

(4) of section 7 of the Industries Development and Regulation Act, 1951. [Placed in library. See No. LT-1631/6g].

NOTIFICATION UNDER THE COMPANIES ACT, 1956

SHRI JAGANNATH PAHADIA :
Sir, I also beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Ministry of Industrial Development Internal Trade and Company Affairs (Department of Company Affairs) Notification G. S. R. No. 1465, dated the 17th May, 1969 (in English), publishing the Cost Accounting Records (Motor Vehicles) Rules, 1969, under sub-section (3) of section 642 of the Companies Act, 1956. [Placed in library. See No. LT-1509/69].

ANNUAL REPORT AND ACCOUNTS (1967-68) OF THE HEAVY ENGINEERING CORPORATION LIMITED, RANCHI AND RELATED PAPERS.

THE MINISTER OF STEEL AND HEAVY ENGINEERING (SHRI C. M. POONACHA): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (1) of section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956, a copy each of the following papers :—

(i) Ninth Annual Report and Accounts of the Heavy Engineering Corporation Limited, Ranchi, for the year 1967-68, together with the Auditors' Report on the Accounts.

(ii) Review by Government on the working of the Corporation.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-1633/69 for (i) and (ii)]

STATEMENT SHOWING THE SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS FOR EXPENDITURE OF THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT (EXCLUDING RAILWAYS) FOR THE YEAR 1969-70.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI JAGANNATH PAHADIA) : Sir, on behalf of Shri P.C. Sethi I beg to lay on the Table a statement showing the supplementary Demands for Grants for expenditure of the Central Government (excluding Railways) for the year 1969-70.

MOTION RE EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PRESENTATION OF THE REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSES ON THE CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1968

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, I beg to move:

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill further to amend the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, be extended up to the last day of the Seventieth (November-December 1969) Session of the Rajya Sabha."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE PRESS COUNCIL (AMENDMENT) BILL 1969

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Mr. Gujral.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : I would like to know from the Minister as to what has become of the recommendations of the Press Advisory Council ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : You know the parliamentary practice. There is nothing before the House. Let him formally move the Bill with his opening remarks.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING AND IN THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI I. K. GUJRAL) : I beg to move:

"That the Bill to amend the Press Council Act, 1965, be taken into consideration."

This is a very simple Bill to validate the Ordinance which the Government issued on 20th June 1969. As you would have noticed from the Ordinance, the only attempt made in this Ordinance and the Bill is to make the term of the Chairman and Members co-terminus. The term of the Chairman was to expire on 3rd July and that of the Members on 15th November 1969. One of the recommendations made by the Advisory Committee of Members of Parliament on the Press Council was that the terms should be made co-terminus. The Government has accepted that recommendation and I fore, the term has been made co-terminus. We have naturally taken a very serious note of the recommendations made by the Advisory Committee and the Government is now in the process of drafting a Bill in the light of the recommendations made.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Have you accepted all the recommendations ?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : It will be difficult to make a categorical statement at this stage whether we have accepted or not. I can only say . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The Minister has said that they are drafting a Bill on the basis of the recommendations of the Committee. Now the recommendations were unanimous, with the Minister in charge at that time being the Chairman of the Committee. All the parties were represented, I was also a Member. They were unanimous. The recommendations were sent to the Government last year. We were given to understand that since they were unanimous recommendations, there would be no difficulty in having them accepted. Till now we are not given a categorical assurance even though they were unanimous recommendations, that they have all been accepted. Only we find a part of the thing is taken up, the one for extension of life. That is not the main thing. A whole number of recommendations have been made, specially in order to give a due place to the working journalists and also the small and medium papers. I now find no reason as to why there is no commitment. The House appointed the Committee on the very serious disclosures made by Shri Ganga Babu and many other Members. The Committee was appointed and we were asked to work overtime from day to day and submit the report. In fact we worked overtime, everybody knows. Then we gave the recommendations. The Minister gave an assurance. Now we find that because of pressures from some press barons they are being tampered with or delayed. Can the Minister make a categorical statement as to what are the difficulties in accepting the unanimous recommendations to which a Cabinet Minister—the Minister in charge—was a party ? Let it be explained. Do I understand that some barons are going to pressurise the Government to the point of delaying the thing which should have been brought before the House last year itself ? Mr. Smha is here. With all respect to him I will say that he was not at that time in charge of that Ministry. He has inherited it. I would like to know from the new Minister why there is delay when a clear assurance was given and we were made to work overtime to expedite the matter ? Certainly the recommendations were good as you will see. It gives a due place to the working journalists and the small and medium papers. Against monopolies some recommendations are there. These have been shelved. Kindly explain why this delay is there over this ?

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION
AND BROADCASTING AND

COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA) : With all respect, may I know why my hon. friend is rattling here and may I know how he has come to this conclusion that we have rejected the proposals ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I have not come to any conclusion. The only conclusion I have come to, which is obvious, is that you have not yet made a categorical statement that you have accepted the recommendations.

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA : If he will have some patience, he will find that that is one of the recommendations we have accepted because in the nature of things it could not be delayed. A Bill is being drafted and when the whole thing will come before the House he will come to know the exact position.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Here was a recommendation by a Committee of the House. Are we not entitled to know...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : What he says is, one of the recommendations could not wait and is being implemented through this Bill. Others are under consideration. There is some point in it.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : We want to know from the Minister, when there was a unanimous recommendation from the Committee and when the working journalists and the small papers are in the frying pan, what is weighing with the Government to delay this matter ? If they are not under the pressure of press barons, let him say so and then we will be satisfied.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : It is very unfair to me that before I could finish the lion, friends have tried to jump to conclusions. Kindly let me have my say and later. If they are not satisfied, then they can say anything they like.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : Unless you say that you are going to accept everything . . .

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : I am not going to say anything like that. I will say in the style which I prefer. The main point is, the Committee was appointed and let me clarify this misimpression that it was a Committee of the House.

[Shri I. K. Gujral] It was not so. It was a Committee appointed by the Government of the Members of Parliament. There is a difference between the two. Then hon. Members need not get upset about anything. So far as the spirit is concerned, the Government has favourably viewed them. I am unable to make a categorical statement at this stage because the very process of bringing forth the Bill involves certain consultations, consultations with the journalists, with those who run the papers, the Press Council and others and it will be unfair on my part . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : On a point of order.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Mr. Gupta, you should have the patience to hear the Minister. You will have your turn to say whatever you like. Nobody is being stopped.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You are in the Chair. It is not consultation. That stage was over. We called witnesses before the Committee but why this consultation again ? He would have seen that witnesses were called.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : I am sorry that my entire speech is being interrupted and it will be appearing disjointed. About the questions asked, I think you have allotted 3 hours for discussion and Mr. Gupta will have sufficient time to have his say and if he is not satisfied after I have explained, let him say what he likes and I will reply in my own way. The main point is that a Committee of the Members was appointed and I must say to the credit of the Committee that they have gone thoroughly into the problem. They have come out with their report which I think is one of the very good reports and I must offer my compliments to the Members who worked on the Committee and gave their time and attention and the report they produced is very respectable but since the very report itself involves that before a legislative measure is being brought before the House, I must go through the process of consulting the journalists, the press owners, the Press Council and all the others concerned, it will be unfair on my part to make a categorical statement just now before that process is completed. Therefore deliberately I am not making an announcement that the Government has or has not accepted in principle. My friend made the point that the Committee had some evidence of these interests and they have come to these conclusions

but please draw a line between the two. The Committee consulted these interests at the stage when they were deliberating over it. Then they came to certain conclusions. It is expected of me and of the Government that I should be able to go to them again with the recommendation of the Committee and obtain their reaction and in the light of the reaction, to come to conclusions and then come before the House with my recommendations on the Bill as to how we look at it. This is the normal procedure which should be followed and it will be correct and I hope this august body does not expect me that I should do anything which is not correct both in procedure and in spirit. In the Press Council, I must say to the credit of the Council and the Members who were functioning in it, by and large the Council has discharged the responsibilities in the way in which we expected. I think the setting up of the Press Council is a turning point in the history of our journalism and in the preservation of the freedom of the press, and since we are all keen that the freedom of the press must be preserved—and freedom of the press is one of the things enshrined in our Constitution—I think there is a very good custodian of the freedom of the press in the Press Council that has been set up. As the House might have noticed from the second annual report which was placed on the Table of this House, the Press Council has discharged its responsibility creditably. Now, whenever an organisation is set up and it grows then, naturally, a stage must come when we must review its growth, try to resolve its difficulties and make such changes as would further strengthen that organisation. I think the Committee of Members of Parliament has done good work in that direction, and when I come up with a detailed Bill in the next session—I hope in the next session—then I think this House will be in a better position to examine the working of the Press Council and their future, and the type of work that is expected of them. In today's context I would (only say this thing—because some debate is going on being initiated by some interested interests in some papers—that to this Government freedom of the press is not a matter of policy only ; it is a matter of commitment. This Government stands committed to the freedom of the press and we are going to preserve it. Since we are the upholders of the Constitution where freedom of the press has been enshrined, we shall see to it that the freedom of the press is preserved in every

sense. Theruibre, if some people choose to use that freedom to criticise us or to tell us that we are not upholding the freedom of the press, I think they are being unfair to us, and I would only say at this stage, Sir, that this Bill is only to amend that part of the original Act whereby the term of office of the members and of the Chairman has been made co-terminus up to 31st March, 1970. I would not like to add much here but, after I have heard the Members, in my own humble way I shall try to meet the points made by them. Thank you, Sir.

The question was proposed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : There is an amendment tabled by Shri Ganeshi Lai Chau-dhary. I do not find him here. So it is not moved. Mr. Lokanath Misra.

SHRI M. N. KAUL (Nominated) : Sir, what is your decision on the scope of discussion on this Bill. Is it limited to the Bill only, or can we discuss the recommendations of the Committee because that point will arise.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M-P. BHARGAVA) : It should mostly be on the amending Bill. That is the usual practice.

SHRI RAJNARAIN (Uttar Pradesh) : "Mostly".

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): Mr. Vice-Chairman, the question that has been put by Mr. Kaul was probably the least expected of him. A person of his experience should not have put this question to the Vice-Chairman to put him into any harassment and to put the House also into harassment.

SHRI M. N. KAUL : I put the ques-tion because I did not want any controversy to crop up during the debate.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : With his experience as Secretary of the Lok Sabha for more than fifteen years and membership in this House for more than three years, if he does not know what to discuss on a Bill, then I am surprised at his experience.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): Come to the point.

SHRI M. N. KAUL : What is the point you are making ?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I shall be making the point. Now I am meeting your point. I shall be making the point after I have met your point.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : After meeting the points re will come to making the point.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Now, Sir, the Minister tried his level best to give an explanation for the delay n accepting the recommendations of the Advisory Committee.

SHRI A. D. MANI : We have not discussed them.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : He is the person to accept them.

SHRI A. D. MANI : But we must discuss* them before he accepts them.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Now, Sir, as indicated by Mr. Mani, the report of the Advisory Committee should really be discussed in this House. That is a \very valid point that Mr. Mani has made, but I do not know whether the Government is prepared to discuss the report of the Advisory Committee hi this House before accepting it. Till today they have not accepted it and we do not know which part of the recommendations are going to be accepted. But one thing, very surprising, has happened in the meantime. The hon. Minister said while moving the Bill that ihey have accepted a part of it and therefore the Ordinance and this Bih. Now, Sir, the recommendations of the Advisory Committee were made available 10 the Minister much before we sat last either in the Rajya Sabha or in the Lok Sabha. There was time for them, if they wanted to accept that particular part of the Committee's recommendations to make the term of the Chairman co-terminus with that of the members of the Council, to bring forward a small Bill. They have got so much used to these Ordinance^s that whenever anything happens it occurs to them first to promulgate an Ordinance. They do not want to face the House with a Bill but they first promulgate an Ordinance when the House is not in session and then present the House with a *fait accompli*- I have been objecting to the promulgation of these Ordinances all through ond I know object to the promulgation of this Ordinance before bringing forward this Bill, because there was time for them to get the Bill passed last session

[Shri Loknath Misra] itself, even if they accepted only on recommendation for the present in the recommendations contained in the report of the Advisory Committee, namely the recommendation to make the term of the Chairman co-terminus with that of the members of the Council.

Now, Sir, when I come to the working of the Press Council, I would like to indicate that it should have proper representation for the working journalists. Along with that I would also like proper representation for the small newspapers. The small newspapers in the country have long been neglected and so are their representatives neglected in the capital city of India. They are neglected in the case of delegations sent to foreign countries; they are neglected in the case of the Press Council as well. Therefore I would plead that in the Press Council the working journalists and the small newspapers must find a place. When they go to amend the Press Council Act according to the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, I hope that at least this point would be taken into consideration and the new Council would include working journalists as well as the representatives of the small newspapers.

SHRI A. D. MANI : On a point of information. Working journalists are included in the Press Council, but the kind of working journalists who are represented there do not represent the profession. I want you to say—I hope you will—that we should have proper representation? nominated to the Press Council.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I quite agree on that point. Since Mr. A. D. Mani is an eminent working journalist himself. I stand corrected. I should like that real working journalists rather than pseudo-journalists should get a place in the Press Council. (Interruptions) I am told that many who have got a place now in the name of working journalists are not working journalists actually. Therefore, proper screening must be made. The panels of names that are submitted for inclusion in the Press Council should be screened properly before the members are included in the Press Council to verify whether they are real working journalists or pseudo working journalists.

Now, Sir, as for the past working of the Press Council, I would like to indicate that I do not consider the work done by the Press Council to be anything signi-

ficant, anything extraordinary.

SHRI A.D. MANI : Waste of money.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Yes, it might be said that it has almost been a waste of money. With the present composition the Press Council does not command the support of the profession as a whole, and therefore I suggested that if the actual working journalists get in, then it would command much better support from the profession as such. In the course of their working for the last three years or more what have they done? If we want to know about the working of a particular organisation or institution we must go into the analysis of their working also. The hon. Minister made a general remark that by and large the work of the Council has been satisfactory. Since the Ministry is responsible for setting up the Council one could always expect the Minister to say by and large it has been satisfactory even if he found that it was unsatisfactory. If he had found it really satisfactory he would have said that the working of the Press Council has been excellent, more than satisfactory. That he has only said that it has been by and large satisfactory goes to prove that it has not satisfied the Minister and since the Press Council still exists he had to say that by and large it has been satisfactory.

Now, Sir, the point that I want to make here is how far this Press Council has been able to tone up the standard of the newspapers. I would like to indicate through you to the hon. Minister and to the House the standard maintained by some of the papers in this country. I can off hand mention two papers at least. One is the *Blitz* and the other is the *Patriot*. The *Patriot* is a pamphlet of falsehood.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Don't stop with the two. Go further; have courage.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : If there is anything true that comes out in the *Patriot* I am prepared to compliment it also. But as it is, I find that the first story, the second story and other main stories that appear in that paper give one the impression that it is only a pamphlet of falsehood, and probably . . .

SHRI A. D. MANI : Perhaps you don't know; there are stories from the other side also.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Which side ?

SHRI A. D. MANI : From that side.
Indicating the Treasury Benches.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : As a journalist you may be knowing.

श्री सुरज प्रसाद (बिहार) : एक पेपर है हिपोक्रेसी का, उसको भी रेफर कीजिए ।

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I do not know whether Mr. Suraj Prasad reads that because there is some affinity between the name *Swaraj* and *Suraj*. Even then I have my doubts whether he reads it because there is so much regimentation in the Communist Party that if he had read *Swirajya* certainly he would have been out of the Communist Party. Therefore a gentleman who does not read *Swirajya* has absolutely no right to say whether it is a paper of hypocrisy or not. I do not know if the gentleman is in a position to read English because he always speaks here in Hindi. I doubt whether he knows English and therefore his remark about my newspaper is something which should not have been in on the floor of the House at least. Now, what I said pained so much Mr. Suraj Prasad who is a Communist. The cat is out of the bag. Mr. Suraj Prasad has his affinity and allegiance to Moscow. Moscow is their dreamland. (*In lions*) You will have your say. Most the place from where they get their directions for the party ideology. Moscow is the place from where they get instructions as to their activity. The source of inspirations of Mr. Suraj Prasad and the Communist Party -and bread and butter of the Communist Party as well as of the *Patriot* are the same—Moscow and the Communist Government of USSR. Naturally we can understand him getting up in defence of the *Patriot*.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M-P. BrlAH.GAVA) : After meeting the point of Mr. Kaul I thought Mr. Lokanath Misra will stick to the amending Bill.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : How can I remain within the ambit of the Bill when there are so many irrelevant interventions ? Now *Blitz* is another paper which is a complete rag. If I had a worse word for it I would not hesitate to use it.

श्री राजनारायण : 'प्रवदा' और 'इज्जत' पर आप आ जायेंगे क्योंकि आप उधर ही जा रहे हैं ।

श्री उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : उस के बाद 'लेबर' पर आ जायेंगे ।

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : But these are papers belonging to this country. The greatest hypocrisy is that these papers draw their money and inspiration from Soviet Russia, yet they are allowed to function, in spite of the Press Council in this country as Indian newspapers. That is the difficulty in this country that the Press Council as well as the Information and Broadcasting Ministry has been allowing such newspapers which are financed, fed and inspired by foreign countries to function here in the name of Indian newspapers. As I said the *Blitz* is another rag. I do not have a worse word for it; or else I would have used it.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Haryana) : What do you think of *Current* ?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I do not read *Current*. If you read *Current*, you can give your reaction; there is no difficulty about that.

Now, Sir, how has the Press Council been able to tone up the standard of the *Blitz* ? The *Blitz* writes anything in favour of Soviet Russia, anything in favour of the Communists. All the same it is allowed to function as an Indian journal. If the Press Council had been helpful in toning up the standards of these newspapers and journals then I could accept the contention of the Minister that the Press Council has done a job. How many times have they called for explanations from these newspapers which are pamphlets of falsehood ? And falsehood, I suppose, is not one of the basic ethics of journalism. If that is so why did not the Press Council deal with these people who are resorting to USSR propaganda and falsehood and nothing else ?

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Tamil Nadu) : It is the same thing.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Yes; they are the same thing.

Now, Sir, the Press Council has to look after the well-being of the Press. I would like to ask the Government whether they have received any information from the Press Council regarding the investment of foreign money in the newspapers here. There was such a demand in both Houses of Parliament regarding foreign investments in some of the newspapers here

[Shri Loknath Misra]

and the Minister in one of the House—I forget now in which House—replied that there was some truth in the comments made that the *Patriot* had either borrowed or surreptitiously got some money from the Russian sources. If that is so, I want to know whether any probe has been conducted by the Press Council into the authenticity or otherwise of the statement and if it is a fact that money has been got from Soviet Russia what has been the recommendation of the Press Council to the Government?

AN HON. MEMBER : Time up.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Are you anxious to speak? You will have your time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : But your time is also limited. You have taken 15 minutes already.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : But I do not talk on irrelevant points.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Out of three hours you can have a certain portion of it only; not the whole of it.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I would like the Press Council to be more compact and I would like a working journalist to become the Chairman of the Press Council rather than one of the jurists. Now, the Government is in the habit of taking jurists for any job, for the chairmanship of anything, any organisation, any institution. This should be discouraged.

I P.M.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh) : They have done a good job.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : They may have done a good job, but we must also encourage journalists to do a good job.

SHRI A. D. MANI : On a point of information, may I ask him whether the Indian Medical Council has a Supreme Court Judge as Chairman or a doctor?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I would like* journalists to come up and take the ultimate responsibility for the Press Council. We must at least stimulate the

feeling among them that they can take over the responsibilities of the Press Council.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : It was the demand and request of the journalists that there should be a high judicial person as Chairman.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I do not know what is the source of Mr. Akbar Ali Khan's information, but as far as I know the reaction of the working journalists is that they would very much like one of them to become the Chairman of the Press Council. If that is not some how acceptable to the Government, I do not know how their thinking is, then it should be a distinguished person from public life, but it should not be a Congressman or any other partyman. As soon as I say that it should be a public man, probably Mr. K. D. Malaviya, a man who was defeated thrice in the Selections, would be dumped on as the Chairman of the Press Council.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : It is time for lunch.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I will take another five minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Please finish it now.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : After lunch I shall finish my speech.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : All right. He needs refuelling—The House stands adjourned till 2 p.m.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at two of the clock, the VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) in the Chair.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, when the House adjourned for lunch I was speaking about the ineffective way in which the Press Council had been functioning. The entire responsibility for the ineffective functioning of the Press Council should be put squarely on the Government, because it does not have adequate powers necessary. Had they the powers they would have been in a position to deal with matters which were their responsibility. Therefore

I feel that the Press Council should be given adequate powers now to deal with lapses on the part of newspaperes and unless that power is given, it would remain ineffective and the toning up of newspapers would remain a far cry.

Now, Sir, the Pres Council had to face certain difficulties in their functioning. One of them was that when they wanted to take some drastic action against a newspaper which had violated the normal ethics of journalism, it was not possible to do so. Since they did not have the powers, what they could do was to call for an explanation and if they could persuade the particular newspaper to send an explanation, that was probably all that could be done under the existing powers. Instead what should be done is to endow them with powers through which they can call for an explanation and if the explanation is not satisfactory, then adequate punishment should be inflicted on the newspaper concerned.

SHRI A. D. MANI : On a point of order, the hon. Member represents the Swantantra Party which stands for freedom. Why do you want to punish newspapers ? They are already punished by the curtailment of newsprint.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What kind of point of order is this ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : There is no point of order.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat) : Exactly similar to what you do. You have taught him.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I want that the newspapers in this country should enjoy the maximum freedom possible, but there are rags in this country which resort to yellow journalism and antinational activities through journals and newspapers. That is what I always want. For the safety and security of the country, you need certain restrictions, and in the name of the freedom of the press you cannot go on repeating in your newspapers in the name of independence of newspapers what *Izvestia* or *Pravda* goes on writing in Russia. Therefore, the Press Council should at least have the power to punish people and take them to task who violate the journalistic ethics and get the apology published in the concerned newspaper. That is the last that can be done. Now, Sir, I was

talking about the inclusion of working journalists. I want to make it very specific here that one who really works as a journalist, who is in the profession of journalism directly, should qualify to be a member. There should be a roll maintained by the Press Registrar. If it is maintained by the Press Registrar, there would be no difficulty in knowing who is an actual journalist and who is a pseudo-journalist* who gets into the Press Council in the guise of or in the name of journalism.

The last point I want to make is very important in the present context. Mr. Gujral, I saw in the newspapers, has made a statement regarding the freedom of newspapers in the country, as distinct and separate from their independence. He has given a new shift that the press should be free in this country without independence. Of course, I was feeling that way. The press in this country is so guided by the Administration that when it suits them they call it free and when it does not suit them, when they start writing against a certain policy of the Government, they say that the independence has been lost. Now, if newspapers in the country are only to take guidance from a All India Radio, there would be nothing left in the columns of newspapers, except the speeches of Mrs. Gandhi. Everything else would be blacked out. That we do not want in this country. We want both points of view to get publicised in the newspapers. So, what I am trying to stress is that the Government should not take the view that things which are critical of them, which go against their policy should be totally blacked out, or else they would dub newspapers as having lost their independence. Newspapers should have the real independence, real freedom to state whatever they feel like about a matter. Now, the Prime Minister said that the press in the country is hostile to her. What does she mean by that ? Indirectly it means that she wants the press to come round to her point of view. They have such a lot of patronage in their hands that . . .

SHRI P. C. MITRA (Bihar) Has she no freedom to express her opinion ?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : She has the freedom.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : You will not understand it by sitting there. Sometimes you depend upon her "Meherbani" for your ticket and so you will not understand it.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : There are other things also involved in it. There is the patronage which the Government holds and which the Prime Minister holds in her hands and it is the advertisement. Suppose a small newspaper is deprived of its advertisement, then naturally it will die out. Once they hear from the Prime Minister that those who become hostile to the point of view held by the Prime Minister would not be patronised, there will be no freedom in this country. Now, I suppose the publicity department of the Information and Broadcasting Ministry might be distributing patronage through advertisements and many newspapers in this country very much depend upon their advertisements. So, if they utilise advertisements as a tool for bringing round all the newspapers in this country to their point of view, it would be a very bad for the country. Now, there has been a wholesale infiltration by communists into the Congress. The day may come when the Congress, which is a democratic party, may not remain so democratic in its outlook. That day would be a very bad day for the country, since the entire press is kept under through this lack of patronage or through the surreptitious means which is in the hands of the Government and the Prime Minister. Therefore, there should be absolutely no attempt on the part of the Government to influence the press.

Thank you.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Mr. Vice-Chairman, before I proceed with some of the points which I wish to mention, I would like to refer to one of the point which my hon. friend, Shri Lokanath Misra, mentioned. He mentioned about the freedom of the press and the distinction that is being made. I hope there can be no difference of opinion about the freedom of the press which it should maintain, and the object of the Press Council Act, which was passed, is to establish a Press Council for the purpose of preserving the freedom of the press and of maintaining and improving the standard of newspapers in India. The question really is, I agree with him when he says that Government should not interfere with the freedom of the press. I agree that Government have the power to interfere with the freedom of the press, but that power should be used the least and all precautions should be taken to see that Government do not interfere with the freedom of the press. But I hope he will not forget that there is a bigger thing,

the money power, the joint stock companies the industries and so on, which control the newspapers, which also curb the freedom of the press, which do not allow those papers to express their views. Of course those papers are free whenever they want to say anything about Viet Nam. They can say anything about foreign affairs. But when it comes to the jute industry, steel industry sugar industry or the budget, then they are bound down by the hidden hands of those people. They cannot express their opinion as journalists, they have not got full freedom there.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY (Tamil Nadu) : What has ownership got to do with that ?

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: I will just come to that. As a matter of fact we are proud of the traditions of Indian journalism. When we were fighting the Britishers, our newspapers played a heroic role in the national awakening. The difficulty is, after independence what happened ? When the economic struggle started, those were the people who controlled the papers. What is the present position of the press in India ? I hope you will yourselves judge whether they are really free papers or not.

The present position is that between 1960 and 1965 the total circulation of common ownership newspapers rose by 54.9 per cent—that is, when there is a chain of newspapers. In 1964 these units accounted for 67.8 per cent of the total circulation of all dailies in the country; the next year it was 68.4 per cent; and in 1966 it was as much as 73.6 per cent. These chain newspapers are controlled by the stock Exchange and the business people. They control these papers. Do you think that they really represent the public opinion in the country ? When industry is controlled by a few hands, when all these things are done by a minority of people, do you think that they represent the view of the vast masses of people in the country ?

In this connection I would like to refer to what Prime Minister Nehru said :

" I am unable to understand how a small group represents the freedom of the Press although it may not be interfered with by Government or anything. But surely the power of money itself is a very important element which interferes with freedom and so many other things."

He further said :

"A newspaper is a big thing, a big concern, big industry by itself. But in India we have the interesting fact that the newspaper is not an industry by itself but is owned by industry which is a different thing. 'The *New York Times* is a mighty newspaper, a great newspaper. By itself it is a great newspaper, and because it is great newspaper, it is a great industry too."

But here the newspapers are controlled by other industries.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY : Except two papers which are controlled by big business, the other papers are all there for a very long time, and they have played an important role during the 104,2 movement.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: I will come to that, Mr. Mariswamy. The present position is, who controls them ? A few persons control them. They are trying to control two things: one is economic power, and the other is with publicity concentrated they can change the minds of the people. That is why we are fighting against this monopoly.

Here according to this report, between 1960 and 1965 the total circulation of common ownership newspapers rose by 54.9 percent. In 1964 these units accounted for 67.8 per cent of the total circulation of all dailies in the country; the next year for 68.4 per cent and in 1966, the year under report, for as much as 73.6 per cent. The significance of these figures will be evident when it is seen that in 1964 there were 63 common ownership units as against only 57 in the reporting year—because the other papers were trying to get hold of them; the number of the chain was becoming less as it happened in England—while the circulation of dailies commanded by these was 51.98 lakhs and 53.41 lakhs respectively. It means that they try to control the publicity media.

Again, according to the Registrar of Newspapers, 26.07 lakhs or 85.5 per cent of the total daily circulation in the four metropolitan cities of Delhi, Bombay, Calcutta and Madras is controlled by common ownership units, eight of which together account for 66 per cent, the fallacy in this calculation will be seen from the fact that two newspaper empires—those are the *Jains* and the *Goenkas*—control about 28 per cent of the total circulation all metropolitan dailies, and if the Birla empire and the *Stateman* are added, the percentage rises to about 40. The percentage commanded by Big Business

has increased considerably despite the increase in overall circulation as well as number of newspapers, according to the Registrar of newspapers.

Coming separately to English and Hindi dailies, so far as English dailies are concerned

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Di readership very much depend upon the capital invested ?

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : The bigger the paper the bigger the circulation.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : You might put it the other way. The more popular the paper the bigger the circulation.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: The question here is, public he hands of whom ? Those who have got the money. The person who has got more money through industry and everything certainly he will have more avenues of giving better material. A poor man, how can he get better material ?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: You are also a poor man. How do you have a lot of material ? You are speaking so many things.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : This material is from the library.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : As far as Mr. Misra is concerned money has no power.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: So far as English dailies are concerned, eleven common ownership units with 18 dailies command 80 per cent of the total circulation of all dailies in India. Of these six alone control 66 per cent and the other five only 14 per cent. In 1965 these six had controlled only 64.26 per cent. Even here the *Express* group, the *Times of India* group and the *Statesman* group among them controlled 43.5 per cent in 1966 as against only 42.9 per cent in the previous year.

Among Hindi newspapers, 10 common ownership units with 18 dailies control 60.1 per cent of the total circulation of all Hindi dailies which number 85 in all. Here again two Big Business newspapers *Nav Bharat*, *Times* and *Hindustan*—control 31.6 per cent of the total, while four other common ownership units share 45.6 per cent. In Bengali, it is the same thing, I would not like to repeat.

[Shri Krishna Kant]

The hon. Member said that they give better material. Who will give better material? A person who has got better material power. That is why we say let monopoly in newspapers be curbed. That is why we wanted the price page schedule. It was cut down. We wanted the competition to grow. But our friends said that competition should not grow. They do not want competition. If competition is there and some restrictions are there . . .

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Probably you are so much one-track minded that you do not understand even the explanation, even the analysis.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : You mean by competition free competition to even curb the poor man. What is happening even now in England? What is happening is that the bigger newspapers are eating away the small newspapers. You want freedom for the bigger newspapers, for the bigger fish, to eat the smaller fish. Your concept of freedom is that the smaller man, the common man, the weaker man, the man suffering, the man miserable, he has no place and he must go because he is not a good man or he is not a competent man.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : It is *laissez faire* that he wants.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : It is not / *tissez faire*. The man must be in a position to manage things. If an incompetent person is placed in that position then where is the efficiency? Then he has to go to the wall.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : How to give opportunity to one to prove his efficiency so that he can flower?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Mr. Gujral, instead of Mrs. Aruna Asaf Ali drawing Rs. 31 lakhs from Soviet Russia and investing it in the *Patriot*, let the Government of India, let Mr. Gujral, give the money to her and we shall be very happy about it.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : I will come to that aspect. But I do not know about the financial aspect.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : In the other House, the Minister of Finance has replied to a question saying that Mrs. Aruna Asaf Ali has invested Rs. 31 lakhs. Has there been any investigation as to what are the sources of Mrs.

Aruna Asaf Ali coming into possession¹¹ of such a huge amount of money? She calls her self a socialist and what about her getting this money and investing it in her name in the *Patriot*?

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : I do not know.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : (बिहार) : कौन कहता है कम्युनिस्ट और सोशलिस्टों के पास पैसा नहीं है ? श्री डांगे का विदेशों में लाखों रुपया जमा है ।

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : You think they have got the money but the Goenkas do not have the money?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : They do not have surreptitious money. The difficulty here is that that money is got from surreptitious sources from foreign countries.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is sleeping. Wake him up.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is conveniently sleeping

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : He has got up.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Even if he is awake, I will tell on his face. He conveniently hears and conveniently sleeps.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : The basic point I was alluding to was what Pandit Nehru said :

"But the fact of a big industry by itself owning a newspaper and owning chains of newspapers cannot be said to give them the kind of freedom which an independent editor has or the public should expect of it.

"What I mean is that these mass circulation newspapers represent the views of a limited number but create the impression, because of their mass circulations, and the money behind them, of representing large numbers of people."

Now it is a fact that the step of nationalisation of banks which has been taken is a step which has been welcomed throughout the country excepting a few friends here and there. It is a fact that even the common men in the villages feel that the one step has been taken after 20 years

of planning, which is going in the right direction. But what do the newspapers in the country say? I mean these chain newspapers. The small newspapers have all supported it. But do those papers really represent the mind of the people of India? (*Interruptions*) The vested interests are there. The question is how to deal with the present situation when we are taking steps for social transformation in this country. Apart from this, further steps will be taken to bring about a new social order in this country while these newspapers owned by big business tycoons and monopolists serve the vested interests. Do they really represent the free will, the free choice and the free thinking of the people of India? Do they represent the aspirations of the people of India? That is the basic question which needs to be looked into by the Government at this stage because if the Government does not give attention to this point, all the social measures, all the economic measures which they want to take will not be fruitful, because today ...

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: The newspaper is to be run like a cinema, theatre or a picture house. Suppose the picture is not good, people will not go. In the same fashion, if the newspaper's editorial is not popular or is something which the people do not want, they will stop buying the newspaper. What do you say?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : Do you think there are no communal papers? Do you think there are no reactionary papers which corrupt the minds of the people? Do you think there are not people who really run anti-national papers? There are such papers.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : There are papers like the *Patriot* and *Link* which cater to the base instincts of man and they get circulation.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Mr. Lokanath Misra is running there. He can come here also. I will only refer him to one paper about which, I think, everybody should be ashamed. It was the *Observer*. What did we read therein a few days ago? What do you think, Mr. Lokanath Misra, about that paper, the *Observer*?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : The *Observer* should be denounced.

SHRI KRISHN KANT : I wish you said that also.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : If you do not have information, it is not being published. If Mr. Krishan Kant lives one year back, if a Member of this House like Mr. Krishan Kant is so ill-informed about the publication of newspapers in the country, how can I help him?

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: I was saying that while he referred to newspapers he forgot about the *Observer*. I thought that I might compliment you.

SHRI A. D. MANI : On a point of information. It is not the *Observer*, it is not the *Organiser*.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Yes. *Organiser*, I am sorry Mr. Vice-Chairman, about the *Organiser*, mention was made a few days ago here. I do not think, yourself or other Members of the Jana Sangh would subscribe to the views given out by it because I know what kind of a person you are and what kind of feelings you have got. I do not think you can subscribe to those views.

SHRI PREM MANOHAR (Uttar Pradesh) : They are facts.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : When they talk of the biological process of a human body interfering with the political thinking and functioning of administration, you can think what taste it is having. It is a shame that such a paper should talk of Indian traditions, Indian religion, Indian superiority, Hindu philosophy. If it is writing and thinking in these terms, what more shame can there be?

SHRI PREM MANOHAR: They are facts. You cannot deny them. You cannot say that they are not facts.

श्री आबिद अली : (महाराष्ट्र) : कुछ एण्टी कम्युनल पेपर्स के बारे में भी बोलो ।

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: I was coming to that. The basic question is this. If we really want to go ahead with our economic and social programme, the first thing to be done is to curb the monopoly growing in the press as I have read out and for that, it is necessary that the question of price-page schedule should be taken up and if necessary, the Constitution should be amended as was recommended by the Advisory Committee and many persons who are actively feeling about preserving the freedom of the press in the country. I do not know why the Government is silent for such a long time. If the Supreme

[Shri Krishna Kant]

Court has struck that down, they should have had a Constitutional amendment. Here it is the question of the basic freedom of the people of this country, freedom of expression, and if the Constitution stands in the way, it should be amended. In the report of the Members of Parliament on the Press Council Advisory Committee they recommended that the question of monopoly should be studied by the Press Council. But we were not very clear as to what can be done because when particular data is placed before the Monopolies Commission or the Press Council, there are different people with different attitudes, their function is different and it is just possible that they will act in a different way. So, a separate Committee of Members of Parliament should be appointed to go into the question of monopoly in the press. It should go into the various aspects the economic aspects, etc. and then the legislative enactment required and then give a report to the country and the people so that this monopoly in the press is curbed in the shortest possible time.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : It is against the dignity of the House that Mr. Bh-Bupesh Gupta should read newspaper here.

SHRI A. D. MANI : And *Blitz*

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, he is speaking on news journals. I am just checking up whether his speech is correct.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: May I draw the attention of the Government to the recommendation of the Press Commission that a legislation should be brought forward to define and suggest punishment in respect of unfair and restrictive practices of the monopoly press ? The Government of India is completely silent. They have not thought of it up till now. The Small Newspapers Enquiry Committee had suggested legislation in this regard. I do not know what the Government is doing about it. The Government should give its immediate attention and see that unfair and restrictive practices indulged in by the monopoly press are put a stop to.

Now my last point that is, interference and foreign pressure through news agencies and other means should be fully enquired into and those who are getting money and financial assistance, directly or indirectly, should be stopped from getting it otherwise freedom of the press cannot be maintained. I think, Mr. Vice-Chairman, twice or thrice I have raised the issue of some

agencies like the U. P. I. and others getting money from West Germany and other places. The whole thing should be looked into. The cost structure and the financial structure of these institutions and agencies should be looked into.

SHRI ABID ALI : Russia also.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: Everything, whichever foreign agency it is. AH those things should be looked into and brought before this Parliament so that proper checks can be brought to bear on them.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Mr. Krishan Kant, what would you say if a newspaper calls Mr. Nijalingappas as just 'Gupta'?

SHRI ABID ALI : That just means humbugappa of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, यह जो प्रेस कांसिल (अनैडमेंट) बिल, 1969 आया हुआ है इसका बहुत ही सीमित उद्देश्य है। इसका उद्देश्य यह है कि जो प्रेस कांसिल का समय समाप्त हो रहा है उस समय को थोड़ा सा बढ़ा दिया गया है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : चेयरमैन का समय बढ़ा दिया गया है।

श्री राजनारायण : चेयरमैन के समय को भी बढ़ाया गया है और सदस्यों के समय को भी बढ़ाया गया है और बढ़ा कर के उसको 31 मार्च, 1970 कर दिया गया है। इसी मकसद को हासिल करने के लिये यह विधेयक यहाँ पर प्रस्तुत किया गया है। मैं यह समझ सकने में अशक्त हो रहा हूँ कि जब एक एडवाइजरी कमेटी बनी और एडवाइजरी कमेटी ने अपने काफी सुझाव दिये कि किस तरह से एकाधिपत्य रोका जा सकता है, किस तरह से प्रेस को सहूलियत दी जा सकती है, किस तरह से स्वतंत्र वातावरण में प्रेस चल सकती है और अनेकों सुझाव हैं, तो उन सुझावों को लेते हुए एक व्यापक विधेयक यहाँ पर क्यों नहीं आया। यह एक गंभीर बात है और इसके लिये सरकार की भर्त्सना होनी चाहिये। जैसा कि हमारे मित्र भूपेश जी ने बताया कि युनेनिमस रिक्मेंडेशंस हैं, यह भी नहीं है कि बहुमत से कुछ तय हुआ हो, सर्वसम्मति से जो सलाहकार

समिति के सुझाव हैं उन सुझावों को कार्यान्वित करने के लिये सरकार विधेयक लाने में इतना विलंब करे यह स्वतः सरकार की भर्त्सना के लिये काफी है।

अब जहां तक अब तक की कार्यप्रणाली है और जिस तरह से यह प्रेस कौंसिल चल रही है, इन तमाम बातों को थोड़ीसी रोशनी में इस समय ले आना आवश्यक है। मैं यह समझ सकने में असमर्थ हो रहा हूं कि जो प्रेस कौंसिल है उस प्रेस कौंसिल में छोटे छोटे जो समाचारपत्र हैं, उनकी प्रधानता है या नहीं है। मेरी जानकारी है कि नहीं है। तो मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि जो भी विधेयक लाने में इतना विलंब हुआ, वह हुआ, मगर अब जो भी विधेयक बने उसमें छोटे छोटे पत्रों की प्रधानता होनी चाहिये, उनको प्राथमिकता मिलनी चाहिए, वरना जो बड़े बड़े पत्र हैं वे ऐसे हावो हो जाते हैं कि छोटे छोटे पत्रों को चलने में काफी दिक्कत और बाधा पैदा करते हैं। इसी तरह से भारतीय भाषाओं के पत्रों के लिये मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि भारतीय भाषाओं के जो पत्र हैं उनको भी प्राथमिकता मिलनी चाहिये। बिना भारतीय भाषाओं के पत्रों को प्रधानता दिये हुये हमारा काम ऊपर नहीं उठ रहा है।

अब हम चाहे जो भी नाम रखें, यह प्रेस कौंसिल नाम रखें या और कोई नाम रखें, हमारे सामने उद्देश्य क्या है, पहले इसकी सफाई होनी चाहिये। क्या हमारे सामने अपने राष्ट्र को सुदृढ़ करने का उद्देश्य है, राष्ट्रीयता का उद्देश्य है, क्या हमारे सामने असंप्रदायवादिता का उद्देश्य है, क्या हमारे सामने स्वतंत्रता और समता का उद्देश्य है? अगर हमारे सामने स्वतंत्रता का उद्देश्य है, अगर हमारे सामने समता का उद्देश्य है, अगर हमारे सामने गैर-संप्रदायवादिता का उद्देश्य है, अगर हमारे सामने राष्ट्रीयता का उद्देश्य है, तो हमको इस नुकते नज़र से देखना पड़ेगा कि क्या अब तक जो कार्यप्रणाली या अधिकार-सौमा है प्रेस कौंसिल की, उसकी तह में इन चार बातों को मद्दे नज़र रखते हुये प्रेस कौंसिल कोई

5-26 R S/69

अधिकारपूर्ण कार्य कर सकती है या नहीं कर सकती है। तो इस दृष्टि से हमको इस पर देखना चाहिये। अभी मेरी जानकारी हुई कि जो वर्किंग जर्नलिस्ट्स हैं उनका प्रतिनिधित्व अभी तक इसमें नहीं है। यह क्यों नहीं है? यह भी कहीं न कहीं राज है कि क्यों उनके प्रतिनिधि नहीं आये। इसके बारे में कोई न कोई व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये। मेरी समझ में यह जो रजिस्ट्रार हैं इनको एक रजिस्टर बनाना चाहिये और उसमें जो सचमुच काम करने वाले पत्रकार हैं उनकी एक सूची हो और वह सूची बिल्कुल फर्जी और जालबट्टा की सूची नहीं हो। मान लीजिये कोई वेस्टेड इंड्रेस्ट वाला है और वह अपने इंड्रेस्ट को पूरा करने के लिये अनाप-शनाप जो सही माने में वर्किंग जर्नलिस्ट्स नहीं हैं उनका भी नाम उसमें रखवाना चाहे, तो उनका नाम उसमें नहीं होना चाहिये। ऐक्चुअल वर्किंग जर्नलिस्ट्स की सूची होनी चाहिये रजिस्ट्रार के पास और उन्हीं में से किसी सिस्टे-मेटिक तरीके से, किसी व्यवस्था से उनके प्रतिनिधियों को उसमें ले आना चाहिये।

श्री ए० डी० मणि : एक सवाल पूछ सकता हूं।

I understand your Hindi very well. Can I put a question? How do you reconcile...

श्री राजनारायण : मुझे आपकी अंग्रेजी समझने में बड़ी दिक्कत होती है।

श्री ए० डी० मणि : आप कैसे फंडामेंटल राइट्स के साथ कम्पेयर करेंगे, क्योंकि हमारे फंडामेंटल राइट्स जो आप दिल में समझते हैं, यह बताना चाहिये कि ऐसा बिल बना देने से हमारा फंडामेंटल राइट रुक जायेगा।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, आप स्वतः समझ गये होंगे कि कितना अनावश्यक और गलत बुनियाद का सवाल हमारे मित्र ए० डी० मणि जी ने उठाया है। मैं इनके फंडामेंटल राइट को सुरक्षित करने के लिये यह सुझाव दे रहा हूं। इसी सुझाव में जो ऐक्चुअल वर्किंग जर्नलिस्ट्स हैं उनके मौलिक अधिकार की सुरक्षा है, वरना बड़े बड़े पूंजीपतियों के जो ग्रुप्स हैं, जिनके हाथ में बड़े बड़े पेपर हैं, वे एक मनगढ़ंत सूची बना देंगे और उसी में से लोग आ जायेंगे और

[श्री राजनारायण]

अगर ऐक्चुअल वर्किंग जर्नलिस्ट श्रो ए० डी० मणि होंगे तो यह रह जायेंगे। इसलिये मणि जी के मौलिक अधिकार की सुरक्षा के लिये ही हमने यह मुझाव दिया है।

एक बात मैं और कहना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि प्रेस कौंसिल का अधिकार क्या है। मैं अपने मित्र लोकनाथ मिश्र जी को बहुत अच्छी तरह से सुन रहा था। मैं समझता हूँ कि आज प्रेस कौंसिल के पास कोई अधिकार नहीं है, केवल कर्तव्य है। अधिकारविहीन कमेटी केवल कर्तव्यसंपन्न हो कर क्या इस समय चल सकती है? जो कुछ भी प्रेस कौंसिल को करना होगा वह मंत्रों की मर्जी से होगा। यह ब्राडकास्टिंग मिनिस्टर है। जब इनको समय होगा तब उसके मुताबिक यह उनके मुझावों को कुछ इधर उधर कर सकते हैं, वरना कुछ नहीं हो सकता है। और प्रेस कौंसिल का खर्चा जो होता है उसके लिए जो रुपया एलाटेड होता है मेरा कहना है कि इस पर ब्राडकास्टिंग मिनिस्टर का कोई अधिकार नहीं होना चाहिए। बाकायदा बजट में एक प्राविजन हो जाना चाहिए और उतनी रकम उनको चली जानी चाहिए उनके सेक्रेटरी या उनके चेयरमैन के पास जिससे इस मंत्रालय की कृपा-भृकुटि पर प्रेस कौंसिल को आश्रित न होना पड़े वरना इसमें बड़ी खामियां होंगी और मंत्रालय जिस ढंग से चाहता है कि वह प्रेस कौंसिल के मुझावों को नियंत्रित कर दिया करता है। तो मेरी स्पष्ट राय है कि जैसे बार एसोसिएशन्स होती हैं या और कोई इस तरह की संस्थाएं होती हैं जो अपने काम, अपने अधिकार और अपन कर्तव्यों की सीमा का निर्धारण स्वतः कर लिया करती हैं वैसे ही प्रेस कौंसिल हो जिसमें वर्किंग जर्नलिस्ट्स का प्रतिनिधित्व हो। वर्किंग जर्नलिस्ट्स जो भी अपने लिए ठीक सोचेंगे, करेंगे। उसमें सरकार के हस्तक्षेप की बात कहां आती है।

पहले मैं यह समझना चाहता हूँ कि प्रेस की स्वतंत्रता आज इस सरकार का मकसद है या नहीं। अगर प्रेस की स्वतंत्रता सरकार का मकसद है तो प्रेस की स्वतंत्रता कैसे कायम रह

सकती है, जिस ढंग से यह सरकार चलाना चाहती है या इसमें मूल संशोधन करके? मेरा कहना है कि वर्तमान स्थिति में जब तक मूल संशोधन नहीं होगा तब तक अच्छी तरह से स्वतंत्र रूप से पत्र नहीं चल पाएंगे। इसी को दृष्टि में रखते हुए मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि अगर राष्ट्रीयता मकसद है, राष्ट्र का उत्थान मकसद है, पत्र की स्वतंत्रता हमारा उद्देश्य है तो विदेशी सहायता से हमारे देश के अखबार प्रभावित न हों इसकी क्या गारंटी सरकार देने को तैयार है। प्रेस कौंसिल के पास क्या ऐसा कोई अधिकार है कि प्रेस कौंसिल जाये और अखबारों के हिसाब-किताब को भी देखे? अखबारों के हिसाब-किताब को देखने का, जहां तक मैं समझ पाया हूँ, प्रेस कौंसिल को कोई अधिकार नहीं है। तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो भी विधेयक अब यहां पर आए उसमें प्रेस कौंसिल को पूरा पूरा अधिकार होना चाहिए, जो सभी अखबारों के हिसाब-किताब को देख सके। जहां तक मैं नमझ पाया हूँ, प्रेस कौंसिल को यह भी अधिकार नहीं है कि अगर कोई गलत चीज कहीं निकल जाये, जिसको वह समझती है इनडीसेंट है, अनुचित है, गलत है, बेबुनियाद है, तो वह उस अखबार से यह कहे कि तुमने यह गलत चीज छपी है, इसका खंडन छपवाओ। उदाहरणार्थ, मैं आपके सामने एक अखबार को पढ़ रहा हूँ, इसका नाम है 'अर्ग-नाइजर' यह 9 अगस्त का है, इसमें लिखा हुआ है :-

"Socialist Rani: On July 31, a one maund parcel (38 kilograms) was received in the Prime Minister's house for her daughter-in-law. It arrived in New Delhi a day earlier by Air India Flight No. 125 from Milan. The parcel was marked "Free samples of medicines." Nobody ever heard of a maund of sample medicines for a healthy young lady. People, are, therefore, wandering if the parcel contained many valuable and dutiable articles. But, of course, no Customs Officer would dare open a parcel addressed to P. M's. house to check the contents and levy duty."

यह समाचार 9 तारीख के अखबार में छपा है। प्रधान मंत्री साहिबा के घर पर 38 किलोग्राम का एक पार्सल आया, 125 एयर इंडिया

फ्लाइंग नम्बर है, मीलान से आया और प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहिबा के मकान पर चला गया, कस्टम ड्यूटी वालों की हिम्मत नहीं पड़ी कि उसको खोलें और ड्यूटी भी नहीं दी गई, अन्त में वह प्राइम मिनिस्टर के घर में चला गया, यह अखबार में डंके की चोट पर छपा हुआ है। यह खबर सही है या गलत है, इसकी कोई जानकारी किसी के पास है? तो मैं समझता हूँ कि प्रेस कौंसिल को यह अधिकार होना चाहिए कि वह 'आर्गनाइजर' से पूछे क्योंकि यह बहुत बड़ी चीज है...

श्री ए० डी० मणि : आप ही यह सवाल पूछ सकते हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : इसीलिए तो कह रहा हूँ कि इस सामान पर ड्यूटी न दी जाये और कस्टम के लोगों की हिम्मत न पड़े, यह पहली बार नहीं है, इस तरह से अनेक बार हुआ है। हमारा सवाल इस सदन में आया कि शादी के अवसर पर जब अनएकम्पनीड वाक्सेज आए तो उनको पहले कस्टम वालों ने ले लिया, चेक किया, लेकिन बाद में प्राइम मिनिस्टर हाउस से टेलीफोन गया कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर का सामान है, उसे वहाँ पर जाना चाहिए, बन्द करके चला गया। यह तो अखबार में बात आ गई, हमारी बात तो दबा दी गई। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर प्रेस कौंसिल की कोई हस्ती होती तो हम भी जो कुछ कहते हैं वह अच्छी तरह से छपता। आज मैं हैरत में पड़ा हूँ जब मैं प्रधानमंत्री साहिबा के मुखारविन्द से यह बात सुनता हूँ कि बड़े बड़े पत्र उनके विरोध में प्रचार कर रहे हैं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहिबा के विरोध में कौन-सा अखबार प्रचार कर रहा है? एक बड़ा ग्रुप कहा जा सकता है बिड़ला का, एक ग्रुप कहा जा सकता है शान्ति प्रसाद जैन का दोनों को देख लिया जाये 'टाइम्स आफ इंडिया' और 'हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स', जितना प्रचार नहीं होना चाहिए प्रधानमंत्री का उतना प्रचार आज ये अखबार कर रहे हैं। श्रीमन्, कल इलाहाबाद में हमारा पत्रकार सम्मेलन था, पत्रकारों ने कम से कम डेढ़-दो घंटे समय लिया,

पूरा जानकारी दी, दिल खोल कर उन्होंने नोट किया, मगर आज हिन्दी के अखबार में इतना थोड़ा-सा मुश्किल से दिया है। इसीलिए जो बैंकों का टेक-ओवर है उसको मैं राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं मानता, मेरा इतना कहा कहीं नहीं आया, मगर इन्दिरा रानो को कहीं छींक भी आ जाये तो तमाम अखबारों में चर्चा हो जायेगी। श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी ने गांधीजी का एक कोटेशन...

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : You must understand that if you are the Prime Minister tomorrow, the same tiling will happen to you.

श्री ए० जी० कुलकर्णी (महाराष्ट्र) : राजनारायण जी, एक हमारे सवाल का रिप्लाय दे दो। आपका इतना आता है, हमारा तो इतना भी नहीं आता तो मैं क्या करूँ? प्रेस कौंसिल उसमें कैसे हेल्प करेगा?

श्री राजनारायण : मैं जितना अपने लिए लड़ता हूँ उससे ज्यादा अपने मित्र कुलकर्णी के लिए लड़ूंगा अगर...

श्री आई० के० गुजराल : कुलकर्णी नहीं कुलकर्णी।

श्री राजनारायण : कुलकर्णी कानों को अच्छा लगता है और मुझे कहने में भी अच्छा लगता है।

मैं कुलकर्णी के लिए लड़ूंगा अगर कोई उनकी उचित ढंग से दी हुई खबर को दबाएगा, छापेगा नहीं।

एक ही बात और, श्रीमन्, मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ। गांधीजी का एक कोटेशन श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी ने यहाँ पढ़ा, तमाम अखबारों में छपा, उससे बड़ा कोटेशन हमने गांधी जी का पढ़ा, किसी अखबार में नहीं आया। गांधीजी ने असमानता को रिमूव करने के बारे में क्या कहा था? गांधीजी ने कहा था कि अगर भारत स्वतंत्र होगा तो एक दिन के अन्दर जो दिल्ली की गगनचुम्बी अट्टालिकाएँ हैं और जो देहातों के मेहनतकों की झोंपड़ियाँ

[श्री राजनारायण]

हैं उनका फर्क मिटेगा। यह तो नहीं आया लेकिन जो अनापशनाप श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी ने गांधीजी को कोट कर दिया वह आ गया जिससे मालूम हो कि उन्होंने गांधीजी को खूब पढ़ा है। क्या खाक-पत्थर पढ़ा है वह मैं खूब जानता हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि ब्राडकास्टिंग मिनिस्टर इसका जवाब दें—हम इस सदन में पहले भी कह चुके हैं—कि 11 नवम्बर, 1968 को सरकार ने बताया कि 'पैट्रियट' को एक देव नारायण मिश्र, नेपाल, ने 50 हजार रुपया दिया, आज तक इसकी जानकारी नहीं हुई। प्रेस कौंसिल को यह अधिकार होता तो मुझे विश्वास है कि प्रेस कौंसिल जाकर हिसाब-किताब की जांच करती और इसकी जानकारी प्रेस और देश की जनता को हो गई होती। 1 के० के० शाह जब इस विभाग के इंचार्ज थे तो उन्होंने स्वीकार किया था कि 'पैट्रियट' और 'लिक' को विदेशी सहायता मिलती है ऐसी सूचना मिली है, किन्तु सारे मामले की अभी जांच नहीं हुई है। यह मंत्री जो के मुखारविन्द से हम ने लिया है। आज भी मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो ब्राडकास्टिंग मिनिस्टर हैं उनसे यहां के सदस्यों को पूछने का पूरा हक है कि अखबारों को कहां कहां से धन मिला इसको वह बतायें क्योंकि यह कसौटी होगी इस देश की राष्ट्रीयता की। इस देश के अखबारों को विदेशी सहायता कितना प्रभावित कर रही है यह हमको जानने का हक है। श्रीमन्, वित्त मंत्री श्री मोरारजी देसाई ने 19 अगस्त, 1968 को बताया था कि 'पैट्रियट' को निम्नांकित चन्दा मिला है : 1963-64 में 93,000 रुपया, 1965-66 में 1,02,500 रुपया, 1966-67 में 3,74,365 रुपया और 'लिक' को 12,500 रुपया 1962-63 में 90,000 रुपया, 1964-65 में 1,09,000 रुपया और 1965-66 में 1 लाख रुपया मिला है और 12,500 रुपया और 90,000 रुपया जो 'लिक' को मिला था वह भी 'पैट्रियट' को ट्रांसफर कर दिया गया है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ इस तरह की जो सूचना है मेरे पास, उसकी जानकारी सरकार के पास क्यों नहीं है और इसके साथ ही मैं सरकार से

और प्रेस कौंसिल से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि वह अपने कर्तव्य का पालन कहां तक कर पा सकती है अगर उसके पास अधिकार न हो पत्रों और पत्रकारों के आर्थिक खर्चों की जांच-पड़ताल करने का ? इसलिए श्रीमन्, मैं आपके द्वारा सुझाव दूंगा कि जो अधिकार-सीमा है प्रेस कौंसिल की उसको बढ़ाया जाये और उनको पूरा हक मिले कि जिस न्यूज को वह गलत समझें, जिस न्यूज को वह सम्मान के विरुद्ध समझें, अशोभनीय समझें उसके लिए वह कहें उस अखबार को कि वह उसका खंडन निकाले और वह अखबार उसका खंडन निकाले। प्रेस कौंसिल को अधिकार होना चाहिए कि सही तरीके से लोकमत बनाने के लिए वह ठीक बातें कहे वरना अखबारों के जरिये एक समा बांधा जा रहा है। मुझे जानकारी कराई गई है और श्री के० के० शाह के बारे में मैं जानता हूँ कि उन्होंने पटना में पत्रकारों को बुला कर कहा था कि हमको एक इमेज बनानी है इसलिए प्रधान मंत्री की इमेज को उठाने के काम में पत्रों को लगाया जा सकता है और वही काम श्री गुजराल भी कर रहे हैं। अगर अखबारों को धमका कर, डरवा कर वे देश की एक नेता प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी के चरित्र को उठायेंगे तो देश के गरीबों का चरित्र गिरेगा। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि आज जिस विलासिता और जिस अरिस्टोक्रैटिक ढंग से भारत की प्रधान मंत्री रहती हैं उनके के बारे में भारत की वह गरीब जनता जिसकी आमदनी दो आना, ढाई आना और तीन आना रोज है, वह किस अखबार को पढ़ती है। प्रधान मंत्री बोलती हैं कि हम बड़े समाजवादी हो गये। आज चारों तरफ उनके चित्र छापे जा रहे हैं। बिल्कुल झूठ, बिल्कुल अनर्गल समाचारों को फैलाया जा रहा है कि समाजवादी क्रान्ति आ गई। हम से पूछो। मैं इलाहाबाद में राजापुर गया था गोसाईं तुलसीदास जी के जन्मस्थान पर। उनके हस्तलिखित अयोध्या कांड को भी देखा। वहां मैंने देखा कि करीब 300 औरतें जिनको घास की रोटी भी मयस्सर नहीं हो रही है, कितने दिनों से भुखी थीं, सभा का

नाम सुन कर आई थीं। हम लोगों के पास कोई धन नहीं था लेकिन हम लोगों ने जो भी संभव था, डेढ़, दो, चार सेर जो भी अन्न हम उनको दिला पाये वह उन को दिलाया। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या कहीं यह समाचार छपता है कि राजापुर के पास सूखा पड़ा और आज वहाँ अन्न नहीं है। वहाँ के लोग घास की रोटी खा रहे हैं। किसी अखबार में नहीं आ रहा है और अगर अखबार में आयेगा तो उन पर सख्त होगी, टेलीफोन जायेगा और उनको कहा जायेगा कि आजकल भी राजनारायण की खबर तुम छापते हो।

श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र : बोलते हैं ?

श्री राजनारायण : बोलते हैं अखबार वाले कि मंत्रिगण बोलते हैं कि तुम तो राजनारायण की खबर छापते हो, जाओ। वस, उनकी तो नानो मर गई। मैं आपके जरिये पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जब इस सदन की रिप्रेजेंटेटिव स्पीच हम लोगों की अखबार वाले नहीं दे पाते तो बाहर को क्या दशा होगी, इसको भी आप देख। मैं चाहता हूँ कि प्रेस कांसिल को अधिकार होना चाहिए इस बारे में भी। आखिर को यह जनतंत्र है या डिक्टेटरशाही है? आज बड़ी चर्चा चली कि अखबारों को सरकार अपने हाथ में ले लेगी। फिर खंडन आया कि नहीं लेगी। फिर एक चर्चा चली कि डिमोनिटाइजेशन नहीं होगा, पहले चर्चा थी कि होगा। यह सरकार है, इसमें तो असत्यता और धूर्तता का बोल वाला है। मैं दावे के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी स्पीच जो बैंकों को लेने के संबंध में हुई है, क्या किसी अखबार को छापने की हिम्मत हुई है। वह कहीं नहीं छपी। क्यों नहीं छपी? इसलिए कि उससे इन्दिरा के ढोल की पोल खुल जाती है। उस स्पीच में तर्क है कि हम इसको राष्ट्रीयकरण क्यों नहीं कहते। एक तरफ जब लोगों को पैसा दे देकर, लोगों को ला ला कर इन्दिरा के सामने उनकी कोठी पर प्रदर्शन कराया जाये और डंके की टट पर कहलाया जाये कि समाजवाद दृढ़ होगा, समाजवाद की धारा फैलेगी तो हमको भी तो यह

कहने का हक होना चाहिये कि हम देश की जनता को बतायें कि जैसे 6,000 करोड़ रुपया पहले इन्दिरा रानी के हाथ में था और वह सारा रुपया बड़े बड़े उद्योगपतियों को मिला, उसी तरह से यह करीब 3,000 करोड़ और चला जायेगा, अगर तुम सजग नहीं रहोगे तो यह पैसा भी उनको चला जायेगा। मेरा यह संशोधन किसी भी अखबार में नहीं आया कि जो बोर्ड आफ डाइरेक्टर्स बने उसमें आधे से ज्यादा प्रतिनिधि किसानों के हों, मजदूरों के हों और जो वहाँ के कर्मचारियों के हों उनके हों। हमारा संशोधन कहीं नहीं आया कि जो यह 2,700 करोड़ रुपया दिया जाये इस रुपये को अन्न सेना बनाने में खर्च किया जाये, इसे निरक्षरता को दूर करने में खर्च किया जाये, शिक्षक सेना बनाने पर खर्च किया जाये और इसके अलावा सिचाई की एक अच्छी योजना बनाई जाये ताकि जो 26 करोड़ एकड़ जमीन हमारे देश में असिंचित पड़ी है—केवल 7 करोड़ एकड़ सिंचित भूमि है—उसको सिंचित करने की व्यवस्था हो। यह करने के बाद तब दूसरे को पैसा दिया जाये। यह बात कहीं नहीं आई, केवल यह बात आई कि राजनारायण ने तो इसे इन्दिराकरण कह दिया। इन्दिराकरण कहा क्यों? हमने यह इसलिए कहा कि राष्ट्रीयकरण होगा तो उसमें राष्ट्र की जनता का चित्त प्रतिबिम्बित होगा, जो राष्ट्र को भूखी-तंगी जनता है वह उसे स्वीकार करेगी। उसमें भूखों के लिए भोजन का प्रबंध होगा, तंगों के लिए कपड़े की व्यवस्था होगी, लेकिन यह दर्शन वहाँ नहीं है और फिर भी कहा जायेगा कि यह राष्ट्रीयकरण है। तो इस दृष्टि से मैंने कहा कि वर्तमान स्वरूप जो उस विधेयक का है वह राष्ट्रीयकरण का नहीं है, हाँ, राष्ट्रीयकरण को शकल उसे दी जा सकती है बशर्ते कि हमारे संशोधन को माना जाय। हमारे संशोधन को माना जाये तो राष्ट्रीयकरण की शकल आगे बढ़े।

प्रेस कांसिल में जैसा मैंने कहा कि एक्जुअल वकिंग जर्नलिस्ट्स के प्रतिनिधि हों और उन को इतनी आजादी हो कि उनके ऊपर सरकारी

[श्री राजनारायण]
लोग अपना रोब न गालिब कर सकें। ऐसी बहुत सी संस्थाएँ हैं, जैसे साहित्य अकादमी है और दूसरी संस्थाएँ हैं, उनके प्रतिनिधि भी उसमें हों। बड़े बड़े साहित्यकार हैं जो देश को बनाने में, उठाने में और राष्ट्रीयता के लिए कुछ करते रहते हैं उन लोगों के प्रतिनिधि इसमें होने चाहिए और इसके अधिकार व्यापक होने चाहिए।

अंत में समाप्त करते हुए मैं अपने मित्र गुजराल जी से यह अवश्य कहूँगा, क्योंकि उनमें समाजवादी दर्शन का कुछ अंश है इसलिए मैं उनको कुछ कुरेदना चाहता हूँ कि सोशलिज्म दो तरह का होता है—सोशलिज्म बाई मेंटलिटी और सोशलिज्म बाई इंबायरनमेंट। जब तक सोशलिस्ट वातावरण नहीं होगा और सोशलिज्म अपने दिमाग से नहीं होगा, दोनों साथ साथ नहीं चलेंगे तब तक समाजवाद नहीं आ सकता। जैसे एक मोची है। वह आज चार आना पैदा कर रहा है, वह दूसरे दिन चार रुपया पैदा करना चाहता है और फिर चार सौ रुपये पैदा करना चाहता है तो वह वातावरण से भले ही सोशलिस्ट हो लेकिन बाई मेंटलिटी ही इज नाट ए सोशलिस्ट। अपने दिमाग से वह पूँजीवादी है। इसलिए गुजराल जी अपने दिमाग से पूँजीवादी न बनें। अपने आप वातावरण में समाजवाद अपने मूल रूप में ग्रहण किया जाये तब तो समाजवाद आयेगा वरना समाजवाद एक सपना रहेगा। 30 हजार रुपया रोज प्रधान मंत्री पर खर्च होता जाये और किसी अखबार में यह न आये। इतना बड़ा यह प्रश्न है, दुनिया में कोई भी प्रेसिडेंट, कोई प्रधान मंत्री जितना कि प्रति दिन भारत की प्रधान मंत्री पर खर्च होता है उतना नहीं करता, अमेरिका का प्रेसिडेंट भी 15 हजार रु० प्रति दिन के खर्च में रह रहा है जब कि भारत की प्रधान मंत्री का कुल खर्चा जोड़ कर के, इनकी सुरक्षा वगैरह में, किचन वगैरह में, आज 30 हजार रुपया प्रति दिन है जब कि हमारे देश की जनता प्रति दिन तीन, साढ़े तीन आने रोज पर रह रही है, कहां तीन आने रोज और कहां 30 हजार रुपया रोज ! जितनी देश की गरीबी है उसके

प्रधान मंत्री की ज़िन्दगी उतनी ही ज्यादा कीमती है ! आज भारत के प्रधान मंत्री की सबसे बड़ी कीमत हो गई है और भारत के गरीबों की ज़िन्दगी खटमल से कम है, साग-भाजी से कम है। यह स्थिति है। अगर इस स्थिति का सच्चा चित्रण न हो अखबारों में तो प्रेस कौंसिल उसको देखे। प्रेस कौंसिल का यह प्रति दिन कर्तव्य होना चाहिये कि वह देखे कि देश में समता, स्वतंत्रता, जनतंत्र, समाजवाद कैसे आयेगा इसके मूलमंत्र का प्रचार आज हमारे समाचारपत्र कर रहे हैं या नहीं कर रहे रहे हैं।

एक और दूसरी बात है। मैं दो मिनट और लूँगा। मैं यह जामना चाहता हूँ कि संविधान में, कानून में, लिखा हुआ है कि अंग्रेज़ी का खात्मा, मगर आज अंग्रेज़ी अखबारों को सरकारी एडवर्टिजमेंट्स, विज्ञापन, कितने मिलते हैं और हिन्दी के अखबारों को या देगी भाषाओं के अखबारों को कितने मिलते हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि प्रेस कौंसिल इसको भी देखे। जब भारतीय भाषाओं की प्रधानता होगी, उनको ठीक तरह से प्राथमिकता मिलेगी, तब वह आगे बढ़ पायेंगी। सरकार अपने विज्ञापनों को ज्यादा से ज्यादा अंग्रेज़ी अखबारों को देगी और केवल मौखिक ढंग से भारतीय भाषाओं की चर्चा करेगी, छोटे छोटे अखबारों के विकास की चर्चा करेगी, तो वह केवल चर्चा मात्र रह जायेगी, वह अमल में नहीं आयेगी।

इन तमाम बातों को सामने रखते हुये आज मंत्री जी की इस बात के लिये निन्दा करता हूँ कि एडवाइजरी कमेटी की पूरा रपट को सामने रखते हुये उन्होंने कोई विधेयक प्रस्तुत नहीं किया, उसमें काफी विलम्ब है, फिर भी जो अवधि बढ़ाने के लिये यह ला रहे हैं कि 31 मार्च, 1970 तक रहे उसको मैं मानता हूँ और साथ ही यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसा विधेयक लाये जिस विधेयक के अन्दर जिन बातों की ओर हमने उनकी सेवा में विनम्रता से उसका ध्यान आकर्षित किया है वह बातें साकार स्वरूप, मूर्तिमान स्वरूप ग्रहण करके कानून की शक्ति में आ जायें। नमस्कार।

श्री जगत नारायण (हरियाणा) : वाइस-चेयरमैन महोदय, मेरा ताल्लुक छोटे अखबारों से है और मैं आपकी वसालत से वजीर महोदय की खिदमत में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि छोटे अखबारों को वह अपने सामने रख और उनको जो जो सहूलियतें मिलनी चाहियें वह प्रेस कौंसिल को देनी चाहियें।

मुझे याद है, वजीर महोदय जब पंजाब में जाते हैं तो वह प्रेस वालों को मिलते हैं, निहायत प्यार से मिलते हैं, मुहब्बत से मिलते हैं, वायदे भी करते हैं, मगर प्रेस कौंसिल के चेयरमैन वहां एक दफा गये थे तो हमने उनसे यह कहा कि छोटे अखबार वालों को इश्टिहार नहीं मिलता कुछ ऐसे चीफ मनिस्टर हैं कि उनके खिलाफ अगर छोटे अखबार वाले लिखते हैं तो उनको इश्टिहार देना बन्द कर देते हैं, अखबारों को कागज का ठीक कोटा नहीं मिलता, सेंटर की तरफ से भी इश्टिहार नहीं मिलते, तो प्रेस कौंसिल के चेयरमैन ने कहा कि यह हमारा काम नहीं है कि इन बातों की तरफ जायें। तो क्या प्रेस कौंसिल का काम इतना ही है कि जो कुछ गवर्नमेंट के खिलाफ छप जाये या जो कोई कम्युनल बात छप जाये सिर्फ वही उनको देखना है और इसके अलावा अखबारों की कोई शिकायत नहीं सुननी है ! फिर तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इस प्रेस कौंसिल का कोई फायदा ही नहीं है।

वाइस-चेयरमैन साहब, यहां पर बहुत कुछ कहा गया कि अखबार यह लिखते हैं, यह टीका-टिप्पणी करते हैं, चीफ मनिस्टर के खिलाफ लिखते हैं, प्रधान मंत्री के खिलाफ लिखते हैं, मैं यह समझता हूँ कि अगर आपने वाकई फ्रीडम आफ एक्सप्रेशन दी हुई है तो आपको इस बात के लिये तैयार रहना चाहिये कि कोई अखबार जो यह महसूस करता है कि गवर्नमेंट का यह स्टेप, गवर्नमेंट का यह कदम गलत है वह अखबार यह लिखे कि गवर्नमेंट का यह कदम गलत है और मैं यह समझता हूँ कि यह कहना कि यह अखबार हमारे खिलाफ लिखता है यह बात नहीं कहनी चाहिये। मुझे याद है कि पंजाब में हमारे सरदार प्रताप सिंह कैरों थे

हमारे अखबार ने उनके खिलाफ बहुत कुछ लिखा, उनके तमाम किरदार के खिलाफ लिखा, वह वहां पर आठ साल तक हुकूमत करते रहे, उन्होंने आठ साल तक हमारा इश्टिहार बन्द रखा, हमारे अखबार के खिलाफ उन्होंने 20 मुकदमे चलाये, 19 मुकदमों में हम रिहा हो गये और जा करके सिर्फ एक मुकदमे में सजा मिली क्योंकि हम जो लिख रहे थे बिल्कुल ठीक लिख रहे थे। इसलिये मैं बड़े अदब से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो खयाल है कि अखबार अगर नुक्ताचीनी करें तो इस नुक्ताचीनी को बर्दाश्त हमारी हुकूमत न करे, मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बात गलत है। अखबार ऐसे भी हैं जो दुस्त नुक्ताचीनी करते हैं और ऐसे अखबार भी हैं जो सरकार के कहने के ऊपर ही हां में हां करते जाते हैं। तो क्या सरकार यह चाहती है कि ऐसे अखबार ही यहां होने चाहियें। एक तरफ तो यह कहा जाता है कि हम फ्रीडम आफ एक्सप्रेशन देना चाहते हैं और अगर कोई अखबार बैंक नेशनलाइजेशन के खिलाफ बात करे तो दूसरी तरफ उसकी मज्जमत करें, मैं यों आज बैंक नेशनलाइजेशन के हक में हूँ, मैंने उसके हक में यहां तकरीर की है, मगर फर्ज कीजिये कि मैं बैंक नेशनलाइजेशन के हक में न हों और अपने अखबार में उसकी मुखालिफत करूं तो क्या उसका मतलब यह समझा जायेगा कि यह अखबार सरकार के खिलाफ है। एक एडिटर अपनी राय रख सकता है, एक राइटर अपनी राय रख सकता है। इसलिये मैं बड़े अदब से यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आप हाउसटाप से कहते हैं कि फ्रीडम आफ एक्सप्रेशन देते हैं तो फिर इस बात से घबड़ायें नहीं, न प्रधान मंत्री को और न चीफ मनिस्टर को या किसी मनिस्टर को घबड़ाना चाहिये।

वाइस-चेयरमैन साहब, प्रेस कौंसिल का क्या फायदा है अगर प्रेस कौंसिल इस बात को नहीं देख सकती है कि अखबार का सेल सबसे ज्यादा है लेकिन उसका इश्टिहार सिर्फ इसलिये बन्द किया जाता है कि वह फलां चीफ मनिस्टर के खिलाफ लिखता है और फलां चीफ मनिस्टर की पालिसी की हिमायत नहीं

[श्री जगत नारायण]

करता है, फलां वजीर की हिमायत नहीं करता है। बदकिस्मती से हमारा जो अखबार रहा है वह तो उसका शिकार रहा है, हर वज्रात के दौरान उसका इश्तिहार बन्द रहा है फिर भी परमात्मा की दया है कि वह हमारा अखबार अब भी चल रहा है और बड़ी शान से चल रहा है लेकिन मैं कहता हूँ कि अगर फ्रीडम आफ एक्सप्रेसन की बात करते हैं, यहां महात्मा गांधी के वाक्य पढ़ते हैं तो फिर फ्रीडम आफ एक्सप्रेसन से घबड़ाये नहीं। यह ठीक है कि मोनोपलिस्ट या कुछ चेंस आफ न्यूजपेपर्स हैं तो चेंस आफ न्यूजपेपर्स हमारे बहन श्रीमती इन्दिराजी के भी हैं, एक वहां लखनऊ से निकल रहा है और एक यहां से भी। तो वह उसको समझ सकती है। यह कहना कि चेंस आफ न्यूजपेपर्स को बन्द करना चाहिये, बन्द करिये अगर आपकी हिम्मत है, मैं उसके खिलाफ कुछ नहीं कहता लेकिन मैं जो बात कहता हूँ वह यह है कि कांग्रेस हमेशा से फ्रीडम आफ एक्सप्रेसन की दावेदार रही है तो उसे इसको वाकायदा अपहोल्ड करना चाहिये। यहां पर अभी अभी मैं अपने अजोय भाई कृष्ण कान्त की तकरीर सुन रहा था और उनकी तकरीर का नुबना यह था कि अखबार को नेशनलाइज करना चाहिये। हमारे स्टेट मिनिस्टर आल इंडिया न्यूजपेपर्स एडिटर्स कांफ्रेंस में तशर्राफ ले गये थे और वहां भी एक एडिटर ने इस तरह का खयाल रखा था कि हमारे कानों में यह आवाज आ रही है कि आप अखबारों का नेशनलाइजेशन करना चाहते हैं। तो मैं बड़े अदब से उनकी खिदमत में अर्ज करूंगा कि जब वह जवाब दें तो इस मामले पर वाजे तौर पर बतायें कि वाकई गवर्नमेंट अखबारों को नेशनलाइज करना चाहती है या नहीं करना चाहती है। उनको वाजे तौर पर यहां यह कहना चाहिये। यह कहना कि हम चाहते हैं कि फ्रीडम चाफ एक्सप्रेसन हो, यह गारी बातें डोंग हैं, बात अस्ल यह है कि मैं भी मिनिस्टर रहा हूँ और मुझे पता है कि जब कभी किसी मिनिस्टर के खिलाफ कुछ अखबार में लिखा जाये तो

मिनिस्टर हमेशा महसूस करता है, जब किसी चीफ मिनिस्टर के खिलाफ लिखा जाये तो वह महसूस करता है, जब प्रधान मंत्री के खिलाफ लिखा जाये तो वह महसूस करती हैं लेकिन अखबारनवीसों का फर्ज यह है कि वह सच्ची बात कहे, जो उसके दिल में होता है, जो वह महसूस करता है, उसको कहे। हो सकता है कि उसका नजरिया गलत हो, उसकी धिकिग गलत हो सकती है लेकिन अगर आप यह कहें कि उसने जानबूझ कर इस चीफ मिनिस्टर या इस मिनिस्टर या प्रधान मंत्री के खिलाफ लिखा और वह इनके खिलाफ है, तो मैं यह समझता हूँ कि ऐसी बातें अखबारनवीसों के मुतल्लिक कहना बहुत गलत है कि जो ठीक ढंग पर अखबार चला रहे हैं, ठीक ढंग पर अखबारात में अपने खयालात का इजहार करते हैं। तो मैं वाइस-चेयरमैन महोदय, आपकी वसातत से वजीर साहब को खिदमत में अर्ज करूंगा कि वह वाजेह तौर पर कहें कि क्या उनकी वाकई यह पालिसी है कि वह अखबारात को नेशनलाइज करना चाहते हैं, क्या वह चाहते हैं कि तमाम हिन्दुस्तान के अखबार प्रधान मंत्री की आवाज के साथ आवाज मिलाएँ, अगर वह कहें कि यह चीज हमें नेशनलाइज करनी है तो वह कहें हाँ ठीक है। अगर ऐसा है तो मैं समझता हूँ यह फ्रीडम आफ एक्सप्रेसन लपज को इस्तेमाल करना महात्मा गांधी का नाम लेकर कहना कि महात्मा गांधी ने फ्रीडम आफ एक्सप्रेसन के लिये कहा था, फिर तो यह तमाम बातें डोंग हैं। इसलिये मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि एक वाजेह पालिसी इसके मुतल्लिक कहनी चाहिये। बाकी रहा यह कि अगर कोई अखबार मैलाइस से लिखता है या कोई अखबार इस ढंग पर लिखता है कि जिसको हम कहें किसी वेन्जीयेन्स से लिखता है तो आपके पास इतनी सारी दफात हैं इंडियन पीनल कोड की और उसी के द्वारा, मैंने आपको बताया, सरदार प्रताप सिंह कैरों ने 20 मुकदमे हमारे ऊपर किये, हर तरह से हमको ट्राई करने की कोशिश की, पर 19 मुकदमों में हम बरी हो गये, कहीं सुप्रीम कोर्ट से हुए, कहीं हाई कोर्ट से हुए, कहीं नीचे

के कोर्ट से हुए । तो मैं आपसे अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि आपके पास सारे रास्ते हैं ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : बाकी एक केस में क्या हुआ ?

श्री जगत नारायण : एक में 20 रु० जमाना हुआ । उसकी बात मैं क्या करूँ वह क्यों हुआ । वह प्रताप सिंह के बड़े साथी थे जज साहब । उन्होंने कहा हमें एक वक्त सजा जरूर देनी चाहिये । यह मैं वैसे ही कह रहा हूँ । तो उसकी वजह थी कि वह उनके दोस्त थे और उनके साथ बड़े ताल्लुकात थे । मगर मैं यह कहता हूँ अगर कोई अखबार मैलिस से लिखे, अगर कोई अखबार गलत बात लिखे तो कानून आपके हाथ में है आप उसके जरिये ट्राई करने की कोशिश कीजिए, आप उसके खिलाफ मुकदमा चलाइये । आज गवर्नमेंट अखबारात को बंद कर देती है, अखबारात को कह देती है कि यह हम सह नहीं सकते हैं । हमारे पंजाब में इतना सख्त कानून बना हुआ है कि एक मिनट में सरकार किसी अखबार को बंद कर सकती है, प्रेस को अपने कब्जे में कर सकती है, यानी इतने बड़े कानून आपकी आरमरी में है । तो मैं अदब से आपकी मार्फत अर्ज कर रहा था कि मिनिस्टर साहब को वाजिह तौर पर यह बयान करना चाहिये कि क्या वाकई उनकी पालिसी है कि अखबारात का नेशनलाइजेशन किया जाये ताकि हिन्दुस्तान में कोई अखबार श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी के खयालात के खिलाफ न लिख सके, अपने सही सही खयालात का इजहार नहीं कर सके । अगर ऐसा है तो आप सोच लीजिए कि फ्रीडम आफ एक्सप्रेसन से आप कहां से कहां जा रहे हैं, कहां पर देश को ले जा रहे हैं ।

अब मैं आपकी बसातत से जो छोटे न्यूज-पेपर्स हैं, उनकी चार-पांच तकलीफें हैं, उनको आपके सामने रख देता हूँ । स्माल न्यूजपेपर्स को सबसे ज्यादा और भारी तकलीफ यह है कि कोई उनको नुमायंदगी नहीं मिलती है । अगर बाहर के किसी देश में हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने जाना है, स्पीकर ने जाना है, किसी और ने जाना है तो बड़े बड़े अखबार वालों को ले जायेंगे, जो छोटे

छोटे अखबार वाले हैं जो सूबाजात में निकल रहे हैं, जो देश की खिदमत कर रहे हैं, उनमें से किसी के नुमायंदे को ले जाने में तैयार नहीं होते हैं, कोई इनवाइट नहीं करते हैं, कभी उनको दावत नहीं करते हैं कि आपका नुमायंदा हम ले जाना चाहते हैं । अगर दावत देते भी हैं तो कहते हैं दिल्ली में आपका नुमायंदा है तो दे सकते हैं परन्तु पंजाब का अगर नुमायंदा है तो उसको नहीं भोजते हैं । तो मैं यह समझता हूँ यह खूबियाँ स्माल न्यूजपेपर्स को मदद करना नहीं है । इसके अलावा स्माल न्यूजपेपर्स को इस बात का दुःख है कि उनको इश्तिहार नहीं दिये जाते हैं । अभी राजनारायण जी ने कहा बल्क आफ एडवर्टाइजमेंट्स अंग्रेजी अखबारों को दिये जाते हैं । मैं पंजाब में गुरुमुखी की बात कह रहा हूँ लेकिन जो हिन्दी के हैं या हर सूबे में अपनी अपनी ज़बान के अखबार हैं उनको बहुत कम इश्तिहार दिये जाते हैं । मैं समझता हूँ उनको शायद एक रुपये में एक आना हिस्सा भी नहीं मिलता है क्योंकि बहुत ज्यादा रेट है अंग्रेजी अखबारात के । वह बल्क आफ मनी सारा अंग्रेजी अखबारों पर चला जाता है । अगर आप वाकई असल में छोटे अखबारात को बढ़ाना चाहते हैं तो उन छोटे अखबारों को, जो लैंग्वेज न्यूजपेपर्स हैं, जो गांव गांव में जाते हैं, देहात देहात में पढ़े जाते हैं, तो उनको ज्यादा से ज्यादा इश्तिहार दें क्योंकि जो मात्रा रखी हुई है वह बहुत कम है । इसको तरफ़ सरकार ने और इस प्रेस काउंसिल ने भी ध्यान रखना चाहिये ।

इसके साथ साथ दूसरी बात यह है कि अखबारात के साइज के मुताबिक कागज़ का कोटा जरूर देना चाहिये । वह ठीक नहीं मिलता है । जाते हैं यहाँ से आदमी और जाकर रात को छाप्रा भी अखबारात के दफ्तरों में लगाते हैं, सब कुछ देखते हैं । लेकिन ऐसे भी अखबार हैं जो 2,000 छपते हैं, लेकिन उनको 10,000 का कोटा मिलता है और कहीं 10,000 छपते हैं तो सिर्फ दो-तीन हज़ार का उनको कोटा मिलता है । (Interruptions) मैं चाहता हूँ कि अगर वाकई स्माल न्यूजपेपर्स को प्रोत्साहन देना चाहते हैं कि मुल्क की खिदमत करें तो

[श्री जगत नारायण]
आपको उनके लिये मौका देना चाहिये।
(Time bell rings.)

चौथी बात आपको वसालत से मैं मिनिस्टर साहब की खिदमत में यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि स्माल न्यूजपेपर्स को किसी किस्म का कोई लोन नहीं दिया जाता है, कोई सहायता नहीं दी जाती है। अगर उन्होंने कोई मशीनरी खरीदनी हो, किसी तरह अपने आपको अप-टुटेड रखना है, तो उसके लिये उनको किसी किस्म की सहायता नहीं दी जाती है न सेण्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से न स्टेट गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से। मैं यह समझता हूँ कि अगर आप वाकई स्माल न्यूजपेपर्स के लिये चाहते हैं कि वह फ्लोरिश कर और देश की सेवा करें, जो कि वह कह रहे हैं और देहातों में वही अखबार पढ़े जाते हैं तो आपको इन सहायताओं की तरफ ध्यान देना होगा।

आखिर मैं सिर्फ यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपको "टचो" नहीं होना चाहिये इस बात से कि फलां अखबार, हमारी पालिसी के मुताबिक नहीं चल रहा है, सेण्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट पालिसी के मुताबिक नहीं जा रहा है। हर एक अखबार की अपनी अपनी नीति है, हर अखबार के एडिटर का अपना अपना नुक्तेनजर है, उसको अपने खयालात का इजहार करने की इजाजत होनी चाहिये, वह उनका प्रचार करे। यह अलग बात है उसके खयालात से आप मुस्-फिक हों या न हों। जब फ्रीडम आफ एक्सप्रेशन आपने रखी हुई है तो हर आदमी को इजाजत है अपनी बात कहने के लिये। तो बार बार इस हाउस में रिपीट करना कि यह अखबार वाले हमारी बात की ताईद नहीं करते हैं, सारी दुनिया हमारे साथ है—जैसा मैंने इस हाउस में कहा था कि 80 फीसदी लोग वह हैं जिनकी आमदनी 1 रु० रोज है जिनको पता नहीं बैंक नेशनलाइजेशन क्या है, बैंकों में रुपया जमा करना क्या होता है तो 20 फीसदी में से उनके पास एक लाख टेलीग्राम, तार आ गये होंगे तो उससे यह समझना कि सारा हिन्दुस्तान उनके पुष्ट पर है, नेशनलाइजेशन के पुष्ट के ऊपर है, यह उनकी गलतफहमी है। मैं यह

समझता हूँ कि अखबारों को इस ढंग से रहना चाहिये कि जिससे वह सही खयालात का इजहार कर सकें। मैं नहीं कहता ऐसे अखबार नहीं हैं जो मैलिस नहीं लगाते होंगे जो वेंजोयन्स नहीं लगाते होंगे लेकिन एक ही रस्सी में सबको बांधें, इसको मैं नहीं मानता। फ्रीडम आफ एक्सप्रेशन, जिसकी महात्मा गांधी ने इजाजत दी है, उसी के मुताबिक आपको अपने यहाँ के अखबारों को फलने फूलने देना चाहिये और छोटे-छोटे अखबारों की मदद करनी चाहिये।

SHRI T. N. SINGH (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, while speaking on this Bill, it appears at first sight that this is a very small measure seeking to extend the term of office of the present Chairman and other members of the Council and to enable them to continue in office in a particular contingency such as this. Yet it has been thought proper by many of our colleagues to bring in other matters in the discussion and this is the provocation which has compelled me to intervene in this debate at this stage.

We have talked of freedom of thought, of speech and of expression and I say there is no country in this world with greater and nobler traditions of freedom of expression and thought than our beloved country. We have got a tradition of tolerance of thoughts and ideas of others which no country can claim. It is our proud privilege that in our great Constitution this great and sacred right of freedom of expression has been given a very prime and important place. I dare say no section of the House this side or that side has any reservations on this very important question of freedom of expression, because on freedom of expression depends the success of democracy. If the press is not free in a country, I say, democracy will not succeed, and I am convinced that the Press Council was originally thought of with a view to protecting the freedom of the press and freedom of expression. Unfortunately, people, whether in power or without power, have occasionally been trying to entrench themselves in the newspaper field in the past and I can confess to this that certain cases had come to the notice of the Press Commission—I was a member of the Press Commission—that the power of giving advertisements or showing such other favours was utilised to influence the press. That is condemnable but, by and large, I say the record of our country in regard to freedom of press and expression despite many failures and

other weaknesses, is such of which any country can be proud. In our country thanks to the traditions set up consistently beginning from Gandhiji right up to the illustrious leaders who followed him we have by and large stuck to this principle of freedom of expression and by and large freedom of the press has been preserved. It was Gandhiji who felt that the power to give advertisements could be misused to take away freedom of expression and therefore he was the one man who brought out his weekly *Young India* later on *Harijan* which accepted no advertisements. Both these papers were run well, without any difficulty. But that was probably a great exception.

After giving much thought to the problems facing the press in India we in the Press Commission more than fifteen years ago were compelled to come to the conclusion that commercialisation has come to stay in the press in India. That is the main problem for us. When commercialisation comes in, therefrom flow a number of other factors and forces which can mar, restrict and even debase freedom of the press. That was why the idea of a Press Council was suggested by the Press Commission which the Government of India set up fifteen or sixteen years back. Two Members of the Press Commission are here today in this House, myself and Mr. Mani.

The Press Council felt that essentially the Council should be a professional body. Journalism is a profession; it is not like trade or industry. Journalism was given the honoured position of a profession. In all other professions efforts have been made to maintain their independence, dignity and stature and for that purpose professional organisations have been statutorily set up by the Governments of most countries, like the Bar Council, the Medical Council and other similar organisations. Journalism was also rightly considered to be a profession and for that purpose it was thought that there should be a self-regulatory organisation. Self-regulation by the profession is one of the ways to protect its independence. The idea of the Press Council was to create an organisation which should enable self-regulation by the members of the profession themselves. That is the basic principle.

Then the next question arises who are the professionals, how to define and enumerate them and thereby some problems arise. Now I am free to say-

was a Member of the Press Commission—that I felt that essentially, basically and in all cases virtually it is the people who carry on the profession and not those who finance the profession, or newspapers who should be the regulators of the profession. Unfortunately, Sir, I was in a minority in the Press Commission. I had by that time joined politics and my journalistic profession was almost at an end. At that time unfortunately, my colleagues belonging to the profession in the Press Commission felt that the people who owned the press must also have a voice and be represented in the Press Council and that, according to me, has been the source of trouble, the genesis of the trouble. They thought that the man who paid the piper had also the right to call the tune. But that is against the principle, against the very fundamentals of the freedom of the press and right of self-regulation by the press. About the Press Council Act of the future which I hope will be framed after full thought—and I would say to the Government not all the talent and wisdom is found in the corridors of the Secretariat—I hope they will take care to consult the people who know this job when reframing or perhaps amending the Press Council Act. It is very essential; if we want to ensure freedom of expression which has been enjoined on us by our sacred Constitution and on which rests not only the foundation of democracy but the very progress and functioning of democracy in the future, let us in all humility reconsider the whole position that a self-regulatory organisation like the Press Council should consist of people who follow the profession and not of those who own and finance the press. This position has to be remedied. I plead again; my voice may be small. I know I failed in the Press Commission to carry other colleagues with me. I confess my failure as a member of the Press Commission to convince my colleagues in this behalf but I feel today more and more convinced that the profession must be given its due place of honour and respect in society, in democracy and in all such institutions of our country which are expected to uphold freedom of the press. And for that reason I would urge a second thought on the whole thing.

We had a Committee which went into certain problems arising out of the deadlock in the Press Council because some journalist colleagues could not cooperate with the Press Council. Certain limited aspects were taken into consideration by that Committee. There were other questions also which have to be thought of

[Shri T. N. Singh]

But here as an advocate of freedom of expression and freedom of the press and one who has had the privilege of carrying on this profession for more than two decades. I want to urge that I will not tolerate in any way, even in the sacred name of nationalisation, any kind of Government control over the press. At the same time I must also say—though mine may be a lone voice today—that commercialisation has come to stay but the right and authority and the unchecked power which the money bags seem to enjoy over the press, over the noblest of the professions in the country, must also be stopped. That also must end and let us apply our mind to that aspect. If we are afraid that the capitalist people with their tremendous resources and by owning the press are trying to impinge on the freedom of the profession we should be equally afraid of the State apparatus getting control of the press. I do not want either. With my last breath—I am not so strong now—I will oppose both moves. I cannot allow such a thing. I will fight the press barons, the money bags; I will also fight the Government. On both fronts I will fight, alone though I may be, in order to protect the freedom of the press, the most sacred right of the human being in India. It is not as if we have recognised this principle today. Centuries ago our *rishis* advocated this. They said a man who does not believe in God and a man who worshipped even a tree were both brothers and they could and should live together. There was no distinction; there was tolerance for all. We have inherited that great tradition. We have not to learn the principles and ethics of freedom of expression or the principles underlying article 19 of our Constitution from Britain, Europe or America. We are born with that tradition. Therefore I say, let us apply our mind as to how to protect the great heritage. Mr. Krishan Kant is an enthusiastic person. He has got great enthusiasm; all honour to him but let him not be carried away because of the misdeeds or errors of some people who happen to control the press with their finances so far as to favour nationalisation. We should find a way out. There is a way out of it. I say there is a solution for it. I would have tried to enunciate it here and now, but it would be inappropriate to deal with this basic problem while considering a minor Bill which only seeks the extension of the term of office of the present Chairman. It will lose all its importance and significance. Therefore, I desist from making any concrete proposal as to how we should set

about meeting the power of money, which is commercialising the press, which today requires large investments and which is in a way not only used to take away or restrict the freedom of the individual to express his views, but is also strangulating democracy. It is killing democracy and freedom. It is a serious matter. Let us think of it. Have we seriously applied our mind to this danger? Some friends, who have meant well, have talked of nationalisation, but the greatest danger, as my beloved leader, the late Jawaharlal Nehru, used to say in his usual loud thinking mood, is this. I want to repeat it. He wanted socialism to come as soon as possible, but he was very much afraid of socialism degenerating into State capitalism. He knew of that danger. I say, if you think of nationalisation in the context of the press, you are ushering in an era of State capitalism, which would be a very serious danger. There is only a very thin dividing line between Fascism and State capitalism, I can assure you in all humility. I wanted to say many things, but I think this is not the appropriate occasion. It is after all a very limited Bill and I am rather old-fashioned. Unlike Mr. Rajnarain I cannot go on talking about all kinds of publications, press allegations, charges accusations, etc. That is not my habit. I want to maintain that habit. Thank you.

SHRI A. D. MANI : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the debate on this innocuous Bill has wandered over wide and varied fields. It was expected when the Bill was moved by the Government that it would be passed without much of a discussion. Various points have been raised in the course of the debate which makes it necessary for me, as one who was a member of the Press Commission, to deal with the issues which have been raised by Members. The Press Commission was formed in 1954 and it is somewhat unusual and strange that a body set up nearly seventeen years ago had four members, who are still Members of Parliament, viz., Shri Tri-bhuvan Narayan Singh, Prof. V.K.R.V. Rao, Mr. Jaipal Singh and my humble self. There was one more, our late lamented Dr. Zakir Husain. They were all members of it.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: But You did not agree with your colleagues.

SHRI A. D. MANI : When we discussed the matter of setting up a Press Council we had before us the spectacle of the Times of India being used by Seth Ramkrishna Dalmia for the propagation of his fads. There was also coming into existence an

obscene and scurrilous press in various parts of the country. One of the places which came up before us in evidence was Banaras. We felt that a Press Council should be set up. I do not want to mention the name. It is all years ago. Dirty things had been published. At that time we thought that a Press Council should be set up under a statute and we made our recommendations. I am an old journalist of forty years' standing and I have been an editor for thirty-three years in this country. These are my only qualifications. The fact that I have been for long a journalist gives me somekind of credential to speak on the working of the Press Council. I must confess that the Press Council, as constituted today, is a great disappointment to all of us. It has not made any visible improvement in the tone of the press. We are now entering a stage of scurrilous politics. Ideological polarisation is taking place. There is bound to be hard hitting in many journals. There is bound to be a good deal of communal and personal propaganda. The only thing that I can say for the press is that we have not descended to the level of some sections of the American press. I was shocked to read the other day in the *Time* magazine, which is internationally known and regarded as a source book for international news, a paragraph about a certain enquiry against Senator Kennedy, who has been involved in an unfortunate incident, saying that he was flirting with a large number of girls in Washington. Senator Kennedy is married. He is having about four children. This was the tone of the *Time* magazine. I do not think that any ingenuous paper would publish this kind of things about persons holding high positions and so on. Nobody would publish material of the kind as the *Time* has done.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: What about the *Observer*?

SHRI A. D. MANI : That is our consolation. The *Observer* has more or less sweated out. While that has been our consolation, we are entering a savage stage in our politics.—The other day an hon. Member referred to the *Organiser*. I have been a regular reader of the *Organiser*—It carries very well-informed articles on international affairs and the person who writes as "Sutradara" is very well known. But I expressed my own personal opinion about the *Organiser's* low standard of journalism in attacking the Prime Minister in the way it was done. This is not done at all. This kind of thing is going on now in almost all the States.

One of the reasons why the Press Council has not made any impact on us and on the public mind is that its proceedings are confidential. As a journalist I am at liberty to reveal even confidential things. One of the cases referred recently to the Press Council was that of a cartoon of *Mother India* being stripped of her Sari and of being in underwear and Mr. Morarji Desai making a gift of Mother India to the World Bank. It was in atrocious taste. This case went up before the Press Council. As a member of the Press Council I came to know about it. Other people are not likely to know about it. In England every case that is discussed in the Press Council is publicised. Some information is given, but unfortunately here we do not get any information about the working of the Press Council and the cases with which it deals.

Another drawback of the Press Council is that its personnel is of such a character as not to command public confidence or the confidence of newspapermen. I do not want to go into the merits and demerits of the persons who constitute the Press Council. A number of arguments may be advanced to justify a person who is in it and a person who is out of it, but we journalists, do not regard the Press Council as constituting the cream of the profession.

It is a matter of great regret to me that my old friend, Mr. Chalapati Rao—he and I started journalism together—refused to be a member of the Press Council because of its composition. How do you expect the press to respect a Council when newspapermen doubt the capacity and the credit of the men who constitute the Council? I personally feel after the working of the Press Council Act, though I have no objection to my good friend, Mr. Rajagopala Aiyangar, getting an extension up to next year, that if the Press Council is to function voluntarily, it must have as its Chairman one of the foremost journalists of the country, as the Press Council is sought to be a voluntary body. I would request my working journalist friends, who would be outside this Hall and elsewhere in this Hall, to bear this in mind that it does not matter whether 'A' is a working journalist or a non-working journalist—He must be a real journalist to be the Chairman of the Press Council. If the Press Council had started with a real journalist as its Chairman, it might have made a much greater impact on the

[Shri A. D. Mani]

newspaper profession. Unfortunately the Press Council since its inception has been involved in a good deal of controversy sometimes of a personal character, which has all been discussed in this House—I do not want to go into that—and it is taking upon itself to much of a load of work. The question of monopoly in press is a matter which can now be handed over to the Monopolies Commission. We do not have the staff for conducting an enquiry of that kind. I may mention here that as much as Rs. 2 lakhs were spent by the Press Commission of which I was a member analysing the financial accounts of various newspapers. We do not have the money, and the money that the Government asks for the Press Council is Rs. 3 lakhs. If we get caught in this monopoly business and ideological warfare, we will forget the main thing for which the Press Council was established, namely, the maintenance of the standards of journalism.

My hon. friend, Mr. T. N. Singh, is not here. He referred to the fact that in the Press Council there was a lot of discussion on one issue, whether freedom of expression belonged only to the working journalists or even to the proprietors. We discussed the matter for seven long days. I do not think that any issue was discussed for hours together as we discussed that issue, and I took the point that the moment you give freedom of expression, you give freedom of expression even to a criminal, you give freedom of expression also to an offender, you will not give it to the proprietor. Under the constitution if a man was being sentenced to seven years' rigorous imprisonment, he is entitled to make a speech. How can you say that because a man has got some property and owns a paper, he can be denied freedom of expression? We all expected that a band of editors would come up, who would be able to stand up to the proprietors. In the old days—I hope, Mr. Vice-Chairman, you do not mind my going on for five minutes more, I am generally very brief—in the old days we had men like Mr. K. Natarajan of the *Indian Social Reformer* who was an editor about the time I became editor of a newspaper, or had been an editor much before; he was asked to edit the *Indian Daily Mail* which was run by the Pettit family—one of the Petits married Mr. Jinnah as you know. One day he went to the office and found Mr. Wilson of the Pioneer sitting in his room at his table, and he asked him "How are you here?" He said, "Mr. Petit wanted me to come round and see the

office". Immediately he tendered his resignation. I am very sorry to say that editors who are editors of the so called big newspapers do not have the courage to stand up to the proprietor and say, "I am not prepared to follow your policy; in public interest I am prepared to tender my resignation". There is no use blaming capital alone. We journalists are not able to face the proprietor because the newspapers are paying such salaries that we cannot get them elsewhere. Papers like the *Times of India* or the *Statesman* can pay Rs. 3,000 or Rs. 5,000, and the journalist would not be able to get an alternative employment. For that reason a good deal of independence has been sacrificed.

I would like to go on to say that my hon. friend, Mr. Jagat Narain, referred to the question of small newspapers and advertisements. My hon. friend, Mr. I. K. Gujral, has taken up the portfolio of Information and Broadcasting with a good deal of enthusiasm and he is a man with receptive mind if I may say so as a senior person. He said the other day that We believed in the freedom of the press but not independence. I would tell him this as an old journalist that as far as the independence of the journalists is concerned no independence can be forced by Government. It must come from within. Unless journalists want to be independent no Government can force them to be independent, and I hope that in the name of independence of the press he would do nothing which will fetter the freedom of the press, big or small, in this country. Big newspapers—you handle them through the Monopolies Commission. There are ways of handling them. You can ask them to use white newsprint, but do not say try to be independent. ...

(Time bell rings.)

One more point, Sir, about advertisements. There are small newspapers in this country which are faced almost with extinction on account of the bigger newspapers of the country, and my paper is one of the sufferers...

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA (Uttar Pradesh): Yours is a very old and big newspaper.

SHRI A. D. MANI: In circulation by the standards of the big newspapers it is a small newspaper. Unless Government is able to allot a bigger advertisement budget and makes it a policy to give a greater share of the advertisements to small newspapers and reduce the advertisements,

it possible, for the bigger newspapers—the bigger newspaper can get it from the commercial public—we people cannot go on publishing our paper at Nagpur or Bhopal or Lucknow. we will not be able to get the commercial advertisements as the other papers get. Unless he does that, all this talk about supporting small and medium newspapers on the part of the Government is phoney.

I would like to reserve my comments when the report of the Committee comes here and there are many other issues which have got to be discussed. I would like to say this that I hope that whatever happens the next Press Council that you are going to have would be of such a character as to win our respect. I can tell my hon. friend, Mr. Gujral, that nobody bothers about the Press Council of India; outside the Government, the Information and Broadcasting Ministry, nobody bothers, and I do not want to show my hands somewhere and say those gentlemen also do not bother. Nobody bothers about your Press Council. He wants Rs. 3 lakhs. You take so much money for other things, you take these Rs. 3 lakhs also, and I give my most reluctant consent to this Bill.

श्री सूरज प्रसाद : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, 1967 के दिसम्बर में इस राज्य सभा में प्रेस कौंसिल के सम्बन्ध में कुछ बातें उठी थीं और एक कमेटी इसके लिए बैठाई गई कि वह इस बात को बताए कि प्रेस कौंसिल के जो कारनामे हैं या जो प्रेस हिन्दुस्तान की है उसके कारनामे कहाँ तक सही हैं। प्रेस कौंसिल की सलाहकार समिति ने सरकार के सामने कुछ सिफारिशें की थीं और जो सिफारिशें आई थीं वे सिफारिशें इसमें जरूरी थीं लेकिन हम लोगों को देखने को यह मिलता है कि जो बिल आया है उसमें सिर्फ एक बात की ही चर्चा है और वह चर्चा इस बात के लिए है कि सभापति की जिन्दगी कब तक बढ़ा दी जाय और कौंसिल के सदस्यों की जिन्दगी कब तक के लिए बढ़ा दी जाय। दूसरी जो सिफारिशें थीं उन पर बिलकुल ही ध्यान नहीं दिया। ऐसी बातें इसलिए की गई हैं क्योंकि आज देश के अन्दर जो प्रेस है उस पर देश के मुट्ठी भर पूँजीपतियों का अधिकार है। उन्हीं के हाथों में हिन्दुस्तान के जितने भी बड़े बड़े अखबार हैं आज केंद्रित हो रहे हैं और उन का दबाव प्रत्यक्ष

या अप्रत्यक्ष ढंग से सरकार पर भी है और इसीलिए यद्यपि सलाहकार समिति की सिफारिशें सर्वसम्मति से थीं फिर भी वे सिफारिशें कानून के रूप में आज नहीं ला पा रहे हैं। उन सिफारिशों में क्या बातें थीं? उन सिफारिशों में सबसे बड़ी बात यह थी कि जो वर्किंग जर्नलिस्ट हैं उन को प्रेस कौंसिल में प्रधानता होनी चाहिए, उसके फैसलों में उन का मत प्रबल होना चाहिए। लेकिन उस बात के संबंध में इस बिल में कोई चर्चा नहीं है। उसमें इस बात की भी सिफारिश की गयी थी कि जितने भी छोटे और मंशोले अखबार हैं उन को विशेष स्थान सरकार की ओर से दिया जाना चाहिए उन के प्रोत्साहन के लिए सरकार की ओर से काफी सहायता दी जानी चाहिए। विज्ञापनों में जो घाघली होती है और उन में जो बड़े बड़े अखबार हाथ मार लिया करते हैं वह नहीं होना चाहिए और उन के द्वारा छोटे अखबारों को विशेष सहायता और सहायता मिलनी चाहिए इस तरह की सिफारिश उसके द्वारा की गयी थी। लेकिन हम को देखने को यह मिलता है कि ये सिफारिशें फाइलों में दबा दी गयी हैं और एक मामूली सी बात को लेकर पहले एक आर्डिनेंस आया और उसके बाद एक बिल पेश कर दिया गया। मैं सरकार से यह चाहूंगा कि भविष्य में जो सिफारिशें प्रेस कौंसिल की सलाहकार समिति द्वारा पेश की गयी हों वे सिफारिशें बृहद् रूप में, एक बिल के रूप में इस सभा में पेश हों तभी हम अच्छी तरह से उन पर विचार कर सकते हैं। इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि सरकार इन सिफारिशों को मद्देनजर रखते हुए एक बृहद् बिल इस सभा में लाये ताकि उन पर विचार हो सके।

इस प्रेस कौंसिल के संबंध में बोलते हुए हमारे कुछ साथियों ने एक दूसरे सवाल को उठाया। आज प्रेस की आम हालत क्या है आज हिन्दुस्तान के अंदर कुछ मुट्ठी भर ऐसे लोग हैं जिनके हाथों में तमाम अखबार केंद्रित हो गये हैं और प्रेस की आजादी के नाम पर वे क्या छापते हैं इसे आप देखें कहीं जट कारखानों के मजदूर अगर ठड़ताल कर देते

[श्री सूरज प्रसाद]

हैं तो ये बड़े बड़े अखबारों के मालिक, जिनका प्रतिनिधित्व हमारे लोकनाथ मिश्र जी करते हैं, कह डालते हैं कि यह तो मजदूरों की बदमाशी है। कहीं जमींदार किसानों को बेदखल कर दे और किसान उसको जमीन पर से बेदखल करना चाहें तो मिश्र जी के अखबार कह देंगे कि यह नक्सलवादियों का काम है। कहीं हिन्दुस्तान के अंदर बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण हो जाय तो मिश्र जी बलबला कर कह उठेंगे कि यह तो तानाशाही की प्रवृत्ति है। अच्छा कदम है, उसका हिन्दुस्तान की जनता को स्वागत करना चाहिए, लेकिन प्रेस की आजादी है और इस लिए वह जैसा चाहें कह सकते हैं। असल में यह आजादी है मोटे सेठ साहूकारों को और बड़े बड़े पूंजीपतियों को और उन्हीं की आजादी की चर्चा हमेशा हमारे दायें बैठे मित्र जनसंघ और स्वतंत्र पार्टी के लोग किया करते हैं और अपनी आजादी की बात कहते कहते वह यहां तक कह डालते हैं और कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी पर यहां तक लांछन लगा देते हैं कि यह कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी देश के बाहर से इंस्पिरेशन लेती है और उस के साथ अपने को बड़ा देशभक्त बना लेते हैं। मुझे ताज्जुब होता है उन दोनों पार्टियों पर। आप देखें कि उनका जन्म कब हुआ। . . .

श्री मानसिंह वर्मा (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मैं अपने मित्र से यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि अपने दाहिने बैठे लोगों पर तो वह एतराज कर रहे हैं लेकिन जब रेलें लूटी जाती हैं, डाके डाले जाते हैं तो उनकी वह वकालत करते हैं। जब आग लगायी जाती है तो उनकी वह वकालत करते हैं, औरतों की जब अस्मिता लूटी जाती है तो उनके पत्र उनकी वकालत करते हैं। देखिये शीशे के मकान में खड़े हो कर डेला फेंकने की कोशिश न कीजिए।

श्री सूरज प्रसाद : आप को बोलने का टाइम मिलेगा। इस समय आप मेरी बात सुनिये। ये लोग कहते हैं कि ये कम्युनिस्ट लोग भी प्रेरणा देते हैं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि जब देश की आजादी की लड़ाई चल रही थी तो ये लोग कहाँ थे? देश की आजादी के 12 साल बाद,

1960 में इनका जन्म हुआ और यह जनसंघ के लोग हैं। इनका जन्म हुआ 1951 में, हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी के चार वर्ष बाद।

श्री मानसिंह वर्मा : आप भी तब पैदा नहीं हुए थे।

श्री सूरज प्रसाद : आप का जन्म हम से पहले हुआ होगा, लेकिन पार्टी का जन्म हमारे बाद में हुआ। तो इसलिए मैंने कहा कि मुझे उनसे देश भक्ति का सर्टिफिकेट नहीं लेना है और न ही राष्ट्रीयता का सर्टिफिकेट लेना है। यह जो राष्ट्रीयता और देश भक्ति की बात करते हैं तो यह किन के लिए है। इनकी देश-भक्ति हिन्दुस्तान के मुट्ठी भर पूंजीपतियों के लिए है। पहले अपना चेहरा शीशे में ठीक से देख लीजिए तब कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के बारे में बोलने की कोशिश कीजिए। मिश्र जी कह रहे थे हिन्दुस्तान के अखबारों के बारे में। मैं सोच रहा था कि कुछ संतुलित बात बोलेंगे, कुछ बात बोलेंगे तमाम अखबारों के बारे में, उनकी दिक्कतों के बारे में, लेकिन बोले क्या? वह बोल गये ब्लिट्ज के बारे में। उनके मुंह से आर्गनाइजर के बारे में एक बात भी नहीं निकली। पांचजन्य और आर्गनाइजर क्या सोचते हैं, प्रेस की आजादी के नाम पर क्या लिखते हैं इस बारे में उन्होंने कुछ नहीं कहा। हिन्दुस्तान के अंदर हिन्दू और मुसलमानों के बीच दंगा कराने की बात बोलते हैं, वे हिन्दू और मुसलमानों के बीच विभेद पैदा कर रहे हैं। हिन्दुस्तान के मुसलमानों के बीच साम्प्रदायिक दंगों की भावना पैदा कर रहे हैं और बिहार के अंदर में क्रिश्चियन और हिन्दू के बीच में यही प्रवृत्ति पैदा करने का प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं। यही आजादी का मतलब है? मैं तो सोचता था कि लोकनाथ मिश्र जी उस पर भी कुछ बोलेंगे लेकिन चोर चोर मौसेरे भाई। जनसंघ और स्वतंत्र पार्टी दोनों भाई भाई हैं उसके बारे में वे क्यों बोलेंगे।

श्री मानसिंह वर्मा : उल्लू का गवाह चमगादड़।

श्री सूरज प्रसाद : हिन्दुस्तान में लक्ष्मी की सवारी क्या होती है ? हमारे हिन्दुस्तान में एक देवी है लक्ष्मी । उस देवी लक्ष्मी की सवारी उल्लू है । वह देवी धन का प्रतिनिधित्व करती है उसी प्रकार ये दोनों पार्टियां किस का प्रतिनिधित्व करती हैं— धनियों का, उल्लुओं का प्रतिनिधित्व ये पार्टियां करती हैं ।

श्री मानसिंह बर्मा : उल्लू ही इन्हें पसंद आया ।

श्री सूरज प्रसाद : तो मैं यह कह रहा था कि हिन्दुस्तान के अंदर कुछ ऐसे भी अखबार हैं जिनका पेशा यह है । मैं प्रेस काउंसिल से कहूंगा कि वह कुछ ऐसा ऐक्ट लायें कि जो प्रेस काउंसिल को सही रूप में यहां पेश करे । इसमें ऐसा कुछ संशोधन होना चाहिए कि जो अखबार हिन्दुस्तान की पार्लियामेंट के फैसलों का विरोध करे उस पर कुछ अंकुश लगे । हिन्दुस्तान की पार्लियामेंट ने समाजवाद को अपना आदर्श बनाया है और हिन्दुस्तान में ऐसे बहुत से अखबार हैं जो हिन्दुस्तान की पार्लियामेंट के निश्चित सिद्धांतों का विरोध कर रहे हैं । क्या इस तरह की बात की इजाजत हिन्दुस्तान में दी जा सकती है ।

4 P. M.

इसलिये मैं मंत्री जी से कहना चाहूंगा कि वह कुछ इस तरह का बिल लायें कि जो इस तरह के अखबार हैं जो कि इस तरह के विचार व्यक्त करते हैं, हिन्दुस्तान की जनता, हिन्दुस्तान के किसानों और मजदूरों के विचारों का जो दमन करते हैं, जो उनको सप्रेस करते हैं, उनके ऊपर अंकुश लगाया जा सके ताकि हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर सही मानों में समाजवाद, सही मानों में जनतंत्र और डेमोक्रेसी हो सके और सही मानों में हिन्दुस्तान की जनता की भावना की अभिव्यक्ति हो सके । इन शब्दों के साथ मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि प्रेस काउंसिल का जो बिल है उसको और भी काम्प्रे-हेंसिव बनाया जाय और भी विस्तृत बनाया जाय और इन तनाम सुझावों का, जैसे कि वकिंग जर्नलिस्ट्स को प्रतिनिधित्व देने या छोटे और मझीले अखबारों को सहायता देने, इन तमाम बातों का उसमें सम्मिश्रण कर के उसे लाया जाय तो बड़ी अच्छी बात होगी ।

6—26 R S/69

SHRI BANKABEHARY DAS (Orissa) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, though I support this Bill, because under the present circumstances there is no meaning in opposing this Bill, I want to remind the Minister particularly of his speech when he moved the motion for consideration of the Bill that he accepted one of the amendments of the Committee of Members of Parliament regarding the Press Council as to make the term of Members and the Chairman co-terminous. But that was not the purpose of the recommendation of the Committee. The purpose was not to just make it co-terminous. The term of the Chairman has already lapsed in July and the term of the members will be lapsing in the month of November. Therefore, it would have been proper for the Minister to see that the new Press Council comes into existence in the month of November. The purpose was not to make it coterminus to defer both the Chairman's appointment and also the appointment of the members. I think both the Members of the Press Council here will corroborate that this was not the purpose.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : We were swindled and fooled.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : Mr. Vice-Chairman, though in the present circumstances there is no other option but to support this Bill, it was not the contention of the Advisory Committee of the Press Council. I am not going into that aspect in detail.

As regards the role of the Press Council I am entirely in agreement with Mr. Mani that the Press Council has not lived up to the expectations that was in the minds of our countrymen when it was constituted. There were two objectives. One was the preservation of the freedom of the press, and the second was to improve the standard of journalism. These are the two major objectives for setting up this Press Council. I will not go into details because this is not the occasion. But I want to point out here that the preservation of the freedom of the press constitutes, to a greater extent, seeing to it that the influence of Government, politicians— I again say 'politicians'—and foreign influence as well do not exist. Only then the press can be free and independent.

I was astonished to hear that somebody gave much more importance to monopoly, with which I am entirely in agreement. Some of them talked about foreign influence but nobody has talked about the

[Shri Banka Behary Da?.]

influence of politicians on the press. I am again astounded to say here that every now and then Parliament, including my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, is seized of the matter whenever there is some criticism of Parliament or Assemblies in the press. I do not like that attitude because of Assemblies and Parliament, which consist of all important political parties and leaders of political parties, are guaranteed freedom from attack from the press, the press also expects that Parliament and the Assemblies will also behave as they expect. So let us not forget that—I am a very small press man and a working journalist also, not a whole-troer now—there is always an attack from this side of the politicians. Sometimes the Government and the politicians combine together because the politicians also become Ministers and they try to see that the freedom of the press is suppressed. I gave an instance in the House. During the communal riots in Orissa I had to point out four or five times, and the Minister had to come and accept that proposition, that the freedom of the press was suppressed when all those telegrams were not allowed to come here violating even the rules framed by the British Government. The Minister, when he was holding the portfolio of Communications, defended the action though at last he had to express regrets. Therefore, sometimes politicians' interest and the Government interest combine together to see that the press does not enjoy that much freedom as they should enjoy.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, in this connection I want to know how many Assemblies⁵ in this country have given this immunity to the press people and the All India Radio to publish fairly whatever is done on the floor of the Assembly in the country. Whatever Mr. Rajnarain has said here today, had he said that in the Uttar Pradesh Assembly, the Press people of Uttar Pradesh would not be able to publish it. Rajnarainji may have that immunity, according to the Constitution of India to speak out his mind in the Uttar Pradesh Assembly or Mr. Bhupesh Gupta in the West Bengal Assembly, no press of Bengal or Uttar Pradesh will be able to publish that because they do not enjoy the freedom which the press people of Delhi enjoy when they cover the proceedings of Parliament. Is it not proper for all of us, who talk so much of the freedom of the press from the hands of the monopoly to be alive to that situation when the Legislatures of India will pass this

law of immunity so that the press at least can faithfully record and publish and inform the public of whatever happens on the floor of the Assemblies. I think only, two Assemblies, Maharashtra and Orissa have passed this immunity law.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : If they did it faithfully, the Governments would have been out of power.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : That is a different thing. Suppose a defamatory statement against Mr. Nijalingappa or the Prime Minister is made in the Assembly of West Bengal, though it might be hundred per cent, true, the press of West Bengal will never publish it because they know . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Why ? That is the law of the land. Even if I say Mr. Nijalingappa is a political joker . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : Mr Bhupesh Gupta must come to his seat

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : If in the West Bengal Assembly it is said that he is a political joker or he has taken so much money and bribe, as it was done in the Lok Sabha only three days back—papers of Delhi published it because it happened in Parliament and Parliament has given that immunity to the press—no Calcutta press will publish it because they do not enjoy the immunity that is granted by Parliament. Suppose Members of the West Bengal Assembly tell on the floor of the West Bengal Assembly that Mr. Atulya Ghosh has taken so much money or bribe from so and so. can they publish it? They will never do that, not even the New Age because the New Age would then be proceeded against under criminal proceedings because the West Bengal Assembly has not given that immunity to the press of West Bengal to publish whatever happens even if it is hundred per cent, correct.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, in this connection I want to point out one thing. I was really shocked. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and Mr. Krishna Kant, my friend, were there in the Press Council. They always talk about monopolists. It is correct that they should do that. But why did this Committee not give as much attention to that aspect ? For the last two years we have been raising our voice. Every year we are finding this monopolist control over the press increasing; it is not decreasing. Combined circulation of the dailies owned by the common ownership units accounted

for 48*21 per cent, of the total circulation in 1967. The dailies owned by common ownership units and located in metropolitan cities like Delhi, Calcutta, Madras and Bombay have 95*2 per cent, of the total circulation of all metropolitan dailies. And eight major units owning 30 dailies control 67 3 per cent of the total circulation of all metropolitan dailies. This is the position in India after 22 years of independence. If you see the Press Registrar's Report, you will find that the units in metropolitan cities are decreasing and their hold over the readership is increasing. So, the Government should have taken into consideration the concentration that is going on in this country in this field; whether it should be referred to the Monopolies Commission or the Press Council is immaterial; the Press Council, in my opinion, should deal with it, because the Monopolies Commission deals with economic concentration. And this merger of papers and some units purchasing other units, this tendency, should be completely curbed in this country. I do not want to say more because you have already rung the bell. . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : You are afraid of the monopoly papers and you are not afraid of the Communist papers But you will be left out and be nowhere, if the Communist papers dominate.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : I agree that Communist papers also may become a monopoly. But anybody owning such a large chain of newspapers will come under the mischief of the law. That is my contention.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : By that time Mr. Bhupesh Gupta will be the lawmaker.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : I do not agree. I agree with Mr. T. N. Singh that newspapers can never be nationalised because we have to get freedom from Government control also. It is not a question of producing wealth. It is a question of producing information, correct information, and educating public opinion.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA • What about *Pravda* and *Izvestia* ?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : They are going to decide who our President and Vice-President are going to be.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The Press Council does not apply there.

SHRI ABID ALI : Sir, I must certainly say, as any other honest man, that those who talk . . .

SHRI M. N. KAUL : Do not act.

SHRI ABID ALI : . . . that the Congress gets preference in reporting in news papers and Government gets more support are themselves not speaking what they believe. And what is the fact ? What is newspaper reporting ? The owner of the paper may be sleeping on his cushion-bed. The Editor may be more concerned with the editorial So the reporting depends on the person in charge of reports, and the Sub-Editor, of whatever mentality or alignment they may be, and the report will appear accordingly in the newspapers in the morning.

Now, Sir, this Press Council came into existence to build up a code of conduct for newspapers and journalists in accordance with high professional standards ; maintenance of high standards of public taste ; to foster a due sense of both rights and responsibilities of citizenship and public service among those who are engaged in the profession of journalism ; to keep under review such cases of assistance received by any newspaper or news agency in India from foreign sources as are referred to it by the Central Government ; to provide facilities for the proper education and training of persons in the profession of journalism ; and lastly to study the developments which may tend towards monopoly or concentration of ownership of newspapers, including a study of the ownership of the financial structures of newspapers and, if necessary to suggest remedies therefor. May I ask the hon. Minister what his assessment is with regard to the success of the working of this Council judged from these standards? Particularly, how many cases did they refer to the Press Council with regard to the receiving of foreign money . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : He is studying Goebbels.

SHRI ABID ALI : ... and with what result? I hope he will be able to give some satisfactory answer to this question

Now, the complaint is that Government advertisements are given to those who support the Government. But why should newspapers exist on Government advertisements? Why should they not exist on their own popularity and working?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Communist papers exist even without advertisements because they have other sources.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : They do not sell ; they distribute.

SHRI ABID ALI : Now, there are some newspapers which are communal to the extent that they publish the next day what is announced over Pakistan Radio, they are anti-Indian and communal to that extent. Then there are anti-national newspapers and periodicals, weeklies and dailies, claiming to be progressive ; there is "Peace and Progress", but which is nowhere near that. And there is Radio China. All these items, without any verification, without any acknowledgment, appear, word for word, in some newspapers here. You give newsprints. There are newspapers which are getting three times more newsprint than their own press can print. And all that goes in blackmarket. Now, there are Communist papers which take your newsprints, your advertisements. One Communist newspaper was given advertisements on Ashoka Hotel. According to the Communists, Ashoka Hotel is "this posh, damned thing" But that is how our Government is patronising the Communist papers. Then about the *New Age* press. From where did the *New Age* press come?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : That is unfair. He is here.

SHRI ABID ALI : From where did it come ? The whole printing equipment was presented to them by a foreign, Communist country. Now all these matters should be enquired into.

SHRI M. N. KAUL : Which one was it?

SHRI ABID ALI : The *New Age* press.

SHRI M. N. KAUL : Which Communist country ?

SHRI ABID ALI : No, that will not be proper. It is not Russia.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What is he speaking?

SHRI ABID ALI : One weekly went on for years together publishing obscene things and existing on blackmail, and Government could not do anything. Why is this helplessness? Anti-national, anti-social and communal weeklies and dailies are flourishing, and here friends come and abuse this Government for not managing things in such a way that everything that they want is published in the newspapers. Even over All India Radio,—here was an item—perhaps it was the 15th

of July—in the 1-30 P.M. English news bulletin which described how a dead person came to life because of Mao's sayings. The moment people went there and recited something about Mao's sayings, the dead man came to life. This is from All India Radio; Now, what is this going on in our country? What comes in the way of the Minister stopping at least advertisements to newspapers which are anti-national, communal or antisocial ? At least to that extent, you will be able to manage things without going to the Council, without going to the court or without going to anybody. And if it is a fact—I do not accept it—that because of Government advertisements these papers are thriving, then you will be achieving a big objective by stopping your advertisements to such papers. Now, why should the Government be so much hesitant ? Is it not your policy that there should be secularism in this country. If that is true, if you are honest about it, then, tell me as to what comes in your way to stop these communal papers ? Of course, you are an Indian, you are a good Indian. I take it that all the Ministers are good Indians. There are so many papers and there are so many weeklies which have been stalled on the border areas which go to the extent of saying that the Chinese are coming here as your brothers in order to liberate you from this torture, to liberate the people whom Delhi is treating as slaves. Can you not stop that type of reporting? If the Press Council has not been able to perform its functions properly, what comes in your way in making it effective ? There are many objectives for which the Press Council was established and I have quoted a few objectives from amongst them. If the Press Council has not been able to function effectively and properly, if it has not been able to achieve its objectives, then there is something wrong somewhere either in its formation or in the standards laid down for the personnel of the Press Council, which the honourable Minister should tell me.

Then there is the talk of monopoly, so much of monopoly, monopoly everywhere. Of course, I can understand my friend, Mr. Krishan Kant, talking of monopoly. He is sincere about it. I like him. He is an affectionate friend of mine. But I cannot understand this communist talk of monopoly. What about "Pravda"? What about "Izvestia"? They are all existing and their reply is that they have no Press Council in Russia. That is an interesting answer. Of course, the Press Council

is not there. But who will establish a Press Council there ? It is a complete monopoly. It is a Government-owned press. Not one man can say a word against it. There they cannot say a word about the requirements of citizenship and the citizens are not loved and liked by the Government. And such people coming and telling in our country, "In your country you talk of democracy, but your country is all going the monopolistic way. You are encouraging monopolists" is something very strange. Of course, I do not like monopoly and do not want it to exist. But where is the monopoly? Everything depends on the reporting and the reporter, on the sub-editor sitting in his office at the time of editing the news. Our friends that side are complaining that their things are not going into the press. Honestly, should we believe this? I know that. I also read newspapers. I know what things they say, how much of it is reported, etc. They reply to the points I have raised. Their replies do come in the papers whereas my name and the points I have raised do not appear in the newspapers. And it is, of course, unfortunate that in this country the Congress has not got even one newspaper. Formerly, during the period of freedom struggle, all these newspapers were supporting our struggle—our struggle meant the national struggle for independence. After independence every party, even the smallest party, having a ridiculously small membership, has got a newspaper or a weekly of its own. We have not got anything of that sort. We have not got any newspaper. That is our misfortune. And all that comes in these newspapers is one-sided reporting. News about the Congressmen the Congress popularity, the Congress progress, the Congress success, all that is suppressed. And when I ask them they say, "Well, the Congress success is no news. Only the Congress defeat is news." that is what they say, "The Congress defeat is news." That is what they claim. Therefore they do not want to give the Congress any importance. . . .

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY : Do-biting a man is not news. Man biting a cln^ is news.

SHRI ABID ALI : Sometime back Mr. Rajnarain was saying that he got that much but I got only this much. (*Time bell rings.*)

All right. Sir. I conclude.

Thank you.

श्री नर० क० शेजवतकर (मध्य प्रदेश):

उत्तमभाष्य महोदय, हमेशा के अनुसार जब

शासन की आवश्यकता उत्पन्न होती है तब तो वह सोती रहती है और जब टीका टिप्पणी शुरू हो जाती है तब वह जागती है। इसी तरह से जब इस बिल के संबंध में लोगों में टीका टिप्पणी होने लगी तो सरकार ने पहले तो आर्डिनेंस जारी किया और अब वह बिल को सदन के सामने लाई है। तो मैं यह बात समझ नहीं पा रहा हूँ कि सरकार को क्या दिक्कत थी कि यह जो समस्या उत्पन्न हुई उसको हल करने के लिए आर्डिनेंस लाने के बजाय बाकायदा एक बिल लाकर हल नहीं किया जा सकता था। यह कमेटी जिस काम के लिए शासन द्वारा बनाई गई थी वह 17 जनवरी 1967 को बनी थी और उसको 1 मई 1967 को अपनी रिपोर्ट प्रस्तुत करनी थी। मुझे सही तारीख का पता नहीं है कि किस समय रिपोर्ट प्रस्तुत की गई। मुझे इतना ही मालूम है कि हमारे कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने, कुछ महानुभावों ने मई के महीने में यह प्रश्न उपस्थित किया था कि इस समिति ने जो सुझाव दिये हैं उन्हें सरकार कब से अमल में ला रही है। लेकिन हमने देखा कि अप्रैल और मई का सेशन जब हो रहा था तो सरकार इस तरह का कोई बिल सदन में नहीं लाई। जब सेशन का आखिरी दिन आ गया तो उसने 3 दिन पहले एक आर्डिनेंस जारी कर दिया और उस आर्डिनेंस के द्वारा ये बातें लाई गई हैं।

मैं माननीय सदस्य श्री दास जी की बात से सहमत हूँ कि इसमें दोनों का एक्सपेंशन क्यों उपस्थित किया गया है। यह बात मेरी समझ में भी नहीं आ रही है कि दोनों का टाइम क्यों मित्रानाइज किया जा रहा है। अगर दोनों का समय खत्म हो रहा था तो केवल अध्यक्ष का कार्यकाल नवम्बर मास तक बढ़ाया जा सकता था और तब तक कोई अस्थायी व्यवस्था करनी थी तो वह की जा सकती थी। इस तरह की चीज क्यों नहीं की गई, इस पर मंत्री जी ने कोई प्रकाश नहीं डाला।

वास्तव में इतनी टीका टिप्पणी होने के बाद इस बिल के बारे में अधिक आवश्यकता नहीं है। लेकिन जब मैंने देखा कि सदन के अधिकांश सदस्यों ने इस अमेंडमेंट बिल को लेकर

[श्री ना० ह० शेजवलकर]

अपने सर्वसाधारण विचार इस कौंसिल के संबंध में व्यक्त किये, तो मैं भी इस अवसर से लाभ उठाना आवश्यक समझता हूँ।

इस बिल के संबंध में अनेक प्रकार की चर्चाएं इस सदन में हुईं और मुझे इस बात का सौभाग्य प्राप्त हुआ कि मैं सब के भाषण सुन सका। मैंने यह देखने का प्रयास किया कि हमारे देश में किस किस प्रकार के समाचारपत्र चलते हैं। मैं जिस नतीजे पर पहुंचा हूँ उससे मैं मोटे रूप से इन्हें 4 हिस्सों में बांटना चाहूंगा।

सब से पहले तो ऐसे कुछ समाचारपत्र हैं जिनका उद्देश्य केवल व्यापार मात्र ही है, जिनका उद्देश्य सिर्फ बिजनेस से ही है। दूसरे प्रकार के समाचारपत्र वे हैं जो किसी न किसी विशेष विचारधारा को लिये हुए हैं और उसी विचारधारा का वे अपने पत्र द्वारा प्रचार करते हैं। इसी लक्ष्य को सामने रखकर वे अपने पत्र द्वारा प्रचार करते हैं और उसके परे जाने के लिए वे तैयार नहीं हैं। कुछ ऐसे भी निम्नतर के अखबार हैं जिनका ब्लैकमेल का ही उद्देश्य रहता है। इस तरह के अखबारों को अपनी इज्जत का ह्याल नहीं रहता है और न ही अपने कर्तव्यों की ही जानकारी रहती है। उन्हें किसी प्रकार की चिन्ता नहीं रहती है और सिर्फ ब्लैकमेल करके रुपया पैसा वे कमाते हैं।

जो सब से अंतिम और जिनको मैं महत्वपूर्ण अखबार समझता हूँ वे ऐसे वर्ग के अखबार हैं जो स्वतंत्र रूप से विचार करने वाले हैं। इसमें से कुछ अखबार एक विचारधारा के समर्थन करने वाले हो सकते हैं, कुछ दूसरी विचारधारा के समर्थन करने वाले हो सकते हैं, लेकिन इसमें चिन्ता करने की कोई बात नहीं है। लेकिन इस तरह के जो अखबार हैं वे हमेशा देश की उन्नति के लिए अपने को डेडीकेट किये हुए हैं और उसके लिए हर प्रकार की कुर्बानी करने के लिये तैयार हैं। तो मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि वास्तव में देखा जाय तो इस किस्म के जो इंडिपेंडेंट थिंकिंग वाले अखबार हैं वे ऊपर जो तीन किस्म वाले अखबार वाले

हैं, उनसे अच्छे हैं और इनके बारे में हमको चिन्ता करने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है और इसके लिए कोई ज्यादा फिक्र करने की बात नहीं है। यह बात सही है कि अधिकांश समाचारपत्र जो पहले 3 श्रेणी में आते हैं, जहाँ तक उनकी विचारधारा का प्रश्न है, भाषणों का सवाल है, उसमें कोई तबदीली नहीं आई है।

टाइम्स आफ इंडिया एक बड़ा समाचारपत्र है जिसके अन्दर लाखों रुपये का एडवर्टाइजमेंट प्रकाशित होता है। यह निजी भी होता है और सरकारी रूप से भी होता है। लेकिन ऐसे अखबार में 50, 60 साल पहले या उससे पहले का कोई समाचार आप पढ़ें तो उसको आप बिल्कुल भिन्न पायेंगे। मुझे याद है कि परसों या कुछ दिन पूर्व जब मैं लोकमान्य तिलक की जीवनी पढ़ रहा था तो मैंने देखा कि उसमें एक समाचार पत्र कोट किया गया था। जब रैंड की हत्या हुई पूना में उसके बाद 1896, 97 का काल होगा जब कि उस समय उस अखबार में यह लिखा हुआ था कि क्या यह लोग समझते हैं कि हम आजादी इस तरह से ले सकते हैं जिस तरह से तिलक प्रतिपादित करते हैं। उसमें यह भी लिखा था कि हमने जो राज्य यहां पर स्थापित किया है वह राज्य तलवार के जोर पर स्थापित किया है, हम किसी से भीख मांग कर यहां पर राजा नहीं बने हैं और हम उसी तरह से तलवार के जोर पर हिन्दुस्तान में कब्जा किये हुये हैं और यह स्वतंत्रता वाली जितनी बातचीत है यह सारी बकवास है। तो यह विचार जिस "टाइम्स आफ इंडिया" में आज से 70 साल पहले प्रकाशित हुये थे, वह "टाइम्स आफ इंडिया" आज हमारा एक राष्ट्रीय समाचार पत्र कहलाता है। यह जो इस प्रकार की श्रेणी है इसका केवल यही काम है कि किसी न किसी प्रकार से अपना व्यवसाय चलायें। इस प्रकार के अनेक श्रेणी वाले अखबार हैं जिनकी चिन्ता करने की हमको कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है। और दूसरी श्रेणी के जो अखबार होते हैं उनकी भी चिन्ता करने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं ज्यादा विस्तार से कहता नहीं क्योंकि समय

थोड़ा सा कम है। मुख्य सवाल जो इंडिपेंडेंट विचार करने वाले अखबार हैं उनका है। और वास्तव में जैसा कि मैंने कहा कि उनको रक्षा कैसे हो। आज हम भारत के अन्दर या कहीं भी किसी देश की उन्नति के लिये समाचार पत्रों को स्वतंत्रता देना चाहते हैं। अब आप देखिये कि भारत के संविधान के अन्दर प्रजातंत्र के महत्व को दिया गया, लेकिन किसी वाद के महत्व को नहीं दिया गया है। हमारे संविधान में साम्यवाद, समाजवाद या किसी वाद को कोई स्थान नहीं दिया गया है। भारत के अन्दर प्रजातंत्र कायम रखने की ओर प्रत्येक व्यक्ति की स्वतंत्रता बनाये रखने की हमने शपथ ली है। इसका संरक्षण करना हर एक का कर्तव्य है और इस अधिकार की सुरक्षा करना अत्यंत आवश्यक है। हम यह देखते हैं कि कई बार ऐसे मौके आते हैं जब इस स्वतंत्रता के हनन के लिये शासन उत्तरदायी होता है। अभी हमारे एक माननीय सदस्य ने कहा कि क्या उनको इस प्रकार की आज्ञा दी जाय कि वे जो चाहें वह अपने समाचार पत्रों में लिखें। मेरा कहना यह नहीं है। मेरा कहना दूसरा है और वह यह है कि अगर कोई सच बात लिखता है या उसके विचार में वह बात सही है और वह मैलिशन नहीं है, तो उसको इतनी आज्ञा दी रहनी चाहिये कि वह अपनी बात को स्पष्ट रूप से सब के सामने रख सके। अभी हमने देखा कि विधान के विपरीत कार्य करने से अदालत के सामने मुंह की खानी पड़ती है। इंदौर में जो घटनाएं हुईं, जो साम्प्रदायिक दंगे हुये, उसको किसी ने अच्छा नहीं कहा। लेकिन उस घटना के पीछे जो सत्य था उसको प्रकाशित करने का प्रयास जब वहां के "स्वदेश" नामक समाचार पत्र ने किया तो एक महीना उसको बन्द करने का आदेश मध्य प्रदेश के शासन ने दिया और अभी आपने पढ़ा होगा कि वह आदेश मध्य प्रदेश के उच्च न्यायालय ने निरस्त कर दिया। तो इस प्रकार से वह गलत आदेश वहां पर दिया गया था। जब आप का विधान मौजूद है और उस विधान में जो स्वतंत्रता दी गई है वह अगर कायम नहीं रखी गई तो आप समझ सकते हैं कि उसका

क्या परिणाम होगा। मैं समझता हूं कि पिछले समय जब यह बिल आया था और उस समय जो विवाद हुआ था उसका आज तक कोई हल नहीं निकल सका। यह कहा गया था कि प्रेस कौंसिल में वकिंग जर्नलिस्ट्स आने चाहिये। मैं उससे सहमत हूं। परन्तु मैं यह चाहता हूं कि समाचार पत्र वाले जितने भी हैं उनके हर एक वर्ग का प्रतिनिधित्व उसमें ठीक प्रकार से होना चाहिये और मैं समझता हूं कि इसमें दो रायें नहीं हो सकतीं। इसी के साथ साथ मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूं कि समाचार पत्रों में जो इंटरेस्टेड लोग हैं केवल उन्हीं की मोनोपली हो, ऐसी प्रेस कौंसिल नहीं बननी चाहिये। शासन का भी उसमें बड़ा भारी हस्तक्षेप नहीं होना चाहिये। प्रेस कौंसिल इंडिपेंडेंट विचार करने वाली संस्था होनी चाहिये। अन्यथा यह होगा कि यदि केवल संख्या के आधार पर उसका गठन होगा, तो पहले तीन वर्ग के लोग उसमें ज्यादा पहुंच जायेंगे और चौथे वर्ग का कोई व्यक्ति उसमें नहीं रहेगा। उसके कारण प्रेस कौंसिल के निर्णयों को सही दिशा नहीं मिलेगी और ठीक मार्गदर्शन नहीं हो सकेगा।

समय बहुत हो गया है। कहने के लिये बहुत सी बातें थी। अब मैं केवल यह कहना चाहता हूं कि अगर मंत्री जी इस संशोधन को स्वीकार कर लें और सदन इजाजत दे तो मैं यह चाहूंगा कि दोनों का एक्सटेंशन करने के बजाय जो केवल चैयरमैन के एक्सटेंशन का आपने प्राविजन किया है उतने तक आप महद्दुद रखिये और बाकी जो प्राविजन है उसको निरस्त करने की कृपा कीजिये। इस प्रार्थना के साथ मैं अपना स्थान ग्रहण करता हूं।

SHRI G. A. APPAN (Tamil Nadu): It behoves me to support the Press Council (Amendment) Bill, 1969. I am really very happy to see the very salient features of the duties and functions assigned to the Press Council. I see here that the Press Council consists of a Chairman and 25 Members on the Council. Everywhere I have been seeing that though there is a provision in the Constitution to provide reservation for the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes to the extent of 16 to 20 per cent. I wonder if there is

[Shri G. A. Appan]

any member from the Scheduled Castes on the Press Council. I do not think anybody will say that we do not have any person who is equal to this task and who is capable of discharging the functions that might be assigned to this Council. That being the case, I do not know why there is not even a single Member of this Community on this Council. Furthermore it does not provide any reservation in the jobs also. Whenever such enactments are being passed by the Legislatures and by the Parliament, I do not find the salient feature of reservation in regard to appointments to the Committees. There are any number of committees in the Government and in the Public sector under various nomenclatures like Boards, Council, Conferences, etc. But here I really wonder whether the members of this Council do really discharge the functions enshrined under 'Duties and functions'. The duties and functions referred to are :

"(a) to help the newspapers to maintain their independence;

(b) to build up a code of conduct for newspapers and journalists in accordance with high professional standards;

(c) to ensure on the part of newspapers and journalists the maintenance of high standards of public taste and foster a due sense of both the rights and responsibilities of citizenship".

Let me tell this House and the nation that the Press is the eye and the conscience-keeper of any society, of any Government. People even begin to question the validity of the Press Council and journalists. They will have to be given complete freedom to express their views and opinions without any fear or favour. I have been seeing that a number of papers or journalists begin to only attack certain people who hold opposite views. I think the Press Council should take a keen interest to see that such nasty and absurd observations are prevented from the various journals. I also see that a number of Government advertisements are given only to certain papers. I may say that we have also journals like 'Murasoli' and 'Nam Nadu'. We do not get any advertisements. I do not know why our papers should be discriminated against from getting such Governments and only those papers get which curry the favour of the Government in some way or the other get Government advertisements. Finally, I say that the Press Council hereafter should consist of at least 4 members from the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and there should be sufficient representation for the

Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes in the various appointments also, in every category, not only in the lower ranks, but in every category. The first chance should be given to these communities.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : Sir, I am grateful to this House that, although this Bill in its very small form is a very simple one and although it is simply extending the term of the office of the Chairman and the members of the Press Council and making one co-terminous with the other, this Bill was able to excite such a lively debate as we witnessed today.

I am one with most of the Members who have been kind to express their views about the freedom of the press and there can be no two opinions in this regard today. As I said in the beginning, freedom of the Press is enshrined in our Constitution, and so far as this Government is concerned, as I said earlier, it is not a question of policy for us; it is a question of commitment for us. We stand committed to the fact that freedom of the Press is a part and parcel of democracy and both of these have to continue to exist together if either of these institutions has to survive. There can be no parliamentary type of democracy if the Press is not *free*.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, my friends have mentioned and referred to my speech to the Standing Committee of the All-India News Editors' Conference, and some quotations have been given from my speech there to the effect that I had said there that our Press is free but not independent. Sir, this was not my own quotation. I had quoted it from one of the utterances of the President of the AU-India News Editors' Conference. And for the benefit of friends sitting here I will quote again, and the quotation is :

"I venture to suggest that our Pros may be free, but it is not independent."

It was in this sense that I adduced it, and I am glad that the President of the All-India News Editors' Conference has gone a step further and said :

"Spiritual values have been displaced by cross commercial considerations, which is also partly responsible for the lack of enterprise and purposefulness in the editorial and news policy and content of newspapers."

And since these utterances were very interesting, I want also to draw your attention to another quotation from the President

of the All-India News Editors' Conference. He has said :

"For the healthy growth of the Press independence of the editor is as vital as freedom of the Press is to democracy."

It is this question, Sir, which is the basic question, whether in today's Press editors are free or not, because it was in the editor symbolising the essence of the Press that the freedom of the Press was ever thought of. This democracy of ours and before us those other democracies, which guaranteed the freedom of the Press, they were basically motivated by the fact that an honest fighting person, wedded to the basic values of a nation, wedded to the basic culture of a nation, wedded to the basic aspirations of the people should be allowed the freedom to say whatever he liked. And he did so. And I must say Sir, in the good old days our press might not have been as efficient as today its display might not have been as good as today, its production values might not have been as good as today, but then Sir these were all compensated for by those bold editorials those fearless editorials, the editorials which inspired the nation, those editorials which put in us the fire to fight for our freedom. It was in that spirit and it was following the steps of those great editors that the Fathers of our Constitution decided that the freedom of the Press in this country shall be preserved. But very unfortunately Sir, as time passed, we faced a crisis, and that crisis was the crisis of communication as running a press became more expensive. As technology grew, as a part of the growth of technology—a technology which is good in many respects—the production of press became expensive and as the product of newspapers became expensive, the money bags came in, and when unfortunately the money bags came in some friends, unfortunately, started thinking that the freedom of the Press was synonymous with the freedom of the owner of the press. Now these are two basically different things. Therefore, when my friend, Mr. Lokanath Misra feels concerned about the freedom of the press, I hope he is not trying to project the basic commitment of his party to the owners of the press, to the money bags and the big guns of the press whose very freedom his party is very keen about, and when his party stands committed to the *laissez-faire* policy such a policy, naturally, projects itself in this sphere also. Let me tell him—and it is not to oblige him but to oblige my own conscience—that this Government has no intention whatsoever of nationa-

lising the press. We have committed ourselves and we stand committed to the freedom of the press. Freedom of the press is an article of faith with us. To many friends it may be an article of convenience and, therefore, compared to them, not only do I have to say today but those who preceded me not only in office but also in this great organisation of ours, to which we are proud to belong, have to say that we have always committed ourselves to the basic values. Unfortunately, some friends get agitated from time to time whenever we take steps to implement our commitment to the people, a commitment not made today but a commitment which our fathers and our forefathers of our freedom struggle had made to the nation in every year of their struggle for bringing about a more just society, for bringing about a society in which social justice shall be given to the people, and when we are trying to implement the commitment by taking these minor steps, some friends are upset, and their mouthpieces are also upset. And not only is my friend, Mr. Lokanath Misra, upset, as bank nationalisation has been done; all those papers, which represent his way of thinking, are also upset by such bank nationalisation. I would not have minded their being upset also. I would not have minded if an editor, whom I respect,—and I respect all the editors—in his own freedom, had opposed this. I would have respected him in that case. But I really feel sorry when an editor starts writing and projecting the views of the owner of the paper.

My friend, Mr. Abid Ali, is unable to understand how money bags interfere. He is too innocent in his understanding of the working of the press, and if he understood the working of the press, he would have known how the big money interferes.

Sir, this is not a concern which I am expressing today. This concern has been expressed from time to time and again and again. And even when the Press Commission sat and deliberated on this they also addressed themselves to this situation, to the position which was bothering them, and I am quoting from paragraph 600 of the Press Commission's Report.

"Interests of the owner.—Such interference with professional standards is most objectionable when it arises from financial and economic interest? of the proprietor. These interests may be divided into two categories; the first is the hope of greater profits from the

[Shri I. K. Gujral] newspaper itself, and the second is the expectation of advantage to the other financial interests of the proprietor".

This is the basic issue that we are faced with. Also, Sir, the Press Commission's Report proceeds further and in paragraph 693 it says :

"Regimentation of news and views.— Having granted the owner the right to express his opinion in the newspaper, we must also stress the fact that diversity in the expression of opinion is the very essence of freedom of expression."

Sir, this is the issue and it is the real issue before the nation today, and if people are feeling concerned that democracy is in danger sometimes, let me repeat it and say it that democracy is in danger not in the hands of those who practise democracy in this House and in the other House, but it is in danger in the hands of those who have got the anxiety to use their freedom as their licence. My friends sitting on the other side have sometimes accused the Prime Minister that she is trying to become a dictator, but those very friends forget that, after the bank nationalisation Bill had been passed by the other House and this House, they had— if I may use a strong word—the audacity of signing a letter addressed to the President urging that he should withhold assent to the Bill. Sir, is this the parliamentary democracy that we are trying to build up in this country that, when both the Houses of Parliament, elected by the people and enjoying the confidence of the people, in their wisdom, had passed a Bill, that Bill should be withheld the assent of the President? But that is what these friends pleaded for in their letter to the President. And they here speak in the name of democracy. When we are trying to take over the 14 banks and use that as an instrument of social justice they tell us that we are becoming dictatorial and we are anti-freedom. I would challenge each one of them to face election on this issue and then decide with whom the people are. They try to make a joke of the issue when the Prime Minister said that the people are with her on this issue. They come and tell us, no, the people are not with her but the people are with Directors of 14 Banks who decide to usurp 75 per cent of the bank deposits for their own use. They think that the people are with them. Let them go to any street

in the country; let them go to any bazar of this country; let them meet and face the people and then they would realise with whom the people are. Sir, the people today have realised that for 22 years although this country developed, although this country built itself, although this country progressed a lot, social justice has still to be dispensed and therefore when a small measure towards this is being taken, unfortunately there are friends on my side also who are very unhappy about it but I can tell you that real and true democracy will come to this country and to our people only if these two Houses remain attuned to the feelings of the people and to their aspirations.

Now, accusation has also been made that through the advertising policy Government is perhaps trying to limit the freedom of the Press. I would only say this thing that under the Press Council Act any newspaper which has reason to believe that the deal of the Government in advertising has been such as to coerce the newspaper to toe the Government line can complain to the Press Council under section 12(2). Under this section such a complaint is possible to be made and this power has been made use of by many papers also. I would only say this thing that the Council has received three complaints so far out of which two have been examined and disposed of and one is pending. In one of the cases that have been decided the Punjab Government restored the advertisement following a reference from the Council. In another complaint the Council expressed its displeasure at the Government action and the Government concerned is the SVD Government of Madhya Pradesh. You see, Sir, that the Congress Government is accused that we are withholding advertisements for coercing the press to do whatever we wish them to do but out of the three complaints made to the Press Council the two which have been decided are against the Governments which my friends there represent. I think if they are so much concerned about the freedom of the press they should go and tell their Governments that they should not use this method and that they should give advertisements freely to all those papers which are even opposed to their way of thinking. Neither the Punjab Government nor the SVD Government of Madhya Pradesh was a Congress Government. Therefore those who are loudest in their cry should now, I hope, look within if I do not use a stronger expression that they should hang their heads in shame.

My friend, Lala Jagat Narain made a strong point that his paper which is opposed to Government did not get advertisements and Lala Jagat Narainji has gone at length to prove that his paper was opposed to the policies of the Government and was very critical. I would only say this that in appreciation of his services to the press, in appreciation of the fact that he was criticising the Government freely we were pleased to increase the advertisements from Rs. 6000/- in 1967-68 to Rs. 15,000/- in 1968-69. This is how the Government is trying to contain the freedom of the Press by means of its advertisement policy! (*interruptions*). This is the prize you have got for opposing the Government and therefore you should now know that we are very much appreciative of opposition to the Government.

Sir, Mr. Lokanath Misra and his friends are trying to make out that we have got mixed with Communists. (*Interruptions*) I am not going to talk about that because the Communist Party is represented here and it is for them to defend themselves but I would only like to remind Mr. Lokanath Misra, Shri Rajnarain and friends in Jana Sangh, Sir, your party, that in the last three years since 1967, the coalition Governments, the SVD Governments with the Communists were not formed by the Congress anywhere and I do not know why at that stage these people and these friends never thought that freedom was in danger, that democracy was in danger. But when bank nationalisation is passed by this House and if the Communists also think that it should be passed, then democracy is immediately in danger. Yes, Sir; democracy is in danger only for those whose vested interests have been touched. When Mr. Lokanath Misra was having political honeymoon with them, when he compromised with them in his enthusiasm for anti-Congress Governments today if we are taking economic steps to dispense social justice he should really understand that his propaganda is baseless and that he is trying to mislead the people of this country through his own mouthpieces. The only thing that I would like to say today is that this nation is now trying to give an economic content to its political democracy. That is why you find a new set-up of alliances.

Sir, in 1967 also we had a presidential election and in that presidential election we had put that person as Congress nominee to whose memory we all bow our head in respect. The like of Dr. Zakir Husain will seldom walk on the face of this earth.

¹ He hallowed the Chair here for many ! years but, Sir, who opposed him then? I Not the Congress; Mr. Lokanath Misra ! opposed him; Mr. Rajnarain opposed j him; the Jana Sangh opposed him; the l Communists opposed him. At that stage j democracy was not in danger. Democracy is now in danger only because of bank l nationalisation.

SHRI RAJNARAIN : You are mistaken.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : I would say they have realised one thing after Dr. Zakir Husain's election.

श्री राजनारायण : अगर आप राष्ट्रीयकरण चाहते हैं तो आप को मदद मिलेगी, हिपोक्रेसी के लिए नहीं।

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : The main thing that I am trying to say basically is that I am glad that at least the Jana Sangh and the Swatantra Party have appreciated and realised that the Congress Party has the capacity to put up good candidates l for presidential election and now they ! are supporting our candidate. I am grateful to them that after making a mistake at the time of the election of Dr. Zakir Husain they are not repeating it again.

Sir, a point has been made by Shri Rajnarain about irresponsible journalism ! and he has taken quite a bit of time in trying to say that the *Organiser* has put up a l news about the Prime Minister. Sir, I j have always learnt to look upon *Organiser* if not officially but in content as a mouthpiece of the Jana Sangh and I have been hoping that as this party is becoming more responsible in our national life their news papers will also become more responsible but it is very unfortunate ! that this paper particularly continues j time and again to use the forum and the j freedom of the Press to misrepresent facts and even make false allegations. I am grateful to Mr. Rajnarain that he has given me this opportunity to talk about this particular news relating to the Prime Minister.

श्री राजनारायण : हम तो भाई, तुम को इसीलिए मदद करते हैं।

5 P.M.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : Sir, I am, in a way, glad that the hon. Member, Shri Rajnarain, made mention of the *Organiser* report, although he did so in his characteristic style of making insinuations. I have made enquiries. The fact is that a l consignment of gift-medicines of various

[Shri. I. K. Gujral]

kinds has been received from some Italian donors. This follows a recent visit to India by a few of them, when they felt moved at the poverty and want in some of our villages. They have sent these, medicines for use to provide free medical relief to the poor and needy. The unsolicited gift consignment of 30 kgs. was brought by Air-India. It is lying with the customs authorities in the Customs House. It has not so far been taken out from there. The intention is to send the medicines directly to the Red Cross or some other suitable charitable organisation in the field of medical relief. Time is perhaps being taken by customs because the papers and the literature about the medicines are all in Italian and are being translated. The consignment was addressed to Shrimati Sonia Gandhi for the only reason that the Italian donors were acquainted with her. The normal law and rules of customs will apply as for such gift-medicines.

श्री आबिद अली : माफी मांगो ।

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : He should apologise.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, यह नवाब साहब हमसे कह रहे हैं कि माफी मांगो । “आर्गेनाइजर” मैं जो समाचार निकला उसको हमने पढ़ा, मंत्री महोदय को अवसर प्रदान किया कि उन्हें जो कुछ स्पष्टीकरण कर सकना हो वह करें, तो हमारा शुक्रिया अदा करना चाहिये । हमको शुक्रिया अदा करना चाहिये कि हमने अवसर दिया । मगर आप देखिये, जरा मुनिये, यह “आर्गेनाइजर” के एडिटर का और जिनका सम्बन्ध “आर्गेनाइजर” से है उनका कर्तव्य है कि बतायें कि सत्य क्या है, मंत्री के वक्तव्य को सुन कर अगर मंत्री की बात सही हो तो इनको खेद प्रकाश करना चाहिये और अगर मंत्री की बात गलत हो तो तुरंत डेके की चोट पर कहना चाहिये कि नहीं जो “आर्गेनाइजर” में निकला है वह सत्य है । मैं अभी मंत्री की बात को पूरा मानने को तैयार नहीं हूँ, क्योंकि एक सवाल मेरा पहले आ चुका है, जो शादी के समय वक्सा आया था, मैं उसको खोलना नहीं चाहता कि किस तरह से उस सवाल को दबाया गया है । इन तमाम चीजों से कि कहां कस्टम है, कैसा है, प्राइम मिनिस्टर के पास गया या नहीं गया इससे मुझे कोई मतलब नहीं है, मगर यह जरूर

कहना चाहूंगा कि जो मंत्री ने कहा है अगर वह ठीक है तो “आर्गेनाइजर” को माफी मांगनी चाहिये ।

श्री आबिद अली : खाली तुम दलाल हो । क्या सिर्फ दलाल हो ?

श्री राजनारायण : आबिद अली साहब, दलाल की बात मत करो । तुम दलाल हो । अगर तुम हमको दलाल कहते हो तो हम कहते हैं कि हमको मालूम नहीं कि तुम्हारी कितनी पुष्टें दलाल हैं ।

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL : When I made a statement about this news in the *Organic* i. I was hoping that Shri Rajnarain would join me in condemning 'he *Organiser* for [irresponsible journalism and I am glad that. . .

श्री निरंजन वर्मा (मध्य प्रदेश) : दूसरे पक्ष की बात को भी तो सुना जाय !

श्री राजनारायण : यह तो मैंने पहले ही कह दिया, श्रीमन् । मुझे अफसोस है कि मंत्री मेरी बात को सुन नहीं रहे हैं कि मैंने कहा कि आर्गेनाइजर के एडिटर को मंत्री की बात को सुन कर के, समझ कर के, उसका पता लगाना चाहिये कि आर्गेनाइजर में जो खबर निकली है वह ठीक है या नहीं और अगर असत्य है तो वह खेद प्रकट करें ।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : क्या मंत्री जी यह समझ रहे हैं कि मैं जो कुछ बोल रहा हूँ वही सही है ? दोनों पक्षों को सुनने के बाद ही आपको कोई निर्णय करना चाहिये ।

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : When I make a statement on the floor of the House, I take full responsibility for it. (*Interruptions*) Let me finish.

श्री राजनारायण : स्टेटमेंट मैंने भी दिया है, इन्दिरा के मिंक कोट के बारे में, डायमंड के बारे में, श्रीमन्, यह प्रिविलेज में भेजा जाय । श्रीमन्, मैं आपसे रिवक्सेस्ट करता हूँ कि आप इसको प्रिविलेज कमेटी में भेजिये और आर्गेनाइजर के एडिटर को बुलाइये, मंत्री जो को बुलाइये, क्योंकि यह मामला तो उठा है, ऐसे रहेगा नहीं ।

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : I have made a statement and I have made that statement with a full sense of responsibility as a Member of this House and I expect this courtesy from Members which I extend to them. My statement should be taken as the last word compared to that of the Member. . .

SHRI RAJNARAIN : Let the Prime Minister say. Who are you? You are not the representative of the Prime Minister.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : I have deliberately said it. I had not said that this statement had been made by any Member of the House. This has appeared in the Press which I have called irresponsible, because the statement is irresponsible and I am surprised that some friends here get up as if they had made that statement. I have never made any such allegation that any Member has made the allegation.

श्री मानसिंह वर्मा : सभी सदस्यों का अधिकार एक सा है, अगर मंत्री की बात सही मानी जा सकती है तो हमारी बात भी सही मानी जा सकती है।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : आपकी बात ही क्यों मानी जानी चाहिये ?

श्री आई० के० गुजराल : क्योंकि मेरा हक है एन ए मेम्बर। आप चैलेंज करिये।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : मंत्री जी को यह जो भ्रम है कि वह मंत्री पद पर विराजमान हैं इसलिये जो वह कहते हैं केवल वह सच है। . . .

श्री आई० के० गुजराल : बिल्कुल नहीं। My statement is very clear and I am on record. I am claiming this privilege as a member of this house. As a Member this house. . .

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर। प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर यह है कि किसी अन्य की बात के बारे में कोई मंत्री क्या यहां पर यह कह सकता है कि जो कुछ वह कह रहा है उसी को सत्य माना जाय। इसमें तीन डिपार्टमेंट्स आयेंगे, इसमें कस्टम डिपार्टमेंट आयेगा, इसमें प्राइम मिनिस्टर का घर आयेगा, इसमें श्री गुजराल साहब आयेंगे। अब मेरा स्पष्ट

निवेदन है कि इस मसले में प्रिविलेज कमेटी में भेजा जाय कि यह मंत्री सही बोल रहे हैं या वह अखबार सही बोल रहा है। कस्टम का सारा रिकार्ड यहां मंगाया जाय। कस्टम के रिकार्ड के बारे में मुझे एक जानकारी है, बाकायदा वहां के पन्ने फाड़े गये, रजिस्टर बदलवाया गया और दो महीने तक हमारा सवाल रोका गया था, बाद में वह किसी प्रकार से आया। मैं मैरिज के समय का कह रहा हूं, मैरिज के अवसर पर जो हवाई जहाज में आया और कस्टम ने रोका। उस सारे मसले को मैं खोलूं। मेरे पास इस वक्त फाइल नहीं है, मुझे क्या मालूम था कि हमें बोलना पड़ेगा।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : Mr. Gujral, you continue.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : Reference has been made here to the powers of the Press Council. Now, Mr. Rajnarain should not get away with the impression that his allegations are going unrefuted. I am deliberately passing on to the next point because I have said what I have to say. I have said that as a Member of this House. Whenever a statement is made by an outsider and by a Member of the House, it is an established convention that the statement of the Member is taken as the last word.

तुम्हारे बारे में कहे तो बोलियेगा। गुजराल के बारे में कोई बात हम कहे तो वह बोलें तो हम मान लेंगे।

SHRI RATNARAIN : It is not for you.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : Having said that, I am passing on to the next point. Reference has been made by many friends to the powers of the Press Council. It has been said that the Press Council should be given more powers to take action against those papers which are held to be guilty of various offences. This issue was also examined by the Committee of Members of Parliament. I have been able to get a copy of their Report. They do not apparently welcome the idea that the Press Council should make recommendations to the Government for suitable action against any particular newspaper. Secondly, the MPs Committee did not support the idea that the Press Council should be given more powers for imposing punishment ...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : It is now five o'clock. He can continue later. He cannot have it that way.

श्री राजनारायण : अभी तो थर्ड रीडिंग इसकी चलेगी।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : Kindly sit down.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : Therefore, the Government is now examining the whole question in the light of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee of the Press Council. They have also made a mention of the problems of the smaller papers. I can only say at this stage that they are causing concern to us, not because they are smaller in size. We have seen that they command a very high percentage of readership. We have made a tabulation of figures of the small and medium-sized newspapers. Even in today's context they have a readership of about 60 to 65 per cent, compared to the other papers, which are called metropolitan papers. But their difficulty still remains. The chain newspapers are there. The aggression launched in smaller cities by the chain newspapers is of some concern to us and that is where the monopoly issue comes in. The Advisory Committee of the Press Council, I understand, examined this point also and in their report they have thought it better to recommend to the Government that this should not be referred to the Monopolies Commission. The study of monopolies in the press should not be referred to the Monopolies Commission, but that it should be continued by the Press Council itself. I understand from the report of the Press Council, which was placed on the Table of the House that they would continue with their study and we hope that by the end of this year they will be able to give their recommendations on the subject. I can only say this thing that not only the Government but any sane freedom-loving Indian today is feeling concerned about the growth of monopoly in the newspaper industry, because the very essence of the freedom of the Press gets defeated if these monopolies are allowed to continue or build themselves. That is why not only we see that the smaller and the medium newspapers should get support from us in the advertisement programme which is being increased but also we have given them more support in the newsprint policy also. At the same time according to the recommendation of the Press Council itself the Government is seriously examining to bring forward in the next session a Bill

to set up a Newspaper Finance Corporation so that when this Corporation is set up at least some sort of relief is given to smaller and medium newspapers.

There is only one more point and I have finished. Friends from various sides have expressed concern about the foreign money in papers and in the Press. I can only say this thing that I am one with them in this. It will be a sad day for India, its democracy, its freedom of the Press, if foreign influences, whether from Left or from Right, whether from East or from West, are allowed to penetrate into our Press. Therefore, whenever these things come before us from time to time we do feel concerned about it and we have undertaken studies. The names of some papers have been mentioned, and as you would know many times questions have been raised about those papers here also and I have seen our record that the Finance Ministry has promised here that they are looking into it. If they are looking into it, naturally it will be the Finance Ministry which can reply better than I can on a specific issue, but generally speaking I can tell you it is not only that money which directly comes, there are indirect foreign influences which are also trying to penetrate into our journalism, and there fore. . .

श्री राजनारायण : क्वेश्चन के ऊपर आन्सर है 1968 का, यानी 11 नवम्बर सन् 1968 का जवाब है गुजराल साहब का। एक जवाब और है 19 अगस्त का। दूसरा जवाब श्री के० के० शाह साहब का नवम्बर 1968 का है। साल भर बीत रहा है और अभी तक सरकार पता लगा रही है।

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : The only thing I would like to say is, whether it is Parliament or Government or any Indian, it will be a very sad day if we thought that influence from outside of a particular type is good or a particular type is bad. I am not trying to say that any foreign influence is welcome. I say any foreign influence particularly backed by money, directly or indirectly, causes us concern, and because of this, and as I said in my Budget speech in the other House, we have undertaken a study, an annual study as a part of the report of the Registrar of Newspapers, of the publications of the foreign Embassies here. This information for this year in one or two lines I want to share with this House because I think

this is one aspect which also should cause concern to Parliament. Out of 76 countries represented in India through diplomatic missions 24 published 103 periodicals or publications in 1968 with a total circulation of 12,71,395, out of which 11,65,776 were shared by the U.S.S.R, and the U.S.A. Embassies in India. The former had 46 journals with a circulation of 6,51,994 copies and 44 papers, while 14 publications of the latter out of a number of 15 had a circulation of 5,13,781. The total circulation of foreign mission publications in India increased by 39 • r per cent during the ten years 1957—67. I think this is something of which the Government and the House have to take notice, because these figures by themselves may not mean much but if the House remembers that a circulation of about 12 lakhs in reality represents about 5-5 per cent circulation of all the Indian newspapers and periodicals put together, whether it is the U.S.S.R, or the U.S.A. Embassy or any other Embassy which is trying so widely to circulate their newspapers and periodicals in India, I think this is a matter of concern and Government is also looking into this and trying to see how this can be prevented and contained.

Before I sit down I must thank you and the House for a lively debate, and the only thing I can say is that I believe that the Press Council has played a vital role and the Press Council can still play a vital role. Therefore, the only thing I can say is that the number of complaints that are referred to the Press Council from time to time compare very favourably with the number of complaints that have been referred to its counterpart in England. For instance, if my figures are correct, and I am speaking from memory, I think the number of complaints last year referred to the Press Council was 73, and I understand that in the Press Council in England the number of complaints made to their Press Council was much smaller than in India. This may be an index that the Press Council has considerable work, also it is an index of the fact that there are many more correctives needed for our press to come in alliance with the policy of the nation, in secularism, in democracy and also in building up its society which is socially just.

SHRI ABID ALI : The figures given by the hon. Minister pertains to the periodicals, etc. owned or circulated by the Embassies themselves. But has he undertaken or propose to undertake a study of

the help, financial or otherwise, which Embassies give to periodicals and newspapers in this country through various sources of theirs?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : I would only draw your attention to a statement which was made, I think, in this House also, but I remember in the other House, definitely, by the Home Minister sometime back, where the Home Ministry had undertaken a study of the infiltration of foreign money in our political life and in journalism. I hope they are looking into it.

SHRI ABID ALI : About the price page schedule...

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : I would only repeat what I had said here once that the Government is now considering all the aspects of the problem particularly because the Diwakar Committee and also the Standing Group of the Labour Commission have recommended that the price page schedule should be brought into force because, they think that this is a healthy measure to build up small and medium newspapers and preserve their identity.

SHRI T. N. SINGH : I think the debate may be continued tomorrow. Members would like to hear Ganga Babu, he was on the Press Council.

श्री मानसिंह वर्मा : वन क्लेरिफिकेशन। माननीय मंत्री जी ने अपने भाषण के दौरान बड़े गरम शब्दों में उन संसद् सदस्यों की बड़ी भर्त्सना की है जिन्होंने राष्ट्रपति को एक ऐसा मेमोरेण्डम दिया है जैसे कि...

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : Is he delivering a speech at this stage?

श्री मानसिंह वर्मा : आपने कहा है अभी।

श्री आई० के० गुजराल : थर्ड रीडिंग में बोलिये।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तोपन्त ठेंगड़ी) : बाद में बोल लीजिए।

श्री मानसिंह वर्मा : बस क्लेरिफिकेशन कराना चाहता हूँ। आपने अभी यह फरमाया है कि दोनों सदनों में बिल पास होने के पश्चात् भी संसद् सदस्यों ने राष्ट्रपति को इस बात के लिये, रेप्रेजेंट किया है कि वह दस्तख़त न

[श्री मानसिंह वर्मा]

करें या इसको विदहोल्ड कर लें। यह बड़ा अन्डिमोक्रैटिक है, अप्रजातान्त्रिक है, संसद् सदस्यों की ओर से जो किया गया है। तो मैं उनसे यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या हमारे राष्ट्रपति को यह अधिकार है कि जब दोनों सदनों से बिल पास हो जाये तो उस पर हस्ताक्षर करें या न करें, विदहोल्ड करें या न करें। अगर यह अधिकार है तो मैं समझता हूँ उस अधिकार का उपयोग करना प्रजातंत्र के हित में संसद् सदस्यों को है।

(Interruptions)

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : Rights and privileges of the *Rashtrapati* are very well defined in our constitution and I do not have to repeat them. But surely it does not behove any Member of this House or the other House after the Bill has been passed by an overwhelming majority that he should try to think of undemocratic, extra-parliamentary methods. I am using the word, extra-'parliamentary'.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHR D THENGARI) : No debate on this point.

श्री राजनारायण : हमारा पाइन्ट आफ आर्डर है कि एक कांस्टीट्यूशनल प्राविजन है। मंत्री महोदय ने ऐसा कह कर क्या जो कांस्टीट्यूशनल प्राविजन है उसको आघात नहीं पहुंचाया है। यह सही है कि हर विधेयक पर उसका अलग अलग असर होगा, जैसा बैंकिंग बिल के बारे में रेप्रेजेंट करना मैं उचित नहीं समझता। मगर अपनी दृष्टि से जो मेम्बरों का भत्ता बढ़ रहा है या बढ़ावेंगे, जब कि 90 परसेन्ट पीपुल 3 आना, 6 आना, 8 आना रोज पा रहे हैं तब मेम्बरों को 51 रु० रोज भत्ता दें उस पर असेन्ट रोकने के लिये मैं जाऊंगा तो क्या वह डिमोक्रैटिक माना जायेगा या अन्-डिमोक्रैटिक? संसदीय परम्परा में that would be most democratic, जैसे उत्तर प्रदेश में राज्यपाल के पास मैं गया था कि उत्तर प्रदेश के विधायकों का जो भत्ता बढ़ रहा है, तनख्वा बढ़ी है, उस पर दस्तखत न करें।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) : The question is :

"That the Bill to amend the Press Council Act, 1965, be taken into consideration".

The motion was adopted.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER RE WITHDRAWAL OF THE STRIKE IN JUTE INDUSTRY

THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN TRADE AND SUPPLY (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, as the honourable Members are aware the workers in the jute industry in West Bengal went on indefinite strike on 4th August 1969, to press certain demands. In the statement I made in this house on the 5th August, 1969, I made a reference to the circumstances leading to the strike. In view of the importance of the jute industry to the national economy I also urged on the House to impress on all concerned the urgent need to place national interests narrow points of view so that production which had been interrupted could be resumed without any loss of time. The representatives of the workers and employers responded to my appeal and agreed to hold discussions with a view to reaching a settlement for calling off the strike.

The negotiations between the representatives of the workers and employers were conducted at New Delhi on 8th and 9th August under the Chairmanship of my colleague, the Minister for Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation. The Labour Minister of West Bengal and I also participated in the negotiations which were conducted in a spirit of cordiality, mutual understanding, and cooperation.

The Prime Minister gave interviews to the representatives of Employers and Workers : her talks with them helped to focus attention of all concerned on wider national interests.

As a result, I am glad to inform the House that an agreement has been reached between the representatives of the workers and the Employers. I expect that this Agreement will be ratified by the concerned Association and Unions, and full production will be resumed from tomorrow.

The terms on which the dispute has been settled are :

1. The question of revision of wage structure will be referred to a suitable