, he simply fails. He may be a very good cricketer.

He may be very good in the I.C.S. but why make him boss here? Why should such people be placed in such positions without any particular knowledge, experience and talent? I agree that it is a matter of opinion, this liking of artistes. Dr. Keskar likes a number of artistes, I have no quarrel with him, but I may not like them. I do not know anything but then the Advisory Boards should be properly constituted; they should not be sort of manoeuvred or manipulated boards. This is what I say. There are very many grievances among the artistes. It does not mean that every one in the Board is bad but they are so formed that they give rise to grievances and criticisms on the part of the artistes. These things are ventilated sometimes in the press also. Is it not the duty of the hon. Minister to take note of these things and review the composition of the Boards and make such changes as are necessary to make them acceptable to broad sections of the artistes and so on? This is not an unreasonable suggestion but we have not heard of such

things being done; even if they are done, they are done so secretly and in a manner that people do not know how things are being handled. I would not ask him to trust me about music because I might mislead him. I realise it but then I would not like it to be placed in the hands of people who have been manipulated into these Boards, who have been brought into these Boards through wire pulling and so on. It is a matter of debate and let it be debated in public, discussed with all shades of opinion which are interested in cultural things and then settled. That approach should be there but it is not there.

He talked about the Central Information Service. He mentioned indirectly about this but there again an unhappy state of affairs prevails there. Promotions have been given ignoring seniority; people have been pushed about; people have been pushed up, people who are in the liking of others, and others who are not so liked by them have been demoted.

About news items, the hon. Minister said that mention was made about the Akalis. One might say, he wanted to condemn the Akalis and therefore, he used the All India Radio to this end. One might argue like this. Is it the number of times that one mentions this that counts? That way, I might say so many things about Dr. Keskar and say that I have spoken about him so many times. You would like to know as to what is it that I said, whether it was something good or bad. This is how the matter should be reviewed. All types of activities go on in the country and so long as they are not official or semi-official activity, they are treated, in the News Section of the All India Radio, in a step-motherly manner and they are ignored. I would like to know as to how many journalists are there, where they have come from. I know somebody is here who had some training in the *Times of India*. I do not know, he may be qualified

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

or disqualified and I do not go into that, but I would like to know as to how many others among them here have journalistic experience and training. One does not become a journalist overnight, most certainly not by joining the All India Radio to begin with. He must have begun somewhere else.

Well, I am not comparing the things as they are now with the conditions that prevailed in the British days. Today, yes, Dr. Keskar has greater control over it; the Director-General has less control compared to him but his control is notional, constitutional, fictitious. Effective control rests with the Director-General and the Station Directors. Dr. Keskar is a very intelligent person; even so, I may say, with all the talk he has indulged in here today, with all the intelligence, with all the shrewdness that he possesses, it is possible that he is being let down by people in those posts. I do not know; let the committee go into it. We can only address the Minister in such matters; we are dissatisfied, the people are dissatisfied. Dr. B. C. Roy got up in Darjeeling and said that he did not like to hear the All India Radio and I think he told Dr. Keskar. Certainly he told Mr. Jyoti Basu, the Leader of the Opposition, that he had told Dr. Keskar or somebody that he puts off the radio when he hears the news. I may not agree with Dr. B. C. Roy but here is one of your own Chief Ministers who would rather not listen to some programmes of the All India Radio. Some of them are not good. In this connection, I would like to say that a lot of time is given to English music. Dr. Keskar, I think, had education in a French University. He may be fond of Western music, we are also, to some extent, but then why should English music has priority? There should be a balance between English, American, French, Italian and even Spanish so long as it is not vulgar, and our own music. This has got to be given into. This

is another point that I want to make. We have our own music and that should be given priority.

Then sometimes they do not fulfil their functions. When the Assam riots took place, it was the task of the All India Radio to see that they broadcast such comments, appeals and statements that the rioters and others there were prevented from indulging in mischief. They should have been made to realise that public opinion was against them. But the All India Radio blacked out, practically blacked out, and they kept quiet about it as if nothing was happening. Again recently the Jabalpur riots were taking place. Is it not the task of the All India Radio to get public men, Hindus and Muslims, to make statements, appeals and so on? They do not do such things. You go by routinism; officers are always like that. Not that every officer is like that but generally they are always like that; when something is burning, they fiddle. We have seen how things happen. We lived in the days of the war in England and we saw how the Radio there sought to mobilise the people, to rouse the people against certain things and in favour of some other things. You talk about disintegration of the country and about fissiparous tendencies but you publicise the speeches of the Ministers for five minutes but would not include in the programme such appeals and statements which will fight these fissiparous tendencies that express themselves in the form of riots and so on. This is not done by the All India Radio.

Then I come to selection of programmes. Again ask anyone in Calcutta. Of course, I am not an expert at that but ever since I have been pursuing this matter I have been consulting people in Calcutta, people who support the Congress Party. They say that they are dissatisfied with it. Many of them say that they are dissatisfied with this kind of selection of programmes. It is not that each and every programme is bad. Some of them are good but why should even

one bad programme be there—I cannot understand—when there are ways and means of improving things. In the Administration something like a coterie rule has come about. How can I prove it here on the floor of the House unless you give me six hours to speak? If you can give me six hours, I can bring out the facts, place them before the House and argue out a case precisely. I have got so many papers with me here but how can I use them now? That is why I say, let it go to a commission of enquiry. We have collected materials which we shall place before the commission and it will be for the commission of enquiry to examine them and come to their own conclusions. That is how I view this matter. I know that in the commission of enquiry the Congress would have the majority but I believe in their good sense and in their sense of objectivity.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Please give all the papers to the Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Well, if the hon. Member thinks that the Minister is a substitute for all the Members opposite, I have no quarrel with her but I cannot share her thoughts in this matter. It is horrid thinking, I should say.

Yes; I shall give them to him and also to you, Madam, if you like and to others. But why to the Minister alone? He is not an idol; he is not Shiva or Brahma that we must give everything to him and we should all retire. After all, we are all here to discharge certain responsibilities. That is why I say, 'Don't take it that way that I am bringing this in a partisan manner.' I am a party man; I am a politician but it is not political views that I am expressing. I know the hon. Minister is subtle enough not to indulge in this kind of crudities. Political coloration is given when you give the news, when the news is given out in a manner that is suitable to your party. You pick and choose in such a way that a particular party gets the

advantage of it. The All India Radio gives out the news broadcasts and they give the news in a particular way. You are doing it that way. That is why I say, 'here is something wrong.' Now, it was brought to my notice—I wrote to him because in individual cases I always write—that a dramatist was sacked because of some political report. This is how things happen.

Now, I am glad that the hon. Minister has said that parliamentary coverage would be looked into. It is a good thing; let him look into it, consult Members of Parliament from both sides and see how a good coverage can be made. People do not read newspapers in our country. To bring Parliament nearer to the people, it is necessary that parliamentary coverage is given adequate attention. Today it is not good at all. The whole thing has to be gone into. I have given many cases of injustices done to staff artistes, casual artistes, employees and so on and many cases of nepotism and other things. Sir, we have to go into all these things, the selection of programmes, advisory committees and how they are run, to what extent the real authority is exercised by people who are bureaucrats, who are officials without any particular accomplishment in the line in which they are employed.

Sir, I am very sorry that some hon. Members have misunderstood my position. Mr. Arora was speaking; he wanted to attack me and he did. I do not know whether Dr. Keskar is pleased with that. If he is pleased, then Mr. Arora has done his job well. If he is not pleased, then I must say, Sir, Mr. Arora has misfired. Between them it is for them to tell us whether a good thing has been done.

As far as the amendments are concerned, I am prepared to accept both the amendments. Let the whole thing be thrashed out. Sir, you will see how considerate I am in these matters. I feel that this matter has to be gone into.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What about the amendments?

SHRI A. D. MANI: I would like to press my first amendment but would beg leave of the House to withdraw my second amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

1. "That for the words 'consisting of 45 Members representing both Houses of Parliament' the words 'consisting of Members representing both Houses of Parliament and representatives of cultural interests' be substituted."

*The motion was negatived.*

\*Amendment No. 2 was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

3. "That for the words 'Committee consisting of 45 Members representing both Houses of Parliament' the words 'Commission consisting of Members of Parliament and others' be substituted."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: \*Amendment No. 4 is barred. I shall now put the resolution to vote.

The question is:

"This House is of opinion that Government should appoint a Committee consisting of 45 Members representing both Houses of Parliament to conduct a general review of the working of the All India Radio and to make recommendations for its improvement."

*The motion was negatived.*

# RESOLUTION RE PROHIBITION OF MARRIAGES WHERE THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE AGES OF THE SPOUSES IS MORE THAN FIFTEEN YEARS

SHRIMATI CHANDRAVATI LAKHANPAL (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I move the following resolution:

"This House is of opinion that Government should bring forward suitable legislation to prohibit marriages between persons where the difference between the ages of the spouses is more than fifteen years."

उप सभापति महोदय, आज जिस प्रस्ताव को रखने के लिए मैं आपके सम्मुख खड़ी हुई हूँ वह सामाजिक सुधार के क्षेत्र में एक अत्यंत आवश्यक और महत्वपूर्ण प्रस्ताव है। आज तक जितने भी समाज सुधार के कानून पास हुए हैं उनमें यह अपना एक विशेष स्थान रखता है। श्रीमन्, तेरह चौदह वर्ष हुए, जब से भारत स्वतंत्र हुआ, हमने अपने समाज को समाजवादी आदर्शों . . .

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Which Ministry will be listening to this. Labour?

श्रीमती चन्द्रावती लखनपाल . . . पर ढालने का संकल्प किया था और तब से हमने इस सदन के अंदर ही कई समाज सुधार संबंधी विधान पास किए। समाज के अन्दर से विषमताओं को दूर करने के लिए हमने एक नहीं अनेक विधान इस सदन के सम्मुख रखे हैं और पास किए हैं—पुरुष के लिए एक पत्नीत्व की अनिवार्यता, विशेष स्थिति में स्त्री और पुरुष दोनों के लिए संबंध विच्छेद की सुविधा, स्त्री को पैतृक सम्पत्ति में अधिकार तथा स्त्री को अभिभावकता का तथा गोद लेने का अधिकार, इत्यादि इत्यादि अनेकानेक समाज सुधार के कानून हमने सामाजिक विषमताओं को हटाने के लिए इस सदन में पास करके अपनी मुहर लगायी है। आज का