

Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Atomic Energy Bill, 1962, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 20th August, 1962."

Sir, I lay a copy of each of the Bills on the Table.

# RESOLUTION RE INQUIRY INTO OWNERSHIP IN NEWSPAPER INDUSTRY—Continued

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will proceed with the discussion that we were having last time. Under Rule 142 of the Rajya Sabha Rules, there is a time-limit of half-an-hour for the mover and the Minister concerned and fifteen minutes each for the other Members. Mr. Arora, who had not finished his speech and had spoken for ten minutes, may now continue.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, while moving this resolution on the 10th August, I had submitted that the Press Commission had pointed out the dangers involved in the growth of monopoly in the ownership of press. The Press Commission, as is well known, submitted its Report in 1954 and warned the country about it. Since then the situation has worsened. Today the stranglehold of monopolies over this important medium of mass communication is much greater than what the Press Commission had looked into,

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

The Press Registrar's report for 1961 shows that chain groups and multiple units command more than 30 per cent. of the total circulation of all papers and periodicals in the country. As far as the press is concerned, everyone knows that it is the daily paper that is all important and not the periodical and in the case of daily papers the concentration is much bigger. The concentration of ownership

of daily papers, which has greater significance than common ownership of periodicals and mixed sets of journals is much greater today because 156 dailies in the country are controlled by three categories of monopoly-owners. They claim more than 67 per cent. of the total circulation of dailies in the country. The chain groups and multiple units control 156 dailies in the country according to the Press Registrar himself and they control more than 67 per cent. of the total circulation of dailies in the country. The central feature of concentration in the Indian press today is that ten owners publish 36 dailies with a circulation of more than 18 lakhs and control about 40 per cent. of the circulation of daily papers in the country. Who are these 10 owners? These 10 owners are, 5 chains, 3 groups and 2 multiple units. The Press Commission pointed out the dangers involved. The Government has not been unmindful of the dangers. The spokesmen of the Government have, time and again, during the period since the submission of the report of the Press Commission, pointed out the dangers of the growth of monopolies in the ownership of the press but they have done nothing. Only this year, addressing the working journalists at Calcutta, the Law Minister said: "A free press is one of the pillars of democracy." He also said: "The greatest danger to a free press was the emergence of monopolies in the industry." But the Law Minister did nothing. The Minister for Information whose job probably it is to look after the state of the press in the country, has also not been unconscious of this unhealthy growth. Speaking in the Lok Sabha on May 29 he conceded that there was a tendency towards concentration of ownership of the press in a few hands and promised a careful study. I am disappointed that after a careful study done by such a high-powered body as the Press Commission in 1954, our worthy Minister for Information promises the same 8 years later. It is of course a ticklish problem and requires constant study. The Press Commission

[Shri Arjun Arora.]

did not recommend the breaking up of the monopolies. It recommended the setting up of a Press Council which should keep a constant vigil on the state of the press. Those recommendations, though accepted by the Government, have not yet been carried out and the Minister, in the Lok Sabha, on May 29, again promised a careful study. In this country, the danger to freedom of the press is real and the monopolistic tendencies have become sinister because of the direct participation in the operations of the newspaper industry by industrial magnates. I have referred to a few monopolistic groups. Three of the biggest of them are well-known names—Birlas, Dalmias and Goenkas. Now who are Birlas? The Birlas have interests in sugar mills, jute mills, textile mills, investment corporation, bank and what not.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): But you have not said about . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I will say many things, even things which are unsavoury to you. Please have patience. The House of Birlas, according to one estimate, controls 60 directorships in different concerns. The Dalmias control many more. The Birlas are a top industrial family of the country and they have stakes in managing agencies which are interested in industries whose capital runs to more than Rs. 300 crores. They control banks, insurance companies and many more things and their power over the press is utilised in furthering the interests of these concerns which bring them more and more profits every year. The case of Dalmia Jains is similar. They control sugar, cement, steel castings, machinery parts, electricity, raw chemicals, asbestos sheetings, stirrup pumps, rubber sheets, vanaspati, soap, etc. It is a long list. The Goenkas are not such big industrialists but their fusion of interests with the Dalmias is obvious. The gentleman who controls

the Goenka chain in the newspapers is also the Chairman of the Punjab National Bank controlled by the Dalmias. So the danger of merger of the Goenka group and the Dalmia group of newspapers is not a distant possibility but a real danger and I shudder to think of what will happen to our press if these two powerful chains of newspapers merge. A thing like that took place in Britain last year and Mr. Macmillan quickly appointed a five-man commission to go into it. According to information available, the report of that Royal Commission is expected shortly. In our country this development has been taking place. Our Ministers have been conscious of it. They have been mentioning it. The Prime Minister has repeatedly mentioned it. Yet, the Government does nothing. The *National Herald*, one great daily which the capitalists of the country have not been able to grab, in April this year, maintained that in this country there is no law which imposes the remotest restraint on the ownership of the press and it said: "It would be folly for any parliamentary democracy to allow itself to be thus imperilled." The crux of the newspaper industry, as in any other country, is ownership. The ownership of this important medium of mass communication in this country is much more dangerous because we neither have television nor have people in the country who can afford to have radio sets. We do not have any other method of mass communication of any great significance. Therefore, in an undeveloped country like India, with vast possibilities of expansion of every sort, including the expansion of ownership, the danger of concentration of ownership of the press is a real one indeed. The figures for readership of some of the newspapers during the last 20 years are available. They have repeatedly been mentioned by the Press Registrar. They show that the circulation of newspapers controlled by these monopolists, not only of the newspaper industry but of many other industries, has during the 15 years of independence, multiplied

many times. Thus we have allowed these industrial magnates to control a method of mass communication which, according to everyone, has a vast influence. The Law Minister only recently said: "The effect of the newspapers was hypnotising" Now we aim at building a socialistic society and we allow the Birlas, Dalmias and Goenkas to hypnotise our people. That surely is not the way we can proceed. The danger was voiced and brought to the fore in his usual manner by our Defence Minister, Shri Krishna Menon, who, speaking at Ernakulam in May this year, said—I am reading from the report—

"The growth of monopolies in newspapers is a very important problem which they have to face in the democratic society of India today."

He further said that the greatest danger to the building up of a democratic society in India lay not in communalism, but in the growth of monopolies and the concentration of economic power in the hands of a few individuals who appeared in several incarnations as in the Hindu mythology of yore. So it is clear that we are imperilling the very development of the country by allowing this sort of ownership of our newspaper industry. The ugly features of this sort of concentration have been obvious here. In Delhi, two metropolitan newspapers have during the last few months, been engaged in a raterwar, cutting each other and trying to kill each other in the process. The lot of the working journalists is obvious. The growth of these monopolies has deprived the working journalists of all initiative. Journalism from being a mission, has become a profession in this country, thanks to this large-scale growth of ownership. Editors have lost their initiative. The Press Commission itself which had distinguished editors like Shri Chelapathi Rao and our worthy colleague here, Shri A. D. Mani, as members was itself conscious that this sort of ownership of newspapers by industrial

magnates was bound to lead to interference in policy matters and interference in the publication of news and this was bound to make the editor a minion in the hands of the owners of jute mills and cement factories. That danger is there. The Prime Minister himself has been conscious of it and he has been conscious of it for some years. In 1957, in the Lok Sabha he said:

"We talk of the freedom of the press. What exactly does it mean? I ask. So much freedom of the press we have today. But the freedom only means suppression or lack of suppression by governmental authority. When huge press chains spring up, when practically the press in India is controlled by three or four groups of individuals, what is that press?"

May I ask, is it the freedom of the press for the citizens of the country, or is it the freedom of the press for the Birlas, the Dalmias and the Goenkas and their like? So that danger is there and that danger goes on increasing. Everyone in the country is conscious of it and I am amazed to find that the Government does nothing in the matter, in spite of such clear-cut observations by the Prime Minister, by the Law Minister and, if I may say so, by more than one Information Minister. The press that we have in this country today is more engaged in the protection of the interests of the industrialists' world than the interests of the socialist world that we want to have in this country. The dangers of monopoly are very clear. Henry Ford is reported to have said that all his customers were free to choose any colour for their cars as long as it was black. He was manufacturing only black cars, and he said his customers were free to buy cars of any colour as long as it was black. This is the sort of thing that is happening. Today we in our daily press are getting the version of the black markets, whether we read one paper or the other. The situation has deteriorated to such an ex-

[Shri Arjun Arora.]

tent that even a paper like 'The Statesman' recently pointed out in March this year that choice was the essence of freedom and all media of mass communication should be able to provide it. But in this country, he said we have chains of newspapers which sing the same song. The step that the Government should have taken long ago, has not been taken. And sometimes, hon. Ministers make statements which seem to give the impression that they do not take the issue seriously. The Press Commission's Report was submitted in April 1954. It was in the year of grace 1962, on July 19 at Hyderabad that Dr. Gopala Reddi, our Information Minister, said:

"The recommendations of the Press Commission with regard to chain papers were not satisfactory. The Commission had only suggested that such a matter should be brought to the notice of the Press Council."

Even that little thing has not been done by the Government and the Information Minister says that that was not enough, that was not satisfactory. It appears that the Ministers themselves are afraid that even the Information Minister may be blacked out in the daily press, in case he moved in the matter. I would urge upon him to have a little more courage and save the country from the danger that the country is facing.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Because he knows that there was once a campaign against Mr. Gadgil.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: The Information Minister in the same speech at Hyderabad, said that the Government expected that the Press Commission would be set up in three or four months.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Arora, you have only two minutes more.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I will take only just five more minutes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You had only half an hour.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I will wind up, Madam.

On the 19th July, he said that he expected that a Press Commission would be set up in three or four months. Looking through the records I find that last year in November, the then Information Minister said almost the same thing. Still this period of three or four months does not seem to come to an end.

Madam, I have full faith in the press. I do regard the press as a very important institution. But I would submit that the press has its responsibility, and in the hands of jute barons and cement barons, it is not fulfilling that responsibility. The Prime Minister, addressing the anniversary of the Urdu paper 'Sher-e-Punjab' said in March this year:

"While newspapers have full freedom of expression without any pressure from the Government, they should at the same time, not slip and come under other pressures."

The fact is that today the bulk of the newspapers have not only come under other pressure but they are under full control of people who do not have a social point of view but only their own individual acquisitive point of view. The sort of enquiry that I have demanded in the Resolution will not be new. There are two parallels of this kind in Britain and in the United States of America. In Britain there is the Royal Commission going into the matter and in the United States of America a Committee of the House of Representatives is engaged in a similar enquiry. These are countries which are supposed to be most devoted to the freedom of the press and if they have Anti-Trust Laws and if they have enquiries of this type, there is every reason why we should have it too. I will not take more time of the House but would only submit that the Commit-

tee envisaged in the Resolution may enquire into the economic effects of the industry, the safeguards necessary for the workers and last but not least the consequences of this concentration on the democratic way of life which we cherish. Thank you.

*The question was proposed.*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, please do not exceed fifteen minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is quite clear. Of course, sometimes we commit mistakes like other people do.

Madam, I am grateful and we are all grateful to Shri Arora who has given us the opportunity to discuss this matter of vital importance for the nation because we cannot think of shaping our democracy much less developing it properly without going into this question of the concentration of monopolistic elements in the sphere of the press. This is not the first time that we are discussing it. Indeed, we have done it earlier but right in the beginning I must say that this Government despite the recommendation of the Press Commission had been moving in this matter in a very distressing way, with faltering steps and it is quite clear that the press barons do not control merely the jute industry, the textile industry, banking and so on but they control powerful elements in the administration of the Government. That is why things do not move. On the one hand we have the journalists pressing their demand for the diffusion of ownership, for the appointment of so many commissions and so on for taking measures to curb monopoly control, on the other hand, we find the Government brushing aside most of their vital demands and allowing the press barons to continue to dominate the Indian press. This is one of the greatest blows to our democratic institutions. The danger may not be apparent today in all its ugly features but if this trend continues to grow, nothing will be left

of democracy. To what kind of perverse lengths the press barons can go, I will give you an example. So many things were said about the cartoon but today the Hindustan Times publishes the cartoon or the sketch of it from the Swadhinata. They distort the proceedings of Parliament, Mr. Hiren Mookerjee's speech there in the Lok Sabha and say that the Chinese aggressors are being invited.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh): That is a matter of opinion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He should have given the proper version of Mr. Hiren Mookerjee's speech and then should have commented but nothing of that kind has been done. It is for the Lok Sabha and the Members of the Lok Sabha to deal with this matter.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): Will the hon. Member kindly bring the cartoon and give it to us, Members of Parliament, so that we can form our opinion and also know . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Akbar Ali Khan should be the last person to speak on the subject. He gave a wrong opinion yesterday. . .

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: There is no question.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: If I am convinced that I am wrong . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You will be convinced. You are an honourable man and, therefore, you will be convinced. This is what they do.

I should now like to deal with some aspects of the problem.

*(Interruption)*

If I were Mr. Akbar Ali Khan, then because of the revelations made from this side of the House, I would have been blushing here all the time and hung my head in utter shame.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Then you will have to do it many a time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Chapter XVI of the Press Commission's Report deals with the question of concentration of ownership in the press. It shows that five owners controlled twenty-nine papers at that time accounting for 30.25 per cent. of the total circulation and these owners control newsprint, control advertisement, control the financial houses and control so many other things. Interlocking has taken place. The Press Commission says that fifteen owners control 54 newspapers with a total circulation of 50.1 per cent. of the total circulation, of the readership and some of these owners belong to nine top families in India which control almost every branch of industry, commerce, banking and so on. Such is the concentration you can easily see today. The Goenkas, the Dalmias and the Birlas are the press barons of the country; they control the newspapers of the country; they decide what should go for public enlightenment, which should be published and which Minister should be backed, which policy should be supported and which should be attacked and which should be lauded to the skies. Are we to submit to this kind of thing if we at all wish well of our democratic institutions? They have no sentiment for democracy, these tycoons of the press, these press barons, who flourish on the sweat and toil of the labour, who indulge in profiteering, tax evasion, illegal trade, trade in illegal bullion, blackmarketing, who introduce bribery in every walk of administration and public life, degrade every system of public life—they are today in control of the newspapers and it is worse than in the United States of America. The Commission on the problem of the press in the United States of America pointed out that fourteen owners controlled twenty-five per cent. of the total circulation but we have here fifteen owners, almost the same number, controlling twice as much circulation, fifty per cent. This is the posi-

tion. Concentration of ownership is the highest in India, is the highest in the world. The American billionaires, in the paradise of monopoly capital, do not seem to do well in competition with their counterpart tycoons here as far as the press is concerned. This is the position and this has to be broken, you will agree. The approach of these tycoons is very simple.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): On a point of information. People say that the Communist Party has twenty-four papers. Is that correct?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You want to make a speech on the basis of a point of order?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I want information.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: He has taken it from you, Sir.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now comes the approach to get advertisements and readership. The approach here is confined to sex and crime. Recently, for example, they have been publishing a smuggling case in Delhi where one Kumari Usha Advani is appearing as a witness. There you find that the story is combined with sex and crime. A picture is published but when the workers go to court to fight the employers or people go to fight in their defence, in the defence of democratic rights, the press ignores them but Usha Advani with all her stories gets covered in the press and everything she says is reported and her picture is also published. This is our press. Now, therefore . . .

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: The matter is *sub judice*.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am not saying anything. I am talking about the Press. Mr. Vajpayee, you are not a lawyer perhaps; I am one.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: But you are more a politician than a lawyer.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: You are a bachelor also.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I was only saying what the Press is publishing. Perhaps Mr. Vajpayee would like to read everything; many people do read them. And that is why they publish them. Now, the emphasis is on crime and sex. They exploit communal feelings. Whenever there is a communal riot, you see how the Press utilises it. I have seen it in West Bengal. Whenever provincialism comes up, the Press takes up the side of provincialism, utilising and exploiting it to push up its circulation. They take up the side of parochialism and utilise it to push up their circulation and they make use of Chauvinism in order to promote circulation. All these make for the violation, degradation and annihilation of democracy. We talk about national integration. But how can we build up national integration when the vehicle of public opinion and enlightenment is left in the hands of those who do not know how to integrate anything except to make money and strike against the very fundamental tenets of national unity and national integration and who cater to the baser instincts of the people, the sex and criminal instincts, in order to flourish in wealth, power and privilege? That is the position we have today.

In the political field you saw what happened in the Parliament elections in North Bombay. The millionaire Press came out, all together, to attack India's foreign policy. It was not a question of the Defence Minister alone. He was merely a target to attack India's foreign policy which we all cherish as something very good and which has brought prestige and honour to our country. We all know how the Indian Press controlled by the millionaires tries to take the nation into the cold war. It was not a question of the Communist Party or the Congress Party being attacked. These people who gave money to the Congress election funds, at the same time instructed their newspapers in Bombay to come out with violent attacks against the Congress candidate in North Bombay Parliamentary

elections and support the candidate of the reactionary, counter-revolutionary front. That is what we saw. Therefore do not think that their anti-democratic policies are confined only to anti-Communism. It begins with anti-Communism. Under the bankrupt banner of anti-Communism which is the banner of the Indian millionaire Press it is the beginning. It strikes at the very fundamentals of democracy and development. We have seen how this Press attacks Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Mr. Krishna Menon and Mr. Malaviya—I am talking of the Treasury Benches—and all progressive people on the other side and on this side of the House. This is the character of the Press. Not only that; they dismiss their own employees. An Assistant Editor was dismissed because he was on a special committee which prepared on behalf of the Journalists' Federation the memorandum for the Press Commission. We all know how Mr. Chalapathi Rau and many other people had to suffer. Now, when we come to the Thimayya episode, the Press took the side of Mr. Thimayya, not the side of the parliamentary institutions and democracy. It smuggled and stole the top secret thing, published it in the newspaper and then wanted to usher in an attack against the Defence Minister in order to bolster Thimayya and the politics that he stood for.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY (Mysore): What is wrong there? Nothing wrong.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is wrong because here was a question of parliamentary democracy and the Indian Press. If the Press permits itself to be the instrument of Mr. Thimayya, it is our task to get up here in this House to register our voice of protest and call upon the Government to do something about it.

Now, coming to the economic field, the millionaire Press is attacking the public sector all the time. The millionaire Press, the Goenka, the Birla

[Shi Bhupesh Gupta.]

and the Dalmia Jain newspapers are all the time carrying on attacks not only against the Communist Party but against public sector, public sector in iron, public sector in everything. And this Press, let it be recalled, came out against the nationalisation of the air companies, against the nationalisation of life insurance companies. This is the running theme of the Indian Press in economic matters.

Wherever there is a dispute between the workers and the employers, this millionaire Press distorts the news and is always on the side of the employers even when the employees in question are Pressmen themselves. I know the tragedy of many well-meaning democratically-minded journalists who had been trying to maintain the elementary freedom to write what they like. Even to write about their own cause, their own trade union cause, they are not allowed; the millionaire Press manacles them and frustrates their efforts and degrades freedom in the very house where freedom should flourish, namely, the printing house and Press establishments in the country.

Now, take the cultural life of the people. You see the advertisements of cabaret and all kinds of things and fantastic articles are appearing on the cultural life of the people. The creation of art by the peasants, the workers and the middle class people do not find any reflection, or adequate reflection in the millionaire Press. As far as the cultural life is concerned, this Press wants to convey the Western culture; anyhow they are not conscious that culture is the culture of the people. You don't find anything of the kind. Whatever they do, they do so because otherwise nobody will buy their papers. Their columns are filled with perversities of all kinds.

There is another thing. We find that prosecution should have been started against the Ananda Bazar Patrika Ltd. after an enquiry into the

charge of blackmarketing newsprint. But I have information that wires have been pulled successfully and the Government of India is trying to hush up and the Government of West Bengal is trying to hush up the prosecution against the Ananda Bazar Patrika Ltd., Calcutta, for blackmarketing newsprint. The Goenkas, when they wanted teleprinter facilities, in violation of the Government's own policy, were given teleprinter facilities. Take the P.T.I. Well, it is concentrated in the hands of a few, whereas it should have been made into a corporation; the people should have got the control, the journalists should have got the control. Coming to news agencies, I know there is in Delhi the Indian Press Agency run by some people who support almost all the progressive policies of Government but do we hear anything about it at all? Nobody hears anything about it. But new news agencies are being started by the small group of millionaires. Therefore my suggestion is, diffusion of control is urgently needed. Nobody should be allowed to hold more than 5 per cent of the shares. The shares should go to the journalists and others. It should go to the public on the basis that no one who has other interests in industries over the value of Rs. 10 lakhs or so should have anything to do with the Press. Ownership should not be allowed to such millionaires and rich people. This is very very important. Therefore I say that the Government should move in the matter. Government is doing a disservice to the country by submitting to the bullying pressures and influences of these Press barons.

I may tell you, Madam, that the most fearsome control which the Press barons have in our country is the control that they have over some Ministers of the Government. I do not know how many Ministers they control but in the Centre and in the States they control a large number of Ministers. If there is an enquiry and if we are allowed to give evidence on the understanding that nothing will



be let out, that witnesses will be protected, I affirm before this House that we are in a position to prove before any tribunal that these Press barons control many Ministers, some Ministers in the Centre at least and many Ministers in the States. That is the most dangerous development in our political life. These people, the Ministers, are provoking the Press to attack their colleagues in the Ministry, in the same party, and we have known how this has been done. Because of these things democracy is throttled and stifled and before it is too late we must take measures because we must save democracy, democratise the Indian Press and liberate it from the most corroding, vicious, hateful control of the rotten, degenerating multimillionaire class.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2.30 P.M.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at half-past two of the clock, The VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिहार) : माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी साथी अरोड़ा जी ने जो संकल्प रखा है, मैं उसका तहेदिल से समर्थन करता हूँ। मेरी समझ में यह प्रस्ताव जो उनकी मन्शा है, उस के लिये नाकाफी है। उचित तो यह था कि वे एक ऐसा प्रस्ताव लाते कि जो औद्योगिक आधार पर टाटा के, टाटा के तो इतने नहीं, लेकिन बिड़ला, डालमिया या गोयनका सरीखे लोगों के, जो अधिक से अधिक प्रेस रखे हुए हैं और तरह तरह के अखबार निकालते हैं, उन का देश में सोशलिज्म के इन्टरेस्ट में जल्दी से जल्दी समाजीकरण कर लिया जाये। लेकिन कमेटी बनाने का एक लम्बा तरीका उन्होंने ढूँढा है और न जाने कब तक उसकी रिपोर्ट

आयेगी ? आज जिस तरह की फ़िज़ा है और हमारे ये बड़े बड़े कैपिटलिस्ट जो प्रेस रख कर अपना उल्लू सीधा करते हैं, उनके लिये यह जरूरी है कि वह जो दोनों सदनों की संयुक्त कमेटी का निर्माण होगा, जिस में दोनों तरफ के लोग रहेंगे, उससे हमारी ख्वाहिश की पूर्ति होगी। मैं उन सब बातों को फिर से दोहराना नहीं चाहता, लेकिन आज हिन्दुस्तान के जो बड़े बड़े पूंजीपति हैं, जो अखबारों का एक समूह बना कर किसी तरह मुल्क में जो हमारी योजना है, उस योजना के खिलाफ वायुमंडल तैयार करने, समाजवाद के खिलाफ वायुमंडल तैयार करने और जब कभी इस तरह की परिस्थिति हिन्दुस्तान में आती है कि कहीं भाषावाद का झगड़ा हो, कहीं संप्रदायवाद का झगड़ा हो या कहीं अन्तर्प्रान्तीय बार्डर का झगड़ा हो, जो अपने प्रान्तों में झगड़े होते हैं, या जब चुनाव आते हैं। तो उस में उन का रवैया अजीब व गरीब होता है, तो इन सब चीजों से मुल्क में एक खराब फ़िज़ा तैयार होती है, जोकि समाजवाद के लिये, देश के लिये और हमारी योजना की कामयाबी के लिये बहुत खतरनाक है। हम आठ वर्ष से अपनी पार्टी आल इंडिया कांग्रेस कमेटी के सामने और इस हाउस में भी जब बजट पर बहस होती है, इस तरह की आवाज बुलंद करते हैं, तो जवाब मिलता है फ़्रीडम आफ प्रेस है, प्रेस की स्वतंत्रता है। बोलने की स्वतंत्रता है, लिखने की स्वतंत्रता है, लूटने की स्वतंत्रता है, शोषण करने की स्वतंत्रता है—तो हमारी सरकार ने इतनी स्वतंत्रता दे दी है कि यह डेमोक्रेसी अब माबोक्रेसी के रूप में परिणत हो रही है। गत इलेक्शन हुआ; दिल्ली में तो हमारे जनसंघ वाले, जो यहां बैठे हुए हैं, कैसे कैसे कार्टून निकालते थे, पोस्टर निकालते थे, जोकि प्रेस में छपते थे। उस की भी यहां इजाज़त है। तो इस तरह के प्रेस देश के लिये बड़े खतरनाक हैं—यह हमारे दिग्गज लोग, महारथी लोग, हमारे नेता लोग, सब कोई बोलते हैं कि प्रेस में मोनोप्ली आ रही है। पंडित जी भी बोलते हैं, यह खतरनाक है।

[श्री शील भद्र याजी]

हमारे माननीय मिनिस्टर आफ इन्फार्मेशन एन्ड ब्राडकास्टिंग भी फर्मति है और लाल बहादुर शास्त्री जी भी फर्मति है कि प्रेस मोनोप्ली खतरनाक है । लेकिन हिम्मत किसी की भी नहीं होती है । एक बगल में पड़ोसी देश सीलोन है, वहाँ एक औरत प्राइम मिनिस्टर है, उनकी हिम्मत देखिये, वहाँ प्रेस वाले—टाटा, बिडला सरीखे कैपिटलिस्ट लोग—जो बड़ी बदमाशी करते थे, उनकी बदमाशी को रोकने के लिये उन्होंने उस मुल्क में बड़े बड़े सरमायादारों के प्रेस के साथ सख्ती की । उस औरत की हिम्मत देखिये, जो कि सीलोन की प्राइम मिनिस्टर है, कि उसने दुनिया भर के जितने बुर्जुआ प्रेस थे—एक इंटरनेशनल गैंग, जिसको हम कहते हैं—उन्होंने बड़ी चिल्लापो मचाई, लेकिन उस औरत ने, महिला ने, हिम्मत के साथ जितने प्रेस, जो बदमाशी करते थे, उन कैपिटलिस्टों के सब प्रेसों का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया, समाजीकरण किया और एक स्वस्थ वायुमंडल बनाया . . .

श्री अनूप सिंह (पंजाब) आप मार्क्सवादी हैं ।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी मैं यथार्थवादी हूँ । यह समाजवाद है । मार्क्सवाद और समाजवाद में आप फर्क समझते हैं, मैं नहीं समझता । मैं यथार्थवादी की हैसियत से बात कर रहा हूँ ।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Only do not become Birla-wadi

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: That is your Government—Kerala Government became Birla-wadi. I know Birla went there to support you. तो इसलिये मैं बिडला का भक्त नहीं हो सकता हूँ । कामरेड भूपेश गुप्त उनके भक्त बन सकते हैं । हम ने कभी मुस्लिम लीग का

साथ नहीं दिया । आपने अंग्रेजी साम्राज्यवाद तथा मुस्लिम लीग का साथ दिया ।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr Vice-Chairman, I never said that he is a follower of Birla. Please do not misunderstand.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: I know your Government, your Kerala Communist Government which helped Birla and in return he helped your party.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You have a liking for all these parties.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी मैं तो अपनी सरकार की शिकायत कर रहा था । आपका क्या है, आप टायटाय करते हैं, तो करें । इसलिये पूजीवादियों के प्रेसों को छोड़ कर बाकी पार्टियों के जितने प्रेस हैं, उनको आप स्वतंत्रता दीजिये, चाहे वह जन सघ का रहे, स्वतंत्र पार्टी का रहे, कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का रहे, पी० एस० पी० का रहे । यह जो न्यूज एजेंसी पी० टी० आई० वगैरह है यह बीच बीच में कभी बड़ी गड़बड़ करती है । चाहे महाराजा दरभंगा का प्रेस हो, चाहे दूसरे लोगों का हो, चाहे वह आनन्द बाजार पत्रिका लिमिटेड का हो, गोयनका का हो या शान्ति प्रसाद जैन का हो, जिसका भी हो, राष्ट्रीयकरण होना चाहिये । हमारे लिये यह बड़े अफसोस की बात है कि इतनी भारी हमारी शासक पार्टी कांग्रेस है और उसका एक दैनिक पत्र भी नहीं है । सभी जगह देखिये, छोटी सी कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी, जिसके यहाँ दो चार आदमी ही बैठे हुए हैं, लेकिन देखिये, उनके कितने अखबार हैं ? टाटा, बिडला उनका मुकाबला नहीं कर सकते हैं ।

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा टाटा-बिडला से ज्यादा हैं—चौबीस ।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : लेकिन उनकी पार्टी को स्वतंत्रता देनी चाहिये । मैं किसी पार्टी के प्रेस का, प्रिंटिंग मशीन का राष्ट्रीयकरण

या समाजीकरण नहीं चाहता। ये जो बड़े बड़े इन्डस्ट्री वाले, हमारे औद्योगिक क्षेत्र के मालिक हैं, वे अंधाधुंध मुनाफा कमाकर हमारे श्रमजीवी पत्रकारों का शोषण करते हैं और देश में अजीब व गरीब वायुमंडल तैयार करते हैं, और समाजवाद के खिलाफ जहर उगलते हैं। आपने देखा कि गत चुनाव में उनकी क्या हरकत थी। इसलिये आज यह जरूरी है कि जितने उनके प्रेस हैं, उनका राष्ट्रीयकरण हो। जब हम बड़े बड़े लोगों के खिलाफ कदम उठा सकते हैं, जैसा कि सर्वदा इस सदन में, जब हमने ६०० राजा-महाराजाओं, चंद्रवंशी और सूर्यवंशी राजाओं की रियासतें जनता की भलाई के लिये खीन लीं, महाराजाओं को और राजाओं को पेंशन दे दिया, प्रिवी पर्स दे दिया और जागीरदारों की और जमींदारों की जमीन ले ली और ३० एकड़ वाले उनको किसान बना दिया, तब हमें इनसे, शांति प्रसाद जैन से, बिड़ला से क्या मुहब्बत है? इनसे आपको क्या खतरा है? इसलिये जल्दी से जल्दी यह कमेटी तो बने। मैं समझता हूँ, सरकार इस प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार करेगी और कमेटी में दोनों सदनों के सदस्यों के शामिल होने से, हमें पूरी उम्मीद है कि वे सारे मसले पर अच्छी तरह विचार करेंगे। वे सभी सदस्य पड़ोसी देश सीलोन को याद रखें, जहाँ एक महिला प्रधान मंत्री पद पर बैठी हुई है और किस तरह में हिंमत के साथ, दिलेरी के साथ, पूँजीपतियों की बकवास को उसने बन्द कर दिया। वहाँ एक इन्टरनेशनल गैंग की साजिश थी, जो चाहता था कि वहाँ की सरकार की एक न चले।

तो इन सब बातों को मद्देनजर रखते हुए, हमारे दोनों सदनों के सदस्य एक ऐसी रिपोर्ट जल्दी में जल्दी रखेंगे जो मोनोपोलिस्ट्स के कब्जे से अखबार का व्यापार, चाहे वह प्रिंटिंग मशीन हो या न्यूज एजेंसी हो, लेंगे। यह इसलिये भी बहुत जरूरी है, क्योंकि आज जो हम योजनाओं का निर्माण कर रहे हैं, उसके द्वारा हम ऐसा वायुमंडल तैयार

कर रहे हैं, जिसमें समाजवाद की नींव इस देश में पक्की हो जाय।

हम देश के लिए जो योजना बना रहे हैं, उसके लिए अच्छा वायुमंडल तैयार नहीं हो रहा है। इसका कारण यह है कि हमारे देश में जितने भी अखबार हैं, वे ज्यादातर पूँजीपतियों के हाथों में हैं। हमारे देहातों में गांव वाले जो अखबार पढ़ते हैं, वे पूँजीपतियों द्वारा छपे होते हैं और इन अखबारों में इन लोगों के ही मतलब की खबरे ज्यादा छपती रहती हैं। इसका नतीजा यह होता है कि हम देश को भलाई के लिए जो योजना बनाते हैं, उसका प्रचार अच्छी तरह से नहीं हो पाता है और न ही योजना के लिए उचित वायुमंडल तैयार होता है। इसलिए यह जरूरी है कि जितने भी हमारे देश में अखबार हैं, प्रेस हैं, प्रिंटिंग मशीनें हैं, उनका राष्ट्रीयकरण किया जाना चाहिए। अगर हमने ऐसा किया तो पत्रकार भी खुश होंगे, प्रेस एजेंसी वाले भी खुश होंगे और इस तरह से हम देश में अपनी योजना के लिए अच्छा वायुमंडल तैयार कर सकेंगे, जिससे यह देश समाजवादी व्यवस्था की ओर और तेजी के साथ बढ़ता जाये। अगर हमने इस प्रस्ताव को मान लिया और उसके अनुसार काम किया, तो जो श्रमजीवी पत्रकार हैं, वे ज्यादा खुश होंगे और उनको ज्यादा मासिक वेतन मिल सकेगा। इसलिए हमारे सदस्य श्री अरोरा जी ने जो प्रस्ताव रखा है, उसका मैं पुरजोर समर्थन करता हूँ और अपनी सरकार से कहूँगा कि वह इस काम में जरा भी कमजोरी न दिखलाये। जैसा कि मैंने शुरू में कहा कि हमारी सरकार ने बड़े बड़े राजा-महाराजाओं, जमींदारों की प्रथा को खत्म कर दिया, लाइफ इन्श्योरेंस तथा दूसरी चीजों का राष्ट्रीयकरण कर दिया है; और भविष्य में और चीजों का भी राष्ट्रीयकरण करेंगे। अगर हम इस तरह की बात नहीं करते हैं, तो देश में समाजवाद की स्थापना नहीं हो सकती है। इसलिये देश में योजना

[श्री शीलभद्र याजी]

के लिये अच्छा वायुमण्डल बनाने के लिये हमें पूंजीपतियों के सभी प्रेसों का राष्ट्रीयकरण कर देना चाहिये ।

हमारे देश में जो प्राइवेट इंटरप्राइज वाले हैं, वे तरह तरह की पुस्तिका छाप कर निकाल रहे हैं, जिसमें समाजवाद के खिलाफ जहर उगला हुआ होता है । राजाजी तो सोशलिज्म के खिलाफ बराबर लेख इन पूंजीपतियों के प्रेस में लिखते ही रहते हैं और बिरला जी भी अखबारों द्वारा इस तरह के लेख निकालते रहते हैं कि भारत में सोशलिज्म की जरूरत नहीं है । हमारे यहां जो सर्वोदयवादी हैं, जो अपने को सर्वोदयवादी कहते हैं, परन्तु वे देश में समाजवाद की व्यवस्था को नहीं चाहते हैं, इन लोगों की यह धारणा है कि हमारे यहां जो टाटा, बिरला और एस० पी० जैन हैं, वे धरोहर हैं, ट्रस्टी हैं ।

**श्री ब्रजकिशोर प्रसाद सिंह (बिहार) :** क्या श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण और बिनोवाजी को भी इसी में शामिल करते हैं ?

**श्री शीलभद्र याजी :** जो सर्वोदय को मानने वाला है, वह समाजवाद के खिलाफ है । ये सर्वोदयी लोग सब का उदय चाहते हैं । ये कहते हैं कि किसान, मजदूर, टाटा, बिरला सब का उदय होना चाहिये । इस बात से स्पष्ट है कि ये लोग देश में समाजवाद नहीं चाहते हैं । इन समाजवाद विरोधी लोगों के पास देश के ज्यादातर प्रेस हैं और इसके जरिये ये सोशलिज्म के खिलाफ बातें छापते रहते हैं । इसलिये यह आवश्यक है कि अगर हम देश में समाजवाद की स्थापना करना चाहते हैं, दस-बारह वर्षों में जो हमने देश में काम किया है, निर्माण का काम किया है और हो रहा है, उसको ये लोग खत्म करना चाहते हैं । इन लोगों के हाथों में प्रेस हैं, अखबार हैं और प्रिंटिंग मशीनें हैं, जिनके जरिये ये जनता में अपनी बात फैलाते रहते

हैं और योजना के खिलाफ वायुमंडल तैयार करते हैं । इसलिए यह जरूरी है कि जो प्रस्ताव इस समय सदन के सामने आया है कि सब अखबारों का जल्द से जल्द राष्ट्रीयकरण कर दिया जाना चाहिये, उसको सरकार को मान लेना चाहिये । इस बारे में एक कमेटी बैठ सकती है, जो इस बात का फैसला कर सकती है कि कितना मुआवजा इस तरह के प्रेसों को दिया जायेगा, जिनका राष्ट्रीयकरण किया जायेगा । इस तरह की बात का फैसला दोनों हाउसों के मेम्बरों की कमेटी कर सकती है कि आया राष्ट्रीयकरण करने के बाद मुआवजा दिया जाना चाहिये या नहीं । मैं इस बात पर कोई लम्बी चौड़ी तकरीर करना नहीं चाहता हूं । मैं तो हाउस के प्रत्येक सदस्य से, सरकार से और माननीय मंत्री जी से, जो इस समय यहां पर बैठे हैं, कहूंगा कि वे कुछ हिम्मत तो दिखलावें और इस प्रस्ताव को मान लें । सरकार को इस तरह के प्रस्ताव को मानने में कोई उज्र नहीं होना चाहिये । सरकार को आला कदम उठाने में शायद कुछ देर लग जाये । लेकिन इस प्रस्ताव को मान लेना चाहिये । सीलोन की महिला प्रधान मंत्री ने इस बारे में जो कदम उठाया है कि उसने अपने यहां जितने भी प्रेस हैं, प्रेस एजेंसियां हैं, प्रिंटिंग मशीन हैं, उन सब का राष्ट्रीयकरण कर दिया है । इसी तरह से हमारे देश में भी यह कार्य जल्द से जल्द हो जाना चाहिये, ताकि देश में प्लानिंग के लिए, समाजवाद के लिए उचित वायुमंडल तैयार हो सके ।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं फिर प्रस्ताव का तहेदिल से समर्थन करता हूं ।

**SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh):** Mr. Vice-Chairman, I listened with great interest to the forceful statement of his case which Mr. Arora made this morning. I would like to say that I would extend my qualified support to this Resolution. When I say qualified support, I feel that the Resolution might have been differently worded and might have included

a paragraph on the methods by which we might strengthen the small and medium-size newspapers.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Move an amendment. With the permission of the Chair you can move an amendment.

**SHRI A. D. MANI:** If I had had the time, I would have given an amendment. I was told that the time for giving an amendment was past. I would consider the Leader of the Opposition's suggestion that I might move an amendment on the floor of the House.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, my support of the Resolution would not be on the lines of the arguments of the Mover of the Resolution. There is certainly a danger today of monopoly, and the danger is not on account of the ownership but on account of the finances and resources which these big newspapers have and which are used for the development and promotion of the regional press. Recently the big newspapers have entered the language newspapers' field, and one newspaper is being published in Bombay with eight pages at 8 or 9 naye Paise per copy which is really affecting the circulation of smaller regional dailies published in the same language. The kind of monopoly which the United Kingdom Royal Commission feared is now taking place in India, and for that reason I would like that the smaller newspapers must be strengthened.

The Mover of the Resolution referred to the structure of ownership in the newspaper industry. I happened to be a member of the Press Commission and we discussed this matter at length. If my memory is not wrong, we discussed the question of suggesting a legislation to change the structure and nature of ownership of newspapers. We discussed the matter for five long days, and we came to the conclusion that any amendment

of the existing laws would infringe the provisions of the articles of the Constitution. I may briefly explain why we felt that there were serious constitutional difficulties in the way of our changing the ownership of newspapers. Under article 19 of the Constitution we have the right to freedom of expression. That freedom of expression includes the freedom for Mr. Dalmia. Mr. Dalmia cannot be excluded from the benefits of that freedom. If a newspaper owner wanted to start a newspaper to propagate his ideas on vivisection or vaccination and was prepared to spend lakhs of rupees for that purpose, on what ground can we object to that? It was on that ground we felt that we could not suggest any alteration or changes in the structure of ownership of newspapers. Therefore, you will find that in the Press Commission we had broadly restated the position as it obtained at that time in the newspaper industry. We did not express any categorical opinion against multiple units of good newspapers. If you go through the Press Commission's report, you will find that all that we said in those recommendations of ours was that every newspaper must have separate accounts so that the workers are not denied the benefit of bonus by one prosperous unit utilising its profit to expand its activities or to meet the losses on newly started units. I still think that the Company Law is capable of modification without any infringement of the Constitution to permit at least newspaper concerns to have separate accounts and separate ownership for newspapers. This is the line on which the Government should start thinking, and if it is possible to enact legislation on this subject, it will be welcomed by newspapers.

Another recommendation that we made was the Price Page Schedule. The Price Page Schedule has been declared as unconstitutional by a recent judgment of the Supreme Court, and today the regional language news-

[Shri A. D. Mani.]

papers are facing a very fierce competition from these big newspaper interests which have got the finance, capital, influence and resources to push up their sale and sell the newspaper at a very inexpensive price in order to compete with the regional dailies. Both Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and Mr. Arora referred to the nature of ownership of newspapers. I know that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta would exclaim that my statement of facts is wrong, but I must say as a newspaperman of long standing in this country that in regard to the presentation of news and views, on account of the resources that they command, the bigger newspapers have given a very good standard of performance. That also was the opinion of the Press Commission. I could quote paragraphs to show that we also came to the conclusion that the big newspapers are very fair in regard to the presentation of news.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: My criticism was not on the details but against the approach.

SHRI A. D. MANI: The Press Commission also said that while these newspapers were very fair and accurate in the presentation of news, they lacked a social purpose. That was their conclusion. Sir, in regard to the presentation of news and views, it is surprising that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and Mr. Vajpayee get the largest publicity in these big newspapers. Whenever Mr. Bhupesh Gupta makes a speech, he gets a much better coverage than any member of the Government.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am very sorry if Mr. Mani is not being given publicity. He controls one paper where he can get publicity. Something should be done. Mr. Birla must do something.

SHRI A. D. MANI: All that I am saying is that in regard to the presentation of news and views, they

have got better resources. They can pay the correspondents better. They have got the newsprint and they have got the advertisements to publish all the things that are necessary to sell a newspaper.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How much Mr. Tushar Kanti Ghosh gets and what does he write? Has he ever written one thing in the editorial column?

SHRI A. D. MANI: I am coming to the point. Where the big newspapers have failed is, they have not brought into existence a trained, independent editor class. Unfortunately, in these big newspapers, the editor does not have the freedom of opinion, the freedom to order the operations of the paper as he likes. (Interruption) I do not want to be interrupted because my time is limited.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But some of those editors do not write at all, people like Mr. Ashok Sarkar or Mr. Tushar Kanti Ghosh.

SHRI A. D. MANI: The newspapers do not have a particular social purpose. As the Press Commission pointed out, they were lacking in their approach to the problems of the day. It is true that the big newspapers have been influenced in only one sphere and that is in the realm of foreign affairs, thanks to the extensive contacts that their special correspondents have with members of the Governments on the other side. I think somebody said on this side that the members of Government did like the big newspapers. As a newspaperman, I may say that the Ministers on that side would like to see their photographs published in 'The Statesman', 'The Times of India' and 'The Hindustan Times', but may not attach the same importance if they are published in 'The Statesman', 'The Times of India' and 'The Swadhinatha'. I mean, the approach of the Government, therefore, is in

favour of the newspaper which renders them service.

(Interruption)

Sir, as my time is limited, I would like to go on . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Mani, make a good speech and give a good picture of yourself.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I will certainly do it. 'The Swadhinatha' may not publish it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not the rightist speech.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I have said early in my speech that the best way of breaking the monopoly of newspapers is to help the small and medium-sized newspapers in the country. The Press Commission recommended the establishment of a Press Council to go into the question of monopoly but there is no Press Council in existence now, and it may not be feasible for us to think in terms of a Press Council until the Government and the affected parties come to some agreement as to what the Press Council should be. I think the newspapers and the Government can set up an Institute of Public Opinion or an Institute of Newspaper Opinion which will publish annually a statement on the performance of the press. If there has been gross suppression of news as there was in the case of Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon's election in North Bombay in the big newspapers of India, that should merit attention in a report which is published by the *Institute of Newspaper Opinion*. And I can tell you that newspapers are afraid of criticism. If they point out others' deficiencies, their circulation is affected, their standing with the advertisers is affected, and that would be the best corrective for the misuse of the enormous powers which these big owners wield.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: These people . . .

SHRI A. D. MANI: The second suggestion that I would like to make for breaking the monopoly of newspapers is in regard to small newspapers, that is to say, newspapers with a circulation of less than fifteen thousand—that would be my criterion for defining a small newspaper—and for newspapers of that size, the newsprint should be available at cost without duty. I mean, that is the only way in which you can help the small and medium-sized regional newspapers. I would also like that in regard to the purchase of machinery, the machinery should be available without duty. That is a kind of assistance which we give to newspapers to exist in this country. It is not subsidy because subsidy means choosing a newspaper for preferential treatment in return for some consideration and so on. When once it is laid down as a policy that newspapers with a circulation of less than fifteen thousand should get all these benefits, the smaller regional and provincial units will be strengthened.

Sir, I would like to mention that there is one other direction in which the Government can help the small newspaper and that is in respect of advertisements. Though it is denied on the floor of the House that political considerations do not play a part in influencing the Government for giving advertisements from Government agencies, I can say from personal knowledge—I cannot prove by documents and so on—that the Government of India does have, at least in the case of certain newspapers, *political predilections*. The Home Ministry, for example, is the authority which advises the Union Public Service Commission, one of the major Government advertisers, in regard to the manner in which Government advertisements should be placed. The Union Public Service Commission does not have any autonomy in this

[Shri A. D. Mani.]  
 matter. The matter is referred to the Home Ministry and the Home Ministry has the final word on the subject. I would like . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Just a word. 'The Jan Sewak', organ of the West Bengal Congress Party, gets U.P.S.C. advertisements, and no other language paper gets them.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I know, I was just mentioning this. I can quote many other cases where newspapers which happen to belong to the Congress Party and which do not have the requisite circulation to deserve the Union Public Service Commission's advertisements, have been placed on the advertising list on the advice of the Home Ministry. When we rake up the matter of advertising . . .

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: What is the harm.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I am coming to it. I am talking about the regional newspapers of first class. What I would like the Government to do is to advertise at a higher rate in the smaller regional newspapers irrespective of the political affiliations that they have, so that we can have organs of news in the various States putting forward points of view different from those of the big business interests.

Sir, I do not know whether the Government would agree to the suggestion made about advertising because as far as advertising is concerned, the pathology of the various Governments has been to regard advertisements as patronage and not as a commercial transaction.

Sir, the greatest danger today to the press and particularly the small regional newspapers is not monopoly or the fact that certain newspapers are owned by big business interests but the fact that these small regional newspapers are subjected to steady

coercive pressure from the State Governments. That is a fact which is very well known. Any person . . .

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: You advocated their case. You were the Chairman of the P.T.I. You represented it. It is also a fact that the P.T.I. news agency is manned by all big press magnates.

SHRI A. D. MANI: No, no. The P.T.I. has nothing to do with the big newspapers. The State Governments exercise a good deal of pressure on the smaller newspapers. I would like some protection to be given to them, and the only manner in which protection can be given is to strengthen their economy and their finances.

As far as the Resolution is concerned, I would like an enquiry to be conducted immediately. There is certainly a danger and that danger is in the direction of the extinction of the smaller newspapers. That was the purpose for which the United Kingdom Royal Commission was appointed. But what manner of enquiry should be conducted is a question on which some more thought should be given. The newspaper organisations would like to place their points of view they would like to be associated with this enquiry. And it is for that reason I say that my support to the Mover's Resolution is of a qualified nature.

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

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now, we have another journalist supporting him.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL (Andhra Pradesh): I promise Mr. Bhupesh Gupta that I shall not enter into polemics as he has done and the preceding speaker has done.

Sir, the preceding speaker brought in a number of points of view which might very well be regarded as the



points of view of persons in charge of newspapers, having chains. I did not hear much of his speech. I came, unfortunately, a little late and therefore I am not in a position to refer to the points that he made, and that gives me also an opportunity to redeem my promise to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta not to be polemic. I shall rather confine myself to dealing with the Resolution under discussion, mainly on its merits. I shall try to be as objective as possible, confining myself strictly to the ambit of the Resolution.

3 P.M. Sir, Lord Beaverbrook once said, "I run my newspapers purely for making propaganda, and not for any other motive". Lord Beaverbrook made this statement in his evidence before the Royal Commission on the press. He is an important newspaper magnate in England exercising a great deal of influence on public opinion in the country, had considerable influence in the higher echelons of the administration, was supposed to have been a friend of Sir Winston Churchill—I do not know now—even at one time advocated a policy of getting friendly with Hitler during the War. He did not care very much for money, as he said, but owing to the propaganda that he conducted in his newspapers, money flowed in as a matter of course. He was interested in advocacy, not in dividends. Now I just want the House to consider, if a man like that, with such angle, with such purpose, with such motive, were to be in control of a chain of newspapers, or had a monopoly in the purveyance of news, what would be the result?

To give a contrasting picture about the idea of propaganda, I would like to refer to what the Press Commission has said about propaganda in its report. It says:

"To begin with, news and views, which newspapers sell, serve not only an informative aspect, but also an educational and a propagandist

aspect. They influence opinion, conduct, and action; and this is done not only in the political but also in the social, economic and cultural fields. Just as the public have a vital interest in the purity of their water supply, so have they an equally vital interest in the accurate presentation of news and fair presentation of views. In other words, the news and views which newspapers purvey, carry with them a vital public interest that needs to be safeguarded"

Now that is the idea with which I agree, the idea of the Press Commission in regard to propaganda, and it is very necessary, very vital for us, that our newspapers and other agencies which purvey views and news should strictly and very prudently observe a certain objectivity and not indulge in propaganda that is prejudicial to the interests of the community at large.

I want this House to think about this matter, as I said, because if a person like Lord Beaverbrook owns a chain of newspapers, what would be the result? I want the House to consider it because in this country, even if we do not have Beaverbrooks at the moment, we may have some in future, and this is very important.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Mr. Roy Thompson is a frequent visitor to this country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We have miniature Beaverbrooks.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: Today newspapers make money; at the same time they indulge in propaganda. The Press Registrar's Report for 1961 gives chains, groups and multiple units, which my friend Mr. Arjun Arora, has quoted to you, and I shall not go into them again. But it is worth recording the number of such chain newspapers and their circulation. One point that he failed to mention was that my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's political party con-

[Shri M. H. Samuel.]

ducts as many as 24 newspapers, according to the Press Registrar's report.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But what is the circulation?

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: I have not got the time for it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will provide you the time.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: Then the Express Group conducts 18 newspapers with about 8,00,000 circulation. The Bennett Coleman group publishes about 11 newspapers with about 6,00,000 circulation. There is nothing fresh I am giving here.

(Interruptions)

I have taken it from the Press Registrar's report. The 'Hindustan Times' and its allied concerns publish about 12 newspapers with about 2½ lakh circulation, and so on. Now here is a point I would like to make in regard to the chains owned by individuals and the chains owned by political parties. To some extent it seems to me that it is legitimate for a political party to have newspapers.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Why 'legitimate'?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Because they want to make out news.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: From the propaganda point of view I am talking. Propaganda is the theme of my speech. (Interruptions.) Can there be a difference between the ownership of chains by political parties and the ownership of chains by private individuals, industrialists, businessmen or others? It is a point that needs to be gone into.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: In the case of political parties there is no such monopoly at all.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: You must judge the parties also. The papers of parties believing in socialism cannot be charged as monopolies and they cannot come under the definition of monopolist press or capitalist press.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If I own a paper or, as is the case, my party owns a paper in West Bengal, I am not a monopolist. I do not earn even Rs. 200.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: I am not at all concerned with what Mr. Gupta and Mr. Yajee are exchanging between themselves. (Interruption.) Let me go on with my speech. Now the Registrar of Newspapers in the Introduction to his report for 1961 . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: The papers run by Goenkas and Birlas and S. P. Jains are advocating capitalism.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is he advocating capitalism?

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Yes, he is advocating capitalism, it seems; they are monopolists.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: I do not advocate them at all. As you listen to my speech and as I develop my argument . . .

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Your sermon is not going to be heard because you are blowing both hot and cold.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: . . . you will find that I am entirely with you on that.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: All right. I shall not interrupt.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: Now I would quote from a paragraph in the Introduction to the Report of the Regis-

lar of Newspapers for the year 1961 in regard to these monopolies and chains:

"As for the trend towards common ownership of newspapers, there was an increase in the number of chains and groups as well as in the number of papers controlled by them and in their circulation. The number of multiple units remained the same and the number of papers belonging to them declined, but their circulation increased. The increase in the number of chains and groups was due to the addition of newspapers to existing newspaper establishments and not because any completely new chain or group came into existence. Another notable point in this connection is that while chains, groups and multiple units have been expanding and claiming a higher circulation, there has been no buying up of any papers by the owners of these combines. The expansion has been of their own establishments and not through the acquisition of other independent concerns or combines".

But who knows, before long the thirst for propaganda on the part of the newspaper-owners and their greed for money will probably persuade them to buy and acquire existing newspapers or found new ones to serve their purposes. To my mind, looking at it rather closely and objectively—perhaps some of my friends here might disagree with me—I do not find today, in the strictest sense of the term, monopolists in the newspaper world (*Interruptions*) But I do find trends towards it, and I want the Government, I want the country to guard against those trends, correct the trends and deter monopolies taking shape.

SHRI ANUP SINGH: Has the trend gone too far, or is it just at the beginning?

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: The very fact that chains have taken place, have formed themselves, is itself a very

manifest trend towards monopolies, and unless we take steps . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If three or four houses between them control a chain and account for a larger part of the circulation, then what do you call it? Is it not monopoly well developed and manifested?

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: There are equally three or four other houses purveying information in their own way, countering in the same field. A monopoly has to be differently understood, and I say that if this trend continues and monopolies come into existence, that is a danger to the country. It is a danger of which we must take note immediately. It is a poison to the body politic in the country. It is a danger to the infant of democracy that we are nurturing in our country. I repeat, we must guard against these trends.

Sir, Britain appointed a Royal Commission to go into the state of the press in 1947. I would like to quote one of the terms of reference of this Royal Commission in order to explain the danger of these trends. This is what one of their terms of reference says:—

"That, having regard to the increasing public concern at the growth of monopolistic tendencies in the control of the Press and with the object of furthering the free expression of opinion through the Press and the greatest practicable accuracy in the presentation of news this House considers that a Royal Commission should be appointed to inquire into the finance, control, management and ownership of the Press".

Here, again, I want to emphasise the trend towards monopolistic tendency.

SHRI A. D. MANI: There is only a trend and there is no danger according to you.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: Trend itself is a danger.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: It is a dangerous thing.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: And monopoly is a still greater danger. The Royal Commission had found such trends in the British press at that time. It has appointed another Commission recently whose report is still awaited. Now, our Press Commission also saw in 1954 a similar danger and spoke about the potentialities or the concentration of ownership in India. I need not go into the chapter and verse of it. You can find it at page 281 of its report.

Sir, it is important that we should examine these trends and tendencies towards concentration of ownership because, as I said, it has dangerous implications to the body politic of democracy in our country, it is almost poisonous to a healthy public life. To the newspaper industry itself, its results can be very grave and menacing. I shall enumerate some of these results which I have noted down. As a result of these monopolistic trends, the number of newspaper will tend to become less and less and go into fewer and fewer languages. There is a danger of **uniformity** or regimentation of news and views. There is a danger of suppression of opinion and news. Independence of journalists will be threatened. The calibre of editors will be undermined. It will result in the boosting of the proprietors, their points of view and their interests. It will result in the **transfer** of editorial control to the management and sub-version of the traditions of journalistic objectivity and high standards of journalism. Finally, it will endanger the freedom of the press and the welfare of the State.

The owner's control over newspapers can be proper or improper. If it is improper, it is going to be dangerous. As I said, at this moment the state of the press in the country, to my mind, from the professional point of view—I am not going into the business point of view—is very

assuring but we must be on the guard. Our journalism still retains something of that objectivity that we have been used to. I think our boys up there have been doing excellent work and during the last ten years journalism in the country has taken a shape which is both adorning and affluent. You see the daily newspapers in Delhi. They are far better than any around the world. Even a newspaper magnate like Thompson, who has now become almost the largest owner of newspapers in the world, paid a tribute to the quality of our journalism.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Is it a compliment or something else?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Your time is over. You should wind up now.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: Since I am being rushed I will come to the conclusion. The Press Commission was appointed in 1952. Its terms of reference also pointed to these trends towards monopolies. It recommended the formation of a Press Council to safeguard the interest of journalists and also to see that these monopolist trends do not become dangerous. What I am asking for is nothing more than what the Press Commission asked for, to see that these trends do not develop into monopolies in the country, and that this Press Council is appointed.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, many hon. Members who participated in the debate on the Resolution expressed their opinion with regard to the prevailing danger to the press. Perhaps the House will do well to know something about the press in the past before we analyse the state of the press at present.

Sir, you know that before independence the Indian press had a glorious past and a rich tradition and most of the people were motivated by a very high desire, a laudable pur-

pose to serve the people, the nation, freedom and democracy. Perhaps that phase is over. Soon after independence a new danger emerged to Indian Press, the danger of commercialism as a result of which the high standard of journalism and public interest were set off.

Sir, when we talk of the press, we must always remember that the press should have a motive, a purpose. Normally, motives may be more than one. Purpose may be always mixed up. But a national press is and always should be motivated by a spirit of missionary endeavour which was there in the past. Today there are many papers and many presses and to me they look more like commercial concerns than national properties or national institutions.

Many hon. Members have pointed out that monopolies have grown in the recent past. That is very true. To me the state of affairs obtaining in the press appears to be partisan and irresponsible. It is partisan because so many industrialists have come to own papers so that they could exploit the paper for their own ends, to promote their own political views. This dangerous tendency has increased. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta took pains to suggest how big people in industrial concerns and combines have taken so much of interest in developing their own press in the country. That is true. I said in the beginning that most of the Indian press is to-day partisan. It is capitalist-oriented. Many of the big business concerns and big business houses have been controlling various dailies, weeklies and periodicals, and the control is increasing, ownership is expanding and they have been starting chains of newspapers all round. I do not want to go into the figures because the figures have been given by my friends. There is enough statistical evidence in the Press Registrar's report to show that recently the dailies, weeklies or periodicals controlled by the chains, multiple

units or groups account for the major portion of the Indian newspapers. Therefore it is not necessary for me to go into this question and it is obvious to one and all that monopoly exists. I said one thing more that our press also suffers from irresponsibility. This irresponsibility is of various kinds but I refer here to a section of the press controlled by the Communist Party of India. Shri Bhupesh Gupta, I know, is always sensitive, whenever we speak about the Communist Party and make some criticism. I am happy that he is not very much upset now. In the morning he made a very elaborate statement to defend himself or his Party in regard to a cartoon and I was in doubt that after all he might be right. That is why I did not interrupt him. After his speech, I saw the cartoon myself, the cartoon here in the paper and also the cartoon which has been reproduced in to-day's 'Hindustan Times'. What do you find in that cartoon? I saw it to my surprise in the cartoon that there are slanting lines at the top. These slanting lines from above showing the frontier . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not at all, I repudiate this thing because the hon Member should not . . . (*Interruptions*) I can understand the discomfort because we wiped out the P.S.P. in West Bengal.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: I can understand that Mr. Gupta wants to cover up his own guilty conscience.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): You want to cover up your guilty conscience. Mr. Hem Barua raised it there.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: That is not the point. I am showing that distortion is taking place in the Indian press and how our friends are becoming irresponsible. I agreed with Mr. Gupta when he attacked. There are chains, monopolies, ope-

[Shri M. S. Gurupada Swami.]

rating in this country. The biggest monopolist is the Communist Party in India.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There you are.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: The Communist Party of India controls 124 papers in the country. May be he asks: what is the circulation? The circulation is one lakh and more but so many papers are controlled by the Communist Party of India.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The P.S.P. runs a paper—the Lok Sabha proceedings are there—which does blackmarketing in newsprint . . .

(Interruption)

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: I object to it . . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is there in the press.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: It is fantastic . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Well, you ask the Government. The Minister has admitted in this House . . .

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: I repudiate the allegation made by the hon. Member . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Manubhai Shah . . .

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: I can understand that he is very much annoyed about the P.S.P. and the P.S.P.'s role about the Communist Party of India.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is there in the proceedings . . .

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: Is not the Communist ideology a monopolistic ideology?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: Monolithic and monopolistic, both. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta referred to some of the individual concerns holding various papers. He objected to this monopoly and to Birlas, Goenkas and Dalmias holding a large number of chains. That is highly objectionable and that is dangerous to freedom. He was asking, how is it that these people have been able to start these papers and been able to control the press world? It has been so and I sympathise with him but at the same time, I ask him and ask his friends, how is it that certain papers were able . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What can I do if the P.S.P. cannot run either their Party or their newspapers? They seem to be failing everywhere.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: The Communist Party of India is always sensitive, I know, whenever criticisms are offered, but here his objections or interruptions are irrelevant. I refer to the case of a newspaper . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You join me for a while and I shall teach you how to run papers.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: . . . which has been founded very recently. Its circulation is only 7000 or 8000 and it has been able to put up a colossal structure in New Delhi within such a short time. I do not know where they get their funds from.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What is that?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: From which source they get?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: New Age printing press? It has big business. The Government of India places orders with it also. That has got a building. You are completely wrong on everything.

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY:** That is my very objection. How was it possible for a small weekly to be able to put up such a huge building?

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** This is misleading. The building has nothing to do with the paper. It is the New Age Printing Press.

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY:** I am sorry that you are interrupting too much. I am just posing a question, whether in the ordinary circumstances it would be possible for a paper, that too a weekly, to be able to set up a big press, not only that, a huge building costing Rs. 20 lakhs in the city of Delhi and that paper has only a circulation of 8,000 to 10,000 at the most.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** On everything he is wrong.

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH:** May God have mercy on him. He does not know what he is talking about.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Shall I give you a statement to-morrow?

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY:** I am just posing a question.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** You are not posing a question. It is *suggestio falsi* and *suppressio veri*.

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY:** It is absolutely true. Everybody knows it. Whatever may be the interpretation of Mr. Gupta, nobody would agree with him. That is the tragedy.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** You come to New Age building and I shall show you what a good business it has.

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY:** I am talking about the irresponsibility in the press and in Indian journalism. Every hon. Member is aware how foreign interests, foreign Governments, foreign powers are taking in-

terest in Indian papers. That is the worst. I can understand a few individuals, industrialists entering or starting a chain of papers, a group of papers. It is objectionable but it is more objectionable when foreign powers take interest, take a hand in the newspapers of our country. I know about a particular news weekly, a weekly from Bombay. Some Indian embassy purchases thousands of copies of it every week and circulates it . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Indian Embassy?

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY:** . . . to the various free subscribers. They do not pay any money at all.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** What is that?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Indian Embassy?

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY:** My friend is aware of that. That paper is purchased in thousands by an embassy and I am told that it is being circulated freely to various subscribers and to the State of Kerala itself nearly 7000 to 8000 go.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Foreign Embassies in India you mean?

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY:** Yes, in India. If you want to verify, I want the Registrar of Newspapers to take the figures of such newspapers and verify whether subscription has been paid for every paper that is sent from the office. If the Registrar is satisfied, there is nothing to complain but if he is not satisfied, some action has to be taken.

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH:** Why don't you name the newspaper so that action may be taken against it?

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY:** That is Blitz from Bombay.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Whether you like it or not, that paper is a very popular paper, exceedingly popular. (*Interruptions.*) I do not agree with many things in that paper. They claim 1,25,000 circulation.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: I refer to another point about the Government of India's approach to the whole problem of the Indian press.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I don't like the last page of it where they put in a lady's picture.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: I refer to the approach of the Government to some of these papers. The Government of India gives advertisements to the papers and this matter was referred to by Mr. A. D. Mani also. I do not know how the 'Link', which is a weekly, gets its advertisements, for most of the advertisements in the Link are from public sector undertakings. It is amazing. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta was saying that a few people are controlling not only the papers but also controlling the Ministers. That is true. At the same time, I would like to know how the Chief Minister in a State can be the director of the 'Link'?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You mean 'Link'?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: Yes. He is Chief Minister and also the director of that weekly.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: I may correct the hon. Member there. He was director previously, but when he became the Chief Minister, he resigned from that directorship.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: If he is not a director, then I am sorry.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He cannot be director when he is the Chief Minister.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: My point is this. When foreign interests entrench themselves in the Indian press that is more objectionable even than the local interests controlling the press. That is my whole point and something has to be done, but nothing has been done as yet. The other day we saw that the New Age press published a China weekly. There was criticism in the House and yet no action was taken.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How can any action be taken?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: Action has to be taken because that publication contained malicious propaganda, scandalous propaganda against India.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are not responsible for that.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: You are responsible, the publishers are responsible.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I should be given another occasion to refute all this.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Gurupadaswamy your time is over.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ (Jammu and Kashmir): What is the time limit given to the hon. Member?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: I can understand Mr. Gupta's line.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, otherwise you will be nowhere.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: Whether I will be nowhere or whether you will be nowhere, the people will judge. It is not for you to say that.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: What is your ism? Is it socialism, capitalism or what? I think you are a Fabian socialist.



THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Your time is up.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: But I have been interrupted so much. I may be given a little more time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He may be given a little more time. I invite you to the People's Publishing House.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: I do not want to be interrupted so much.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Take two more minutes and finish.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: The Press Commission went through this aspect of the problem very carefully and recommended one solution. But that solution has not been touched upon by any hon. Member now. I wish to point out that. Having gone into the aspect of the concentration and control of ownership in a few hands, the Press Commission suggested that one of the ways to deal with it, one way out, would be to have a public trust for papers. That will be a remedy, perhaps a partial remedy, to avoid this danger. May I ask why the hon. Minister or the Government has not given sufficient thought to this aspect of the problem? Some steps have to be taken to promote a public trust. Once you find that the papers become monopoly and that monopoly has to be avoided, you should see how to stop that monopoly. You cannot just avoid a monopoly by passing a law, because it may infringe the freedom of the press. If there is no infringement of the freedom of the press, I would even suggest that there should be some physical limit put on the number of papers to be started by a group or chain. Some ceiling has to be put, if that is possible. So this aspect of the matter should be given proper thought and attention and public trusts should be encouraged

and, if possible, a series of co-operatives should be started. They should be started and even assistance should be given to such co-operatives so that we may have a large number of papers representing various views and opinions and voices in the country, representing also the various interests in the country so that we may do away with the danger that is inherent in these monopolies. This aspect of the matter has to be carefully gone into.

There is just one more point which I would like to touch on and I have done. That relates to the Press Council. I do not want a Press Council to be started by Government. I do not want it at all. I do not want the Press Council to be started by the Government which will run as a limb of the Government, a limb of the Administration, a satellite, through which the Government may exercise its sinister influence, its sinister control and diabolical hold over the various papers. I do not want that to happen. Nor do I want a press advisory committee nominated by the Government because that also will take away the spirit behind the whole idea. I rather feel that the Press Council should be set up by the press itself, by the various paper concerns and paper interests coming together and joining to have a Press Council, and this Press Council can look into all these questions and also maintain discipline and decency in the press.

SHRI ANUP SINGH: May I ask the hon. Member whether there is not danger in the suggestion that he is now making? Is there not the danger that the same big papers or groups which you are criticising now for these trends, will control this Council also? Will not this Council be controlled by these same papers? What is the way out and how would you rectify or avoid that danger?

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY:** It is a question of representation on the Press Council. All the interests have to be represented there. However big and powerful an interest may be, it cannot get more than the necessary representation. So the remedy or the solution to this problem lies in seeing that the Press Council is open to all the interests in the Press. Therefore, I would suggest that this matter should be gone into. I wish some steps are taken to see that a Press Council is formed so that we may, at least partially, avoid some of the anomalies and anachronisms that have set in and that are seen in the press today.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** One thing I must make clear. Serious allegations have been made against our party. I was the editor of "The New Age". Shri Nambudiripad is now editing it. I can tell you that the New Age owns no press and the building where it is printed, is a building owned by the People's Publishing House, one of the biggest publishing houses in the country. I invite Shri Gurupadaswamy to come and see it. I can give him a cup of tea and something else also.

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY:** The People's Publishing House is controlled by the Communist Party of India.

**SHRIMATI K. BHARATHI (Kerala):** After hearing some of the speeches here, I do not know what is really meant by the monopoly of the press. If a person or a firm starts one newspaper and the same spreads all over the country like a giant banyan tree, throwing into its shadow all the other newspapers, or if a person or firm starts simultaneous editions from every province, can you say that it is a monopoly? If they run papers in all the languages in all the States, can you call the same a monopoly? Or, Mr Vice-Chairman, is it when the same firm owns more than one paper in one language that it turns itself

into a monopoly? I do not know how we can define it and how we can intervene in this field without impinging on the freedom of the Press.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, the price-page schedule was an effort to intervene and save the small newspapers and you know that the same was declared as an infringement on the fundamental freedom of the Press. It is rather difficult to define what you mean by monopoly of the Press and it is still more difficult to prevent the same but there is no doubt in my mind that the monopoly of the press is a threat to the real freedom of the Press.

Now, Sir, the question is whether we are facing such a threat today in this country. The hon. Mover of the Resolution, very ably pointed out, "Yes, there is a threat"—firms with their excessive money power run a chain of newspapers which instead of interpreting news, prevent it; instead of objective reporting, they indulge in subjective stories; instead of leading the people, they mislead them. We heard ample examples quoted by Mr. Arjun Arora, and it is not my purpose to go into the details. I only want to add that it is inevitable that when big, big firms, owning a variety of business concerns, ranging from fish to politics own the Press, the Press becomes a mere tool in their hands to suit their purpose, to suit their business interests. But I do not hesitate to say that the same evil you will find when this monopoly grows in political parties too, whether it is the Congress or the Communist. But, Mr. Vice-Chairman, how to save our democracy and the people from the monopoly of the Press? Freedom of information is fundamental to our functioning effectively in a democracy. Today, unless a person can have at least two or three newspapers, giving the same news independently, and interpreting the same from various angles, he has no chance of knowing the truth and coming to his own judgment. Then there are people who become addicted to a single paper and

I am sure that except in the case of a few papers, they are likely to have a perverted view of life and facts. As I do come from Kerala, the land of newspapers, I know the confusion that newspapers create in the mind of the public. Now, the question is, how to create the conditions by which the people will have access to more than one paper, I mean papers run by persons or firms, who have different angles of vision.

At present, we know that our newspapers are no longer the dedicated institutions of national service, as they used to be in the pre-independence days. Of course, some of the papers which were born with the nationalist movement and have grown with it, still carry the tradition in the face of bitter competition. A stage has now been reached that they too cannot exist without being sound business concerns. The growing competition to monopolise the press by big business firms can be met to a certain extent by the vigilance of the Government, eternal vigilance of the Government. One important factor in this is advertisements. I think some kind of control can be judiciously exercised in this by which this tendency of the growth of monopoly can be discouraged. Chain newspaper concerns which own more than one paper may be subjected to some additional tax on their advertisements, and some control may be exercised on the release of Government advertisements to them. Sir, if in each State, at least two leading paper concerns, owned and operated by different persons or firms are given Government advertisements, it will help a lot. Also, in fixing remuneration the chain circulation in different languages may be reckoned with.

Sir, I come now to a very vital question as regards the finding out of the exact amount of circulation and also distribution of newsprint. I wonder whether we go by the truth at all in this. I wonder whether we adhere to correct checks and practices

in this. I am told that the circulation figures are most often bogus. The Minister for Information and Broadcasting, I am happy he is here, himself in his speech at Hyderabad on the 4th August, referred to the case of a newspaper which gave a print order of 5,000 copies as against a newsprint allotment of 25,000 copies. I do not know what happened to that paper. But anyway, I only want to say that this is not an unusual practice in this country today. It was also revealed in the Minister's speech that there was blackmarketing in newsprint and the question arises whether it is done by the big ones. The big ones say that the small ones do it and the small ones say that the big ones do it but it is a nasty state of affairs. Blackmarketing can be stopped by physical verification of the stock, verification of the print order and the actual printing. I am sure, Sir, that even an assessment of the capacity of some of the printing presses will tell their own story, and I fear the story will be a staggering one indeed. I wonder whether A or B or C does the work thoroughly. If so, how does newsprint go into the blackmarket and the paper concern flourishes that way, that is to say, it flourishes not by printing paper but by not printing paper? Then there is another type of abuse also. Papers are printed and dumped on to agents to be sold as waste. It is the most criminal way of boosting up circulation—circulation which is round about the "samans" of the "dukandars". I am not telling tales. I am just telling the ugly truth because that is what is happening in this country today and we speak of "newsprint cut" because of shortage of foreign exchange, etc. Can't these be checked by vigilance, I ask? Then, Sir, there is free circulation for a week or even for a month. These are all criminal abuses of newsprint. In order to circumvent the Wage Board, managerial staff is made to do editorial work. I mention these things just to show how monopoly leads to corruption. All these will be interesting if a close study is made of our

[Shrimati K. Bharathi.]

flourishing newspaper concerns. The Press must be an asset of the nation and it must be honest in its views and dealings. Then, of course, it will lose the "monopoly" or control over many things in our national life. Sir, I do not forget to admit that there are still some papers which keep up the highest traditions or rather the highest standards of journalism and if we want them to survive the competition from the big ones, we have to devise some effective steps to control this growth of monopoly.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I whole-heartedly support the Resolution moved by Mr. Arjun Arora which says:

"That this House is of opinion that Government should appoint a Committee consisting of 15 members representing both Houses of Parliament to enquire into and report on the growth of monopoly and concentration of ownership in the newspaper industry."

It is important that in any consideration of the content of freedom or the manner in which that freedom is exercised we should not impose any restriction which will lead to the destruction of that freedom itself. But if tendencies show which, in the name of freedom while claiming the right to be free, are likely to destroy the very freedom that they claim, then there should be no question of staying our hands. Often such tendencies are insidious and most dangerous. The same concept should be extended to the Press and its freedom. We must do nothing which will fetter the freedom of the Press but if the monopoly trends try to destroy the very freedom of the Press, then the Government should not hesitate to lay its hands upon it. I do believe that monopoly trends in India are insidious and dangerous developments which, if not checked properly and at the

proper time, may prove very dangerous to the freedom of the Press itself.

It is true that the Press Commission was charged with the task of examining those trends and recommending some remedies to control such trends if they are found to be dangerous. The Royal Commission which was appointed later took pains to see that there were monopolist trends in the British Press but they did not report or recommend any step to be taken in that direction. In Britain there are countervailing forces which can be brought into play to check the monopoly of the Press but in India the conditions are different.

I am strongly of the opinion that today big chains and monopolies, convert and overt, have developed in Indian Press which can, if not effectively checked, prove disastrous not only to the Press in India but to the very freedom of the Press and the substance of democracy. The fact that chains and monopolies are controlled by the Big Business strengthens this concern.

Let us examine how these chains operate and in what insidious ways they benefit from the freedom of the Press. In the Annual Report of the Registrar of Newspapers for India, 1961, on page 82, it has been stated:

"Out of a total circulation of 46.10 lakhs of dailies in the country the share of those forming part of 17 chains, 115 groups and 27 multiple units was 31.10 lakhs."

On page 84 he gives the number of chains, groups and multiple units in 1959 and 1960 and the number of papers controlled by them. In 1959, 14 chains were there with 101 newspapers, 36 groups with 99 newspapers and 23 multiple units with 63 newspapers. In 1960 there were 17 chains with 103 newspapers, 42 groups with 115 newspapers and 23 multiple units with 60 newspapers. On pages 85, 86 and 87 he gives the names of the chains which are now operating in

India. The Express Newspapers are publishing Indian Express from 6 centres and some other language dailies from three or four centres and also other periodicals. Bennett Coleman & Co. publishes the Times of India and some other newspapers. Now they are also publishing one Marathi daily from Bombay. The Hindustan Times and Allied Publications publish newspapers both in English and Hindi. We should examine the constitution of the Board of Directors of this chain. The concern is Hindustan Times Ltd., and shareholders holding more than one per cent. of the capital are Birla Bros. Private Ltd., Birla Jute Manufacturing Company Ltd., United Commercial Bank Ltd. Then there is the Newspapers Ltd. owned by the Hindustan Times and Allied Publications and the shareholders who own more than one per cent. of the capital are Sutlej Cotton Mills Ltd., Kesoram Cotton Mills Ltd., Birla Cotton Spinning and Weaving Mills Ltd., Birla Jute Manufacturing Co. Ltd. and Messrs. Pilani Investment Corporation. I have quoted all these to show that most of these chains are owned not by individuals formed into a company or corporation but these chains are controlled again by a series of companies. The most prosperous among these is Bennett Coleman & Co. Ltd., now owned by Sahu Jain & Co. There is yet another chain which does not operate openly as a chain but operates rather covertly and all its publications are controlled by the Birla Group. There is another chain and that is controlled by the Goenka Group which runs the Indian Express from Delhi, Bombay, Madurai, Chittoor Vijayawada and one or two Tamil dailies and Telugu dailies and some periodicals including cinema periodicals. Together in number and extent they are the most prolific. If they are not stronger than they are and if they have not exterminated other smaller papers, it is not because of their fault but because of the sub-standard methods that have been adopted by them. An examination of the growth of these chains shows in

what insidious ways they operate under a single ownership. This chain had a very small beginning in Madras and by alliances and doubtful operations it has spread out to all parts of the country. In the last ten to fifteen years it has been able to produce English dailies, language dailies and weeklies and it has put up a very palatial building, the land for which was leased out by the Government at a very nominal price and that building is now fetching exorbitant rents from Government. I understand that licences for expensive equipment to bring out specially produced publications which have yet to be published have been given to this chain while existing small newspapers have been denied essential replacements in the name of foreign exchange. Newsprint quotas are liberally given to this chain and to other chains as well and if the balance sheets of these chains generally have been in the red, one wonders how they have been able to grow steadily and rapidly unless the liberal licences that have been granted to them are otherwise utilised. I am not here concerned with how the chains get the most favoured treatment from the Government but what I am concerned with is how these chains with their monopoly control over all the newspapers and periodicals have a very dangerous influence over the policies of the Government and over the development of the country in a wrong direction.

There is this difference between the Express Newspapers chain and the Hindustan Times or Times of India chain. This chain tries to operate from different centres on the same day but with different directors. In fact though it is split up into six or seven units, it is all controlled by one chain, so much so that the benefits to the working journalists in these newspapers, particularly in the Indian Express, are not given to them in the same quantum as would be due to them if all the newspapers that are now published by the Indian Express

[Shri Mulka Govinda Reddy.]

and other allied publications are considered as one unit, as one concern or as one chain. By this way 4 P.M. the Goenka group has tried to deceive or tried not to extend the benefits that are reasonably and legitimately due to the working journalists. On the other hand, while giving advertisements to this chain of newspapers, the Government consider all these papers published by the "Indian Express" as one and the same. Their total circulation is taken into consideration and the charges are paid at that rate. Government have been more liberal to this chain for reasons best known to themselves. They are not aware of the favours this chain receives because of the close association of some of the officials and one or two Ministers of the Government of India and State Ministers. While the Government accepts and pays advertisement rate on the basis of combined circulation, it does not collect the taxes that are due from this concern, if calculations are made on that basis. Recently the Mysore Government have leased out a very good plot in a central place, at a very nominal rate, for this concern.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Which is this concern?

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: It is the "Express" concern. These chains get most favoured treatment at the hands of the State Governments as well as the Central Government, as Britain gets most favoured treatment from the Commonwealth countries. While they defend their right to criticise the Government, the manner in which such propaganda is being carried on by these newspapers should cause anxiety to us. So, the nature, power and state of monopoly in the press should be thoroughly gone into. The chains not only enjoy Government patronage, but they also wield considerable economic power because of their tie-up with big business and high finance, through the biggest business houses and large

banks. Because of the variety of newspapers and editions, the chain newspapers exercise the pressure that is normally employed by monopolies. They can force newspaper agents and advertising agents to support them and clamp down on the smaller newspapers. It can be easily seen that chain newspapers acquire Government and political influence which they wield for various nefarious purposes and to crush their competitors, the small newspapers. Additionally, with the economic and financial backing they have and the monopolistic hold on their selling agents and advertising agencies, they wield the big stick and drive the smaller units to the wall. With their low working costs but with all the advantages of big business monopoly and higher revenue, what chance have the smaller newspapers to exist? While they enjoy unfettered freedom, they destroy the smaller newspapers which are not tied up with big business to wield influence to get the necessary machinery and newsprint import.

Again, this Goenka chain has started one news agency in competition with the PTI. I do welcome it and there should be not one, but at least two or three independent news agencies, gathering news from all the capitals in the world and disseminating it in India, to the Indian press.

I would also like to add a word here. The Press Trust of India is also becoming a monopolistic concern. The directors who are on the PTI have been there continuously for more than ten years. That does not augur well for this organisation. The Press Commission had recommended that the Press Trust of India should be converted into a corporation, where the interests of newspapers, particularly the interests of the working journalists and the smaller newspapers, are properly represented on the board of directors and that their interests are safeguarded. I would urge that the Government should seriously enquire into this question and see that there

is more democratisation of PTL. Working journalists should be represented on the Press Trust of India.

Thus, is there any doubt of the necessity to control these tendencies and make it impossible for chains to develop and acquire the power which will be dangerous to the country's interests, which will be dangerous to the socialist society to which we are all wedded, and which will be dangerous to a democratic life in this country? I would like to add one word. While recommending this Resolution for the acceptance of the House, I would suggest that a Wage Board for working journalists should be appointed, so that the recent rise in prices should be taken into consideration and their lot ameliorated properly.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR (Madras): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I was amused, indeed amazed, over some of the observations that had been made on the floor of the House arising out of the debate on the Resolution of my good friend, Mr. Arjun Arora, to curb the monopoly of the press. I was just wondering, where it is that we have got monopoly in our country today. When I had been to some of the countries in the West, I had seen that some of the leading lights in the world of journalism had their circulation running into millions. In our country, a country of which we are justifiably proud, a country of 435 millions, ever since the advent of freedom, our newspapers, even the most leading amongst them, have nowhere come near some of the leading lights in the world of journalism. To call them tycoons at least to me appears to be rather monkeying with the problem. I would even try to say that leading lights of journalism in our country compared with some of the world-famous newspapers can at best be only pigmies. It was rather very amusing for me to hear Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. It does not lie in the mouth of the Members of the Communist Party to condemn monopoly in this

country, because in the countries of their communist ideology, where totalitarianism prevails, where regimentation of public opinion obtains, where they have got certain newspapers of the standard of "Izvestia" running into ten million every day, and also "Pravda" whose circulation runs into no less a number. And what is it that we see there? Does it lie in the mouth of the hon. Member of the Communist Party to come and condemn the leading lights of our press? We are proud of our press and we are proud of the gentlemen of our press. And we are proud of the leading newspapers, the, big six of the press of India, viz., "The Statesman", "The Hindu", "The Times of India", "The Indian Express", "The Hindustan Times", "The Amrit Bazar Patrika" . . .

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: I would like clarification on one point from you. Are you aware that in the Soviet Union ordinary people are given facilities of paper as well as printing machinery in order to print and publicise whatever they like?

DR. ANUP SINGH: I just want to point out that the discrepancy between the number of newspapers circulated here and in the Western world can be very misleading. It does not show that our trend is not towards monopoly or it is towards monopoly. I am not concerned about that. But the percentage of literacy in India is so low that no newspaper can afford to circulate in millions. I just want to point out that that does not make a capital argument out of that discrepancy.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: I am very much beholden to my hon. friend for his information, but let me tell him—and he will bear me out—that particularly with the advent of freedom, the news-reading public has been growing in such large numbers that in the vernacular press we have got some of our papers. I refer in this connection to the "Thinathanthi" of Tamilnad whose circulation, I am told

[Shri N. M. Anwar.]

on good authority, is probably the largest in our country, two hundred thousand or a little more. Even so, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I must take my hat off to these press barons, to the big six, for the manner in which they have been able to carry on our fight for freedom, and to the gentlemen of the press we owe not a little for the freedom that we have secured for our country. And what is the tradition that they have been maintaining all these years? There has been reference to the Press Commission's report by several Members of this House, a report which appeared in 1954. I do not think that in these eight years that have gone by since that report was published much water has flown and that far too many irregularities have come to our notice for which we should now ask for another Commission. I quite see that there are very many difficulties and disabilities which we have got to get over in this world of journalism. But then to carry on a tirade against the big barons of the press I for one cannot understand. It arises from a defeatist mentality or an inferiority complex. On the contrary I would be glad to see that our newspapers increase in their circulation, grow in their size, and also expand in their influence and importance. But to say that our public opinion is corrupted and prostituted by these leading lights of journalism is a very sad commentary on the state of affairs of our country.

Actually during the recent elections we have seen, and seen with unmistakable truth, that not all the leading press, call it the jute press, call it the vested interests' press, in spite of all the forces they could combine and in spite of all the conspiracy, have been able to dislodge certain personalities and certain political parties from claiming political ascendancy. What happened in Bombay in that memorable election victory which our Party had in getting Mr Krishna Menon elected? In spite of all that has been said against him, against the stand that he has taken, our public

opinion is much wiser, infinitely much wiser than all the gentlemen of the press, let me say this. And let us be proud that in a country where we are having wonderful lessons in democracy, where public opinion is being educated not necessarily by these barons of the press alone but by the political parties participating in it, we have got abundant faith in our people. We can look up to them and we know that they are not going to be swayed this way or that way simply because certain barons of the press have taken a particular stand. But this is not to decry the gentlemen of the press. Whether they are the small fries or the leading lights of our journalism, where national issues are involved particularly in our relations with Pakistan or in our relations with China, I must say that we are beholden to them and we must have to take this opportunity to express our deepest and most sincere gratitude to them for the wonderful way in which they have vindicated our national honour. They have been given not only a free hand but a blank cheque by the hon. Prime Minister.

The other day, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I was glancing through as many as 280 editorials of the world press to find out how our moral stand with regard to China has been vindicated, and I was happy and pleasantly surprised to find even in some of the leading newspapers of Rio de Janeiro that there was a tremendous volume of opinion in favour of our stand with regard to the relations between India and China. Mr. Vice-Chairman, when I look at the world press and when I see the high standards of efficiency maintained by some of these newspapers in our country that belong to the vested interests, when I as a citizen of India keep my head erect and feel proud of it, I must say that we must give every encouragement to see that they keep up their standard. Indeed because of this efficiency that has come about by virtue of the mass circulation they have been able from the business point of view to stream-



line the press and to appoint special correspondents. (*Interruption*). Some of them have been appointed as correspondents in such nerve centres of world politics today as Washington, London, Paris, Cairo, Peking and Moscow. As some of these correspondents report the trends of public opinion, the currents, under-currents, and cross-currents of world opinion, I sometimes feel that they are able to discharge the responsibilities imposed upon them much better than some of our Ambassadors have done. Why should we not be proud of them, of the leading lights of the press, who have such correspondents accredited to the different capitals of the world? Let us say now "hurrah" to the press.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am very happy now to say that there are other matters where I agree with some of the Members who expressed their views. We have got to see that a Wage Board is appointed for improving the conditions of the working journalists. We have also got to see that these leading lights do not abuse the newsprint that is being allotted to them by virtue of their position. There are other ways and means by which the Government can use the rod of authority to curb the abuses that flow from monopoly, but not in the dissemination of news, not in the circulation of newspapers. When we are proud of numbers in other walks of life, why should we not be proud in the field of journalism? They have stood by the good causes of the country and naturally we must be grateful to them. But I must say now that I can imagine a tirade against the yellow press. There are certain newspapers which try to endanger the vitals of our society, which try to strike at the root of our democracy.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: What about the green press of the Muslim League?

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: I think my good friend, Mr. Tariq, probably does not appreciate what I mean by the yellow press. I think there are cer-

tain newspapers which try to describe more the bickerings of factions and which try also to describe more the under world. I can understand if we can take a moral stand and record the verdict of public opinion against such newspapers but not against the 'Statesman', not against the 'Hindustan Times', not against the 'Times of India', not against the 'Hindu', not against the 'Amrita Bazar Patrika', not even against the "Thinathanthi" which has got the largest circulation in the country and which happily belongs to my part of the country, Tamilnad. Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, let us not call these newspaper barons as tycoons. Compared to the standards of the world, with due deference to the view that was expressed by my good friend, they are pygmies. We have yet to get a large newspapers group in our country.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have yet another point to make, and that is there must be fairplay for the smaller fries. I know that under the dispensation of our Ministry here, there is a hue and cry amongst the editors and amongst the journalists of the smaller fries that they are not getting their due share. I would be one with the entire House in pleading that they must be given not only their right share but also a right to flourish in this world of unfettered competition. The finest proof of our democracy that we have got is the co-existence of ever so many giants with hundreds of smaller fries. We want them to exist and exist with honour. Believe me, Mr. Vice-Chairman, the greatest deterrent that has come to the growth of these big barons, is their fair competition. Just as between the two nuclear giants they have got the biggest deterrent to war, so also between the biggest barons of the press we have got the greatest deterrent to monopoly in the shape of unfettered competition as an insurance against corruption, regimentation and prostitution of public opinion. Our people in the North Bombay election have

[Shri N. M. Anwar.]

demonstrated beyond any shadow of doubt that in spite of all the barons of the press combining and conspiring together they can take the right stand, which they have taken.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: The press barons will be surprised to know that they have such a stout defender in the person of Mr. Anwar Ali Khan.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR: I am very proud to express my opinion even if I should be in a minority of one.

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, there have been expressions of some doubts regarding the very concept of monopoly by some of the hon. Members. Some have said that there is only a trend towards a monopoly and not the actual existence of a monopoly. And in support of this argument, they have said that there are more than two or three houses or groups owning newspapers in a chain and therefore it is a negation of monopoly, and not monopoly itself. I am afraid that this sort of theorising in relation to the concept of monopoly is entirely wrong for monopoly has taken the forms of oligopoly and duopoly in the context of modern economics. All these forms, in other words, are the various modifications of monopoly and they form part and parcel of the very concept of monopoly itself. When we read the economic history of India and compare it with the history of development of the newspaper industry, we see an organic connection between the newspaper industry and the economic development of this country; it is in relation to industrial development and monopoly. And monopoly in a newspaper industry is the projection of financial capital into the newspaper industry. That is the state of affairs which we have seen now. The Annual Report of the Registrar of Newspapers has given ample statistics. Statistics have been quoted by various friends here in order to prove statistically the growth of monopoly in the newspaper industry. I

need not traverse over that subject. It is also seen from this Report that there are various chains of newspapers, both in relation to the publication of newspapers, as well as the news agencies which are controlled by the various business houses, the names of which have already been mentioned, notable among them being the Birlas, the Goenkas, the Dalmias and the Jains. If we take a peep into the economic history of India again, we will see the growth of monopoly, how interlocked directorships are controlled by these business houses in the various aspects of the economic life of this country. Unless we are prepared to appreciate how this economic domination is being held in the hands of a very few business people, we will not be able to understand the full meaning of the monopoly in the newspaper industry. One is organically connected with the other. And Dr. Mehta in his "Structure of Indian Industries" has clearly pointed this out. And I may say in this context that Dr. Mehta is not any Socialist or Communist, but is the Economic Adviser to the Madhya Pradesh Government and is the Director of Statistics in the Economic Bureau. He has given figures and statistics to show how various interlocked directorships are controlled by these people. It is stated—

"The Representatives of Birlas are on the Board of Directors of:—

Banks:

1. United Commercial Bank Ltd.
2. Bank of Baroda, Ltd.

Insurance Companies:

1. New Asiatic Insurance Co., Ltd.
2. Ruby General Insurance Co., Ltd.

\* \* \* \* \*

Representatives of Goenkas are on the Board of Directors of:—

**Banks:**

1. State Bank of India, Ltd.
2. Bank of Baroda.
3. Bank of India.

**Investment Trusts:**

1. New India Investment Corporation, Ltd.
2. Jaipur Investment Co., Ltd.
3. Calcutta Investment Co., Ltd.

**Insurance Companies:**

1. Standard Insurance Co., Ltd.
2. Triton Insurance Co.
3. Hercules Insurance Co."

I have quoted these companies more as illustrations rather than as elucidation of the entire theory or entire facts of the case. And from this point of view if we once look not only at the concept of monopoly but also the entire magnitude of monopoly in relation to industry and financial capital, the projection of finance into the newspaper industry will become clear. Otherwise, we will be carried away more by phrases, more by slogans, than by the actual understanding of the subject.

Now, Sir, the Press Commission had made certain recommendations. The Press Commission had dealt with the subject elaborately. And regarding the aspect of monopoly, I cannot do better than quote one of the statements issued by Shri M. Chalapathi Rau, one of the greatest editors of this country. I am quoting his comments, *vide* 'The Press Commission's Report (Comments and Reactions)', page 42. He says:

"The picture of the Indian Press, as it emerges from the report which is as judicially worded a judgment should cause great concern ... The fact that the shrinkage in the number of newspaper owners is not the product of evil design but is largely attributable to economic and technological influences, does not lessen the

implications of the trend according to the Commission. I may point out what the Commission has not cared to point out as perhaps, being too obvious, that the five of the 15 owners control not only a high percentage of the circulation but the management and operation of almost every sector of the industry. They are in a monopolistic position in regard to newsprint, advertisements, financial resources, banking facilities, and relations with the Government in their representative capacity."

It has been said by certain hon. Members that the members of the Government themselves say that the Press Commission has not made any specific recommendation which can be implemented by the Government itself. I am afraid that this is a very unfair criticism about the efforts of the Press Commission and the recommendations that they have made. There is one specific recommendation out of the many which have been made. It is highly notable recommendation which they have made. They have said that the Government should bring forward legislation to define 'restrictive and unfair practices in the press'. In other words, it would be the duty of the Government and Parliament to define what is meant by 'restrictive and unfair practices' and also find out ways and means by way of legislation to prevent this type of thing happening. This is a specific recommendation made by the Press Commission. Unfortunately, this has not been looked into nor given serious thought by the Government so far. Legislation can be brought forward as in the case of the Prevention of Corruption Act, there can be legislation named Prevention of Restrictive and Unfair Practices Bill. Legislation on that model can be brought forward, and it would be the duty of the Government to bring forward such type of legislation as early as possible.

Sir, regarding the power of the press and the utilisation of the power of the press by the monopolistic interests,

[Shri Raghunatha Reddy.]

views have been clearly expressed by many hon. friends. One of the notable, rather classic, examples of how the press can be used for the purpose of distortion and for forming opinions by making use of the tremendous, cumulative processes of suggestion is of very recent times, and it is in regard to the North Bombay election. And many hon. friends have spoken about it. I need not refer to it further. But the said fact remains how the press magnates tried to manipulate the electorate by trying to form opinions, by trying to distort things, by processes of cumulative suggestions and by creating a pathological atmosphere in which a particular candidate would win and the other would lose. So, the power of the press is as it was at the time of Goebbels, as it has been well depicted in a book named "The Rape of the Masses". The power of the press can be used to a tremendous extent for the formation of opinions which the people may not like but which they may be forced to accept by the constant publication of news in some form or other. Thus, the monopoly exists either in the economic field or in the field of the press or in some other form. The very act of monopoly is very bad and it is a negation of the socialistic attitude and the socialistic way of life, which are planned to be created and generated in this country. In this context I may quote Mr. Krishna Menon, what he has expressed in one of his recent articles published in the 'Link' in its Independence Day issue on August, 15, Dealing with the subject under the caption 'Why socialism?', he has said:

"In our situation, all forms of economic and social privilege, of sectional interest of monopoly, and other concentrations of economic power and any substitution of influence for equality and placement for expertise are fraught with danger."

There cannot be a better warning that can be given in relation to the development of monopoly in this coun-

try than the warning given by Mr. Krishna Menon. In addition to the solution which the Press Commission had suggested, of bringing forward legislation for the purpose of defining restrictive and unfair practices and preventing them I might suggest, if it does not sound highly revolutionary, that all the existing newspapers may be handed over to the working journalists who in their turn, may form co-operative societies, and if that is not possible, if the provisions of the Constitution are likely to come in the way, the owners of the Press can be paid for their properties, for what they are worth, under a hundred-year hire purchase agreement, in instalments, and this way the working journalists can run their own press and newspapers. The history of Indian journalists has proved so far that they have lived up to their mark; the working journalists have never disappointed us and so, Sir, it is high time that we took this line. It is a pity that we are still thinking in terms of another Press Commission without even implementing the recommendations of the Press Commission which had already met and made their recommendations. It had been said by Karl Marx once, during the time of the British Government in India, that whenever there was trouble in India the British Government used to appoint a Royal Commission, and the appointment of Royal Commissions used to go on *ad nauseum*, and though one Commission after another used to be appointed, the recommendations of the previous Commissions never used to be implemented. Unfortunately, in 1962, the Government of India is likely to follow the same course as the British Government had followed in relation to their Royal Commissions. It is a bad augury, and it is high time that the Government of India realized the danger of monopoly not only in industrial and economic life but also in the press, which is organically connected with the economic life of the country.

Thank you.

شری اے - ایم - طارق : مسٹر

وائس چیئرمین - جہانگیر اس ریپوزیشن کا تعلق ہے سوائے اسکے کہ میں اسکی حمایت کروں اور کچھ نہیں کر سکتا ہوں - لیکن ان بڑے بڑے لوگوں کو جنہوں نے ہمارے ملک میں اخبار نویسی کی - یہاں تک اخبار نویسی کے لفظ کا تعلق ہے میں اس میں ایڈیٹروں اور کورسپانڈنٹوں کو شامل نہیں کرتا بلکہ جن لوگوں کی اجارہ داری ہے جن لوگوں کی ملکیت اخباروں پر ہو گئی ہے - ان کو شکست دینے کا انکے ہاتھ سے مونوپولی کو چھیننے کا ایک ہی راستہ ہے کہ ہماری حکومت ہماری سرکار چھوٹے چھوٹے اخباروں کو اس قابل بنائے انہیں یہ طاقت پیدا کرے کہ وہ بڑے اخباروں کا مقابلہ کریں ورنہ خالی یہ کہنے سے کہ ہم پندرہ ممبران کی کمیٹی بنائیں اس سے کام نہیں چلے گا۔ دیکھا بہت سے ممبران اس شدت سے ان کے حق میں بول رہے تھے کہ یہ تعجب ہوتا تھا کہ وہ اس مسئلہ کو سمجھ ہی نہیں - یعنی اس میں بڑے بڑے لوگوں کا تعلق ہے جن کے ہاتھ میں اس ملک کے اخبار ہیں - ہم یہ جانتے ہیں کہ اگر خالی اخبار ہوتے تو شاید ہم اس قدر آویلا نہ کرتے - انہوں نے اس ملک کی اقتصادی حالت پر جس طرح سے قبضہ جمائے رکھا ہے اس قبضہ کو ہمیشہ قائم رکھنے کے لئے اخبار ان کے لئے ڈیفنس

ہیں - اخباروں کے سائے میں وہ اپنے بڑے بڑے کرپشن کو بڑی بڑی غلطیوں کو دبائے رکھتے ہیں - ٹائمس آف انڈیا پبلکیشنز کو لے لیجئے - ایک بہت بڑے سہتہ کا اخبار ہے جو نہ معلوم پانچ یا چھ دفعہ اسمگلنگ تک میں پکڑے گئے ہیں اتنے بڑے عظیم الشان آدمی ہیں - اسکے علاوہ انکا قبضہ صرف ہماری پریس انسٹوری پر ہی نہیں ہے بلکہ ہماری زندگی میں جو ایک بہت بڑا شعبہ ہے فلم انڈسٹری اس کے لئے علیحدہ علیحدہ اخبار ہیں - ہندی کا علیحدہ اخبار ہے - اب ذرا بمبئی میں انہوں نے دیکھا ہے کہ حالت ٹھیک ہے تو اب مراٹھی میں شاعت کر رہے ہیں - کل اردو میں کر رہے ہیں ؟ پڑھوں گے - راتنی میں کر رہے ہیں - ایسی حالت میں اس ریپوزیشن کا مطلب یہ ہے جس کی میں اہمیت سمجھتا ہوں کہ ہم تمام ملک کے دھنیے والوں کو ان چالوں سے ان سازشوں سے خبردار کریں جو یہ بڑے بڑے سرمایہ دار اخبار کے نام پر کرتے ہیں ورنہ کسی آزاد ملک کے لئے جو ترقی کی طرف جا رہا ہو اسکے لئے اخبار بے حد ضروری ہے - اس میں کوئی شک نہیں کہ جہاں تک آزادی کا تعلق ہے آزادی کی پیچھلی جنگ کا تعلق ہے - ان تمام لوگوں نے نہیں لیکن چند اخبار والوں نے کسی حد تک ہماری حمایت کی

[شری اے۔ ایم۔ طارق]

لیکن آزادی کے بعد جو خطرات ہمارے ملک میں ہیں جیسے ہندو مسلم فساد ہے، ہندی، اردو، انگریزی کا جھگڑا ہے۔ ہمارے ملک میں جو صوبوں کا جھگڑا ہے، گجراتی کا بسنٹی والے کے خلاف، آسام کا بلکال کے خلاف، ہم یہ جانتے ہیں کہ اس کے پیچھے ان بڑے اخبار والوں کا ہاتھ ہے۔

جذاب والا۔ میں نہایت ادب سے آپ کے سامنے ایک واقعہ رکھنا چاہتا ہوں۔ میں چاہتا ہوں اس ایوان کے معزز ممبران اس پر غور کریں۔ مدھیہ پردیش بہت بڑا صوبہ نہیں ہے۔ بڑا پیچھڑا ہوا صوبہ ہے۔

شری اکبر علی خان : بہت بڑا

صوبہ -

[شری اے۔ ایم۔ طارق : اس کے

ساتھ ہی جب وندھیہ پردیش تھا اس زمانہ میں بڑا براڈرس نے وہاں اس چیز کے لئے لائسنس لیا کہ وندھیہ پردیش میں وہ کافڈ کی ایک فیکٹری قائم کریں گے اور کافڈ کے لئے انہیں بانس کا ٹھیکہ چاہئے۔ جذاب وائس چھرمین صاحب - بانس کا ٹھیکہ ان کو ساڑھے سات روپہ فی ٹن کے حساب سے ملا ہے اور اسی بانس کو آج بڑا براڈرس اسی مدھیہ پردیش میں نوے روپے ٹن روز بیچتے ہیں۔ نو سال ہو چکے، نہ پریس بنا، نہ کافڈ بنانے کا پلانٹ بنا اور مسلسل پچھلے نو سال سے

ساڑھے سات روپہ ٹن بانس وہیں خرید کر اسی روپے میں بیچا جاتا ہے اور روز مرہ ایک ٹرک نہیں بیس، ٹرک آتے ہیں اور ہر ٹرک میں پچھیس تیس ٹن بانس لے جاتے ہیں اگر اس بڑے ملک میں جس کی آزادی پر اور خودداری پر - میں فخر کرتا ہوں، میں مسلمان ہوں، میں معافی چاہتا ہوں مجھے حساب نہیں آتا آپ ایک دن کی آمدنی کا حساب لیجئے اور دیکھئے کہ چودہ سال سے کتنا کھا، ہوا ہے۔

(Interruption) قہائی کروڑ سنا تو

ہے دیکھا نہیں - ایسی حالت میں یہ جو پریس کا معاملہ ہے اس کو وہ اپنا ہتھیار سمجھتے ہیں اور سوچتے ہیں کہ وہ ملک کی خدمات کر رہے ہیں - چھوٹے چھوٹے جرنلسٹ جگمگ

دماغ میں، جگمگ جسم پر، جگمگ قلم پر، ان کے اخباروں کی بنیادیں قائم ہیں ان کو دو روپہ تلخوڑا بڑھائے ہوئے جس قدر تکلف انہیں ہوتی ہے یہ ہم جانتے ہیں - لیکن ایک ایڈیٹر صاحب کو چلکو میں جانتا ہوں، مہوے درست ہیں، ایک زمانہ میں

بہت اچھے دوست تھے آج ان کی حالت یہ ہے کہ دو خط بھی لکھتے نہیں کرا سکتے ہیں لیکن چہ چہ ہزار، سات سات ہزار تلخوڑا لکھتے ہیں یہ سب چیزیں جو ہیں صرف اخبار ہی نہیں، اخبار نویسی کو لیں تو اس میں کافی غلط فہمی پیدا ہو جائے -

اس تحریک کی حمایت کرتے ہوئے  
میں وزیر صاحب سے یہ درخواست  
کروں گا کہ بنیادی بات جو ہے وہ یہ ہے  
کہ ہمارے ہندی اردو اور ریجنل لہنگویج  
کے جتنے چھوٹے چھوٹے اخبار ہیں ہم  
ان کو اس قابل بننا سکیں کہ وہ لوگوں  
کی دماغی کھیت کو تھک کر سکیں۔  
اس کے لئے یہ ضروری ہے کہ ہم یہ  
دیکھیں کہ ہمارے ملک میں جو  
چھوٹے چھوٹے لکھنے والے ہیں جن نے  
قلم سے یہ فائدہ اٹھاتے ہیں، ہم ان کے  
لئے کوئی ایسا کام کر سکیں کہ آزادانہ  
طور پر یہ کہی لوگوں کو اپنا قلم بھی  
تکثیف کر سکیں ورنہ حالت یہ ہے کہ  
یہ پانچ چھ اخبار نویس اجارہ دار  
ہیں - صاحب، یہ تو ہمارے بس  
کی بات نہیں ہے، ان سے بڑے بڑے  
وزیر کابینہ ہیں - قبطی سیکریٹری  
پریس رجسٹرار ان کے بس کا کام نہیں  
ہے - وہ یہ بھی جانتے ہیں کہ انکے  
ہاتھ میں کس قدر اختیار ہے کہ جو  
چاہے کہہ سکتے ہیں - میں کرشنامین  
کے بارے میں کچھ نہیں کہنا چاہتا  
ہوں لیکن پچھلے الیکشن میں جو ہوا  
ہے میں سمجھتا ہوں ہندوستان کے  
لوگوں کے لئے کافی ہے - ایک طرف اس  
ملک کا سب سے بڑا آدمی جسکو ہم  
کہتے ہیں جواہر لال نہرو اس کے ایک  
ایک لفظ سے تمام دنیا کے کان اور آنکھ  
اور دل کے دوڑے کھل جاتے ہیں -  
جب وہ تقریر کرتا ہے اسکی تقریر دو

انچ بھی نہیں چھپتی ہے لیکن جب  
رام کرشن بجاج بولتا ہے تو صفحے کے  
صفحے بھرے جاتے ہیں -

اس سلسلہ میں میں یہ کہنا  
چاہتا ہوں کہ دیانتداری کو سامنے رکھ  
کر ایک اور خطرناک بات دیکھئے ان  
اخباروں میں سے ایک نے جمعہ کی  
رات کو کہا شروع کر دیا جہکے ستون  
کو آپ کوئی کنٹریڈکشن نہیں کر  
سکتے - آپ کوئی تقریر نہیں کر سکتے -  
سندے سے ورثہ ہے - کہنے لگے کہ  
صاحب لداخ میں چھٹی آئے ہیں  
رشین ٹیلک پر - پی - ٹی - آئی نے  
اسکو روک دیا - گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا نے  
روک دیا - لیکن ایک اخبار نے یہ  
چیز چھاپ دی - ان لوگوں کے ہاتھ  
اس قدر مضبوط ہیں - یہ تو میں  
نہیں کہہ سکتا کہ اگر میرے بس  
میں ہو تو میں ان کو کٹ دوں -  
لیکن ضرورت اس بات کی ہے کہ ان  
کے ہاتھوں کو کمزور کرنے کے لئے ہم نمزور  
اخبار نویسوں کو چھوٹے چھوٹے اخباروں  
کو اس قدر مضبوط کریں کہ وہ ان کا  
مقابلہ کر سکیں - لیکن مجھے انتہا  
سے زیادہ افسوس ہے دو باتوں پر کہ  
میرے ایک دوست نے یہ کہا ہے ”ہورا  
تو جرنلسٹ“ ہم بھی دھوراء کہہ  
سکتے ہیں - میں نہ صرف ایک کے  
لئے دھوراء کہہ سکتا ہوں بلکہ سب  
خاندان کے لئے دھوراء کہہ سکتا ہوں -  
میں دھوراء اے - پی - جیون کے لئے

[شری اے۔ ایم۔ طارق]

بھی کہونگا - ددھورا، شانتی پرشاد  
چین کے لئے بھی کہوں گا - ددھورا،  
کوئٹہ کے لئے بھی کہوں گا - ”دھورا“  
جے - قی برلا کے لئے بھی کہوں گا اور  
”دھورا“ اے۔ قی منی کے لئے بھی کہوں  
گا - لیکن میں یہ دیکھتا ہوں کہ کس  
حد تک ان اخبار والوں نے پچھلے  
چرہ سالوں میں اس ملک کی  
اقتصادی پالیسی کے بارے میں اس  
ملک کی خارجہ پالیسی کے بارے  
میں اس ملک میں نیشنل  
انٹیگریشن لائے کے لئے، ایجیٹوٹ کیا  
ہے لیکن میرا دعویٰ ہے اور دیانتداری  
سے دعویٰ ہے کہ انہوں نے ہر موقع پر  
مجھے، میری اولاد کو، آئندہ آنے والی  
نسلیں کو، اس طریقہ پر غلط راستے پر  
دالا ہے کہ آج ہندوستان میں جو کچھ  
ہو رہا ہے وہ سب ان کی مہربانی سے  
ہو رہا ہے - میں اس ایموان کے ممبران  
سے یہ پوچھنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اگر چین  
سے جنگ کرنا ہی ضروری ہے تو میں  
شام کو کردوں گا - اس میں کیا بات  
ہے دو سخت لفظ کہہ دیجئے - جنگ  
چھوٹی چھوٹی باتوں سے ہو سکتی ہے -  
لیکن ان اخبار نویسوں سے بڑے بڑے  
اخبار نویسوں سے، میں یہ پوچھنا  
چاہتا ہوں کہ کیا چین ہی صرف اس  
ملک میں قابض ہوا ہے - صاحب  
ایک راستہ نکالا جانا ہے کہ چین سے  
جنگ کرو اور پاکستان سے دوستی کرو -  
اگر پاکستان ہماری کوئی بات کہتا ہے

تو یہ اخبار والے اس طریقہ سے اور ایک  
خاص پالیسی کے تحت بات کرتے  
ہیں کیونکہ انکا انٹرسٹ وہاں بھی ہے -  
پاکستان میں اچھے خاصے نیشنلسٹ  
مسلمانوں کو مار مار کر ان کا حلیہ درست  
کیا جاتا ہے - بادشاہ خان پچھلے دس  
بارہ سال سے جیل میں ہیں - لیکن  
رام کوشن بجاج وہاں اب بھی بزنس  
کرتے ہیں - ان لوگوں سے سوال یہ  
ہے کہ سرمایہ داری کی جو ذہنیت  
ہے اس کا ادھر اثر ہے نہ ادھر اثر  
ہے - ان کو مسلمان ہندو سکھایا  
جانا ہے لیکن آپس میں یہ سب  
دوست ہیں - جناح صاحب بھی  
اپنا مکان ڈالیمیا جی کو ہی بھیج  
گئے تھے یعنی ان میں ہندو مسلمان  
کا سوال نہیں ہے - میں یہ چاہتا  
ہوں اور میری وزیر صاحب سے یہ  
درخواست ہے کہ ملک کی موجودہ  
حالت کو مدنظر رکھتے ہوئے - اس  
میں کوئی شک نہیں کہ ہمارے  
ملک میں بہت بڑے لکھے لوگ  
نہیں ہیں لیکن چارہ چھ آٹھ دس  
سال سے لوگ علم کی طرف جا  
رہے ہیں - یونیورسٹی میں ہمارے  
اچھے اچھے لڑکے آ رہے ہیں - تعلیم  
بڑھ رہی ہے اور لوگوں کو اخبار  
پڑھنے کا شوق ہو رہا ہے - یہ ضروری  
ہے کہ ہم ایک ایسا پلان بنائیں جس  
کے تحت ہم یہ کوشش کریں کہ اگلے  
چار پانچ سالوں میں ہم اس ملک



میں اتنے اخبار پیدا کر سکیں، اتنے اچھے اخبار پیدا کر سکیں جو انکے مقابلہ میں لوگوں کو اس قابل بنادیں کہ وہ اخبار پڑھنا شروع کردیں۔ ان لوگوں کو گئی گھاتا نہیں کیونکہ دس بیس قسم کے کاروبار ہیں۔ یہاں گھاتا ہوا تو وہاں مذافع ڈالا۔ اگر فلم فیو فیل ہوتا ہے ٹائمس آف انڈیا سے اس کا گھاتا پورا ہوتا ہے۔ نہیں تو جواہر لال جی کے نام سے ایک کتاب چھاپ دی وہ جواہر لال نہرو بائی رفیق ذکر کیا وہ دفور وڈ بائی ایس۔ پی۔ جی۔ ۴۴ تو ایسی چھڑیں ان کے پاس ہیں۔ ان کے پاس بہت گور ہیں۔ یہ تو بالکل یلڈے ہیں۔ لہذا اس چیز کی بے حد ضرورت ہے کہ آپ مہربانی فرما کر اس چیز کو مد نظر رکھیں تاکہ اس ملک میں کافی اخبار پیدا ہو جائیں۔ چھوٹے چھوٹے اخباروں کو ایڈ دی جائے۔ اچھے اچھے جرنلسٹ آپ کے پاس ہیں اور اس سے ہی اس ملک کا بھلا ہو سکتا ہے۔ ورنہ اس طرح سے ہم کہیں کہ ان سے مونوپولی چھین لی جائے یہ نا ممکن بات ہے۔ ان کے ہاتھوں میں آخر ہماری بھی جان ہے یعنی ہمارے بارے میں بھی وہ جو چاہیں صبح سے شام تک کہیں۔ ان کی مرضی ہے لیکن میری درخواست ہے کہ آپ اس مسئلہ پر مہربانی فرما کر توجہ دیں۔

مجھے سوشلسٹ پارٹی کے ایک ممبر کو ایک ملٹ میں جواب دینا ہے میں ان سے یہ امید رکھتا تھا کہ

وہ بغیر کسی شرط کے اس ریژولیشن کی حمایت کریں گے کیونکہ سوشلزم میں اجارہ داری نہیں ہے لیکن انہوں نے اپنی تقریر اس طرح سے کی کہ کہیں کمیونسٹ پارٹی پر، کہیں کمیونزم پر، کہیں نیو ایج پر، کہیں بلٹز پر ایسے خیالات کا اظہار کیا کہ جس سے ہم کو غلط فہمی میں ڈال دیا ہے۔ کمیونسٹ پارٹی کیا ہے اس سے مجھے کوئی تعلق نہیں ہے لیکن جہانتک انہوں نے بلٹز کے بارے میں کہا ہے یہ کہنے کا مجھے حق ہے کہ بلٹز کے ایڈیٹر مسٹر کرنچیا میرے دوست ہیں، میں انکو جانتا ہوں اور میں اس ایوان میں یہ بیانیہ دھل کھنا چاہتا ہوں کہ میں ان لوگوں میں سے ہوں جو اسکی دیانتداری پر فخر کرتے ہیں، اسکی وطن پرستی پر فخر کرتے ہیں۔ میں جانتا ہوں کہ وہ ایک ایسا جرنلسٹ ہے جس کا اخبار چھپتے ہی بک جاتا ہے اور بڑی مشکل سے ملتا ہے۔ بڑے بڑے سرمایہ داروں کو بچانے کے لئے اگر چھوٹے آدمی پر حملہ ہوتا ہے تو اسکو روکا جانا چاہیئے۔ جیسے میں چھوٹا آدمی ہوں اور مجھ سے کوئی غلطی ہو جاتی ہے تو یہ کہاں تک ٹھیک ہے کہ میری غلطی کو اس طرح سے ایکسپوز کیا جائے کہ جیسے میں کوئی بہت بڑا آدمی ہوں جو اس ملک کے ٹکڑے ٹکڑے کرنا چاہتا ہے جو اس ملک کی اقتصادی

حالت پر اپنا فیضہ جمائے رکھنا چاہتا  
ہے اور آپ کے میرے خون سے اپنے جسم  
کی طاقت کو بڑھانا چاہتا ہے -

ان چند الفاظ کے سامنے س  
ریزولیشن کی پوری تائید کرنا ہوں اور  
حکومت سے توقع رکھتا ہوں کہ وہ اس  
ملک کے چھوٹے چھوٹے اخباروں کو زندہ  
رکھنے میں اور بڑے بڑے یلڈوں کو  
ختم کرنے میں مدد دے گی -

†[श्री ए० एम० तारिक (जम्मू और  
कश्मीर) : मि० वाइस-चेयरमैन, जहां तक  
इस रेजुलेशन का ताल्लुक है, सिवाय इसके  
कि मैं इसकी हिमायत करूँ और कुछ नहीं  
कर सकता हूँ लेकिन इन बड़े-बड़े लोगों  
को जिन्होंने हमारे मुल्क में अखबारनवीसी  
की—जहां तक अखबारनवीसी के लफ्ज  
का ताल्लुक है, मैं उसमें एडिटिंग और  
कारस्पोंडेन्टों को शामिल नहीं करता,  
बल्कि जिन लोगों की एजारादारी है, जिन  
लोगों की मिल्कियत अखबारों पर हो गई  
है—उन को शिकस्त देने का, उन के हाथ  
से मोनोपोली को छीनने का, एक ही रास्ता  
है कि हमारी हुकूमत, हमारी सरकार,  
छोटे छोटे अखबारों को इस काबिल बनाये,  
उनमें यह ताकत पैदा करे कि वो बड़े  
अखबारों का मुकाबला करें वरना खाली  
यह कहने से कि हम १५ मेम्बरान की कमेटी  
बनायें उससे काम नहीं चलेगा। आपने  
देखा कि बहुत से मेम्बरान इस शिद्दत से  
उनके हक में बोल रहे थे कि यह ताज्जुब  
होता था कि वो इसको समझे भी या नहीं।  
याने इसमें बड़े बड़े लोगों का ताल्लुक है।  
जिनके हाथ में इस मुल्क के अखबार हैं।  
हम यह जानते हैं कि अगर खाली अखबार  
होते तो शायद हम इस कदर बावेला न  
करते। उन्होंने इस मुल्क की इकतसादी  
हालत पर जिस तरह से कब्जा जमाये  
रखा है, उस कब्जे को हमेशा क्रायम रखने

के लिये अखबार उन के लिये डिफेंस हैं।  
अखबारों के साथे मैं वो अपने बड़े बड़े  
करप्शन को, बड़ी बड़ी शक्तियों को दबाये  
रखते हैं। टाइम्स आफ इंडिया पब्लिकेशन्स  
को ले लीजिये। एक बहुत बड़े सेठ का  
अखबार है जो न मालूम ५ या ६ दफा  
स्मगलिंग तक में पकड़े गये हैं। इतने बड़े  
अजीमुश्शान आदमी हैं। इसके अलावा  
उनका कब्जा हमारे प्रेस इंडस्ट्री पर ही  
नहीं है बल्कि हमारी ज़िन्दगी में जो एक  
बहुत बड़ा शुअबा है फिल्म इंडस्ट्री, उस  
के लिये अलहदा अखबार हैं। हिन्दी का  
अलहदा अखबार है। अब ज़रा बम्बई में  
उन्होंने देखा है कि हालत ठीक है तो अब  
मराठी में भी इशात कर रहे हैं। कल उर्दू  
में कर रहे हैं, परसों गुजराती में कर रहे  
हैं। ऐसी हालत में इस रेजुलेशन का मतलब  
यह है जिसकी मैं अहमियत समझता हूँ कि  
हम तमाम मुल्क क रहने वालों को इन  
चालों से, इन साजिशों से खबरदार करें  
जो ये बड़े बड़े सर्मायादार अखबारों के  
नाम पर करते हैं वरना किसी आजाद मुल्क  
के लिये जो तरक्की की तरफ जा रहा हो,  
उसके लिये अखबार बेहः जरूरी है।  
इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि जहां तक आजादी  
का ताल्लुक है आजादी की पिछली जंग  
का ताल्लुक है, इन तमाम लोगों ने नहीं,  
लेकिन चन्द अखबार वालों ने किसी हद  
तक हमारी हिमायत की। लेकिन आजादी  
के बाद जो खतरा हमारे मुल्क में हैं जैसे  
हिन्दू मुस्लिम फ़साद है, हिन्दी, उर्दू, अंग्रेज़ी  
का झगड़ा है, हमारे मुल्क में जो सूबों का  
झगड़ा है, गुजराती का बम्बई वाले के  
खिलाफ़, आसाम का बंगाल के खिलाफ़,  
हम यह जानते हैं कि इसके पीछे इन बड़े  
अखबार वालों का हाथ है।

जनावेवाला में निहायत अदब से  
आपके सामने एक वाकिफ़ा रखना चाहता हूँ।  
मैं चादता हूँ इस एजान के मोअज्ज मेम्बरान

इस पर गौर करे। मध्य प्रदेश बहुत बड़ा सूबा नहीं है बड़ा पिछड़ा हुआ सूबा है।

श्री अकबर अली खां : बहुत बड़ा सूबा है।

श्री ए० एम० तारिक : इसके साथ ही जब विन्ध्य प्रदेश था उस जमाने में बिडला बादर्स ने वहां इस चीज के लिये लाइसेंस लिया कि विन्ध्य प्रदेश में जो कागज की एक फैक्टरी कायम करेंगे और कागज के लिये उन्हें बांस का ठेका चाहिये। जनाब वाइस चेयरमैन साहब, बांस का ठेका उन को साठे सात रुपये फी टन के हिसाब से मिला है और इसी बांस को आज बिडला बादर्स इसी मध्य प्रदेश में नब्बे रुपये टन रोज़ बेचते हैं। नौ साल हो चुके, न प्रेस बना, न कागज बनाने का प्लांट बना और मुसलसल पिछले नौ साल से साठे सात रुपये टन बांस वही खरीद कर अस्सी रुपये में बेचा जाता है और रोज़ मर्रा एक ट्रक नहीं, बीस ट्रक आते हैं और हर ट्रक में २५-३० टन बांस ले जाते हैं। अगर इस बड़े मुल्क में जिसकी आजादी पर और खुदारी पर मैं फखर करता हूँ—मैं मुसलमान हूँ मुआफी चाहता हूँ मुझे हिसाब नहीं आता—आप एक दिन की आमदनी का हिसाब लीजिये और देखिये कि १४ साल से कितना, क्या हुआ है (Interruptions) ढाई करोड़ सुना तो है देखा नहीं। ऐसी हालत में यह जो प्रेस का मामला है उसको वो अपना हथियार समझते हैं और सोचते हैं कि वो मुल्क की खिदमात कर रहे हैं। छोटे छोटे जर्नलिस्ट जिनके दिमाग में, जिनके जिस्म पर, जिनके कलम पर उनके अखबारों की बुनियादे कायम हैं, उनकी दो रुपया तनख्वाह बढ़ाते हुए जिस कदर तकलीफ उन्हें होती है यह हम जानते हैं। लेकिन एक एडिटर साहब को जिनको मैं जानता हूँ, मेरे दोस्त है, एक जमाने में बहुत अच्छे दोस्त थे, आज उनकी हालत

यह है कि दो खत भी डिकटेड नहीं करा सकते हैं लेकिन छ-छ हजार, सात-सात हजार, तनख्वाह लेते हैं। ये सब चीजे जो हैं सिर्फ अखबार ही नहीं, अखबार नवीसी को ले, तो उसमें काफी गलतफहमी पैदा हो जाये। इस तहरीक की हिमायत करते हुए मैं वजीर साहब से यह दरखास्त करूंगा कि बुनियादी बात जो है वह यह है कि हमारे हिन्दी उर्दू और रिजनल लैंग्वेज के जितने छोटे छोटे अखबार हैं हम उनको इस काबिल बना सकें कि वो लोगो की दिमागी कैफियत को ठीक कर सकें। उसके लिये यह जरूरी है कि हम यह देखें कि हमारे मुल्क में जो छोटे छोटे लिखने वाले हैं, जिनके कलम से यह फायदा उठाते हैं, हम उनके लिये कोई ऐसा काम कर सकें कि आजादाना तौर पर यह कमी अपना टर्म भी डिकटेड कर सकें वरना हालत यह है कि ये पांच छः अखबार नवीस इजारादार हैं। साहब, वह तो हमारे बस की बान नहीं है, उनसे बड़े बड़े वजीर काप उठते हैं। डिप्टी सेक्रेटरी, प्रेस रजिस्ट्रार, उनके बस का काम नहीं है। वो यह भी जानते हैं कि उनके हाथ में किस कदर हथियार है कि जो चाहे कह सकते हैं। मैं कृष्ण मेनन के बारे में कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ लेकिन पिछले इन्वेक्शन में जो कुछ हुआ है, मैं समझना हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान के लिये काफी है। एक तरफ हिन्दुस्तान का सब से बड़ा आदमी जिसको हम कहते हैं जवाहरलाल नेहरू, उसके एक एक लपफ से तमाम दुनिया के कान और आख और दिल के दरवाजे खुल जाते हैं, जब वो तकरीर करता है उसकी तकरीर दो इंच भी नहीं छपती है, लेकिन जब राम-कृष्ण बजाज बोलता है तो सफे के सफे भरे जाते हैं।

इस सिलसिले में, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि दयानतदारी को सामने रख कर एक और खतरनाक बात देखिये। इन अखबारों में से एक ने जुम्मे की रात को क्या शुरू

[श्री ए० एम० तारिक]

कर दिया। जब कि सेटर-डे को आप कोई कन्ट्राडिक्शन नहीं कर सकते, आप कोई तकरीर नहीं कर सकते, सण्डे से वोटिंग है। कहने लगे कि साहब, लद्दाख में चीनी आये हैं रशियन टैंक पर। पी० टी० आई० ने इसको रोक दिया, गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया ने इसको रोक दिया, लेकिन एक अखबार ने यह खबर छाप दी। उन लोगों के हाथ इस क़दर मजबूत है। यह तो मैं नहीं कह सकता कि अगर मेरे बस में हो तो उनको काट दूँ। लेकिन जरूरत इस बात की है कि उनके हाथों को कमजोर करने के लिये हम कमजोर अखबार नवीसों को, छोटे छोटे अखबारों को इस क़दर मजबूत करें कि वो उनका मुकाबला कर सकें। लेकिन मुझे इन्तहा से ज्यादा अफसोस है दो बातों पर कि मेरे एक दोस्त ने यह कहा है “हुरी टू जर्नेलिस्ट”। हम भी “हुरी” कह सकते हैं मैं न सिर्फ़ एक के लिये “हुरी” कह सकता हूँ बल्कि सब खानदान के लिये “हुरी” कह सकता हूँ। मैं ए० पी० जैन के लिये भी कहूँगा “हुरी”, शान्ति प्रसाद जैन के लिये भी कहूँगा। “हुरी” गोयनका के लिये भी कहूँगा। “हुरी” जी० डी० बिड़ला के लिये भी कहूँगा और “हुरी” ए० डी० मणि के लिये भी कहूँगा। लेकिन मैं यह देखता हूँ कि किस हद तक पिछले १४ सालों में इस मुल्क की इक्विसादी पोलिसी के बारे में, इस मुल्क की खारजा पालिसी के बारे में, इस मुल्क में नेशनल इंटेग्रेशन लाने के लिये, एजिटेट किया है लेकिन मेरा दावा है, दयानतदारी से दावा है, कि उन्होंने हर मौके पर मुझे, मेरी औलाद को, आइन्दा आने वाली नस्लों को इस तरीके पर ग़लत रास्ते पर डाला है कि आज हिन्दुस्तान में जो कुछ हो रहा है उनकी मेहरबानी से हो रहा है। मैं इस ऐवान के मेम्बरान से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि अगर चीन से जंग करना ही जरूरी है तो मैं शाम को कर दूँगा। इसमें क्या बात है दो सप्ताह लफ्ज कह दिये। जंग

छोटी छोटी बातों से हो सकती है लेकिन इन अखबार नवीसों से बड़े बड़े अखबार नवीसों से मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या चीन ही इस मुल्क में काबिज हुआ है। साहब, एक रास्ता निकाला जाता है कि चीन से जंग करो और पाकिस्तान से दोस्ती करो। अगर पाकिस्तान हमारी कोई बात कहता है तो ये अखबार वाले इस तरीके से और एक खास पोलिसी के तहत बात करते हैं क्योंकि उनका इंटरैस्ट वहां भी है। पाकिस्तान में अच्छे खासे नेशनलिस्ट मुसलमानों को मार मार कर उनका हुलिया दुरुस्त किया जाता है। बादशाह खान पिछले १०-१२ साल से जेल में हैं लेकिन रामकृष्ण बजाज वहां अब भी बिजनेस करते हैं। उन लोगों से सवाल यह है कि सर्मायादारी की जो जहिनियत है उसका इधर असर है, न उधर असर है। उनको मुसलमान हिन्दु सिखाया जाता है, लेकिन आपस में ये सब दोस्त है। जिन्ना साहब भी अपना मकान डालमिया जी को ही बेच गये थे यानि उनमें हिन्दु मुसलमान का सवाल नहीं है। मैं यह चाहता हूँ और मेरी वज़ीर साहब से यह दरखास्त है कि मुल्क की मौजूदा हालत को मद्देनजर रखते हुए—इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि हमारे मुल्क में बहुत पढ़े लिखे लोग हैं लेकिन चार, छः, आठ, दस साल से लोग इल्म की तरफ़ जा रहे हैं, यूनिवर्सिटी में हमारे अच्छे अच्छे लड़के आ रहे हैं, तालीम बढ़ रही है और लोगों को अखबार पढ़ने का शौक हो रहा है—यह जरूरी है कि हम एक ऐसा प्लान बनाये जिसके तहत हम यह कोशिश करें कि अगले चार पांच सालों में इस मुल्क में इतने अखबार पैदा कर सकें, इतने अच्छे अखबार पैदा कर सकें जो उनके मुकाबले में लोगों को इस क़ाबिल बना दें कि वो अखबार पढ़ना शुरू कर दें। लेकिन इन लोगों को कोई घाटा नहीं क्योंकि दस बीस किस्म के कारोबार हैं। जहां घाटा हुआ तो वहां मुनाफ़ा डाला। अगर फ़िल्मफ़ेयर फ़ेल होता है, टाइम्स आ इंडिया से उसका घाटा पूरा होता है। नहीं तो जवाहरलालजी के नाम से एक किताब छाप

दी "जवाहरलाल नेहरू बाई रफीक जकरिया" "फोरवर्ड बाई एस० पी० जैन"। ऐसी चीजे उनके पास है, उनके पास बहुत गुर है। ये तो बिल्कुल पण्डे है, लिहाजा इस चीज की बेहद जरूरत है कि आप मेहरबानी फरमा कर इस चीज को मदेनजर रखे ताकि इस मुल्क में काफी अखबार पैदा हो जाये। छोटे छोटे अखबारों को एंड दी जाये, अच्छे अच्छे जर्नलिस्ट आपके पास है और इससे ही इस मुल्क का भला हो सकता है, वरना इस तरह से हम कहे कि उनसे मनोपोली छीम ली जाय यत तामुम्किन बात है। उनके हथों में आखिर हमारी भी जान है याने हमारे बारे में भी वो जो चाहे सुबह से शाम तक कह दे उनकी मर्जी है लेकिन मेरी दरखवास्त है कि आप इस मामले पर मेहरबानी फरमा कर तवज्जो दे।

मुझे सोशलिस्ट पार्टी के एक मेम्बर को एक मिनट में जवाब देना है। मैं उनसे यह उम्मीद रखता हूँ कि वो बगैर किसी शर्त के इस रेजुलेशन की हिमायत करेंगे क्योंकि सोशलिज्म में एजारादारी नहीं है लेकिन उन्होंने अपनी तकरीर इस तरह से की कि कहीं कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी पर, कहीं कम्युनिज्म पर, कहीं "न्यू-एज" पर, कहीं "ब्लिट्ज" पर ऐसे खयालात का इजहार किया कि जिससे हमको गलतफहमी में डाल दिया है। कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी क्या है, इससे मुझे कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है, लेकिन जहाँ तक उन्होंने "ब्लिट्ज" के बारे में कहा है यह कहने का मुझे हक है कि "ब्लिट्ज" के एडिटर मि० करजिया मेरे दोस्त हैं, मैं उनको जानता हूँ और मैं इस ऐबान में यह बबागे दुहल कहना चाहता हूँ कि मैं उन लोगों में से हूँ जो उसकी दयानंदारी पर फख्र करते हैं, उसकी बतन परस्ती पर फख्र करते हैं। मैं जानता हूँ कि वो एक ऐसा जर्नलिस्ट है जिसका अखबार छपते ही बिक जाता है और बड़ी मुश्किल में मिलता है। बड़े बड़े समयादारों को बचाने के लिये

अगर छोटे आदमी पर हमला होता है तो उसको रोका जाना चाहिये। जैसे मैं छोटा आदमी हूँ और मुझसे कोई गलती हो जाती है तो यह कहा तक ठीक है कि मेरी गलती को इस तरह से एक्सपोज किया जाये कि जैमे मैं कोई बहुत बड़ा आदमी हूँ जो इस मुल्क के टुकड़े टुकड़े करना चाहता है। जो इस मुल्क की इक्नसादी हालत पर कब्जा जमाये रखना चाहता है और आपके, मेरे खून से अपने जिस्म की ताकत को बढ़ाना चाहता है।

इन चन्द अलम्राज के साथ मैं इस रेजुलेशन की पूरी ताईद करता हूँ और हुक्मत से तबक्को रखता हूँ कि वो इस मुल्क के छोटे छोटे अखबारों को ज़िन्दा रखने में और बड़े बड़े पण्डों को खत्म करने में मदद देगी।]

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (DR. B. GOPALA REDDI) Mr Vice-Chairman, Sir, we have covered a very large ground on what looked like an innocuous Resolution.

Sir, we have pleaded for helping the small newspapers in our country, we have gone into the details of the dictatorship of some of these big press barons and our advertisement policy also came in for a good deal of discussion. So, I believe we have had a very wide range of discussion on this matter.

Sir, there would not have been any difficulty on my part to have accepted the Resolution if I felt convinced that there existed today in the country a sort of concentration of press power which is leading to regimentation of ideas. If the public were not able to get adequate choice of newspapers, certainly we could have straightway said there is monopoly.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is a choice between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party

DR. B. GOPALA REDDI: I am not yielding, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. I want to examine the position whether there is an adequate choice of newspapers for the public. If they want to go in for any type of newspaper, certainly they can. Whether it is Communist, whether it is D.M.K., whether it is P.S.P., whether it is Congress, whether it is Hindu Mahasabha, all types of papers are now available in our country. Therefore, I do not think, Sir, that we have reached a stage when we have developed a sort of regimentation of ideas and it may be said to the credit of our press here and to the credit of the Government also that the newspapers are free to express their opinion. Whether they are of the Communist leanings, or the D.M.K. leanings or any type of leanings, they are free to express their views. They are expressing freely and they are, of course, campaigning and doing propaganda in their own line. Looking at it from that angle, the democracy in our country is quite safe because there is variety of opinion in our country as expressed by the newspapers.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But the Press Commission did not say that.

DR. B. GOPALA REDDI: I am coming to the Press Commission. Do not be in a hurry.

Therefore, Sir, there is adequate choice of newspapers. Take any State. There are certain papers in certain States where they have a large circulation, say, even in West Bengal. If a man wants any other type of newspaper or he wants to see the other side of the picture, he is certainly free to buy any newspaper which is available in the country. After all, he can get one side of the picture from one paper and another side from another paper and he can form his own opinion. Therefore, there is no question of regimentation of ideas.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is the latest philosophy of the Minister.

DR. B. GOPALA REDDI: After all, I am dealing with a very difficult question in the matter because most of the hon. Members have expressed their opinions and it is up to them also to listen to what I want to say in this matter before I can say whether I am accepting or rejecting the Resolution or whether I am requesting the hon. Member to withdraw the Resolution or whatever . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But you have already said that you would not like to accept it.

DR. B. GOPALA REDDI: Again, when we say "monopoly", is there any one firm or one house or one baron who is controlling all the newspapers or most of the newspapers in our country? As he himself said, there are three houses which are competing with each other. And that is good in a way. If it is only one Shanti Prasad Jain, or one Birla or one Goenka, there would have been a greater danger. Now that there are three people, their own self-interest compels them to compete with each other and different opinions might be given out from their own standpoint. So even from that strictly legalistic point of view, there is no monopoly. There is no one man trying to control the entire press or trying to give his own views to the entire country. There are three people. Even about these three people, I would like to examine the figures. When you say chains, groups and multiple units and all that, even newspapers like the 'Hindu' is included in this. I am really sorry that when we examine these figures, we say that the 'Hindu' also is one of the group papers because they have a 'Sports Weekly'. Because they have the 'Sports Weekly', the 'Hindu' also is called a group paper. Our definition of these chains, groups and multiple units have to be re-examined. The 'Hindu' is only one paper coming from Madras. It has been there for a very long time. It is not by any means a sort of a group paper but because it has a weekly paper called 'The Sportsman' or 'The

Sport', it is called a group paper. Likewise other papers are called—the 'Malayala Manorama' for example—because they have a weekly. They have one daily and perhaps one weekly. Therefore they are called group papers. The 'Hindustan Standard' will have one Bengali paper and one English paper and therefore it is a sort of chain paper. Suppose the 'Hindustan Times' has got a chess paper, suppose tomorrow it starts a chess paper, it is also called a group paper. After all in the different fields if they are trying to reach different people and try to give expression to different subjects—it may be economics, it may be sports, it may be literature, it may be culture, it may be dramatics or anything—they will be called immediately a group paper or multiple unit paper and all that. You have to take only the dailies. If they have a weekly paper for films and things like that, it does not matter. If they have a Femina, it does not matter. It will cater for a different reading public altogether but as far as daily papers are concerned, we will have to confine ourselves to examining how they stand vis-a-vis the daily newspaper reading public, as far as the English or language papers are concerned. Even if we take the Express Newspapers, after all taking their entire papers—the Telugu, Tamil, English etc., all the five papers—all that comes to 10·5 per cent. of the circulation of the daily newspapers in India. 10·5 per cent. is the highest. The 'Times of India' is 6·5 per cent. The 'Hindustan Times' is . . .

**SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE:** They are press Maliks, the 'Hindustan Times', the 'Searchlight', the 'Leader', and their allied Hindi newspapers are owned by Birla.

**DR. B. GOPALA REDDI:** It is only 10 per cent. The balance of 90 per cent. is available for the non-Express people.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** One group.

**DR. B. GOPALA REDDI:** One group has got only 10 per cent. while 90 per cent. of the reading public is available for the other papers. Even the so-called 'monopoly units and things like that—The 'Times of India' with all its dailies and weeklies—have only 6·5 per cent. (Interruptions.) Therefore, I say that after all we have not reached a stage like Roy Thompson and others. He controls about 195 papers in England and other places . . . (Interruptions.) I am dealing with a very difficult subject. You can ask questions towards the end of the speech.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Give the circulation of the English papers.

**DR. B. GOPALA REDDI:** Even if we take the circulation of the English papers, after all in our country we do not have even one daily newspaper for every 100 people. The entire circulation of the daily press—English, language papers and all that—is 46 lakhs of papers or so. We do not have a paper per 100 persons, whether it is Hindi, Bengali, Gujarati or English or whatever it is. We are in that infant stage, we are yet to reach the masses of our people through this effective medium and just to say that because somebody has got 10 per cent. of the daily newspaper public with him, that it is a monopoly and then try to control it by a committee of both the Houses and all that perhaps is a little premature and we are constantly on the watch. I am not an apologist for any big jute paper or any other paper. I am not anxious that they should be controlling public opinion by any means but all the same, I say that the time has not yet come. We have to encourage the newspapers whether they are big, small or mofussil papers, metropolitan papers, language papers, district papers, taluk papers or any other papers. All types of newspapers must be encouraged and I do want that the small papers must have a fair deal in this matter. The time has not yet come when the so-called big papers—after all their circulation may be hardly 2 lakhs or even less

[Dr. B. Gopala Reddi.]

than 2 lakhs and it is only the Indian Express which is a five-centre newspaper that has crossed the limit of two lakhs, otherwise all of them are well below the 2 lakh circulation . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are entitled to ask this, since the Government is intervening in the debate. The Press Commission took certain facts and pointed out a concentration. According to the report of the Registrar, that has increased. The Press Commission recommended that this concentration should be broken. The Government was more or less committed to it in a way—more or less I say. Now I would like to know why the Government is not carrying out its commitment.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: These questions may be put at the end of the Minister's reply because we are anxious to listen to the Minister. There has been a very lively debate and we are anxious to listen to him rather than the interruptions. We have heard Mr. Gupta before.

DR. B. GOPALA REDDI: The Press Commission suggested a potential tendency for concentration and from 1954 to 1962 nothing very big has happened. We have examined the figure from year to year. The Registrar himself has said:

"There has been no buying up of small papers by large combines nor has there been any amalgamation of combines as a result of buying of one by the other. The monopoly of readership and concentration of ownership in a few combines however exist."

There is a slight change. The number of newspapers remains more or less the same. The percentages have varied, sometimes they have gone down and sometimes they have gone up. Nothing has happened since 1954 when the report of the Press Commission came out to the public. The Press Commission, again as Mr. Mani has

said, have examined it in great length. They sat for 5 days on this very matter of how to control these monopolies. What did they do ultimately? What is the constructive suggestion that they have given? They said: 'You appoint a Press Council and if the Registrar feels that there is a tendency for the growing up of monopolies or concentration of newspaper power, then you bring it to the notice of the Press Council. Then they will start investigating into the matter.' That is what they said. They could not give anything more than that. Had they said something more constructive, certainly we would have jumped at it and implemented those ideas. The Press Commission, having gone into the whole question so thoroughly, having examined so many people, ultimately suggested: "You bring it to the notice of the Press Council". What the Press Council is going to do, they have not defined. Even on a small little matter like the price-page schedule, to what trials it led? It was upset by the Supreme Court. Even on a small matter like that they said: "You have not got the power to curtail their freedom, their profession or the price or whatever it is." Likewise in a matter like this, immediately, any small paper or big paper, will go to the Supreme Court and challenge what we are trying to do or what we propose to do.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are here to amend the law.

DR. B. GOPALA REDDI: If you amend the Constitution, it is a different matter. As the law stands to-day, we do not have much power to curtail their expansion or whatever it is and we cannot even say: 'Do not start another newspaper', because that power, given to the Government again, is a very dangerous weapon in the hands of the Government. Nobody wants to trust the Government with giving that power. We will not have the power to say: 'Do not start a paper and because we have no newsprint we cannot say, "Do not start a weekly or daily."' After all if they want to criticise the Government by bringing out



their dailies or weeklies, it is open to them to do so. It is not for the Government to say, 'Do not start' and we do not want to be accused later that we have stopped a newspaper because it is likely to be anti-Government and things like that. We do not want that power either.

5 P.M.

Certainly I am one with Shri Arora when he says that they did not act properly in the North Bombay election. The Prime Minister's speech was blacked out. Every intelligent man, every reader in India, felt that what the press had done was a very wrong thing to do. They were condemned and they stand condemned for what they had done. But apart from that I do not think, Sir, that they deliberately suppress certain items of news and things like that. As my hon. friend Shri Anwar said, the presentation of news generally is good in our country and they give all varieties of opinions. I get Rajaji's speech in Chittoor, Sanjayaya's speech in Chittoor, all varieties of speeches are given in the Madras papers. In the papers concerned, in election campaigns even the opposite views are given. Even if it is a Congress paper, the opposition views are also given. That is done in most of the newspapers. Not so much in the Communist papers, because they give only one side of the picture, not what is said by the other side.

(Interruption by Shri Bhupesh Gupta)

They are entitled to do that. I mean I don't object to that. After all they are party papers and I feel they are entitled to do that. I cannot find fault with them and if they sponsor a Communist candidate, they can certainly campaign only for that candidate.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Dr. B. B. Reddi, do you know that your speeches were not reported?

DR. B. B. GOPALA REDDI: I don't want them to be reported.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not in the bourgeois press!

DR. B. B. GOPALA REDDI: Anyway, it does not matter.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Are you likely to take more time?

DR. B. B. GOPALA REDDI: Another ten minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Is the House agreeable to sit for ten more minutes?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: With this reservation.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Go ahead.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, with this reservation that he throws good light on the subject and gives us some assurance.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: And do not call us bourgeois.

DR. B. B. GOPALA REDDI: The press, Sir, on the whole, has done well and I want it to do even better, and I want it to reach as many people as possible in the coming years. I want the press to become a first-class press and I want the papers to increase their circulations and build up much larger circulations and things like that.

As far as mischief is concerned, whenever there is provincial trouble, some boundary question or language question, it is not the monopolist press alone which is to blame. Much more are the small district papers to blame. They are responsible. The taluka paper is responsible and the district paper is responsible and the provincial paper is responsible. Quite often the bigger papers act in a more restrained manner than the provincial, the district and taluka papers. Being very much more alive to the situation developing there in that area, they are more irresponsible and the monopoly

[Dr. B. Gopala Reddi.] papers or the daily papers or the metropolitan papers, are more restrained, and they do not indulge in excesses. Mr. Arora brought in this question of the monopolist press trying to foment trouble in communal matters, in questions of language and things like that, whether it be in Bengal or Assam or Maharashtra or Gujarat on a boundary question or a language question. But these papers as a whole, if they are responsible,—they are all responsible. I can tell you that—the bigger papers act in a more restrained manner than the smaller papers, the provincial and district papers. If monopoly is there, it is bad. Which paper is doing greater harm is a different question and it need not be linked up with this question. Anyway, without going further into this question, I may say that I am really not fully convinced that the reader has no choice of newspapers. Somebody said that in England also they went into this question as to what is a monopoly, what constitutes a monopoly. They generally said that if some factory manufactured, say, one-third or 33 1/3 per cent. of the articles consumed by the people, then that factory can be said to have got the monopoly of it. It need not be 50 per cent. Even 33 1/3 per cent of consumer goods consumed in the country, if that much is made by one factory or company, then that would be a monopoly.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What about economic power?

DR. B. GOPALA REDDI: Now as it is it has just touched about 10 per cent. It is not anywhere near that 33 1/3 per cent limit, or one-third of the entire newspaper circulation. Therefore, to say that there is monopoly, that they are trying to corrupt public opinion, that they are a danger to democracy and all that, is, I would say, to exaggerate it a little.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Ashoke Sen said it. Mr. Krishna Menon said it. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said it and the Press Commission said it.

DR. B. GOPALA REDDI: The Press Commission said it. And ultimately the Press Commission, what did they say?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Ashoke Sen said it.

DR. B. GOPALA REDDI: I also say it. (Interruptions.) And if there is monopoly, we will certainly deal with it. We are certainly trying to set up a Press Council.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: There was the question about economic concentration also regarding these papers.

DR. B. GOPALA REDDI: Economic concentration there is among other industries also. After all, this is a small industry, whereas you have the textile industry, the sugar, cement, iron and steel and other industries. Economic power is there in all these also.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Will the hon. Minister throw some light on the assistance which the Government proposes to give to the small and medium-size papers to face this competition which they have to, on account of the failure of the price-page schedule which could not stand the test of the Constitution? The price-page schedule was cut down and so the small papers are now facing the fierce competition of the monopoly papers. So what kind of an assistance the Government propose to give to these small and medium-size papers?

DR. B. GOPALA REDDI: This is a matter about which I would like to consult my hon. friend Mr. A. D. Mani himself and his colleagues in the press industry. After all, it is a very complicated question. It is easy to say: you better give them advertisement.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I inform Dr. Gopala Reddi that Dr. Keskar stated that of the Rs. 18 lakhs worth of advertisement given by the Central Government, excluding that of the Railways, only Rs. 4 lakhs went

to the language papers. That certainly is not in keeping with the letter or the spirit of the recommendation of the Press Commission.

DR. B. GOPALA REDDI: As soon as I came to the Ministry, I asked my officers to increase the advertisements given to the newspapers and within the next two or three years....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Three years?

DR. B. GOPALA REDDI: Yes, in two or three years they will reach parity with English papers.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Provided they are nationalistic and not communal.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, a paper edited by Shri Akbar Ali Khan.

DR. B. GOPALA REDDI: We are trying to do what we can do to help the language papers.

SHRI A. D. MANI: The small papers.

SHRI B. GOPALA REDDI: There again my difficulty comes. A small paper has not a large circulation. It is a district paper or a provincial paper. How can we give advertisement to it and how much? That is a matter which I will have to consider very deeply. I will consult Mr Mani and others and.....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why not consult me also?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Yes, Mr. Gupta also.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I was an editor of a daily paper. I was the editor of a weekly paper. Why not consult me also? What have I done? Is it political prejudice or what?

DR. B. GOPALA REDDI: Anyway, we are constantly looking into the figures and we are anxious to see that as many papers as possible come to

exist. The small papers also have got the right to exist. We will certainly see and when we are convinced, we will bring it to the notice of the Press Council. After all, the Press Commission said: "Bring it to the notice of the Press Council". I am prepared to do that. We are setting up the Press Council very soon and I hope there will be unanimity of opinion, though of course . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: How soon will this "very soon" be.

DR. B. GOPALA REDDI: Say, four to five months.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do I get the assurance, Sir, that the Opposition will be consulted?

DR. B. GOPALA REDDI: Yes, of course, when the Bill comes up . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no. Before the Bill comes up.

DR. B. GOPALA REDDI: I give no assurance on that matter. Let us see.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You said you are sympathetic to consultation.

DR. B. GOPALA REDDI: We will consult all possible interests in the matter.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You are a cultured man, Mr. Gopala Reddi. You were in Shantiniketan. Why not you consult us?

DR. B. GOPALA REDDI: We will set up the Press Council and when we are convinced of it, we will certainly bring it to the notice of the Press Council and it will go into this question. Therefore, just now I do not feel that there is room for accepting this Resolution and then have a sort of enquiry by fifteen Parliamentarians, fifteen Members of Parliament, into the question of monopolies in the press and so on. After all, we are also anxious to see that we keep under check these tendencies, this potential tendencies of

[Dr. B. Gopala Reddi.]

the concentration of power and things like that. Therefore, I would request Mr. Arora to withdraw his Resolution and trust us to act in the matter as best as we can. We shall see and we shall also from time to time, examine the figures. As I said at the beginning, nothing much has happened between 1954 and 1962. We shall set up the Press Council very soon and it will come into being and it will go into the matter. Thank you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would like to know from the hon. Minister if he is aware that some of these newspaper owners have their foreign offices in London and other places? For example, the 'Ananda Bazar Patrika' has its office in London and they have got foreign exchange and that money is spent there and wasted in some cases. And recently Mr. Ashoke Sirkar, the owner of this paper, was there and in a few weeks he spent £800 there. All these things are happening. Is the hon. Minister aware of all that?

DR. B. GOPALA REDDI: They have foreign correspondents, I know, I mean some of these leading newspapers.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Shri Ashoke Sirkar went to London. I had it from people who were in London, and when he was in London—he is the owner of the Ananda Bazar Patrika Limited and the Hindustan Standard papers . . .

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: This question hardly arises now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It does arise because the concentration is such that . . .

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Are we discussing West Bengal politics now? The controversy between Mr. Gupta and Mr. Ashoke Sirkar and their foreign exchange money need not be brought in here.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It does not suit you, it suits me.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you cannot refer to persons who are not here.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What are you saying, Sir? We can. If we can discuss Dalmia Jain, why not this? How could we discuss the L.I.C. question on Feroze Gandhi's motion? This is a new ruling you are giving. Anyway, the proprietor of the Ananda Bazar Patrika Limited was in London and he spent foreign exchange to the extent of £800 and money shifted there.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Monday, the 27th August

The House then adjourned at ten minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday the 27th August 1962