

LOK SABHA

Monday, November 27, 1967/Agrahayana
6, 1889 (Saka)

*The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the
Clock.*

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

NOMINATION OF HIGH COMMISSIONER-
DESIGNATE TO U.K.

+

*270-A. SHRI N. DANDEKER :

SHRI M. R. MASANI :

Will the Minister of EXTERNAL
AFFAIRS be pleased to state :

(a) whether Government are aware that
Shri S. S. Dhawan, High Commissioner-
designate to the United Kingdom in an
article in *Blitz* of the 29th January, 1966,
inter alia wrote the following :

"Nehru had not anticipated British
treachery. He did not realise that Britain
was still an implacable foe of a strong
and United India....As regards Britain,
I see no future for Indo-British friend-
ship, because reluctantly I have come to
the conclusion that Britain does not re-
gard the existence of a strong India in
her interests and she will shed no tears
if India is disrupted"; and

(b) whether in view of these views of
Shri Dhawan, Government will reconsider
his appointment as High Commissioner to
the United Kingdom ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
(SHRI B. R. BHAGAT) : (a) Yes, Sir.
The quotations which are, in fact, two dis-
tinct quotations, have been taken from a
lengthy article entitled, "Has India's foreign
policy failed?" The first is in the context
of late Prime Minister Nehru's Kashmir
policy, and the second, from the concluding
portion of the article, with particular re-
ference to Indo-Pakistani relations.

(b) In the context in which the quota-
tions appear, Government see no reason to

re-consider an appointment which has been
made with the agreement of the British
Government.

SHRI N. DANDEKER : May I know
whether (a) it is a fair presumption that
one sends persons in ambassadorial posts
with the object of maintaining, developing
and fostering friendly relationship between
this country and the country to which that
person is accredited ?

(b) Is it a fact that the High Commis-
sioner-designate is Chairman of an organi-
sation known as the Blitz National Forum
in Lucknow and that this particular orga-
nisation as well as the newspaper *Blitz*
is consistently, continuously and bitterly
anti-British ?

(c) may I know whether the High Com-
missioner-designate avowedly believes that
the U.K. has committed treachery against
this country, is the implacable foe of this
country and that there is no future prospect
whatever of establishing Indo-British
friendship, as he himself says ? and

(d) in these circumstances, will Govern-
ment reconsider the designating of this
gentleman as our High Commissioner to
U.K. ?

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINIS-
TER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER
OF PLANNING AND MINISTER OF
EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI
INDIRA GANDHI) : As the Minister of
State has pointed out, these statements were
made by Justice Dhawan at the time of the
Indo-Pakistani conflict. It was soon after
the British Prime Minister had made a
statement saying that India had committed
aggression against Pakistan. I do not think
a man should be judged by an isolated
statement taken out of its context. It is
the totality that matters....

SHRI RANGA : Oh ! Of his personality ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I am
convinced that Justice Dhawan will do a
good job in Great Britain. All the facts
about him were placed before the British
and they have agreed to his appointment.
It will, therefore, not be possible to make

any change. I am sure he will work to strengthen the relationship between India and Great Britain.

Many of us have at some time or another expressed various views. In fact, the whole independence movement was directed against Great Britain.

SHRI RANGA : Did he also take part in the independence movement? Is he a freedom fighter? Has he gone to jail?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : He may not have gone to jail. But he did play a part in it.

So, this does not mean that one sticks to certain attitudes. I am fully convinced, as I said earlier, that his going there will help us to forge new links with different sections of the people, as well as the Government, of Great Britain.

SHRI N. DANDEKER : My questions have not been met. I asked first of all as a question of fact whether he is not Chairman of the Blitz National Forum in Lucknow which Forum is admittedly continuously and persistently anti-British, and so is the newspaper. These are questions of fact concerning which there has been no answer. Secondly, I asked as a question of fact whether or not Mr. Dhawan is presently believing in the proposition that England is our implacable enemy, that there is no possibility of establishing Indo-British friendship that is friendship *vis-a-vis* a country which has been treacherous towards this country. I have had no answers to these.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : My colleague has stated that Justice Dhawan has denied the first point, about the Chairmanship of the Blitz Forum. I have no information about that. He can answer it later. As far as the other matter is concerned, I thought I had already answered that it was said in a particular context. Obviously these are not his views now. Otherwise, he would not be willing to go to that country for the express purpose of strengthening our relations, which is our intention.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : This matter was raised by Mr. Masani in a letter to the newspaper that Mr. Dhawan is a member of the Blitz National Forum, Lucknow. He has categorically denied this.

SHRI HEM BARUA : May I know if the attention of Government has been drawn to the comments in a section of the British press on the appointment of Mr. Dhawan as our High Commissioner in London? The *Guardian* has said—I have read their comment—that by appointing a man who is not known either in Britain or in India to a job that was once held by Mrs. Pandit and Mr. Krishna Menon, India shows that she does not pay the same importance to Indo-British relations which she used to pay once. And the *Time*—I have read their comment also, and it is more funny—says that Mr. Dhawan has no inhibition in the matter of food and drinks, for he is a Punjabi. In the context of that, may I know whether Government think that the Indian cause will be served best by Mr. Dhawan who is a non-vegetarian, as Mr. Piloo Mody says, and among whose qualifications are that (a) he was the President of the Cambridge Students Union, (b) he writes occasionally for the *Blitz* and the *Leader*, and (c) he has no inhibition in the matter of food and drinks, whether Government think that our cause is served best by this gentleman?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Yes. Government do think so, not because of the reasons which the hon. member has mentioned, but because he has a very thorough understanding of our foreign policy and of the trends of various policies followed by other countries. He does not have set views, and I think that he knows the British people and Great Britain sufficiently, as I remarked earlier, to be able to project India's point of view and to create a new understanding. It is true that our previous relations with Britain have left much to be desired, and it is my belief that Mr. Dhawan can help in such a situation.

SHRI R. K. SINHA : May I know from the Minister of External Affairs whether it will be a qualification in future appointments that India or Pakistan, America or United Kingdom should not be criticised if it is in the interests of the patriotic growth of the country? Will it be a qualification that Indian patriotism should not express itself in view of the fact that a certain acceptability has to be worked out with all countries or with the benches opposite? Is it also a fact that Mr. Masani said

that Indians behave like the peons of UAR and Mr. Dhawan wrote an article stating that Mr. Masani had put his party interests above his patriotism? Was this question revoked because of that? These are the questions I would like to put before the Minister of External Affairs.

SHRI RANGA : He has become notorious now.

SHRI R. K. SINHA : He has been a patriot. Ours is a democratic country and everybody has a right to express his opinion freely. I think it should be appreciated. As the Prime Minister has explained in a particular context we may express ourselves in a different manner. Actually I can remind the hon. Members of the tempo that was prevailing in this House itself after Mr. Wilson's statement on the Indo-Pakistan situation, and so, if Mr. Dhawan has written in a certain manner in a particular article, that should not be taken as a permanent view. It is the personal opinion expressed at a particular moment of time.

As for the second part of the question, that Mr. Dhawan has written an article in which he said that Mr. Masani put his party interest before the country, that is a fact.

श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डीज : अध्यक्ष महोदय, चूँकि हमेशा यह टोका आती है कि जो हिन्दुस्तान के राजदूतों की नियुक्ति होती है विदेशों में उन में कहीं हारे हुए मंत्री, कहीं पुराने नौरुशाह, कहीं ऐसे लोग कि जिन के बारे में बाद में यहाँ पर सवाल आ जाते हैं, ऐसे लोग रखे जाते हैं तो इस हालत में सरकार इस बात पर विचार करने के लिए तैयार है क्या कि किसी भी राजदूत की नियुक्ति करने के पहले उसके बारे में इस सदन की सम्मति ले और सारे मालूमात इस सदन को दे (व्यवधान) दुनिया के मुल्कों में क्या होता है जरा आप उस का अध्ययन करिए। और अगर अध्यक्ष महोदय, सदन के सामने आने में बहुत ही तकलीफ होती है तो विदेश नीति की एक अलग समिति बनाने का काम करें जैसे इस सदन की दूसरी समितियाँ हैं और उस समिति की सम्मति ले

कर उसके बाद फिर हिन्दुस्तान के राजदूत की नियुक्ति करें ?

श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी : आप को मालूम है कि यहाँ पर कितनी रायें अलग-अलग और विभिन्न हैं विदेश नीति के बारे में और अगर कोई भी समिति बने जिस में सब विरोधी दलों से उन के सदस्य हों या उनके प्रतिनिधि हों तो कभी भी वह एक राय से नहीं हो सकेगी

श्री मधु लिमये : एक राय क्यों ? बहुमत से कर सकते हैं। लेकिन समिति के सामने रखिए। (व्यवधान) अध्यक्ष महोदय, ठीक जवाब देना चाहिए। जार्ज फर्नेन्डीज ने यह नहीं कहा था कि एक राय होनी चाहिए। आप जरा प्रश्न को समझ लीजिए न ?

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : मैं प्रश्न को बहुत अच्छी तरह से समझती हूँ।

श्री मधु लिमये : तो उन्होंने कहा एकमत से होना चाहिए ?

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : अध्यक्ष महोदय जो राजदूत जाता है उस का कार्य है कि जो भारत की सरकार है उस की क्या नीति है उस को वहाँ पर समझाये। इसलिए यह कार्य केवल सरकार के द्वारा ही हो सकता है।

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, फर्नेन्डीज के प्रश्न का जवाब नहीं दिया उन्होंने।

MR. SPEAKER : Constitution of a committee on foreign affairs.

श्री मधु लिमये : उन्होंने यह नहीं कहा था कि एक राय से समिति का फैसला हो। उन्होंने केवल यह कहा है कि राजदूत की नियुक्ति करने के पहले या तो पार्लियामेंट किसी संसदीय समिति के सामने आये जैसे अमेरिका में सिनेट में आते हैं और उस में पता चलता है कि यह आदमी लायक है या नहीं।

श्री आबं फर्नेन्डीज : ईंग्लिस्तान की सरकार की सम्मति ले कर भेजते हैं मगर यहां के लोगों की सम्मति नहीं लेना चाहते ।

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : Sir, we follow the parliamentary system where the functions of the executive are well defined and of the legislature are also well-defined. Here, we have checks and balances. The presidential system which the hon. Member has quoted, is entirely a different system which prevails there. Therefore, to apply, without going into the entire constitution as it is, a thing which prevails in an entirely different system, will make it completely confused.

श्री मधु लिसये : अरे, अब हाउस आफ कामन्स में भी कमेडियां बनने लगी हैं ।
(ब्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे क्षमा करेंगे मंत्री महोदय । मंत्री महोदय संसदीय प्रणाली के अन्दर क्या सुधार हो रहे हैं उस के बारे में बिल्कुल जानकारी नहीं रखते । हाउस आफ कामन्स के आधार पर हम चल रहे हैं न अध्यक्ष महोदय ? (ब्यवधान) तो फिर वही प्रश्न मैं पूछूँ ? मैं तो दूसरा पूछना चाहता हूँ ।

श्री ब० रा० भगत : माननीय सदस्य ने कोई ऐसी बात नहीं कही है जिससे पता चलता कि उस की जानकारी नहीं, उन्होंने अमेरिकन सिस्टम की बात कही ।

SHRI PILOO MODY : It is generally known that the post of the High Commissioner in the United Kingdom has been going abegging for several months, and the Government of India in their wisdom have not been able to find a suitable incumbent for the job. Am I to understand that in this country of over 500 million people, all that they could find to represent us in the United Kingdom was an occasional correspondent of *Blitz*? (Interruption).

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I do not think that this question requires any answer.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : Of late, posts are being given to superannuated persons. May I know if there are any special reasons for appointing superannuated persons to the diplomatic missions in the United Kingdom or the work has become so unimportant that no younger man is considered suitable?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : The work is important. But here it is not a question of age, it is a question of people who understand and are able to interpret our policies and to strengthen the bonds with other countries.

DR. RANEN SEN : Sir, from these questions and answers it is quite evident that a section of hon. Members of this House are quite annoyed with the Government of India for appointing one gentleman who at a certain time when India was in danger had uttered certain comments or criticism about the United Kingdom Government. Is it the criterion of the Government of India to appoint only stooges of certain countries as ambassadors of India?

SOME HON. MEMBERS : *rose*—

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Madhok—

DR. RANEN SEN : Sir, I want an answer to my question whether it is the policy of the Government of India to appoint only stooges of certain countries as ambassadors of India.

MR. SPEAKER : No answer is necessary.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : Sir, ambassadors are appointed in various countries so that they should be able to present the country's case and build public opinion elsewhere in favour of the country. They are also meant to see that the problems of the people of this country who are living there—in the United Kingdom it is quite a large number—are properly tackled. Is it a fact that for the last so many years there have been complaints after complaints about the behaviour and conduct of the people who have been holding the post of High Commissioner in the United Kingdom which has the highest number of personnel—about 1400 people—working there? In that context, may I know whether the Government of India could not find a man, even if they had to find one

from their own party, who could deal with the people, who could command the confidence of the people and also of the Government to which he is accredited, instead of finding a man who is known for his views and who is, for that matter, even a *persona non grata* in the country to which he has been sent?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: They would never have agreed to his appointment had he been a *persona non grata*. May I use this opportunity, Sir, to answer one or two other questions which were asked in between? I think it was Shri Fernandes who said that we got the permission of the British Government but not of this Parliament. Whenever an ambassador or a High Commissioner is appointed it is the custom to take an agreement from the country to which he is to be accredited just as our agreement is sought when their ambassador or High Commissioner comes to us. I should also like to take this opportunity of stating clearly that Shri Dhawan has never been anti-British. He has always advocated Indo-British friendship on honourable terms. As I pointed out, it was on this specific occasion that he expressed particular opinion at a time when everybody was excited about this matter. This article was one of the series of articles that he wrote. It did not contain only comments against the British, he also praised the British for playing a progressive role in India and said that side by side with her imperialist role there were enough people in Britain and the British Government who had supported Indian independence and who continuously supported the policies of the Indian Government. In fact, just as we are blamed by both the extremes, the Communists thinking that we are Swatantrites and the Swatantrites thinking that we are Communists, similarly, in his case also, for one of his articles he was, at one time, called "a paid agent of British imperialism" by a Moscow Journal. Anybody who expresses his opinion honestly always seems to get into trouble with one side or another.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: I do not know this gentleman from Adam and I do not know his doings in India because I do not read *Blitz*. But may I ask if it would be desirable to send persons as

foreign ambassadors who are not liked by a large section of the House?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Well, this is a very difficult question. Until you see his working, you cannot really decide what type of work he is capable of doing. In my previous answer I did not fully reply to the question of Shri Madhok, when he spoke about the large Indian population there. I must say that we appreciate what he said, because this was one of the factors which weighed with us in selecting this person, because he would be able to help with a large number of Indian emigrants there, as he knows their language and as he has been in touch with the problem for quite some time.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: This is not an answer to my question. I asked whether it is desirable to send as our representative a person who is not liked by a section of the House, which means also a section of the public.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH: The sentiments expressed by Shri Dhawan....

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: Is that gentleman replying to my question?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I thought I had replied to it, Sir. We had sought the agreement of the British Government and that agreement has come. It would not be proper now....

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member was referring to the views of a large section of the people in India.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I am not prepared to believe that a large section of the House is against him. I want to say that I doubt if we will find any really effective person about whom some section of the House will not object. Of course, if we send somebody who has no opinions, probably everybody will accept that person. But, then, that person will not be able to do his job effectively.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH: Shri Dhawan is an eminent jurist and his sentiments are that of a patriot and a realist. Is it a disqualification for a person for appointment as Ambassador if he is a patriot and realist?

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : Is it a question ?

MR. SPEAKER : He has repeated what the Minister has stated.

SHRI NATH PAI : Mr. Speaker, it seems, like the office of Governor, the office of our envoys, Ambassadors, High Commissioners etc., also is being reduced in its value by being used as a matter of patronage. I would not say that what qualifications these days are necessary to be a Governor, but we have instances of Congress candidates defeated in elections being sent as Ambassadors. Now, is it fair to this country, or the countries to which such Ambassadors are being accredited, that people who were rejected by their people are to be sent as Ambassadors? What exactly are the criteria that are being evolved as qualifications to represent this country, may I know? It used to be said during the tenure of office of her distinguished father that the highest ambition of an Indian envoy who went abroad was not to project the image of this country, such as it is, but to return to India with a duty-free Ambassador car, a General Electric refrigerator and a Grundig radio-gram. Has there been any change in this? Is there any change in the desires or ambitions of our envoys?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I submit that this is a very unfair remark to make about our Ambassadors abroad. As far as the other part of Shri Nath Pai's question is concerned, I think I have already answered it a number of times just now.

SHRI HEM BARUA : I can give you the name of the Ambassador, if you want.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : If he has any specific instances, he may bring them to our notice. But it has nothing to do with Shri Dhawan's appointment.

SHRI NATH PAI : Why is she referring to Shri Dhawan? I have not referred to him.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is about Shri Dhawan's appointment.

SHRI NATH PAI : But in a supplementary she cannot take shelter behind the fact....

MR. SPEAKER : That was the original question. And this is the question hour.

SHRI NATH PAI : I know this is the question hour. That is why I am on my legs. Otherwise, how could I? I would like to know what exactly are the criteria that the Prime Minister is trying to evolve and to what extent it is true that defeated men are appointed. This is very serious. Unless she provokes me, I would not name the man.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Sir, the difficulty is that they bob up immediately, even before one starts.....

(*Interruption*). As far as the second part of Shri Nath Pai's question is concerned, that is, about ambassadors in general, I have said that it is a very unfair statement to make. If anybody has any specific allegations to make, he can certainly come and speak to me about that. As far as the first part is concerned, Shri Dhawan is not a defeated candidate. In fact, although he took part in the independence struggle, he was not and has not been a member of the Congress Party, as far as I know.

SHRI HEM BARUA : What about Shri Raj Bahadur? He was also defeated.... (*Interruption*).

श्री एस० एम० जोशी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारी विदेशी नीति के लिये यह कहा जाता है कि वह ज्यादातर लोगों को पसन्द है, ज्यादातर लोग यह मानते हैं कि हमारी नीति नान-एलाइनमेन्ट की है। ऐसी हालत में जब किसी राजदूत की नियुक्ति होती है तो क्या यह जरूरी नहीं है कि जो दूसरे विरोधी दल हैं उन से सलाह मशविरा कर के नियुक्ति की जाये, ताकि जैसा दादा के सवाल के जवाब में कहा गया कि हम लोगों को पता नहीं है कि बहुत सारे लोगों को मन्जूर नहीं है, ऐसी स्थिति न आये। तो कन्सलटेशन्स कर के ऐसी नियुक्ति हो, क्या इस के लिये प्रधान मन्त्री जी राजी हो जायेंगी।

AN hon. MEMBER : No.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : This is not practical.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : The appointment of Shri Dhawan has been defended by saying that the article was an isolated one. May I know in this context whether Shri Dhawan is the Chairman of the Indo-Soviet Cultural Society, UP Branch, and whether he had been writing regularly for years in the *National Herald* under the name of Sanjaya anti-British articles? Is it not a fact that during his 20 years' career in the past he had systematically been conducting anti-British activities? May I know whether the Government is prepared to look into the activities of this gentleman for the last 20 years to see to what extent he had been acting as anti-British and thereafter whether they would like to reconsider their decision?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I have already replied to this by saying that Shri Dhawan is not anti-British or pro-Soviet. Supporting the Government's policies towards the Soviet Union is not being anti-British; in fact, sometimes, Britishers also support the Soviet Union.

SOME Hon. MEMBERS : rose—

MR. SPEAKER : We have spent half an hour on this question. I know, everyone wants to ask only one question but I do not think it is proper for me to go on with this, Shri Banerjee.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : From the various questions it appears that some people are unhappy because he had written certain articles said to be anti-British. Every Indian was anti-British at one time. I would like to know whether instructions have been issued to Shri Dhawan that while holding this office in the UK he would counteract the vicious propaganda that is launched by the British imperialists against India and in favour of Pakistan.

MR. SPEAKER : I think, we should do one thing. Your question should be answered by Professor Ranga and Professor Ranga's question should be answered by somebody else! I think, that will be very fair!

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : This is a pertinent question. Let the Prime Minister answer.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU : My question is slightly different.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : These instructions are issued to all our ambassadors and not just to one, obviously.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU : Has the Government considered the propriety of appointing a Judge of the High Court to a post like this which implies that you are rewarding his services? If this Judge was so eminent, as was suggested, why would it not have been more appropriate to appoint him to the post of Chief Justice?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I cannot think, why this question is raised? The question is not whether any Judge is good or not. All of them cannot be appointed Chief Justices. I can assure the House that it is not a question of finding a job for a retired judge. It was a question of finding a person who fitted into the job, which is not only a diplomatic one but which needs other attributes. As Shri Madhok rightly pointed out, there is a very special problem in England with regard both to Indian students and a large number of Indian immigrants. That is just as important a part of the High Commissioner's functioning as it is to create better relations with Britain.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि यह ब्रिटिश हाई कमिश्नर की पोस्ट जो दस महीने से खाली पड़ी रही उस के कारण क्या थे? क्या प्रधान मंत्री महोदय यह नहीं समझतीं कि इस पोस्ट के खाली रहने से दोनों देशों के रिलेशनस में फर्क पड़ता है और काम भी रुकता है? दूसरे क्या यह ठीक है कि श्री चागला पहले हाई कमिश्नर थे जो कि जज थे और उसके बाद दूसरे हाई कोर्टे जज यह बने हैं। माननीय प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा कि चूंकि यह फ्रीडम फाइटर रहे हैं इस लिये उन को बनाया गया है। मैं प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या सिद्धान्त रूप से यह ठीक बात है। कि हाई कोर्टे जज को किसी जगह गवर्नर या अम्बैसेडर बनाया जाये, क्योंकि इस से जुडिशियरी के ऊपर डाइरेक्टली, या इन्डाइरेक्टली कहिये, असर पड़ता है? क्या इस सम्बन्ध में सरकार कोई इंडेपेन्डेंट एन्क्वा-

शरी या कमिशन बिठलायेगी और उस की राय लेंगी कि ऐसा करना ठीक है या नहीं ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : It is no question of any rule about judges being appointed. There have been one or two appointments before. As to the question of the post lying vacant, it was not 10 months, it was less. I do not think this has affected our relationship with Great Britain in any way. We had a very good and competent Deputy High Commissioner there....

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Banerjee.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : Why was the post lying vacant for the last 9 to 10 months ?

MR. SPEAKER : She has answered that. That is why I called Shri Banerjee.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इसका जवाब आना चाहिये ।

MR. SPEAKER : She has answered that.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : May I also add that some persons were not willing to go and that also caused some delay ?

MR. SPEAKER : Next question; Shri Banerjee.

BROADCAST ON INDEPENDENCE DAY

*271. **SHRI S. M. BANERJEE :** Will the Minister of INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that no Minister including the Chief Minister of West Bengal made any broadcast on A.I.R. on the Independence Day this year; and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor ?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRIMATI NANDINI SATPATHY) : (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Owing to differences which arose out of a proposed broadcast by one of the Ministers of the U. F. Government of West Bengal, the Cabinet of that Government decided not to broadcast from A.I.R. Calcutta until the difference was settled. The code was agreed to but the difference on

method of implementation is yet to be resolved.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : This has happened from 1st May, 1967, the May Day. This matter could not be settled and now another Chief Minister has come. Now, they have got a Chief Minister whose broadcast, if he wants to broadcast from A.I.R. Calcutta, will be signed by Mr. Dharma Vira and counter-signed by Mr. Y. B. Chavan. I would like to know whether any action has been taken against the Station Director or he is still there.

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI K. K. SHAH) : The Station Director is still there because the Station Director has done nothing wrong and there is no reason why he should be transferred.

DR. RANEN SEN : He has already been transferred.

SHRI K. K. SHAH : It will be from the 1st of December.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I put this question on the 27th November. Our information is that a particular officer is being transferred, but it seems that he will be transferred after this question is put so that a feeling may not go round the country that he has been transferred because of this question. My question is whether it is a fact that transfer orders have been issued to Mr. Chatterji.

SHRI K. K. SHAH : It is true that Mr. Chatterji, in the course of the usual transfers, will be transferred on 1st December.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Now it is said that the code has been accepted. I would like to know whether another meeting is likely to be held with a representative of the non-Congress Government before finalising this thing, and what action has been taken to report the final action taken after this consultation, to this House.

SHRI K. K. SHAH : May I draw the attention of my hon. friend to the joint statement issued by me and Mr. Lahiri on the 22nd September, 1967, in which Mr. Lahiri has agreed to write to me after consulting the Cabinet on the suggestion made by me. I was awaiting that answer, but, of course, now I cannot await that answer.