

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.

I may also point out to my hon. friend what Mr. Ajoy Mukherjee wrote to me and how it was a change in the stand taken by the West Bengal Ministry that has been responsible for the prolongation of this discussion....

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Mine is a straightforward question. I would only like to know whether he will have further consultation with a representative of the non-Congress Government, whether it is Mr. Mukherjee or Mr. Chatterjee or Mr. Banerjee.

SHRI K. K. SHAH : To answer this, my hon. friend, Mr. Banerjee, ought to permit me to read a portion of the letter, so that he will be satisfied that, so far as this side is concerned possible effort was made to come to terms and to accommodate their point of view. How we took our stand is based on the letter of Mr. Ajoy Mukherjee. He had said in a letter dated the 6th May, 1967, to the Prime Minister :—

"If the contents of the proposed radio talk by a Minister of a State Government appeared to be objectionable to the Station Director, should he have the right to censor the speech or should it be sent to the Central Minister concerned for his opinion. I agree that if an objection is there, then the question will be decided by the Central Minister in consultation with the State Minister."

But unluckily, Mr. Somnath Lahiri did not accept that, and that is how the discussions have been prolonged.

SHRI RANGA : May I suggest that the letter, from which the hon. Minister quoted just now, be placed on the Table of the House ?

SHRI K. K. SHAH : I can leave it on the Table of the House.

SHRI NATH PAI : We want it to be laid on the Table and not left on the Table.

SHRI K. K. SHAH : I will lay it on the Table.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Despite what the hon. Minister has just stated, the point at issue which emerged after the talks between him and the representative of the State Government was whether in the case

of a State Minister who wishes to make a broadcast, if there was anything which the Station Director considered to be objectionable in the text, the final arbitrament or the final choice was to be with the Station Director or with somebody of a higher rank, preferably the Minister at the Centre. He says that he had agreed that the Station Director would not have the power of veto and that it would have to come up here. If that is so, may I know, according to him, what is the point of dispute which remains between him and the State Government ?

SHRI K. K. SHAH : The point at dispute is that, according to Mr. Lahiri, the speech of the Minister should be allowed to be broadcast before that question is decided by the Central Minister, and I say that it cannot be done once you accept the code of conduct; the implementation of the code cannot be left only to the speaker on the AIR; if an objection is raised, the Minister of Information and Broadcasting here and the State Minister can discuss and if we do not agree, even the Chief Minister and the Prime Minister can discuss.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : There is one point to be clarified. Now, it is really a thing of the past and it is a matter of historical interest only; if what he says is correct, is it not an admission that on the previous occasion on which the dispute originally arose, the Station Director had interfered and prevented that broadcast from being made and he had acted wrongly ?

SHRI K. K. SHAH : No, even under the suggestion made, the Station Director has the right to point to the Minister concerned that it is not in accordance with the code of conduct.....

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : He can point out but not prevent the broadcast from being made.

SHRI K. K. SHAH : Before he could refer it to me, Mr. Subodh Banerjee refused and cancelled the broadcast. I am sorry that he has not read the whole thing.

SHRI MANUBHAI PATEL : May I know whether there was such a code followed only for Bengal or it was followed for all other States ? May I also know whether

in other States where non-Congress Ministries were in power they had refused in that manner?

**SHRI K. K. SHAH :** This was a code applicable to all. I am very happy to say that all the States have accepted, and on the question of implementation which arose in the case of Bengal, all have agreed, and I am grateful to them.

**SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM :** An important question arises out of this. Is the broadcasting department the private property of the Central Government? What is the meaning of giving a right to the Station Director to object to a speech to be made by a Minister of the State? Is it the private property of the Central Government where a State Minister who has to broadcast has to conform to a particular code of their own conduct? I think the matter deserves better consideration.

**SHRI K. K. SHAH :** My hon. friend is overlooking the fact that this property is of the entire country and, therefore, what is acceptable to the entire country can be the only rule.

**श्री जार्ज फर्नेंडीज :** कौन तय करेगा ?  
क्या स्टेशन डायरेक्टर तय करेगा ?

**MR. SPEAKER :** Next question.

**SHRI K. K. SHAH :** Is it my hon. friend's contention that in any set-up to whichever party it may belong, there will be no officers carrying out the orders of that Government?

**MR. SPEAKER :** I have already gone to the next question. If the hon. Minister goes on answering, there will be no end to it.

#### DEMOLITION OF BORDER PILLARS BY PAKISTANIS

\*272. **SHRI NIHAL SINGH :**

**SHRI RAM KISHAN GUPTA :**

Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that Pakistan authorities have demolished most of the border pillars demarcating India-Pakistan borders in the Nadia district; and

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (**SHRI B. R. BHAGAT**) : (a) In May 1965, Pakistani nationals removed some of the international boundary pillars on the India-Pakistan border in the Nadia District of West Bengal.

(b) The matter was discussed with the Pakistan authorities at various levels. The Directors of Land Records and Surveys of West Bengal and East Pakistan in their meeting held on the 25th and 26th September, 1967 at Dacca, agreed to replace the damaged and missing pillars on the East Pakistan-West Bengal border including the Nadia District region.

**श्री निहाल सिंह :** क्या मंत्री महोदय बताने की कृपा करेंगी कि जिस समय यह सीमा स्तम्भ उखाड़े जा रहे थे उस समय वहाँ पर हमारे सीमा रक्षक थे या नहीं थे? यदि थे तो उन्होंने उस समय क्या कार्रवाई की?

**श्री ब० रा० भगत :** सामने अगर उखाड़े गए होते तो जरूर वे कार्रवाई करते। जाहिर है कि चुपके से इनको उखाड़ दिया गया था।

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA :** May I know whether it is a fact that not only in the Nadia border but in the border of Tripura, Assam and some other parts of West Bengal, such things have been done? I would particularly mention the Belonia sector of Tripura, the Goalpara area of Assam and the Cooch-Behar area of West Bengal, and in these areas there have been occasions where such pillars have been removed. There are innumerable occasions, particularly in the months of October and November when there had been innumerable infiltrations by armed Pakistani people into these three areas. May I know whether this is a fact, and if so, what steps have been taken by Government to prevent such Pakistani infiltration and such removal of pillars in other areas also?

**SHRI B. R. BHAGAT :** The main question specifically refers to the Nadia district, and I have already supplied the information. If the hon. Member wants to know how many such incidents have happened in other areas, then I would like to have notice of the question.