

13.40 hrs.

**STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE. DIS-
APPROVAL OF PRESS COUNCIL
(AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE
PRESS COUNCIL AND (AMEND-
MENT) BILL**

श्री मधु लिये (बांका) प्रेस काउंसिल के बारे में सूचना मन्त्रालय द्वारा जो अध्यादेश जारी किया गया है उसको मदन अस्वीकार करे यह मकल्प मंखना चाहता हूँ। मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ कि

"This House disapproves of the Press Council (Amendment) Ordinance, 1974 (Ordinance No 3 of 1974) promulgated by the President on the 28th June, 1974"

वास्तव में इस अध्यादेश का मकसद बहुत ही मामूली है। लेकिन चूंकि यह प्रेस काउंसिल का मसाला है इस वास्ते आप का अनुमति में उस के कार्यों के बारे में मैं कुछ निवेदन करूँगा। इस का इसलिए बनाया गया था कि प्रेस की स्वतन्त्रता को हम लोकतन्त्र की बुनियाद मानते हैं और इसलिए अगर प्रेस काउंसिल कारोबार ठीक नहीं चलेगा तो प्रेस की स्वतन्त्रता खतरों में पड़ सकती है। बिना कुछ महीनों में प्रेस की स्वतन्त्रता पर सरकार ने जो आक्रमण कर रही है। बिहार में सर्चलाइट और प्रदीप नाम के अखबार हैं चूंकि ये अखबार सरकार विरोधी समाचार छापते हैं, जिन आन्दोलन के बारे में सूचना केन्द्र छापते हैं इसलिए बिहार की सरकार ने इन को अपनी सूची से हटा लिया और इन को विज्ञापन देना भी बन्द कर दिया। अफसोस की बात है कि हमारे केन्द्रीय मंत्री ने जिन की सरकार का बहुत इस मद में भी है और बिहार में भी है इस सम्बन्ध में बिहार सरकार को कोई हिदायत नहीं दी कि आप यह बहुत गैर मुनासिब काम कर रहे हैं। और अखबारों के साथ आप को इस

प्रकार का विषम-व्यवहार नहीं करना चाहिये। अगर सरकार विरोधी अखबारों को इस तरह नग्न किया जाएगा, उनको विज्ञापन देने से सरकार इन्कार करेगी तो इस का मतलब होगा कि संविधान में जो समाप व्यवहार का और कानून के समाप संरक्षण का आप ने जो आश्वासन दिया है उस का भी उल्लंघन होगा और अन्ततोगत्वा सभी सम्पादक और प्राइडटर समझने लगेंगे कि डर गुजराल और अम्बुल गफूर की चाप पत्ती करो, तभी जा कर हमें विज्ञापन मिलेगा। यह बहुत अनुचित काम आप कर रहे हैं। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि इस का आप अपने उत्तर में कुछ खुलासा करें।

इसी तरह मंत्री महोदय जिस सूत्र में आते हैं उस सूत्र के एक सम्पादक और प्राइडटर ने मुझे यह पत्र भेजा है कि जिस में उन्होंने हिन्दू समाचार और पंजाब केमरी नाम के जादू निकालधर में निकलते हैं उन के साथ किस तरह का दुर्व्यवहार पंजाब की सरकार न किया है, उसका विवरण दिया है। मैं आप को इस में से थोड़ा सा पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने लिखा है .

"Hind Samachar was sanctioned an electric connection for 9.528 KW by the Punjab State Electricity Board since 1969.

On 7th April, 1971, a requisition for an increase of 26 920 KW load was made to the State Electricity Board for running a new Web Offset Rotary machine imported from U.S.A. A security of Rs. 640 as demanded by the Board in respect of the above requisition was deposited and an agreement duly executed in this behalf was also tendered. The above increase of load was sanctioned by the Chairman, Punjab State Electricity Board...."

उस के बाद वे कहते हैं :

"On 18th May, 1973, we applied for further extension of 25.420 KW electric load vide our requisition dated 18th May, 1973. A further sum of Rs. 520 was deposited as security and the agreement duly executed was tendered in this behalf...."

उसी तरह आगे वह कहते हैं :

"On 8th August, 1973, we received a letter from the S.D.O. Electricity, Civil Lines, Jullundur with reference to our above application that the load checked at site was 74.600 KW and directed us to apply for further extension to regularise the existing load of 74.600KW...."

आवश्यकतानुसार बिजली वे अधिक कंज्यूम करने लगे। इस के लिए जितने भी बिज्ज आते थे उन को बराबर वे चूकता करते रहे, किसी तरह के एरियर्स वगैरह नहीं थे। बाद में पंजाब की सरकार ने आक्षेप उठाया कि आप बहुत ज्यादा बिजली कंज्यूम कर रहे हैं। उस का नतीजा हुआ कि उन्होंने बिजली के कनेक्शन को तोड़ दिया। अभी अभी मेरे एक मित्र जालंधर हो कर आए हैं। उन्होंने मुझे यह सूचना दी है कि ट्रैक्टर की पावर का वहां इस्तेमाल किया जा रहा है मशीनें वगैरह चलाने के लिये। मेरा कहना यह है कि इस सरकार के पास कितने विवेकाधीन अधिकार डिसक्रीशनरी पावर्ज हो गए हैं कि अगर किसी अखबार को ये पसन्द नहीं करेंगे, अगर कोई अखबार इन के खिलाफ टोका टिप्पणी करेगा, आलोचना इन की करेगा तो या तो ये किसी की बिजली काट सकते हैं, किसी का परमिट छीन सकते हैं, किसी को विज्ञापन देना बन्द कर सकते हैं और पचासों प्रकार से इन लोगों को ये तंग कर सकते हैं। इसलिए रेलवे के इस्थिहारों के बारे में आप तफसील देने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं। विज्ञापन देना, बिजली देना क्या अखबारों को गुलाम बनाने

का आपने साधन बना लिया है मैं चाहता हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय पूरी शक्ति के साथ पंजाब सरकार, बिहार सरकार तथा अन्य सरकारों को यह हिदायत दें कि प्रेस के साथ इस तरह का दुर्व्यवहार वे न करें।

एक दूसरा भी मामला अभिव्यक्ति से सम्बन्धित है, उसकी स्वतन्त्रता के साथ सम्बन्धित है। प्रेस काउन्सिल में यह शायद नहीं आया। आजकल सांज एण्ड ड्रामा डिवीजन इनके तहत है। कई बार मैं अर्ज कर चुका हूँ कि यहां जो भी प्लेज आदि किए जाते हैं उन के ऊपर दिल्ली प्रशासन के द्वारा पचास तरह के बंधन लादे जाते हैं। सखा राम बाइंडर, घासी राम कोतवाल के लिए उन्होंने एंटरटेनमेंट टैक्स भी माफ नहीं किया। अब्दुल्ला दीवाना नाम का एक नाटक था उस के लिए भी फी माफ नहीं की क्योंकि अब्दुल्ला दीवाना में कमिटेड ज्यूडिशरी के बारे में उन्होंने कुछ आलोचना की थी। बकरी नाम का एक प्रयोग चला था कि गांधी जी की बकरी की आड़ में कसे इनको भ्रष्टाचार चलता है। इस का उस में विवरण था। उस के लिए भी इन्होंने एंटरटेनमेंट टैक्स माफ नहीं किया।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: All these come within the Press Council? Song and Drama Division also?

श्री मधु लिमये : अभिव्यक्ति की स्वतन्त्रता, फ्रीडम आफ एक्सप्रेसन। नाटक इस का बहुत जबर्दस्त हथियार है इस पर मैं अधिक समय नहीं लूंगा।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am not preventing him. Under the rules, you have your half an hour, the statutorily allotted half an hour. You can say anything you want.

श्री मधु लिमये : प्रेस काउंसिल क्यों है? फ्रीडम आफ एक्सप्रेसन, अभिव्यक्ति को

[श्री मधु लिमये]

स्वतन्त्रता की रक्षा करने के लिए। अभिव्यक्ति के कई साधन हैं। प्रेस एक उममे से जबर्दस्त साधन है। लेकिन नाटक भी एक बहुत बड़ा साधन है। इनका प्रकाशन ऐसा है कि एनीमी आफ दी पीपल नाम के नाटक का प्रयोग हो रहा था तो उसके ऊपर भी इन्होंने रोक लगाई और कहा कि आपने स्क्रिप्ट नहीं भेजा है। आप जानते हैं कि एन.म. आफ दी पीपल नाटक किम के द्वारा लिखा गया था? इकसम ने सो साल पहले किया था। इस का नाम इनके अफसरों ने सुना भी नहीं होगा। ऐसे नाटक पर भी पाबन्दी लगा दी और इंटेलिजेंट टैक्स माफ नहीं किया। एक नाटक है गालिव के उडेगे पुर्जो। उस में वतमान जो डाचा है, बहादुर शाह हुए हैं इन सब पर व्यंग्य बर्बर था। ये कितने सेंगेटिव बन गए हैं कि तत्काल इस के प्रशामका के द्वारा इस पर रोक लगा दी गई—और कहा गया कि आपको थेंटर नहीं मिलेगा, आपका एडरटेनमेंट टैक्स माफ नहीं किया जायगा। अभी अभी एक कलाकार मेरे पास आया था उसने कहा कि मंदर नाम का कार्य प्ले है। मेने ता यह पढ़ा नहीं है। अब हेमलेट है हेमलेट के बारे में भी 14 दिन के पहले आप ने स्क्रिप्ट नहीं दी। तो हेमलेट के लिए भी इजाजत चाहिए जो शेक्सपीयर ने चार सौ साल पहले लिखा होगा? एनीमी आफ दी पीपल के लिए भी चाहिए। तो यह एड्र कुमार गजगल बा मन्त्रालय अमरा में बटा हुआ है मिनिस्ट्री आफ कल्चरल अफेयर्स में, कुछ शिक्षा विभाग में आता है और कुछ इस के तहत आता है।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: If objection can be taken to Confucius of 3,000 years, why cannot objection be taken to Hamlet of 300 years?

श्री मधु लिमये ना दिल्ली में, इस राजधानी में, आज सस्कृति और सभ्यता की

हालत क्या हो गई है? क्या मनोदशा है इस सरकार की और इन के प्रशामकों की इस के ऊपर मैं रोशनी डाल रहा हूँ। इस के बारे में इमेडिएट परफॉर्मिसज के एक्ट में सशोधन के बारे में प्राइवेट मैम्बर्स विधेयक की भी एक सूचना मैं दे दूँ और आप के साथ बात भी की है। उसा बिन को देख लीजिएगा और सारे बालून को भी। मेरा समय आधा घटा ता है लेकिन मैं ज्यादा समय इस पर लेना नहीं चाहता हूँ। जो मद में उठा है उन सारे मटा पर मंत्री महोदय प्रमाण चलने की कृपा करेंगे।

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Resolution moved:

"This House disapproves of the Press Council (Amendment) Ordinance 1974 (Ordinance No. 3 of 1974) promulgated by the President on the 28th June, 1974".

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI DHARAM BIR SINHA). I move*:

"That the Bill further to amend the Press Council Act of 1965, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration"

As the hon. Member, Shri Madhu Limaye himself says, the Bill has a very limited object, that is, to extend the life of the Press Council till the 31st of December, 1974. The House is aware that a committee consisting of Members of Parliament is going through the consideration of at the moment, the nominating processes and the various aspects of the Press Council. At the moment I would like to confine my remarks only to this and later, when the time comes, I will respond to the various speeches to be made.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That the Bill further to amend the Press Council Act of 1965, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

SHRI SAROJ MUKHERJEE (Kolkata): There is nothing to object to in this Bill as such. It seeks to extend the tenure of the Chairman of the Council and the Members of the Council upto the last day of 1974 because the Parliamentary Committee set up to find out the ways and means for the selection of the Chairman of the Council and Members has not yet completed its deliberations and sent its recommendations....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It looks the Members of Parliament are very slow in their work.

SHRI SAROJ MUKHERJEE: However, the Press Council of India is responsible for the freedom of press in our country. Therefore, the Press Council of India and the concerned Ministry's performances have to be analysed here during discussion on this Bill.

To-day, in India we find freedom of the press being suppressed....

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Burdwan): Every minute,

SHRI SAROJ MUKHERJEE: though their leader. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said in 1950, "I would rather have a completely free press with the dangers of misuse than a suppressed and regulated press." Now, our government, followers of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, are flouting their leaders advice and they are not only suppressing the freedom of the press but the safety of the journalists is in danger to-day. Nowhere in the world and in no country in the world the lives of journalists are in danger as in India of to-day. Not only harassment and other things but the journalists are being killed by the

officials in league with the goondas. Besides the case of 'Searchlight' and 'Pradeep' in Bihar, all of us know the case of gruesome murder of the Jamshedpur journalist-editor who was killed early this month because he wanted to find out and disclose the links of the officials with the smugglers in the Jaduguda uranium smuggling case and he was brutally murdered and even the tongue of his wife was chopped off. Your heads should hang in shame.

Our Minister here and the Press Council of India cannot defend our journalists. Nowhere in the world journalists are tortured as in India. In the democratic countries of the world or in the socialist countries the press and the journalists are held in high esteem. They are respected by the parties by the society and by the Government. But here in this country they are being brutally tortured. Sometime ago the *Times of India* Correspondent, Mr. B. D. Gupta, was arrested and harassed like anything because he exposed link of the high officials with police atrocities against Harijans in U.P. In U.P. there are other cases as in Banda district where the editor and printer of a local fortnightly has been hounded out of Banda by the police because they printed two special issues criticising police atrocities in the district. This is the fate of our journalists in India. Can any Minister, can any leader of the ruling Party imagine how much freedom journalists of the U.S.A. are allowed to enjoy? Everybody knows what the freedom of the press and journalists means there. They exposed various misdeeds of the man in the highest position, Mr. Nixon, the President and they have got the freedom to expose the President of the USA who had to face impeachment charges and subsequently had to resign. Here what do our Congress leaders do? You still boast of India being the largest democracy. If you boast of it, can you take lessons from the USA and democratic functioning of their Press?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is a very significant statement.

SHRI SAROJ MUKHERJEE: They could take lessons in this case at least regarding freedom of the press. But they do not do it. They do not even believe in the bourgeoisie democratic rights and privileges of the journalists. They are killing parliamentary democracy. That is why we say that there are symptoms or elements of fascism not lurking but clearly discernible in the attitude of the Government and the Press Council of India, as regards their attitude to wards freedom of expression and all these things.

They have decided that the Press should not be free; they want that press and journalists should remain tied to the apron strings of the ruling party and monopoly interests. This is the policy which they follow. This is what they do by way of curtailing advertisements curtailing many other things, assistance, newsprint and by all these things they want to harass those who are critical of Government policies and performance.

There are two Ministers of the I&B Ministry. They go round the country and make speeches. Particularly the I&B Minister Mr Inder Gujral is adept at making nice speeches on varied subjects. He has some ideas and plans in his own ministry also but these are remaining on paper only, they are not implemented. Drifting goes on. Everything goes on drifting. Nothing is being implemented. He himself sometimes said, he is helpless, he has to depend upon other Ministries. In regard to newsprint supply, he said, yes, it is related to the Commerce Ministry. Regarding high price, he said yes, he has to depend upon other Ministries who sign contracts in foreign trade. In the case of import he said, he cannot do anything, he has to depend upon other ministries. In the case of in-

crease of production he said it depends upon Industrial Development Ministry, and so on.

14 hrs

Attacking on the journalists and press, representing them and all that depends upon the Home Ministry. You must assert yourself if you want to function or if your ministry wants to get certain things done, you should not shirk on the plea of helplessness.

We know that the journalists want to write objectively and to expose corruption. But, they are not in a position to do it as the situation stands to-day in India. I am in this profession for so long and many of the reporters of the newspapers and news agencies told me that they cannot do that and if they expose anyone of corruption or write out in the papers, their lives are in danger and they may really be killed. That is the situation to-day a horrifying situation. There is no freedom of the press, and journalists are being under the threat of dismissal or are being killed if they write anything. There are honest journalists who want to write but the monopoly owners and vested interests and also Government do not allow them to write under the threat of dismissal. That threat is there and also their being killed by the persons to-day a horrifying situation. There is no freedom of the press; and journalists lives are not at all safe in India. I want to make this point so that the Minister can reply as to how he is going to protect them. This is not the only method to control press in India. Even in Punjab for two daily newspapers in Hindi and Urdu supply of electricity has been stopped. In Bengal also in case of the Opposition papers and press, supply of electricity is being stopped in the name of load-shedding. Every now and then in the plea of load shedding electricity is being stopped. As they write against the Government, the State Electricity Board stops giving electri-

city to them. Take for example Punjab. There too the electricity was stopped because of government's intervention. That is because the journalists are critical about. State Governments. There are many instances like this. In Gujarat about 25 journalists were beaten up some time back. They gave a memorandum to the Prime Minister about their grievances. Nothing has been done either by the Home Ministry or by the Prime Minister Lok Satta and Jan Satta groups of dailies in Gujarat are selling and re-selling their assets. There is apprehension that they will lose their jobs. There are talks of reselling and selling of assets because the Minister had announced in Parliament that very soon he would be bringing forward the Diffusion of Monopoly Ownership Bill. He said that the Bill was being finalised. So, they are disposing of their assets in various dubious and illegal ways. That only means that the journalists will have to suffer for all that is done by the monopolists—vested interests. Sir, this is a dangerous game. The President of the Association of Press Photo Reporters was terrorised by the police in Ahmedabad. This happens in U.P., in Punjab everywhere. Their cases were also referred to the Press Council of India. It did not move at all. They did not care for the rights and privileges of the journalists; they did not care for the freedom of the press. The Press Council of India is to preserve the freedom of the press and to maintain the standard of the newspapers. That is not being done. They only help the vested interests—monopoly interests and not the journalists. These Press tycoons are controlling everything and direct as to what should be written in the newspapers. The Government is trying to control the entire press. Take for example the *Basumati*, a Calcutta daily. This has been taken over by State Government. There is also an editor there. Shri Vivekanand

Mukherjee is the editor. The Government has imposed another overall editor-in-charge. An ex-Chief Reporter of the *Statesman*, Shri Kedar-nath Ghosh has been imposed as an overall editor over the head of Shri Vivekanand Mukherjee. That means they do not believe in freedom of Press and want to control the Press entirely so that it may toe their line. With these words I suggest the Press Council when reconstituted should be very much democratically elected from electoral colleges of various states, and a democratically representative body with all shades of opinion, that is, representing Editors, Sub-Editors specially of small and medium newspapers and working journalists and other associations related with newspaper industry. It should have a big weightage of working journalists' associations. Then only the freedom of the Press can be assured and Government control could be fought out.

With these words, I conclude.

SHRI B. V. NAIK (Kanara):
Hon'ble Deputy Speaker, Sir, this is a very limited Bill and according to the statement of objects and reasons:

“The members of the Nominating Committee felt that it would not be desirable to expose their respective offices to any possible criticism”

We had the opportunity of participating in this discussion last time when we extended the term. The key offices involved are that of the Hon'ble Speaker, the Chairman of Rajya Sabha and the Chief Justice of India. The present Bill that has been brought is in the form of a temporary measure and, I think, some decision will have to be taken before the close of this year. The subject has been exercising the mind of the Minister and the Ministry and when the persons holding eminent office in

[Shri V. K. Naik]

this country refuse to perform a certain responsibility that has been evolved by a legislation which has been made under the Constitution. I wonder whether at the time when they said they do not want to carry this office of a Committee to nominate this Council any suggestion as to the alternatives as to who else could carry the job was made. I feel it would not be possible for us to accept this contention at all. Ultimately we cannot find anyone else. Either it has to be done by the Council of Ministers or by the hon'ble Members occupying this Constitutional office. I think we have been postponing an issue through this Act which under the given circumstances we are not able to find any solution. I would, therefore, be grateful if the hon. Minister were good enough to tell us as to what are the alternate avenues which are up his sleeves.

Secondly, I would like to draw your attention to a case as reported in the Eleventh Report for 1972 of the Press Council of India.

There was a case particularly in regard to the late Chief Minister of Goa, Mr. Bandodkar and the paper called *Gomantak* in Goa, wherein the Chief Minister had stopped the advertisements to the local paper called *Gomantak* on the ground that the paper was highly critical about the conduct or certain actions, or decisions of the Chief Minister; and the Press Council came to the conclusion:

"The Council was clearly of the opinion that this amounted to interference with the freedom of the press and it had reached the conclusion that the Government had been attempting to do this. Notwithstanding the Government's claim that it had been following the directives of the Central Govern-

ment in regard to its advertisement policy, there had been a clear departure from these directives, namely in that the Government had assumed that every attack on the Chief Minister or any unfriendly comment about his activities called for action by the Government against the paper in the form of the refusal of advertisements."

This is the old theory of the cane and the carrot. If a journalist or a paper does not behave properly, or if he does not flatter the powers that be at a particular point of time, in the absence of these incentives most of the small papers are invariably starved; so, if the financial assistance tap by way of advertisement revenues is cut off, they can be disciplined. This is the old theory. I could appreciate, with due deference to the memory of a very great son of Goa, the late Mr. Bandodkar, while not commenting upon the person but upon his office and actions in office, the Chief Minister being a politician indulging in such things. I could appreciate a paper like the *Gomantak*, financed by India's highest wealth-tax assessee, Mr. Chowgule going in complaint before the Press Council, spending all the money that is needed for this costly and expensive litigation and proving his point of view and getting a verdict in his favour. But I do not appreciate the way the Press Council has given its verdict. If the Press Council is worth its name and it has the signal objective of preserving the freedom of the press, which has been laid down as the reason for its existence, if the press council were to be worth its name, then this toothless wonder, this commentary without its teeth is of no use. We can write such pleasant shibboleths using the symbols of cordial terms, but that was not what was wanted. They could have passed strictures. They could have made use of all the press media available in the country; they could have an

advertisement saying 'This is the way we have dealt with the Chief Minister, Mr. X, or Y or Z, so that no other Chief Minister shall do such things or any other dignitary in office or in power'. There is no point in having an expensive, and costly press council in this country, if it is going to act like a weak sister in trying to protect the freedom of the press. I would have ventured to suggest that it is true that we have a fair time to go and a long way to travel before we could have journalist like the two unknown journalists in the United States who could expose the racket that was involved in the White House, of one of the most powerful Presidents, and still come out victorious and see to it that the President of a great country was removed from his office. We do not have such strong press here, with due apologies to the press. But if we have got to have a strong press, we have also got to have a very strong press council, an effective press council. For this purpose, I would submit that rather than postponing a decision, we should take a decision right now. I would urge upon these people holding the high office of the Hon. Speaker or the Chairman of the Rajya Sabha or the Chief Justice of this country, not to be worried about the slur that they might carry or to care for what criticisms come and from which quarters they come which may please the one and displease the other; in spite of whatever may happen, they have got to do that.

So I would urge upon them to stick to their office and perform their duties.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: A strong press without strong finance—I do not see where it comes.

श्री भान सिंह औरा (भटिंडा) डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, देखने के लिए यह बिल छोटा सा नजर आता है। इसमें सिर्फ इतना ही है कि डेट एक्स्टेंड करनी है, पहले से जो प्रेस कौंसिल

बनी हुई है उसको 31 दिसम्बर तक कर देना है। लेकिन प्रेस कौंसिल जिस ग्राम्य को लेकर बनाई गई थी क्या उसके मुताबिक प्रेस कौंसिल काम कर रही है या नहीं, इसको भी देखना है। आपने बिल बना दिया और उसमें कह दिया कि प्रेस कौंसिल ऐसा करेगी मगर जो हो रहा है उसको भी देखना पड़ेगा। हमारे सामने प्रेस कौंसिल की रिपोर्ट है। सबसे पहले में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि प्रेस कौंसिल का चेयरमैन बंशक जज है लेकिन उस जज को चेयरमैन बनाया गया जिसने पहले सुप्रीम कोर्ट में प्राइस पेज शंड्यूल् के खिलाफ अपना फैसला दिया था, जिसके लिए पता था कि बकिंग जर्नलिस्ट्स में भी वह खिलाफ होगा और उभरा एट्टीट्यूड क्या है लेकिन उसको चेयरमैन बना दिया गया। उसके बाद प्रेस कौंसिल में जो दूसरे लोग हैं उनके बारे में मैं कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता।

आपने बिल में तय किया है कि कौंसिल के फंक्शन्स क्या होंगे। वह इस प्रकार है :

"The Council may in furtherance of its objects perform the following functions: (a) to help newspapers and news agencies to maintain their independence and (b) to build up a code of conduct for newspapers, news agencies and journalists in accordance with professional standards."

इन बातों को तय करना है। लेकिन हमारे सामने प्रेस कौंसिल की रिपोर्ट है। एक साल में 103 कम्प्लेन्ट्स आईं। उनमें से उन्होंने 24 चुनीं और 13 को रजेक्ट कर दिया। 11 कम्प्लेन्ट्स थीं जो एक साल में डील हुईं और वह भी कैसे डील हुई वह इसमें है। मैं समझता हूँ बकिंग जर्नलिस्ट्स और जो दूसरे

[श्री भान सिंह घौरा]

लोग है उनके इन्ट्रस्ट्स को बात करने के लिए और इसको इफेक्टिव बनाने के लिए चाहिए था कि सरकार इससे पहले कोई एक रि-आर्गनाइज्ड कौंसिल ले आती लेकिन पोस्टपोन किया जा रहा है इस नाम पर पोस्टपोन किया जा रहा है कि पार्लमेंट की एक कमेटी बनी है वह जब कोई फैसला करेगी तो उस वक़्त करेगी। लेकिन इसमें लिखा है 3 साल के बाद होता है तो वह रिआर्गनाइज्ड क्यों नहीं हुई यह पता नहीं है।

दूसरे फ्रीडम ऑफ प्रेस के नाम पर प्रेस में होता क्या है ? हमारे देश में प्रेस का बड़ा हिस्सा मानोपोलिस्ट्स के पास है बड़े बड़े लोगों के पास है। गवर्नमेंट आज तक कहती रही कि इंडस्ट्रियल हाउसेज में हम प्रेस को डी-लिन करेगे लेकिन आज तक नहीं कर सकी। क्या नहीं कर सकी ? मैं समझता हूँ यह गवर्नमेंट सिर्फ एलान करनी है मीरियस नहीं है और वह करना नहीं चाहती है। बड़े बड़ टाइकून्स के दाबब में आकर करना नहीं चाहती है। आज फ्रीडम ऑफ प्रेस के नाम पर क्या होता है वह सभी को पता है। आज भी एक अखबार ले लीजिए जो वह एडवर्टाइजमेंट से भर रहा है। हर किसिम में वह खपता कमाल है। उनमें खबरे कम रहनी हैं, एडवर्टाइजमेंट्स ज्यादा होने हैं। गवर्नमेंट आज तक चैक नहीं कर सकी, और दूसरे सरकार के एडवर्टाइजमेंट उन अखबारों में जाते हैं जो मोनोपोलिस्ट्स के हैं ? दूसरे जो अखबार हैं, जो लोगों के पक्ष में लिखते हैं, वर्कर्स और एम्प्लॉईज के काम को लेते हैं उन को अजबूर किया जाता है कि एम्प्लॉईज

के खिलाफ इस्तहार छापें। अगर नहीं छापोगे तो एडवर्टाइजमेंट बन्द कर दिया जाएगा। मेरी जानकारी है बहुत से अखबारों में एडिशनल खर्चा किया जाता है वर्कर्स और स्ट्राइकर्स के खिलाफ लिखने के लिये। और आप ने खुली छूट दे दी है। पिछली दफा मैंने एक मामला उठाया था कि इंडियन एक्सप्रेस की कीमत बढ़ा दी 30 की जगह 35 पैसे कर दी और आज सरकार कहती है कि हमें बताया गया था बढ़ा दी और उन को इजाजत दे दी। जो अखबार 8 जगह से निकलता है जिस को कागज भी काफी मिलता है, छोटे अखबारों का कागज नहीं मिलता वही अखबार अपनी कीमत बढ़ा रहा है और आप उस को कुछ नहीं कहते हैं।

“लोफ़्समा” का जिक्र किया है मेरे गुजरात के दादा ने अहमदाबाद में जब प्रधान मंत्री गई थी तो उन के सामने शिकायत आयी कि “लाक़्समा” का गायनराने परबेज किया और उस के बाद चिमन भाई पटेल ग़ुप का बेचा जा रहा है। जा वर्कर्स वहाँ काम करने थे उन के इंटरेस्ट को बाच नहीं किया जा रहा है। पर उस शिकायत पर आज तक कुछ नहीं हुआ। यहाँ का प्रेस कुछ बड़े लोगों के ही हाथ में है, जिस में रूबल लाइफ डेपिक्ट नहीं होती। वह कहते हैं कि जो लोग हमारे अखबार पढ़ते हैं उन की बात छाते हैं। इसलिये सरकार का फर्ज है कि ऐसे अखबार जो हैं जो आम जनता तक पहुँचते हैं उनको ऐनकरेज किया जाये, न कि ऐसे अखबारों को ऐनकरेज किया जाये जो जनता की बात छाते ही नहीं हैं। अगर अफ़सोस है कि प्रेस काउंसिल में जो 14

थावायें आप ने संविधान में मानी हैं उन का कोई रिप्रजेंटेशन नहीं है। सब अंग्रेजी के अखबारों के रिप्रजेंटेटिव रखे हैं। और कहते यही हैं कि रीजनल लघुएनेज को डेवलप करते हैं। लेकिन जिस मीडियम में आप को लोगो तक प्रोग्राम पहुचाना है, पंजाब में पंजाबी में देना पड़ेगा, उस को आप एनकरेज नहीं करेंगे। और दूसरी तरफ अखबारों को जो डीमैनेट करते हैं उन की आप मदद करना चाहते हैं।

आज हमारे सामने कुछ जर्नलिस्ट्स हैं जो अपना काम करते हैं, अच्छी इयूटी परफॉर्म करते हैं। बहुत से जर्नलिस्ट्स ऐसे हैं जो अखबारों का नाम लेकर ब्लैकमेल करते हैं और अपना छोटा सा बीकली या फोर्टनाइटली अखबार निकालते हैं, उन के जरिए से अफसरों से मिल कर विज्ञापन लिए जाते हैं और उन के बयान छपे जाते हैं। मैं पंजाब की बहुत सारी मिसालें दे सकता हूँ जहाँ ऐसे जर्नलिस्ट्स हैं जो अपना एक अखबार निकाल लेते हैं बीकली या फोर्टनाइटली और विज्ञापन इकट्ठा करते हैं। हमने अभी एक शिकायत की थी भटिंडे कि 'ट्रिब्यून' के जर्नलिस्ट्स, ज. जो ब्लैकमेल करता था, डिप्टी कमिश्नर ने एक कोठी भ्रष्टा कर दी। हम ने शिकायत की और मुझे खुशी है कि 'ट्रिब्यून' अखबार ने उन का रिप्रजेन्टेटिव कांड छीन लिया है। और भी बहुत से लोग हैं जो ऐसे काम करते हैं।

हिन्दुस्तान में वह पेपर जो कमूल प्रोपो-गेन्डा करते हैं, अबसीन लिट्रेचर निकालते हैं उन के बारे में प्रेस काउन्सिल को शिकायत करें और फिर सबूत दें। मेरा कहना है कि यह प्रेस काउन्सिल की खुद की इयूटि होनी चाहिए जब कि उन के पास सब अखबार घाते हैं, वह अपने फायदे के और ऐसे अखबारों के खिलाफ

खुद ऐक्शन लें। छोटे छोटे अखबारों को ब्लैकमेल करने के लिए निकलते हैं वह छोटे कर्मचारियों के खिलाफ लिखते हैं और अफसरों को बचा कर पैसा लेते हैं। ऐसे अखबारों को बन्द करना चाहिए। आप को प्रेस काउन्सिल ऐक्ट और कास्टीट्यूशन के आर्टिकल 292 में संशोधन करना चाहिए ताकि ऐक्शन ले सके। मैं चाहता हूँ कि प्रेस काउन्सिल को रीआर्गेनाइज करें और वर्किंग जर्नलिस्ट्स को ज्यादा रिप्रजेन्टेशन दें और मालिकों को कम दें। मेरी मांग है कि 31 दिसम्बर से आगे इस काउन्सिल को नहीं जाना चाहिए और इस की जगह आप को दूसरी प्रेस काउन्सिल बनानी चाहिए।

इन अफ्फेयर्स के साथ मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस बिल को मजूर न किया जाए।

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chirayinkil) Sir, I was hearing the opposition members who were very vocal about the freedom of the press and attacked the Government all the time on the ground that they are pressurising the newspapers to toe the line of the Government. It is very surprising that such an allegation is made that the newspapers of the country are supporting the Government. I request them to name one national newspaper which is toeing the line of the Government.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: It is easier to name those who are not toeing the Government line.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Every newspaper today is opposing the Government and the Congress Party. I can cite instance after instance. Of course, I agree with the hon. members in their condemnation of the attack on the journalist in Bihar who exposed the smugglers.

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI: (Shajapur): What about Deshabhimani?

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: They are getting more quota of newsprint than any other paper in Kerala! It is the Congress Committee Secretary from Bihar issued a statement condemning the murder of the journalist. I do not know why Government is not taking proper action against the murderers. In Gujarat the same thing is happening. There is a weekly carrying a lot of reports against the top police officers for purposely attacking the journalists who exposed the administrative and bureaucratic corruption. I demand severe action against such elements.

A point was made about advertisement. In the Rajya Sabha the hon. Minister stated that small papers

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: May I say that our rules do not permit reference to the proceedings in the other House?

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: I am sorry.

श्री वयलर राव कृष्णरायः (मुरैना) लेखन
आप तो जानते ही हैं कि मई 21 मैक्सिम को
व्यक्तिगत तौर पर मारपीट करना पड़ा
है।

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The whole thing was very unfortunate.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: According to reliable reports, the small papers get 24.5 per cent., medium papers 25.5 per cent and monopoly papers 50 per cent of the Government advertisement. This shows that the monopoly press corner the advertisements.

Take the speech which the Prime Minister made in Calcutta a few months ago. How many newspapers published that speech? It was blacked out because it was an attack on them. The Howrah speech was not reported properly by the newspapers.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: There were photographs of the foundation stone as well as the removing of that by people who have no faith in your professions of socialism. The whole area was cordoned off and that photograph had also come. Further, do not forget that it was reported on the radio

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: The hon. Member is referring to the official function. I am referring to the speech of the Prime Minister in another meeting where it was mentioned that the Bihar agitation has been sponsored with certain motives and some of the businessmen formed a committee at Bombay to pour black money into the Bihar agitation. One top newspaper magnate threatened that he will teach them a lesson unless the CBI case against him is withdrawn.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: It had appeared in the papers. You want it in block letters?

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have read this somewhere

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: The PTI flashed this news the second day after there was criticism. So, my point is that the newspapers are not at all with the Government. They are not serving the interests of the people but monopoly interests.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Ask for diffusion of ownership.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: I am for it. This Government is not doing it. That is my complaint against this Government.

There is a lot of criticism about the Youth Congress rally held in Delhi, to which many people had come from all over the country. Did any newspaper give a single column to refer

to this rally? Newspapers contained only what happened in the Lok Sabha. Even the speech of Prime Minister appeared in single column. The Youth Congress demanded capital punishment for hoarders and blackmarketeers.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE
My hon friend is emphasising the youth rally. What was the percentage of youth in that rally?

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER Youth is a state of mind.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI I am not disputing your criticism.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai) That statement of mind had a certain amount of liquor and contraceptives.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI The entire press carried the news only to malign the rally. The youth of the country demanded capital punishment to black marketeers and hoarders. They wanted reforms in education. (Interruptions) The hon Member's party had beaten the editor of *Alai Oasi*, Mr Narayan who was in the hospital. (Interruptions) I do not know what is the position now.

As regards the Bulsar incident, I am not going to justify what some of them did. I regret what some of them did. But one point has not been highlighted properly. Usually, the police resort to firing because it may happen that someone has got a pistol or a dagger and attack the police. The police cooked up a story to cover the whole incident. Nobody said whether the boy who died was inside the compartment. As soon as the train arrived, within seven minutes, the police resorted to firing. All the boys put down the shutters. They were all inside the compartment. The police resorted to firing and broke the door and the boy died inside the compartment. The police wanted to justify their own action. They searched the compart-

ment. They found some bottles and other things. Is it a crime to keep bottles or other things in the train? Mr Jyotirmoy Bosu was very angry about the Cooch-Bihar firing incident. The same Mr Jyotirmoy Bosu was justifying the police firing at Bulsar. He did not utter a word against the police action.

The entire press covered the incident. A national daily from Delhi carried a big story. The *Madhya Pradesh* Correspondent had written from Bhopal that there were many Jana Sangh people who had infiltrated into the rally with the knowledge of their leaders. (Interruptions) There was a campaign carried with stories after stories instead of saying what actually happened at Bulsar, what was the reason for resorting to firing, whether there was any justification for firing or the police acted in a manner in which they should have acted. All the stories were built up to malign the youth rally, the youth movement in the country.

Some of the journalists have started writing diaries on Mr Javaprakash Narayan. With all respect to him I differ with him politically, not personally. Various diaries have started appearing in these national dailies. Why? The whole agitation is fizzling out. Mr Shyamnandan Mishra will agree with me. How many MLAs from his party have resigned?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA Where do they exist now? Do the Ministers exist anywhere? Can they stir out of their houses?

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI You are speaking on the myth.

There were agitations in Kerala, like the liberation movement. I am one who participated in the agitation once upon a time. But I regret today that we made a mistake. My party and we had made a mistake when we had a liberation movement in Kerala in 1959.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: That was done when she was the Congress President. It was under her auspices.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: It was not with her permission. I was then in the Congress and it was imposed on Congress leadership. Shri Shyamnandan Mishra was then in our party. You ask him and he will explain to you.

Mr. Somnath Chatterjee and his party today taking the same line... (Interruptions) I am telling you how the press is behaving. My whole argument is that the press is not toeing the line of the Government. They are opposing the Government consistently. I am proving that now. The entire press is campaigning and all the newspapers are building an attack on Government and supporting the reactionary movement where the Communist Party Marxist is also joining the movement. What happened in 1959 you are trying to repeat. The agitation is fizzling out. There is no momentum. Now they have started writing diaries in the newspapers on this reactionary movement. (Interruptions) For them, interests of the monopolies are the interests of the country. It is because the monopolies are controlling the newspapers. As Mr. Krishna Menon said, it is a jute press. The monopolies are controlling the entire press. The freedom of press is distorted as the freedom of the monopolies. By freedom of press do we mean the interests of the monopolies group and their vested interests or the freedom of the people? Freedom of press means freedom of the people. In 1969 this country saw what was the reality and what was the myth. We have seen how the whole propaganda that had been carried out by the monopoly press to defeat the Congress in the elections had been proved wrong and baseless. They cannot misguide the people. People will not be carried away by their propaganda. These monopolies are trying to exploit the present economic crisis. In the name of

freedom of press, these monopoly groups and their vested interests are trying to exploit the situation. They want to have full control over the press. This cannot be allowed. That is why I fully agree with the demand that diffusion of ownership must come. Without diffusion of ownership, people's freedom cannot be protected. Freedom of press does not mean protecting the interests of the monopolies who control the press today. The Press Council, on page 8 of their report, has mentioned this. A former Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh—Mr. Charan Singh—has withdrawn advertisements to the Times of India because they published something against him. We know, paper bundles and vans of Malayalam Manorama and Mathrubumi were burnt by the Marxist Communist Party workers many times in my States. They speak very loudly about freedom of press and at the same time attack the journalists and the press. Speaking loudly about freedom of press, they make physical attacks on the journalists, they attack the newspaper offices. Today, Sir, freedom of press is in peril or danger. In the name of freedom of press they merely attack the Government. You know, Sir, how a distorted version was published about the youth rally. The agitation of Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan had actually fizzled out. But what was the propaganda given? It was just boosted. (Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: What is meant by 'freedom of press'?

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: It is freedom of the people. It is not the interests of the monopolies.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: They publish only the speech and photo of the Prime Minister... (Interruptions)

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: If Mr. Jyoti Basu is the Chief Minister of West Bengal, his speech must come in the newspaper because he is elected by the people of West Bengal. I agree. The people should know that. Our

people should know what the Members of Parliament say. Our speeches must come. I am not saying this only of Congress members but of the other members also. My complaint is that they do not come. I have my own experience. I was in Nagpur two months ago. Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan had come there one day earlier. There was black flag demonstration against Jayaprakash Narayan. But I found the news in the newspapers of Bombay next day was that Jayaprakash Narayan addressed a largely-attended public meeting. But the fact is that the meeting was held only in a Hall. There was no news item about the black flag demonstration because the newspapers do not want to show what has actually happened but want to project a view. Consistently the entire monopoly newspapers are protecting the monopoly interests. They are consistently against the Government and attacking the Government and it is because they believe the present government is against their interests and only the Marxist Communist Party is their friends, they are attacking the Government and the Communist Marxists are supporting them and are completely toeing their line (Interruptions).

I do not want to take much time of the House. Lastly, a word about the third Wage Board for the Journalists. The journalists of the country to-day are very much agitated over the delay in the appointment of the Third Wage Board. I hope the Government will take a decision as early as possible regarding the third Wage Board because it is a vital matter so far as the journalists are concerned.

The other thing is. I want to make a submission about the Press Commission's report. I know the Government has not completely implemented the recommendation of the Press Commission where they have categorically suggested that the Press Trust of India be made into a corporation. I know the Government has not so far examined it.

Lastly, I will conclude with the comment of hon. Mr. Justice K. K. Mathew. You agree with me that he made a famous comment about the newspapers that the adulteration of news is being indulged in by the newspapers. Adulteration of news is as bad as adulteration of foodstuffs and pollution of the air.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE:
But he was in the minority.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI. I hope the hon. Minister will take note of that famous judgment of Mr Justice Mathew regarding adulteration of news. To-day the political thinking of the journalists and the vested interests of the monopoly capitalist press and the adulteration of the news is poisoning the entire atmosphere of the country which the Government must take into account.

With these words, I support Mr. Bhaura that the Press Council must suo motu act instead of waiting for a complaint and go into the whole working of a newspaper.

With these words, I support the Bill.

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी (शजापुर) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय प्रेम परिषद के कार्यालय को बढ़ाने की दृष्टि से जाएँ गए अध्यादेश और उस के ही आधार पर बनाए गए विधेयक, दोनों पर सदन में साथ साथ चर्चा चल रही है। वास्तव में इस का दायरा बहुत छोटा है किन्तु इस के दो तीन महत्वपूर्ण पहलू हैं जिन पर सरकार का ध्यान में ध्याकृत करना चाहता हूँ। एक तो यह है कि इस का कार्यकाल जब 20 जून 1974 को समाप्त होने वाला था यह बात मान्यमयी, ऐसा होते हुए उस के पहले ही विधेयक के रूप में ला कर इस का कार्यकाल क्यों नहीं बढ़ाया? अध्यादेश क्यों? क्यों कि यह सरकार जो ऐडहॉक बेंसिस पर काम करती है उस के ऊपर भेरा विरोध है। कोई भी कार्य सोच समझ कर करे तो इस में कोई आपत्ति नहीं है, किन्तु जब पता था

[श्री जगन्नाथ गव जोशी]

कि 30 जून, 1974 को कार्याकाल समाप्त होगा तो उसके पहले ही एक विधेयक ला कर एक काल को कल्पना कर के कि कितना समय लगेगा आखीरी पतीजे या निर्णय पर पहुँचने में, उतना समय बढ़ा देते विधेयक के रू में तो उस में कोई आति नहीं थी। किन्तु बीच बीच में जैसा मन में आता है वैसा करते हैं, कान समाप्त हो गया। फिर करेंगे। अभी भी जो बढ़ाया है वह दिसम्बर, 1976 तक है। यह भी मुझे लगता है कि ऐडहक वैमिक पर ही है या इस के पहले ही क्या रचना वगैरह सब हाँ जाएगी? तो यह जो अस्थायी रूप में सरकार का एक काम करने का तरीका है कि जब मन में आया अध्यादेश जागे कर दिया और बाद में समझ का मतलब जब हुआ तो उस में विधेयक का रूप दे दिया, यह मुझे लगता है कि ठीक नहीं है। अब वास्तव में जो प्रेस परिषद की रचना होने वाली है उस की रचना जितनी मर्यादपूर्ण उतने ही उस के अधिकार मर्यादपूर्ण हैं और मुझे लगता है—जैसे अमरीका में अभी हाल ही में वाटर गेट काण्ड हुआ, जिसकी वजह से उस देश के अन्दर राज्य शासन में जो गन्दगी है वह कितनी मामूली घाई, उतनी ही या उसमें ज्यादा बढ़ा की जापनकारिता है वह कितनी निर्भीक है, कितनी निर्भीकता से वे अपना प्रतिवाद कर सकते हैं, देश के सर्वोच्चय नता का भी मोचे लगाया जा सकता है, यह सब कुछ देखने के बाद हम को सबक सीखना चाहिए। यदि लातन को ठाँक गये चाना है तो यह जो पत्रकारिता की स्वाधीनता है, स्वतन्त्रता है, उस को जितना सुरक्षित रखा जाए, उतना देश के हित में है, लोकतन्त्र के हित में है।

किन्तु मुझे डर लगता है—जिस तरह में अमरीका में वाटर गेट काण्ड का परिणाम निकला हिन्दुस्तान में उस तरह का परिणाम नहीं निकलेगा, या कि हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर पोटेन्शियल वाटर गेट काण्ड बहुत है। जैसे अमरीका में वाटर गेट काण्ड को कोई बाहर लाया, वैसे

हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर कोई बाहर न लाये, इस लिए उसके दबाने की दृष्टि से, उस की स्वाधीनता को समाप्त करने की बात होंगी—यह मुझे आशंका है।

अभी मेरे मित्र मधु लिमये जी ने पंजाब का मामला हमारे सामने रखा। बड़ा हिन्दू समाचार और पंजाब केसरी को जो बिजली मिलती थी—वह सारी फाइल मेरे पास मौजूद है, यह चित्र भी मौजूद है—उस को काट दिया गया। किस तरह उन्होंने दीवाल तोड़ कर ट्रैक्टर लगा कर अपने पत्र को छपा और छा। रते हैं, देश के अन्दर बिजली की कमी है—यह बात समझ में आ सकती है, लेकिन कोई अपने खिताफ आलाचना करता है इस बात को लेकर उस की स्वाधीनता का दबान की कोशिश की गई—यह बात लोकतन्त्र के लिए ठीक नहीं है।

दूसरा मामला ट्रिब्यून का है जो प्रेम काउन्सिल के सामने लाया गया। आप जानते हैं बीबी लाल जी का हरियाणा में क्लिप्पा आतक है, वहाँ जा कुछ हाँ रहा है वह हम लोग में छिपा नहीं है। ऐसी स्थिति में पत्रकार आलाचना न करे, यह कैसे सम्भव हो सकता है। अब यदि खुले रूप में आलोचना होनी है तो उस आलोचना का स्वागत न करने हुए जो बिज्ञापन उनका दिये जाते थे, वे बन्द कर दिये गये। मामला प्रेम काउन्सिल के सामने आया। प्रेम काउन्सिल ने भी इसके बारे में कहा कि यह बात ठीक नहीं है, लेकिन उसको भी उन्होंने नहीं माना, हरियाणा की सरकार ने नहीं माना। ऐसी स्थिति में सरकार के दोष हैं, जो कमियाँ हैं उनकी आलोचना की जाय और प्रेम काउन्सिल भी उसको सही माने तो प्रेम काउन्सिल के पास कोई अधिकार नहीं है कि वे सरकार को उसे मानने के लिये बाध्य करें। श्री बी० बी० नायक ने भी इस बात का उल्लेख किया है कि उसके जो "टोप" होने चाहिये, वे उसके पास नहीं हैं, सिर्फ रिकमैण्डरी फंक्शन है।

मधु लिमये जी ने सर्व लाइट और प्रदीप का मामला भी उठाया। उनके दफ्तर को जलाया गया, उसके बावजूद भी वह निर्भीकता से लिखते रहे तो अब गणपूर साहब ने इन अखबारों को अपनी विज्ञापन सूची से निकाल दिया। लेकिन सूची से निकालने के बाद भी उन्होंने अपनी निर्भीकता को नहीं छोड़ा।

अपने देश में कुछ और भी अजीब सी चीजें हैं।

It seems that everybody has a price of his own.

वास्तव में जितनी स्वाधीनता और स्वतंत्रता रहनी चाहिए, उसमें सरकार कुछ आदेश उपस्थित करें—ऐसा नहीं होता है। या तो उसको दबाने का प्रयास होता है या उसको खरीदने का प्रयास होता है। या तो डर दिखाओ या उसको खरीद कर अपने साथ मिला लो—“फेवर और फीयर”। पहले तो उसको डर दिखाओ, यदि नहीं मानता है तो खरीदने की कोशिश करो, जाल में फसाने की कोशिश करो। कुछ भी करना पड़े लेकिन आलोचना नहीं होनी चाहिए—यह सही विचारधारा नहीं है। मैं तो यही चाहता हूँ कि देश में पत्रकारिता को खुले रूप से अपने विचार व्यक्त करने का अधिकार होना चाहिये।

अभी हमारे बी० रवि ने कहा कि जब चरण सिंह थे तो उन्होंने भी यही किया था। यह सबाल चरण सिंह या स्वर्ण सिंह का नहीं है—जो भी गलत काम करता है, आलोचना का पात्र है, उसकी आलोचना होनी चाहिए। ऐसा मैं क्यों कहता हूँ—मान लीजिये कोई व्यक्तिगत रूप से अखबार चलाता है, उसमें विज्ञापन छपते हैं, जैसे तेल का विज्ञापन छपता है, दवाइयों का विज्ञापन छपता है। जो विज्ञापन देते हैं, कल उनको पता चले कि आगे चल कर उस अखबार में विज्ञापन देने से कोई लाभ होने वाला नहीं है, तो स्वाभाविक

1960 LS—10.

है वह विज्ञापन देना बन्द कर देगा—क्योंकि यह उसका व्यक्तिगत मामला है, जिसके लिये मुझे कोई आपत्ति नहीं है। एक बड़े बीड़ी उद्योगपति हैं, एक बार उन्होंने एक पत्रकार को बताया कि जब तुम खुद बीड़ी नहीं पीते तो तुम्हारे अखबार में विज्ञापन दे कर क्या करूंगा, क्योंकि जो तुम्हारा अखबार पढ़ेंगे वे भी पीने वाले नहीं हैं, इस लिये तुम्हारे अखबार में विज्ञापन देने में मुझे कोई लाभ नहीं होगा—वह यदि विज्ञापन देना बन्द कर देता है तो उसमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं है। लेकिन यह सरकार तो जमता की है, यहां कोई व्यक्तिगत मामला नहीं है। जो पार्टी आज शासन में बैठी है, हो सकता है कल दूसरी पार्टी शासन में आये। इस लिये विज्ञापन द्वारा धन की जो शक्ति शासन के पास है, वह किसी पार्टी की नहीं है, वह शक्ति सब की है। जो भी आलोचना करता है वह अपनी मर्यादा के अन्तर्गत करता है, इस लिये खुले रूप से उसको अपने विचार प्रकट करने की छूट रहनी चाहिए।

मैं बहुत बार पार्लियामेंट का मेम्बर होने के नाते हवाई जहाज से देश के विभिन्न भागों में जाता हूँ। देखता हूँ हवाई जहाज में नेशनल हैरल्ड से लेकर पैट्रियोट तक सब अखबार होते हैं, लेकिन वहां मंदर-लैंड दिखाई नहीं देता . . .

श्री इमामनन्द मिश्र : दूसरे अखबार भी नहीं होते।

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : मुझे समझ नहीं आता कि ऐसा क्यों है। सरकार को जो अखबार अच्छे नहीं लगते, आप चाहते हैं कि लोग उनको न पढ़ें। ब्लिट्ज होता है लेकिन आर्गनाइजर नहीं होता है। विचारों की खुली स्वाधीनता तब ही हो सकती है जब कि देशवासी सब प्रकार के विचार पढ़ें और सब विचारों को जान कर मंथन करके किसी नतीजे पर पहुंचें।

[श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी]

मेरे कम्प्यूनिस्ट भाई यहां बैठे हैं— डिफ्यूजन् और डीलिकिंग की बात कही गई है, मैं उसको मान लेता हूँ, लेकिन क्या रूस में डिफ्यूजन् और डीलिकिंग है? 'इजबेस्तिया' कितना छपता है, पता है It is millions. Where is de-linking and where is diffusion?

मोनोपोली की बात को छोड़ दीजिये। यह सरकार उसी लाइन पर जा रही है— हर चीज कमिटेड चाहते हैं, सिविल सर्विस कमिटेड हो, जूडीशियरी कमिटेड हो, हर बात कमिटेड हो . . .

श्री सरजू पाण्डे (गाजीपुर) : वहां की सरकार कमिटेड नहीं है, वह गरीबों की सेवा करती है। . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : यहां सबाल पैस का नहीं है। यदि एक ही अखबार रहा तो जपान के सामने एक ही विचार आयेगा। मैं तो डीलिकिंग और डिफ्यूजन् का समर्थन करता हूँ, लेकिन जो बाहर का पैसा लिक होता है तो कैसे डीलिकिंग हो—

I want a real de-linking इस लिये डिफ्यूजन् जरूर हो। हम तो किसी भी मोनोपोली के विरोध में हैं—वह मोनोपोली सरकार की हो या टाटा, बिरला की हो, हम सब के खिलाफ हैं।

प्रेस कान्फ्रेंस को विचारों की स्वतंत्रता के साथ यह भी देखना होगा कि इनके स्टैंडर्ड में इम्प्रूवमेंट कैसे हों—मंत्री महोदय इस बात को भी ध्यान में रखें। अखबारों को कैसे चलाना है, जिला स्तर पर कैसे चलाना

है—उन अखबारों को कौन लोग पढ़ते हैं, जनता तक वे कैसे पहुंचें—उनको विज्ञापन मात्रा कहा तक की मिलती है—इन सब बातों को देखना होगा। जब भी प्रतिनिधित्व का सवाल आता है तो हमेशा अंग्रेजी अखबारों के प्रतिनिधि ही सामने आते हैं। कभी राष्ट्रपति जी या प्रधान मंत्री जी को बाहर जाना है—बाहर कौन कौन से अखबार वाले साथ जायेंगे तो केवल अंग्रेजी वाले ही दिखाई देते हैं। हमारे यहां प्रादेशिक भाषाओं में भी अनेकों अखबार निकलते हैं, जैसे केरल में मातभूमि है, मलयालम के अखबार हैं, दूसरी भाषाओं के अखबार हैं—इनका वाचकवर्ग काफी बड़ा है, जिला स्तर पर चलने के बावजूद भी वाचक वर्ग बहुत बड़ा है—ये अखबार कैसे चले ?

Otherwise, how are you going to improve the standards? They are already being starved

सब से पहले तो उनको कागज का कोटा ही नहीं मिलता। यह सब आपके हाथ में है। अगर किसी को मिलता है तो इसमें एक बड़े मजे की बात है—जैसे आप अहमदाबाद के मिल वालों को सूत देते हैं, बंगाल को—बंगाल के मिल वालों को सूत देते हैं दूसरी जगह से। इसी तरह से बम्बई में चलने वाले अखबारों को पेपर का कोटा दिया जाता है कलकत्ता से और कलकत्ता में अमृतवाजार पत्रिका में कहा जायगा कि तुम अपना कागज का कोटा दूसरी जगह से लो। आखिर यह क्यों चलता है? यह अव्यवस्था क्यों है, यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती। प्रेस कौंसिल का मतलब तो यही

है कि स्टैंडर्ड को इम्प्रूव करे लेकिन जिला स्तर पर छोटे छोटे प्रादेशिक अखबार चलते हैं उनको ठीक समय पर और उचित दाम पर कागज नहीं मिलता। मंत्री महोदय को उनका खयाल जरूर होगा लेकिन जो दाम कागज के तय किये जाते हैं उस पर उनको वह मिलना नहीं है। इसलिए मुझे मालूम है कुछ अखबारों का कि उन्होंने तय किया है अपने एकाउन्ट्स में जो आन का पैसा मांगा जाता है उसको वह दिखाते हैं कि इतना आन दिया है क्योंकि आपके राज्य में उचित दाम पर निश्चित दाम पर कुछ भी नहीं मिलता है। आज छोटे अखबार बिल्कुल मरण घटका गिन रहे हैं क्योंकि उनका विज्ञापन नहीं मिलने उनके कागज में बटौती हो गई। तो मैं कहता हूँ कि प्रेम कोमिल का काम है स्टैंडर्ड को इम्प्रूव करना लेकिन अगर अखबारों को चलाने लायक कागज न मिले उनके पास धन की क्षमता न रहे तो फिर वह अखबार चलेंगे नहीं।

15 00 hrs

इसके अलावा यह जो आप चाहते हैं कि मानोपाली न हो लेकिन इसमें कबल अंग्रेजी अखबारों की मानोपाली हो जायेगी। दा प्रतिशत लागू ही जिस भाषा को पढ़ते हैं वही भाषा मानोपोलाइज करने बैठ जायेंगे। आखिर यह क्यों हो? 40 प्रतिशत जनता जो भाषा पढ़ती है उस भाषा के अखबारों पर भी सरकार का ध्यान जाना चाहिए। कागज की उचित मात्रा उपलब्ध होने की दृष्टि से या विज्ञापन द्वारा या सरकार की मदद के द्वारा भी अखबार चल सकें—यह बात भी बहुत आवश्यक है। (स्वबोधन)

श्री इसहाक सन्तली : (अमरोहा)
आपने "मदरलैंड" अंग्रेजी में निकाला लेकिन हमने अपना अखबार "जनयुग" हिन्दी में निकाला। (स्वबोधन)

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : इसीलिए मैं बता रहा हूँ कि प्रादेशिक भाषाओं को सरकार प्रोत्साहन दे देती तो हमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं थी लेकिन विज्ञापन के जरिये पीछे के दरवाजे से अपना अधिवार चलाने की बात होती है उस पर मुझे आपत्ति है।

रेल मंत्री ने कल कहा कि किन किन अखबारों का उन्होंने दिया उनके नाम भी दिये किन्तु कितनी राशि दी यह नहीं बताया। यह बात हमारी समझ में नहीं आई। आखिर हम यहां लोकमभा में बैठ किस लिये हैं। सरकार पैसा देती है और जब सरकार के मन में ही कुछ वाला है तभी उसको वह छिपाने की कागिरी करती है। कुछ अखबारों का इन्होंने ज्यादा पैसा दे दिया होगा और कुछ का बताया होगा कि रेल कमचारियों के खिलाफ तुम चाहे जैसा छापा—यही किया होगा। तो विज्ञापन के जरिए स यह जो होता है इसके बारे में मैं चाहता हूँ सरकार अपनी नीति स्पष्ट कर आए उस नीति पर अमल करने की कागिरी रहे। इसके बारे में जब प्रेम कोमिल आपका ध्यान खींचेगी तो उस पर भी आप ध्यान देंगे। यह कोमिल जा है उसका अधिवार क्षत्र आप बढ़ाइये।

अब जहां तक रचना का मवाल है, मुझे लगता है पहले जा रचना बनी थी उसमें कोई खराबी नहीं थी। आलोचना तो अपने देश में सभी की होने लगी है। आलोचना होने ही कोई अपना त्याग-पत्र दे दे या उससे हट जाये तो मुझे लगता है वह ठीक नहीं रहेगा। या कुछ मर्यादा का हम स्वीकार करें। जैसे सुप्रीम कोर्ट के चीफ जस्टिस है या सर्वोच्च न्यायालय के न्यायाधीश है उनके बारे में, या राष्ट्रपति के बारे में मर्यादा को हम स्वीकार करें। ऐसे पद रहे जिनकी गरिमा को ध्यान में रख कर कोई बटु या कड़ी आलोचना न हो—यह बात तो समझ में आती है लेकिन जहां लोकतंत्र है वहां तो आलोचना होनी।

[श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी]

अब हम कहेंगे राष्ट्रपति का पद है तो ठीक है किन्तु निक्सन वंसा ही था, उसके बाम में गडबडी निकली। आज तो हर कोई जानता की निगाह में सम्पेक बन गया है। स्थिति ऐसी है कि हम करे क्या। तो ला.तल को ध्यान में रख कर हम कहते हैं कि आलोचना के लिए मर्यादा का पालन होना चाहिए।

दूसरे हम कौमिल में जो मनोनीत सदस्य हो उम्मे अम्मीवी पत्रकारों के भी प्रतिनिधि

हिए। जो सम्पादक वत्त चित्र चन्नेने है उनको भी इसमें सम्मिलित प्रतिनिधित्व मिलना चाहिए। अमजीवी पत्रकारों में भी दो दो मगठन बने हुए हैं—कोई नेशनल यूनियन बनी है कोई वाक्म केडरेगन बनी है।

(व्यवधान) : मैं दो मिनट में समाप्त करता हूँ। तो इनके अगडे में जाऊँ अमजीवी पत्रकारों का मही प्रतिनिधित्व हा यह देखना बहुत आवश्यक है।

तीसरी बात यह है कि अखबारों में जो आता है उसका देखने के लिए जैम प्रम कौमिल है वैसे ही आज आज उडिया गडियो आकाशवाणी पर क्या चन्ना है उनको देखने के लिए कुछ है ही नहीं। ना इसके बारे में भी जो शिकायतें हो, चाहे रवाटलाट के बारे में हो या जो भाषण वहाँ में होते हैं उनके बारे में हो, जो न्यूज दी जाती है उनके बारे में शिकायतें हो जैसे इन्होंने गालों में हम यहाँ पर हैं बिरोधी दलों के लोगों का भी कभी वहाँ पर कोई भाषण होता है यह तो कभी हमने सुना नहीं।

(व्यवधान) : कभी मतपल वपूर, कभी शशि भूपण कभी दूसरे, उधर ही बैठने वाला का प्रोग्राम टी० वी० पर भी आता है।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: If Mr. Jagannathrao Joshi's picture does not appear on the TV, the TV is the poorer for that. So, why is he complaining?

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : तो आकाशवाणी के बारे में भी कुछ हो। इसके बारे में भी विचार किया जाय, हमारे पार्लमेन्ट के सदस्यों की कमेटी बैठी हुई है, वह इसके डिटल्स और बकिंग में जायेंगी। यह भी देखना चाहिए कि किस तरह से हमकी परिधि को बढ़ा कर आकाशवाणी भी इसमें आ सकती है ताकि आकाशवाणी पर भी अकुश लग सके।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं चाहता हूँ मंत्री महादय अपने उत्तर में मेरो इन बातों का भी उल्लेख करें।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I see the name of Mr. D. D. Desai. Is he interested in speaking? The way in which is sitting and moving around, it does not seem that he is very keen on speaking. Is he interested in speaking?

SHRI D. D. DESAI: Yes, I was expecting that I would not get time. At 3.30 p.m. I have to attend a consultative committee meeting and so, I was wondering whether I would get time.

In regard to the Press Council (Amendment) Bill which has been presented before us today I would strongly urge Government to see that it is made as independent as possible, because it had already landed itself in a situation where three illustrious people nominated by Government, namely, the Speaker, the Vice President and the Chief Justice were under severe attack from some section of the press and, therefore they had felt sorry that had landed themselves into that unpleasant controversy and therefore they left the press council. Today, the result is that we find that the press council is without the apex body which could take care of or honourably discharge its obligations.

There is a difference between the press and the government. A government identifying itself with the press is never worth-while in a democracy. We have seen recently how in the USA

[Shri D. D. Desai]

and several other countries including West Germany, Japan and even the UK, the government had been thrown out or somebody in office had to leave because of exposure by the press. The latest instance is that of Mr. Willy Brandt who had to resign and leave as Chancellor of West Germany. Similarly Nixon had to leave on account of the two young journalists of the *Washington Post* who exposed something which was then classified as third-rate burglary as they called it. People were asking why the fair name of a country like the USA was dragged into it and why the fair name of the President should be brought into that third rate burglary and so on, but ultimately they went on pursuing the matter with the result that Nixon had to leave. But the reputation of that country has gone up much higher. But the reaction to it elsewhere is worth noting. There are certain controlled presses who thought that the American press had brainwashed the American people. For example the Soviet Press in its commentary had said that the American press had brainwashed the entire nation so much so that the people could not see what was right and threw away a person like Nixon whom it wanted to defend.

If the Government identifies itself solely with the press or the press is solely controlled by Government what could be the result? It could easily be judged from the comments of the Soviet press. There it is a controlled press. The interest of Government and the interest of the public are assumed to be one. The press is assumed to be a tool and the people who rule the country believe that they have a certain obligation or a certain message to be delivered and for that they are the only competent persons to do so. In other words there is no freedom left to individuals to criticise or alter the conditions whereby the voice of the people could be reflected in government and the management of government or the day to day operations of Government so that these are in tune with the public aspirations. In other

words, national interest is not the same as the individual interests or government interest. The government may at one time be composed of X Y or Z, but in course of time it is likely to deteriorate. What happened to Nixon was during his second term. We have seen how an individual with an excellent record of public service like Brandt had to go. After all, they are all human beings.

SHRI B V NAIK Nixon and Brandt are not of the same brand.

SHRI D D DESAI. I know there is a big difference but the deficiency is always there. What we are differentiating is not the depth or range or quality. Brandt left because he had a feeling that his aide was essentially a very faithful and loyal person, loyal to the West German Government and the nation. In other words he supported him. I do not want to go into the controversial aspect of it. But the fact remains that a person who had started with an excellent record and whose public service cannot be questioned had at some point of time to go. Of course the public at large did not feel that he was a desirable person to be in the job. Even then I must give credit to Brandt because even before the public could pass a verdict, he resigned the job.

We have seen by what has happened in the past that the UK has ethical standards which are superior to those of any other country. I have travelled through most of the countries of the world not once but several times and I can safely say whether you compare it with Japan, Germany, Scandinavian countries or the US, the ethical standards of UK so far as the politicians and bureaucrats are concerned are superior to those of any other country's.

We are talking of the public sector. Public sector means ethical standards. But if the ethical standards of the politicians and bureaucrats fall short of the high standards expected of them, we have seen in the past that the press has not hesitated, if it is a free press, to bring to the notice of

[Shri D. D. Desai]

the public the failings of the individuals and the individuals have stepped down. We have seen that the press has been responsible on many occasions not only for change of Ministers but sometimes change of Governments also. This has not been done. I am not making this proposal from the point of view of any person, any particular person. Since we are for honest, upright and just democracy, we should not be worried about truth being brought to light and under all conditions. This is what I would say.

There are certain areas of mass media like radio, television etc. today, which are under the control of Government. The Government may have certain control, but, I would suggest that at the earliest date, these media should be placed under an independent authority. The independence of press should not be less than that of judiciary. An independent judiciary is the biggest asset, which a democracy can possess. Similarly, an independent press is the biggest instrument of public opinion. It is an asset that a democracy can possess. To that extent, there is the importance of this measure and the urgency of taking early action on the report of the Committee of Members of Parliament, which has been appointed to formulate, at the earliest date, proper press regulations so that the press can be independent and it can discharge its obligations to the nation. We should not look to a particular party or a particular person or anybody within the limits of India. So far as the press is concerned, there should be guidelines as to how the press should function. Sir, I thank you for giving me an opportunity.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN (Madras South). Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the Press Council is the unique creature of Government of India which does not bite, but which barks occasionally. It is a pity that those barkings are not taken seriously in this country. This is because, the Press

Council has no teeth. Perhaps, intentionally, it was created like that, as the hon. Minister has said recently. Because of this, the watchdog function over the Indian Press could not be performed by the Press Council. Sir, it has become one of the ineffective bodies. The Press Council was constituted with laudable ambitions. One of the objectives of the Press Council was to preserve the freedom of the Press and to maintain and improve the standards of newspapers and news agencies. But, what is happening today? The freedom of the Press in India is a myth because of the newsprint control and because of the higher prices of newsprint. The economy of the newspapers is in jeopardy. The economic conditions of the newspapers, especially language newspapers, have gone from bad to worse. Now, the newspapers can survive provided they have advertisement revenues. So, the concept of a powerful self-financing newspaper whose strength and independence is based on the public's willingness to buy its news and opinions has disappeared. As we know, the Government, I mean the Central Government and the State Governments are one of the biggest dispensers of advertisement revenues. Recently, the hon. Minister Mr. Gujral made a statement saying that the total advertisement budget in the country is Rs 65 crores, of which the share of the Government is only Rs 5 crores. But, how is the Government spending this amount? It may be a meagre sum. I would like to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister certain cases. Take for example, *Readers Digest*. It is one of the well produced magazines in the world, there is no doubt about it. It has established an office in India and they are repatriating dividends to England. Is it essential, I would ask the hon. Minister. They claim to have a big circulation, say, one lakh fifty thousand or two lakh copies. But, they are not a member of the Audit Bureau of Circulation. They refuse to become a member of the Audit Bureau of Circulation. But, I do not know on what basis, DAVP is giving advertisements

[Shri Murasoli Maran]

to the *Reader's Digest*. Many other public sector undertakings also are patronising *Reader's Digest*. I would like to point out this. The other day, I put a question to the Finance Minister. My question was this:

"Whether funds are repatriated in the case of *Reader's Digest* to their foreign principals;

If so, the percentage of such repatriation to the total profits every year and the year wise break up of the amounts so repatriated during the last three years."

The reply given was that during the six months from 1-1-1968 to 30-6-1968, an amount of Rs. 67,000 and odd was repatriated to England. During 1969, more than Rs. 51,000 was repatriated. During 1970 more than Rs. 1.45 lakhs were repatriated. Apart from this dividend, the company also remitted during each of the years 1963, 1969 and 1970 an amount equivalent to £18,750 to its British principals towards editorial and other expenses incurred in London on behalf of the Indian company. This magazine is competing as a giant with other Indian newspapers. May be it is a well-produced magazine, but except the Indian money going abroad, there is nothing Indian in the *Reader's Digest*. I would request the minister to look into it. While you have a paltry budget of Rs. 5 crores for both the States and the Centre put together, why should we encourage such newspapers? That means, Government's money is going abroad. I am told they are charging a fantastic amount per page. In fact, the DAVP is questioning the circulation of small and medium-sized papers, they never even care to answer letters. The smaller and medium-sized papers in far off parts of the country do not get a line of DAVP advertisement, whereas a giant like the *Reader's Digest* is knocking away a lion's share of the advertisement revenue. I would request the hon. minister to look into this and pass on this information to other public sec-

tor undertakings also, so that public money is not wasted on such a newspaper, whose dividends are going abroad. It is a very serious matter to consider whether such a magazine should be at all allowed to be printed in India, because they send out a large sum of money in the name of editorial expenses. In fact, they can establish their editorial offices here. We are second to none in our talents.

Another laudable aim of the Press Council is to keep up the standards of the newspapers. But what is it doing? Every day there is a spurt in eroticism. In the name of youth magazines, glossy magazines are published every month with nude photographs as centre-spread. When the Press Council asked the publishers to explain, they boldly said, what they are publishing is nothing but import substitution. By offering salacious matter at a cheaper cost, they said they are doing a great service to the country. These things are printed in this report. But the Press Council cannot raise a little finger because it has no teeth at all. So, vulgarity is one aspect of the present day newspaper world. The other aspect of the regional newspapers and to some extent of some English newspapers, is that they are indulging in sensationalism and blackmailing. The Press Council sheds crocodile tears, may be sometimes real tears, but they are ineffective. They just point out that these are the things done by some of the newspapers but they are helpless in this regard. So, I would say that this kind of window-dressing will not do.

If at all you want to Press Council, it should be an independent body, a powerful body. There is no use having a Press Council in the nature of a police court in a small town. In fact, even the police court has got some powers whereas the Press Council has virtually no powers at all. It is a magnificent zero. That is why I say: scrap the Press Council; avoid any kind of window-dressing because that

[Shri Murasoli Maran]

will not help. If at all you want a Press Council, it should be independent with all powers.

Here I would say that the Chairman of the Council should not be a retired Judge. This observation should not be considered as an aspersion on the present Chairman, Mr. Rajagopala Iyengar. In fact, I have every respect for him. But, then, there is the question of propriety in appointing retired judges for such posts. Democratic traditions require that retired judges should not be appointed as Members of the Election Commission or Press Council because that will remove the semblance of impartiality of these high posts.

I would say that the Press Council should not take too much time in settling cases. They should avoid time-consuming processes. I am told that in the case of Bennet Coleman & Company to go into the sale of some wastepaper where black money was involved, they took several weeks and months and, finally, when the party went to the High Court the matter was settled within a few days.

Then, in the constitution of the Press Council it is not necessary to include people of different ideologies. Neither is it necessary to give representation to this union or that union or people with different political persuasions. It should have at least the appearance of a judicial body.

The conception of the Press Council by the Press Commission was really on very strong ground. It recommended:

"the Press Council not only to safeguard the freedom of the press but also to help the press to maintain its independence, to keep under review any developments likely to restrict the supply and dissemination of news of public interest and importance, and to keep a watch on

the arrangements made by the Indian newspapers and news agencies with foreign newspapers and news agencies...."

Then they have given 14 functions. One of the important functions of this Committee is:

"to study the developments which may tend towards monopoly or concentration of ownership of newspapers and news agencies, including their financial structure."

This is one of the functions of the Press Council. But the Council was not asked to do that function. In fact, in this Report it is stated that the Press Council was going in this direction. They themselves were doing some research on this aspect of monopoly ownership and several related matters. Suddenly, the Government of India appointed a sub-Committee of the Cabinet to go into the question and again a fact finding Committee was appointed to go into that question. If you have created a Press Council a specific function, to go into the study of development which may tend towards monopoly or concentration of ownership, why did you overstep this Council? Don't you have any confidence in the Press Council? Have you lost your confidence in the Press Council? It looks that there is some kind of side-tracking the Press Council's function. I want to know what happened to the research they mentioned, that they were doing on. Suddenly, after seeing the news that the Government of India is also embarking on this work, they have stopped this function. I want an answer from the hon. Minister whether the Government has lost the confidence in the Press Council.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER Now, we have a Member of the celebrated Committee which is to evolve a machinery for the purpose. I would like to know from him why the Committee has taken such an inordinately long time to come to a decision.

SHRI DINESH CHANDRA GOSWAMI (Gauhati): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the Bill by itself is probably the most non-controversial Bill that the Government has brought during this session. This Bill wants to extend the period of the Press Council and the circumstances necessitating it have already been brought before your notice.

As a Member of the Committee of Members of Parliament, I would say that we are seriously considering about the nature of changes that may be desirable in the Press Council Act, particularly keeping in view the circumstances in which the entire Press Council has been put because that high-powered Committee has refused to function.

15.32 hrs.

[SHRI ISHAQUE SAMBHALI in the Chair].

I can assure you, as a Member of this Committee that it is not because of any default on the part of the Committee or on the part of the Government that there has been delay in bringing the necessary amendments in the Press Council Act.

In the Committee, we have been posed with many problems. One of the problems is that the high-powered Committee which was formed with three illustrious persons, the Chief Justice of India, the Speaker of Lok Sabha and the Chairman of Rajya Sabha, has refused to function because of certain unfortunate controversies.

After that, the Committee has been confronted with various questions. The question is how to maintain the interests of the language papers *vis-à-vis* the English papers on which aspect many Members have spoken and voiced their serious concern. We have also been confronted with a question as to how we can avoid the Press Council being dominated by a big concern, a monopoly concern, or a combination of big concerns. We have been confronted with a question as to

how we can make effective representation in the Press Council of categories of unions or categorised persons who are working in different aspects of press life. Also, we are confronted with a delicate question as to how we can maintain a balance between the independence of the press and the ethical standards of the press. These are such delicate and difficult questions.

SHRI B. V. NAIK: Is there a conflict between the freedom of press and the ethical standard?

SHRI DINESH CHANDRA GOSWAMI: There may be a conflict in the way you look at it. A person may feel, "I have got a freedom of expression and, obviously, my freedom of expression is unlimited and the ethical question should not come in the way." The other view may be that the ethical question should predominate and the freedom of expression becomes a secondary concept. Therefore, while we make a legislation, we ought to maintain a balance between the two extreme views.

Being confronted with these delicate questions, we have thought out various proposals, alternative proposals. But the difficulty is that when we examine any proposal, ultimately, we find that most of the proposals are not very satisfactory to really resolve the problems that we are posed with. It is because of this primarily and because of our serious concern to improve the Press Council Act that there has been some delay in bringing the legislation. As a member of the Committee, I assure the House that we are trying our utmost to come our own conclusions and present our own views before the Government so that the Government may come with a Bill within the next session or so. Though controversies have been raised in this debate which do not really come within the purview of this Bill itself, some aspects of the Press Council have been brought in

[Shri Dinesh Chandra Goswami]

this House and I would like to express my own opinion also on those.

I was listening to the speech of Mr. Jagannathrao Joshi. He spoke a lot about the freedom of press, and ultimately, while concluding, said, 'I am against all sorts of monopoly'. Tomorrow he will find that the content of his speech is completely contradictory to the last sentence which he uttered in his speech.

Now the question comes as to what we mean by the expression 'freedom of press'. I agree, there should not be unreasonable restrictions and limitations on the freedom of expression of the press or any other mass media. The freedom of expression, subject to certain restrictions and limitations placed by the Constitution itself, is a very sacred freedom which the press has. But does it mean that the press should be absolutely free from all sorts of controls? After all, in this country today we should not forget that, having accepted the democratic form of life, the press plays a very dominant role in formulating the opinion of the people and also in leading the country on the path on which we want them to lead this country. There are certain groups or companies which have a dominating control over the press and we cannot permit a monopoly press to continue. We want that the press should be of such a nature that it may project the aspirations and desires of the millions of people who have really no avenues by which they can express themselves. It is the duty of the Government, it is the duty of Parliament, it is the duty of all of us, irrespective of party affiliations, to create a climate in which the mute millions who have no way of expressing themselves may find their expression through the very enlightened press. To that extent, obviously, some sort of limitation or control is necessary.

I am sure, this has been very adequately expressed by the hon. Minister, Shri I. K. Gujral, when he said:

"Freedom of the press does not mean freedom from control, but freedom to write. How could society be indifferent to the influence of the private owners of the press? It is the ownership pattern that is to be controlled and not the written word...."

Another aspect on which we should ponder and to which we should give serious thought is this. In this country, really, has there been a freedom of expression? Whose freedom of expression do we want? We want freedom of expression not of the few businessmen who control the press but we want the freedom of expression of the editors, the enlightened writers. But unfortunately the situation today in this country is such that the voice of the editors is stifled in many cases by the controlling hand of the persons who are controlling the papers. Therefore, if we really want to have freedom of expression through press, we should try to create the climate in which the editors of this country can express their view points without fear or favour, subject, of course, to the restrictions which the Constitution in general public interest has placed.

The next question to which I come and over which perhaps not much attention has been given is the role of press vis-a-vis Parliament. This is one aspect on which I wish to say a line or two. After all, we shall have to admit that all of us feel happy to see our names in the newspapers. Therefore, after delivering speeches here, the first thing that we do in the next morning is to go to the library and see whether our names have appeared or not. This is human psychology. We all like to hear our own voices, we like to see our names in print, we like to see our photos in the papers. (Interruptions) There

are, of course, exceptions. Therefore, the press plays, even indirectly, a very important role in the deliberations of this Parliament. I am trying to focus the attention of the House to a very important aspect. I had the opportunity to attend the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference last time and a very serious question that came up for discussion at that forum was that the standard of Bills and legislation throughout the world was going down day by day. It is not as if in this country alone that the standard of legislation has gone down. Throughout the world today we find that the standard of legislation has gone down and, therefore, probably, year after year, we have to bring amendments after amendments, a feature not only common to this country but common throughout the world. One of the conclusions that we had arrived at was that today if there is any aspect of the parliamentary life which is absolutely neglected by the news media, it is the legislating portion itself. We are here to legislate but I know if you look to the type of publicity that is given, the most serious aspect, that is the legislating part of the legislature, is completely ignored today. That is why today probably in this House we want to spend more time through the Zero Hour and during the rest of the period there is an empty House. This is one of the reasons that even on the most important Bills there are not enough speakers while everybody wants to speak on the most sensational aspects which get cheap and easy publicity. I beg of the members of the news media of this country to ponder over this question. I may be wrong, but if they feel that there is some point in it, it is their duty to see that they can also create a climate by which they can help us in really having a very fruitful and meaningful discussion and deliberation in this House.

The last point to which I wish to draw your attention is this. As you

say we are hard-pressed for time and being myself a fellow Chairman, I do not want to inconvenience you by continuing my speech I thank you for giving me an opportunity. I hope the House will reconsider this question which I have placed before them.

सभापति महोदय : मैं एक घान अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ—इस बिल के निये 2 घन्टे रखे गये थे, वे दो घन्टे हो चुके हैं। मैं दख्खवास्त करूंगा कि जो साहवान बोलने वाले हैं वे वक्ता का लिहाज रखे और कम से कम समय लें।

श्री मधु लिये : मैंने तो 20 मिनट बचाये हैं। मुझे 30 मिनट भाषण करने का अधिकार है, लेकिन मैंने तो 10 मिनट या उस से भी कम समय लिया।

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad): This is a minor piece of legislation and also a harmless measure, it deals with certain difficulties which have come in the way of the Government because of the absence of the nomination committee appointing the members of the Press Council and, therefore, there can hardly be any objection against this Bill as such. But what is objectionable all the same is the manner of the Government resorting to ordinance issuing in this regard.

I can see the difficulties of the Government ..

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI I. K. GUJRAL): This point has been made.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: Let me put it in my style, if I may. The Government of India has a power to make ordinances under the Constitution. But, would the Minister accept the fact that because he has the power, therefore, he will go on using it for any kind of things? Is this

[Shri P. G. Mavalankar]

an emergency? Surely, the Government could have persuaded the authorities concerned to expedite the matter so that they were not put to an unnecessary resort to issuing the ordinance. That is my point. Therefore, I hope in future at least, the Government is not forced or compelled to issue ordinances on such grounds such as the present one, that because of the fact a certain time table was not completed, therefore, in order to meet the emergency situation, 'we are issuing an ordinance' and get it passed by the Parliament. This is not a healthy practice. This is what I want to suggest.

Second thing is my esteemed friend, Shri Goswami, has assured us that the committee will go into the question as quickly as possible. I wish that they will be able to come to some kind of a definite and concrete proposal with regard to the composition of the nominating committee so that this particular difficulty in which the Government finds itself today is not there.

SHRI DINESH CHANDRA GO-SWAMI: We are at the moment discussing whether we should have a Nominating Committee at all or whether we can have some other alternative form by which we can get an atmosphere in which the problem can be solved.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: That answers my point to a certain extent. Having said this, I would say, this measure which has come before us affords us a welcome opportunity of reflecting briefly on the Press Council and its functioning in particular, and the role and value of the free, independent press in general, and on the contribution that the Fourth Estate has to make in any democracy in the world and a developing democracy such as ours.

One may not agree with many things happening in America, and also with the way the American democracy functions. One may have objections and doubts about many things. But on one point everybody, I think, should remain agreed that there is great and undoubted freedom of the press in USA, UK and in many other developed and democratic countries. The recent example of the exit of the American President Mr. Nixon from the White House is a case in point. What do you see? It is ultimately the freedom of the Press which has asserted itself, which has made a significant contribution in regard to the dismissal of the President who was thought to have so much entrenched himself in power that it was difficult to remove him. The role of the press in USA was significant and decisive. It shows what a free, independent newspaper world can do in regard to such unfortunate situation. Now compare that with our country. The situation in our country is far from satisfactory. There are attacks on editorial freedom by the establishment. By establishment, I mean, both Government and the big tycoons of business, managements on the financial side and Government on the political side. The newspapers come under the spell and the overpowering authority of this Establishment. Therefore it is becoming more and more difficult for honest, upright, individual journalists to function independently and without fear or favour.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: The Minister is not listening; he is talking with the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: I don't mind the Minister talking to the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs because in any case I have the satisfaction that what I say...

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: My hon colleague has to reply to the debate and not me.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: has gone on record. Even if I say something to him he is not going to listen to what I say; let him continue his dialogue. My point is this.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I can assure my hon. friend that I have great respect for his wisdom and whenever he says something I always listen. Whenever I am unable to listen even then I respect him all the same. I wish to assure him that whatever he has said, I have listened and if I have missed anything, I will also read that.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: I do not object myself; I was only referring to what Mr. Somnath Chatterjee was objecting.

The journalists' duty is to write without fear or favour. A genuine journalist has to undergo various hazardous duties. There are all kinds of risks which are involved. There is, as it were, a sword constantly hanging; there is so to say, a certain in security. That is why Press has to be protected and its freedom preserved in terms of freedom of the Press, with great care and attention. Let me refer to certain events in Ahmedabad earlier this month. Newspapermen had gone to the Gujarat Governor's Adviser's house, Mr. Sarin's house, in Ahmedabad.

And when 25 of them went, not only did the Adviser not come out to listen to their grievance, but the police instead lathicharged the 25 newsmen and one of them got seriously injured. Upto this date, there is no definite inquiry that has come out. If newspaper men are men who are going to write something which is inconvenient and awkward to the authority that be, then instead of rewarding them, if you are going to punish them for such writing—they are doing their job which they are supposed to do—then that is indeed sad. Everywhere and especially in Gujarat you will find the trouble as there is in last few days or so. Probably, that is the position

not only in Ahmedabad but everywhere else, too. What happened yesterday in Ahmedabad or day before yesterday or what will happen tomorrow is also something worth observing, and it shows that there is this kind of uneasy and uncomfortable feeling that obtains between the citizens and ordinary people on the one hand and the police and the authorities on the other. It is only when the police and the authorities try to strangle the people, and try to strangle the freedom and rights of the people that situations of this sort are created. On some flimsy grounds some are arrested—it may be right or wrong—and even on superficial grounds they are arrested. My information is this. A young cloth merchant in Ahmedabad was arrested on grounds of "teasing" a daughter of a police inspector. This was alleged to have happened. But it was not true, and there was so much of disturbance that followed. That is all due to the fact that there is not that climate of confidence and understanding between the authorities on the one hand and the citizens on the other. For the press, I say that the press media and the press publicity are vital in a democracy. But what we find in India is that attempts are being made continuously by the Governments to shackle and fetter the press and the journalists. Attempts are made to brisk and even banish them? on editorial freedom by big tycoons of business and they punish the journalists. So, we must stand up and speak up against such atrocious attacks on our Press and Pressmen. It is here precisely, that the Press councils duties become significant and crucial.

Lastly, I request my hon. friend to consider one thing. I would like to make a few of suggestions. Can you really think of any better nominating committee—stronger and more acceptable—than the one consisting of Vice-President (Chairman of Rajya Sabha), Speaker and Chief Justice? It is better to have a committee consisting of these three people. Around these

[Shri P. G. Mavalankar]

three persons' names have been woven so well and firmly during these last twentyseven years the traditions of integrity, impartiality and independence that there can be reasonable assurance that they can make a good choice of the Members of the Press Council. Moreover, if the Press Council has to function better, and if it has to function effectively on its own, I would suggest to Government that they come forward with some kind of a small amendment saying that criticism of this nominating Committee shall not be permitted or even if there be criticism it shall be fair criticism. You can put in some kind of a reasonable restraint, so that unfair criticism is avoided. I am not saying anything with regard to decision making or selection-making power as such

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE:
How will they decide that? If there are 20 names, how will they select out of them?

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR:
Obviously they will decide on the basis of their general competence and experience. These three honourable men are highly respected and have the traditions of integrity, impartiality and independence. After all, you have to put faith in some kind of a machinery. Lastly, I want to suggest that the Press Council should not have any punitive powers. They should not punish anybody. Let them of course be free to pass any moral strictures on the wrong doers. That would be enough. We have seen that even in a developing democracy, public opinion will have its own effect. But I hope Shri Gujral will see to it that the amendment that he brings forward will be such that the Press Council has some powers of even summoning the parties concerned. Today, the difficulty is that the Press Council cannot summon. You would have heard that in Haryana, in connection with certain cases, the Press Council wanted the Haryana Govern-

ment definitely to send their representatives to give evidence. In particular they wanted Shri Bansi Lal, the Chief Minister or his representative to give evidence before them. I was told that nobody from Haryana Government came before the Press Council for giving evidence. If the Press Council are not able to summon anybody, then how can they proceed further? So, if you can give some powers to the Press Council for summoning, then the functioning of the Press Council would really prove more helpful and the freedom of the Press will have greater meaning and greater significance.

श्रीपरिपूर्णानन्द पंमूली (टिहरी गढ़वाल):

महापति जी, जो ममला बहुत माधारण और आसन या उसका ग्रहमवाह तूल दे दिया गया। प्रेम कोमिन की अवधि को बढ़ाने की बात थी। आवश्यकता इस बात की थी कि पिछले सेशन में ही इसकी अवधि बढ़ाने की तजवीज सरकार की तरफ से पेश की जाती और इसको 31 दिसम्बर, 1974 तक के लिए बढ़ा दिया जाना बजाये एक आइनेन्स इश्यु करने के। इस कमेटी के एक सदस्य ने जो राज्य सभा के हैं उन्होंने कहा कि इतना समय बढ़ाने की कोई जरूरत नहीं थी, उन्होंने कहा हमारी कोई दिलचस्पी नहीं है, हम हिस्सा नहीं ले पाते हैं। राष्ट्रपति तक के चुनाव के लिए जब 15 दिन का समय काफी रहता है तो क्या इसके बेयरमैन की नियुक्ति करने और इसके सदस्यों की नियुक्ति करने के लिए इतना लम्बा चौड़ा समय देने और इतना अधिक पैसा खर्च करने की आवश्यकता है? और मैं इसको छोड़ता हूँ।

यहां पर हमारे कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने फ्रीडम ऑफ प्रेस की बात कही है। प्रेस काउंसिल विधेयक में, उसके सेक्शन (2) में, इसके उद्देश्यों की व्याख्या करते हुए कहा गया है :

"That the object of the Council shall be to preserve the freedom of the Press and maintain and improve the standards of the newspapers in India."

यह बहुत अच्छी बात है, प्रेस की स्वतन्त्रता होनी चाहिए। किन्तु वह लोग जो गल्ले के व्यापार की स्वतन्त्रता गल्ला व्यापारियों को देने की बात करते हैं, जब वही लोग प्रेस की स्वतन्त्रता की बात करते हैं तो हम समझते हैं कि उनका अर्थ क्या है।

आप किसी भी दिन का अखबार देख ले किमी महीने या किमी हफ्ते का अखबार देख ले, अपवाद-स्वरूप दो एक अखबारों को छोड़ कर, कोई भी अखबार ऐसा नहीं होगा जिसमें कालम के कालम कांग्रेस और सरकार की आलोचना में न रगे गए हों। दुहाई यह दी जाती है कि कांग्रेस ने प्रेस का गला घोट रखा है, प्रेस की स्वतन्त्रता छीन रखी है। 1971 के चुनाव में कांग्रेस के विरुद्ध जिस तरह का प्रचार किया गया, 1972 के चुनाव में जिस तरह का प्रचार किया गया, पिछली बार यू० पी० असेम्बली के चुनाव में बड़े बड़े मानापोली प्रेसज ने जिस तरह से कांग्रेस के विरुद्ध प्रचार किया वह किमी से भी छिगा हुआ नहीं है। अभी राष्ट्रपति के चुनाव में अभी हमारे जनसंघ के एक महान नेता जोशी जी भाषण दे रहे थे, उनके "मदरलैंड" ने जिन प्रकार का कम्प्युनल प्रचार किया है और जिस प्रकार की अनर्गल

बातें कही वह किसी से भी छिपी हुई नहीं है। अगर शासन चाहे तो इस प्रकार के अखबारों को बन्द किया जा सकता है। किसी दूसरे देश में इस प्रकार की बातें अखबारों में छपती तो मैं समझता हूँ उनको बन्द कर दिया जाता। मैं तो समझता हूँ हमारे देश में प्रेस स्वतन्त्रता आवश्यकता से अधिक है जिसका दुरुपयोग बहुत से अखबार वाले करते हैं।

यह भी कहा जाता है कि एडवर्टीजमेंट देकर अखबारों को खरीदने का काम किया जाता है। स्वयं विरोधी दल के एक सदस्य ने कहा है कि 65 करोड़ रूपए का कुल बजट अखबारों के विज्ञापनों के लिए होता है जिसमें से केन्द्रीय सरकार, प्रान्तीय सरकारें और जिनकी पब्लिक सेक्टर अन्डरटेकिंग है उन सभी का मिलाकर 5 करोड़ का बजट होता है तो 5 करोड़ रूपया खर्च करके केन्द्रीय सरकार, प्रान्तीय सरकारें और पब्लिक सेक्टर अन्डरटेकिंग कितने प्रेसज को खरीद सकती है ? इसलिये यह कहना भी सर्वथा गलत है।

अब रही अखबारी बागज के कोटे की बात को 20 अखबार ऐसे हैं देश में जिनका 90 प्रतिशत भाग बागज का कोटा होता है। 20 साल पहले 1954 में जब प्रेस कोमिल बनी थी उस समय 20 सबसे ऊंचे चाटी के अखबारों का जो मकुलेशन था वह आज 10 चाटी के अखबारों का मकुलेशन हो गया है। इसलिये मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ यह कहना सरामर गलत है कि सरकार अखबारों पर अकुश लगाना चाहती है या उनका मुह बन्द करना चाहती है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ हमारे सूचना

श्री परिपूर्णानन्द पन्थली

एवं प्रसारण मन्त्री अनेक बार कह चुके हैं कि मानोपोली हाउसेज से अखबारों को मुक्त करना चाहते हैं, यह सरकार की नीति है जिसका तीन साल से वादा हो रहा है किन्तु अभी तक इस बात को कार्य रूप में परिणत करते हुए नहीं देखा है। इसका परिणाम यह हुआ है कि वा. प्रजाशी प्रकाशक हैं जिनकी दशा बहुत खराब है, 5-6 साल से उनका वेतन बढ़ाने की बात हो रही है किन्तु मानोपोली प्रेस उस पर कोई ध्यान नहीं देते हैं। मानोपोली अपने स्वार्थ सिद्धि के लिए, अपने प्रचार के लिए और अपनी लाबी बनाये रखने के लिए प्रेस को अपने पास रखते हैं। वे नहीं चाहते हैं कि वकिंग जर्नलिस्ट्स श्रमजीवी पत्रकारों की दशा सुधरे। वे भले ही श्रमजीवी पत्रकारों की दिशा सुधारने की बात करें परन्तु यह निश्चित बात है कि मानोपोली हाउसेज श्रमजीवी पत्रकारों के हित की बात नहीं करेंगे। इसलिए मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जो हमारे श्रमजीवी पत्रकार हैं या अखबार में काम करने वाले दूसरे सम्पादक हैं उनके हितों की रक्षा के लिए इस प्रेस कोमिल का अधिक शक्तिशाली बनाने जाने की आवश्यकता है।

16.00 hrs.

एक अन्तिम बात और कह देना चाहता हूँ कि प्रेस की स्वतंत्रता के नाम पर छोटे छोटे अखबारों को तरजीह देने की बात की जाती है। इन अखबारों में कई ऐसे हैं जो ब्लैक मेलिंग से काम चलाते हैं जैसे उत्तर प्रदेश में एक एक जिले में 10, 10, 20, 20 अखबार निकलते हैं जिन का सर्कुलेशन 50 भी नहीं है। उन को

रिश्त देकर के जो चाहें छपा सकते हैं, जिस की चाहें इमेज खराब करा सकते हैं। इस प्रकार से जो ब्लैकमेलिंग करने वाले पत्रकार हैं उन को इस पवित्र व्यवस्था से दूर करने की आवश्यकता है तभी स्वस्थ प्रेस बन सकता है।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस का समर्थन करता हूँ।

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): I have absolutely no doubt that the time has come when we must set up another Press Commission. The first Press Commission was appointed about 22 years back. During this period, enough experience has been garnered in the light of which the constitution and the functions of the press council could be reviewed. That has happened in the United Kingdom also, that from time to time Press Commissions have been appointed, and I should think that Government would address themselves to this problem now after 22 years.

Broadly, what has been our experience during this long interval? Our experience has been that the press council cannot function properly so long as the suppressed-council of Mr. Gujral functions, reinforced by the sup-press-lords in the sphere of business and industry. That was what had happened during the course of the railway strike. During the railway strike, all kinds of reprehensible hoardings and pamphlets were brought out and publicity materials were brought out by Government. But Government were not satisfied with them at all and they invoked the assistance of the FICCI. Government did depend upon their own enormous resources in the matter of publicity but they had also invoked the assistance of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry to support them in their endeavour to malign the striking railway employees. That is what has happened. So, does it lie in

the mouth of my hon. friends from the other side to say that the businessmen and the industrialists happened to be on the other side? Here is a clear example where the apex body of industry and business, namely the FICCI came to their help and rescue at the time of the railway strike. We can produce before you here all the boardings and pamphlets that were produced by the FICCI on that occasion.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajpur): We must salute Mrs. Gandhi.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: I have spoken about the sup-pressed-council of Mr. Gujral functioning at the Central level, but they have got their own subedars at the State level. One of the subedars is very near to the capital city of Delhi, that is, the subedar in Chaudhary Bansi Lal. You know how the press council had passed strictures on that Government, but those strictures have remained completely sterile. Why did not my hon. friends on the other side, if they were champions of liberty and freedom of the press, address themselves to this task? What exactly have they done? When we used to function in the united body of the Congress, we did take up such matters in our general body meeting or in the executive committee meetings. Now, during these days of the supreme leadership of the Prime Minister, nobody can speak out his mind.

That is how their party is functioning. Why are they not pulling up this sup-press-lord called Chaudhary Bansi Lal? Mr. Ghafoor's regime in Bihar has been responsible for the worst kind of atrocities on two important newspapers from which we derived inspiration all these days—I am speaking of the *Searchlight* and *Pradeep*—since independence and even before. Why have these people not taken any action against Mr. Ghafoor? If the people of Bihar have risen against the regime there, it is because they have found some fault with it. And look at the complacency of some of the hon.

members on the other side when they say that the movement in Bihar is fizzling out. In the very first week or probably first two weeks of the movement, you had to dismiss 34 out of the 46 Ministers. Who made you dismiss them? Did you dismiss them of your own sweet will? You had to do it under the pressure that was building up because of the movement.

Later on notifications in regard to the bye-elections to fill vacancies were announced. But you had to withdraw the notifications. You did not have the courage to face those bye-elections. And yet you are sitting here and speaking in these terms. These are the people who are going to kill this Government, the sycophantic and flattering type. Mrs. Gandhi must realise that it is frauds, flatters and sycophants like this who are going to undo them.

Therefore, I would say that if they had really any love for freedom of the press, they would have pulled up Mr. Ghafoor for what he has done.

Even my hon. friend, the Railway Minister, has publicly condemned the delisting of *The Searchlight* and the *Pradeep*. He is a member of the Council of Ministers here, The President of the State Unit of their party, Shri Sitaram Kesri, who happens to be a member of the other House, has also condemned the delisting of these two papers. And yet Shri Gujral would not open his mouth. They would not do anything about it. The entire world has risen against this kind of treatment meted out to these two papers. Their own men are rising against it. They are important persons. And yet they would not do any thing about it.

You know to what kind of arson and vandalism these two papers were subjected to. And yet why did this Government not institute a judicial inquiry because freedom of the press should be the concern and responsibility of the Centre. They should have

[Shri Shyam Nandan Mishra]

instituted a judicial inquiry, let alone what is being done by the Press Council. I have no doubt the Press Council would be giving its most impartial and judicial verdict in this matter, but this Government has failed to do anything in that respect to mollify public opinion.

Similarly, as has been very rightly pointed out by my hon. friend, Shri Madhu Lumaye, there is another subedar in Punjab, Mr. Zail Singh who has cut off the electricity connection to *Hind Samachar* and *Punjab Kesari*. This is what is happening.

Then you also must have read in the newspapers—I am concluding; I am almost speaking at supersonic speed—what is happening in the city of Jamshedpur. The journalists are living in a kind of terroristic atmosphere. One was killed earlier. The Government would not do anything about it.

My submission is that if you really mean sincerely by the freedom of the press, then, you must take one or two steps. One is, whatever subsidies given by this Government to the agencies or to any newspaper in any form should not be their sole responsibility and even if it is their responsibility as Government, then, the Press Council must give its report on the manner in which the subsidy is being dispensed with by this Government every year. They must give not only the report. These are the main key elements which would determine the real content of the freedom of the Press. Similarly, with regard to the paper, the newsprint that is given to the press, in that matter also, there should be a report from the Press Council and so also in the matter of advertisements. If it is only to the extent of Rs. 5 crores that the Government has dispensed with in the matter of advertisements that should be subject to some kind of control, at least normative and regulative control, of the Press Council. They will lay

down norms and they will also give their opinions how advertisements have been given to the various newspapers and so on. Finally, that should be supported by some body at the Parliamentary level. If Parliament of India is really the guardian of the freedom of the people and of the Press then, there must be a supporting body here, which would look into the reports of the Press Council closely and which would also bring to the notice of Parliament, whether the reports of the Press Council have been seriously attended to or not. Then, it should be the first concern of the Minister of Information and Broadcasting to see that the reports submitted by the Press Council are annually discussed by Parliament separately; not only as a part of the functioning of this Ministry. In fact, it sounds rather strange that the Press Council's reports should be considered to be part of the normal functioning of this Ministry. They must receive a separate and exclusive consideration by Parliament annually on a particular date. These are my few submissions.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI DHARAM BIR SINHA): Mr. Chairman, Sir, this has been a very wide ranging debate. Problems relating to interference in the running of newspapers, attack on individual journalists, monopoly nature of the Press, state of journalism, wrong doing by journalists, ethical behaviour, yellow journalism, diffusion and de-linking etc, have all been touched in this debate. As I said in the beginning, this debate had a very limited objective of extending the life of the Press Council. But, I welcome this opportunity to clarify certain points. To begin with, I would like to refer to the point mentioned by Mr. Joshi and Mr. Mavalankar about the need to bring forward this Ordinance, and whether we could have possibly avoided the extension of the life of the Press Council through an Ordinance. I would say, in mitigation—of

course, it would have been better if it had been possible for us to avoid extending the life of the Press Council through an Ordinance—that we had expected that the Committee of Members of Parliament would be able to complete its work in time and we would be able to come before Parliament with a Bill on the recommendations of the Committee.

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI: It is a reflection on the working of the Committee.

SHRI DHARAM BIR SINHA: No, Sir. Not a reflection I said in mitigation. We would have wanted to come with the Bill itself, but it has taken us more time than we had anticipated. Another point which I would, in the very beginning, like to refer is the point made by Mr. Madhu Limaye. This is about censorship. We are against either overt or covert censorship, not only in relation to the Press, against direct or indirect censorship not only in relation to the Press, but also—as mentioned by Mr. Madhu Limaye—in relation to theatre or any other media. I would like to say this that anyone who is aware of Indian history would at all times stand against any sort of censorship in relation of thoughts. We have had a very sad experience in Indian history, when knowledge itself had been denied to many. It is not only a commitment of my party as such, but it is a national commitment, in relation to both our present need, and the Indian history itself that no censorship, direct or indirect, covert or overt, is introduced in any medium of expression to throttle ideas. I hope the voice of sanity raised by Shri Madhu Limaye in relation to theatre, will be attended to by the Delhi Administration. It was the Jan Santh who introduced this procedure of demanding submission of the script for drama and theatre to the administration for clearance.

श्री मधु लिमये : यह अच्छी खबर मिली है कि जन संघ के कदमों पर ही ये

लोग चलते हैं। फिर जन संघ को गाली क्यों देते हैं।

श्री इय्याम नन्धन लिमये : कभी चौ० चरण सिंह के चरणों पर और कभी जन संघ के चरणों पर।

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री (श्री आई० के० गुजराल) : असल में बात यह है कि श्री जाशी फ्रीडम आफ एक्सप्रेशन के लिए बड़े बराड थे ...

श्री मधु लिमये : जन संघ प्रशासन ने ऐसा किया तो कोई अच्छा तो नहीं किया।

श्री आई० के० गुजराल : अनफार्चुनेटली जन संघ के प्रशासन ने भारत के इतिहास में पहली दफा थेंटर पर प्रतिबन्ध लगाना शुरू किया। पहले कभी नहीं होता था ऐसा। हमारी एजेंशन इस तरफ दिलाई है अब और हम पूरा स्पॉर्ट करते हैं उन थॉट्स को जो लिमये जी ने जाहिर किए हैं थेंटर के मुताल्लिक और खाम कर स्टेंज के मुताल्लिक। हम भी यही चाहते हैं कि उनको पूरी आजादी होनी चाहिये और मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो एमेच्योर थेंटर पर एट्रेंटेनमेंट टैक्स लगाता है वह नहीं लगना चाहिये।

SHRI DHARAM BIR SINHA: We want not only a free press but a lively, prosperous and diversified press to inform the public on current affairs and express opinion which would stimulate and strengthen democracy in this country. Freedom and independence of press should also include the variety of newspapers available to readers. Freedom should not only mean that the press should not be beholden to the Government and I must repudiate any suggestion that Government has brought at any time any pressure on any newspaper. Press freedom should be the freedom not only of those who own and produce papers but of the reading public as well. We consider that an important component of the freedom of the press is the freedom of choice of the readers to select their newspapers. Dependence on industrial

[Shri Dharam Bir Sinha]

interests which to a very large extent is relevant the situation in India, has limited variety amongst newspapers. Unfortunately the trend in concentration of ownership has strengthened during the last 20 years since the Press Commission submitted its report in 1954. In 1954, 15 newspaper concerns controlled 51.1 per cent of the total circulation of newspapers. Today, 20 years later, only 7 papers control 51.1 per cent of the total circulation. Among English newspapers, it is only 7 owners who control 82.2 per cent of the entire English newspaper circulation in the country. In the various other languages, the situation is as bad. The problem of concentration of ownership and monopoly which has been raised in this debate is very valid. I can assure the House that whatever delay has been there in bringing a measure about delinking of newspapers has arisen from the Supreme Court judgment. There is a Committee which is examining the various aspects of it, the examination of the judgment of the Supreme Court, which is very voluminous which gives so many pronouncements, will be completed soon and I hope we will be able to finalise the measure before long.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra referred to the need for a second Press Commission. We do not think we need a second Press Commission now. The first Press Commission's report is very much valid even today. So, instead of going through the broad canvas of the press again, our strategy is to have expert groups to deal with specific areas.

At one level we are considering the delinking of the press from big monopoly houses. Then, we have a committee which is going into the economics of newspapers. We are also thinking of another group to go into the question of machinery and other plant weeded in the printing trade and in newspaper production. When these reports come in, when their recom-

mendations are available, along with the Press Council, we hope that we would be able to get a fair idea of what needs to be done, in the background of the canvas of the recommendations already made by the Press Commission.

I would like the House to acknowledge that the press today is also a power. Because, in a democratic structure it is not only the various organs of the State which constitute power but the press itself also, constitutes power. When we discuss power relationship in any democratic society, we have to consider power in terms of responsibility and accountability. Parliament is generally accountable to the Indian masses, to the electorate. As Baldwin said, in another context in England, real power is available for the responsibility owned. In this context we have to accept the fact that the press is accountable to the general good of the country and the general good of the Indian masses.

Shri Maran raised the problem of free flow of information standard of newspapers, and sensationalism and blackmailing which is growing in the Indian press. I accept that this is happening. That is endemic sin is developing in Indian journalism today. It hints more than it says. There is more of innuendoes and smear than direct accusation. I would not say that most of the Indian press is involved in it but, as Shri Maran said, a certain percentage to the Indian press does things like this.

I would like only to refer to the very disgraceful way in which one Karnataka Minister was hounded out from his office. It was more by a smear; it was more by an innuendo; it was more by a campaign of vilification, without making a direct charge. I think, here again, the role of the Press Council becomes more valid. (Interruptions) Whatever be the political conflict within a political party, we are discussing here the role of the press in a particular situation.

As I said, in a democracy like ours, we cannot adopt a value free method of judging the press, of press reporting or other aspects of journalism, because value free method, I consider is a myth and is a very dangerous myth. In reality it does not fit with any theory or the needs of a changing society.

Another point that I would like to refer to is the one raised by Mr. Jagannathrao Joshi and some other Members about Haryana, Bihar and Punjab incidents. These are within the jurisdiction of the State Governments. I would not like to comment on them in this House, in this forum, on subject in which the State legislature by itself is sovereign. The Press Council has been formed and it is there. They have given their judgment in cases referred to them. To that extent, the purpose of bringing the Press Council Act and creating the Press Council has been fulfilled. I am sure, whatever the complaint against the Bihar Government is, which is pending before the Press Council, the Press Council will go into it as it went into Haryana complaint.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: The question is, if the Press Council does find a State Government responsible for anti-press activities, will there be a censoring power on the part of the Press Council or the Central Government which is in overall control of press matters? This is a more fundamental point. I would request the hon. Minister to deal with it.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: It is a fundamental point. It is for this House also to address itself to. Do we or do we not wish to give to the Press Council the authority? Do we wish that the Press Council should function only as an opinion-making, opinion-forming body? Do we want the Press Council to enforce a decision by an authority? It is not a question of the Government or this side of the House to de-

cide. It is an issue on which the nation must make up its mind....

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Can't you place the reports of the Press Council with a moral authority? Don't you have any moral authority?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: But the basic issue is, whether to provide teeth to the Press Council. By and large, both in the press and outside, a general opinion has been that it is not good for us to give teeth to the Press Council.

It is also a fact, whereas I agree that the Press Council should look into wherever the freedom of the press is compromised, that this House and the other House have set up a Press Council. This is something on which the nation as a whole has to make up its mind. Basically, the State Government is responsible to its own legislature. I think, these things do matter.

My general opinion, as a citizen of India, is that whenever the Press Council has made observations either about a paper or about a State Government or about a State authority or about any form of authority, I think, it has had its effect and every effect is not just legally enforceable. In a democratic society, opinion-making is a very strong thing I think, my hon. friend, Shri Shyamnandan Mishra should be satisfied with that. It is a very good thing that is happening.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: How do you act in order to create that public opinion? The Press Council must be supported by the Government of India. Otherwise, it has no sanction behind it.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: It is an unusual thing in India that we have set up the Press Council by an Act of Parliament. Normally Press Councils are set up...

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: We know that.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: All right. That is number one.

Secondly, please do not forget the basic philosophy of the Press Council. The basic philosophy is that there is the judgment by the fellow peers. Therefore, when they sit in judgment of an act of Government which is not represented on that, the limitations are bound to be there. It is not that I want the Government to be represented. But some limitations will have to be reckoned with and also, I think, whatever the Press Council might say about an act of Government

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Only one word. The journalists have to submit to the censure of the Press Council but the Government cannot be subjected to the censure of the Press Council. Is there not gross inequality in this? How are courts putting up with such a situation?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: This is a wrong impression. He was saying, 'Journalists have to submit'. There is no such thing as 'have to'. I am aware of a newspaper in this country which was censured six or seven times and he did not care at all. (Interruptions)

MR CHAIRMAN: No dialogue please. Mr. Dharam Bir Sinha, please try to conclude.

SHRI DHARAM BIR SINHA: At this stage I would not go into the Constitutional problem of the sovereignty of the State Legislature as far as the functions of the State Governments are concerned. As the Parliament is sovereign in its own area and powers given by the Constitution, the State Legislatures are sovereign in their own areas. I would not like to go into the details of the Constitutional position. This is not the occa-

sion to go into the various divisions of power which the Indian Constitution has provided.

But I would like to refer to the speech made by Shri Vayalar Ravi about the growing monopoly in the Indian press. While I completely endorse his sentiments about the danger to freedom of opinion and danger to the variety of opinion from the growth of concentration in press, I would like to point out that the biggest danger to the freedom of press in this country is not from Government but from the market economy under which the newspapers are at the moment working. This operation, of market economy itself is leading towards concentration, and I hope that this House, this Parliament, would give due consideration to this problem. An hon member referred to about Rs 60 crores of advertisement budget of the private sector as compared to Rs 5 crores of the public sector advertisement budget which include the advertisement budgets of the State Governments, and the Central Government and of the entire public sector undertakings. The difference between the budgets of Rs 60 crores and Rs 5 crores can be easily understood. I need not dwell on that very long. The only point that I would like to make is that these Rs 60 crores of advertisement budget go to certain papers because of the market economy in this country, because the advertisers happen to aim at certain target areas and only certain papers are serving those target areas.

I am sorry, I have taken so much of time. I would like to dwell more on other aspects, but I can see that I have taken more time. I do not want to hold up the other business of the House and I hope that the House will approve and pass this Bill.

SHRI JAGANNATH BAO (Chatrepur): May I know the policy of the Government with regard to giving advertisements especially to newspapers which are published from more than

one place? For example, the Indian Express is published from six places, The Statesman from three places and the Times of India from two places. Is it the policy of the Government to give six advertisements if a newspaper is published from six places?

SHRI I K GUJRAL The policy regarding this is very simple. With regard to advertisements we have got differential rates system so far as the papers which are published from more than one place. We have got a rate for one place as well as rates for 2 places and 3 places etc. Whatever advertisements are given, it may be according to the number of places

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola) In the light of our policy for economy in the country, are you thinking in terms of reducing the advertisements given to the Press? You yourself said that out of Rs 60 crores, advertisement revenue Rs 5 crores are spent by the Government. If the size of the advertisement is a full-page or half a page, can you think of that the matter may be the same but the size is reduced so that you save some money for the country?

SHRI I K GUJRAL I think one thing I might clarify. My hon colleague has rightly said that the public sector budget is Rs 5 crores. It does not mean that the Government of India spends Rs 5 crores on advertisements. The DAVP budget is approximately Rs 17 or 18 crores.

So far as the utilisation of the space is concerned and the material published, depending upon the subject and the area to be covered, we may select the size. I might clarify that advertisements is neither an instrument of policy nor an instrument of subsidy.

श्री कृष्ण लालजी सभापति महोदय, यह सुनकर मुझे खशी हुई कि दिल्ली के थियेटर के संबंध में जो समस्याएँ हैं उन के बारे में मंत्री महोदय कोई ठोस कार्यवाही करने जा रहे हैं। इन्होंने जनसंघ के प्रकाशन को तो

दोष दिया, लेकिन मागे राम का प्रकाशन क्या करना है—इस का उन्होंने कोई जवाब नहीं दिया है। लेकिन मैं इन के धाड़वाहन को मान कर चलता हूँ और धाड़वाहन करता हूँ कि इस तरह की शिकायतें करने का फिर हमको ये लोग अवसर नहीं देगे।

सभापति महोदय, समाचार भारती का मामला एक धर्म में चल रहा है—मैं यह एक नया विषय उठा रहा हूँ आप इस का उन्मुख यह रीटिंग में कीजिये—यह मामला खतरे में खाली नहीं है—क्योंकि इस का संबंध इन्दर गुजराल से है। समाचार भारती का जो इन्तजाम है, वह बहुत ही खराब है। उनके चेयरमैन श्री जय प्रकाश जी ने वदन पहले ही इन्तीफा दे दिया था, क्योंकि उन को समय नहीं मिलता था और वे इस पर ध्यान नहीं दे सकने थे। यह भी दर लगता है—यदि मैं इन को लिख नो फिर ये इस तरह से इन्तजाम करेगे कि मजिन्स होगा, उस को पूरी अपनी ही जेन्सी बनावेगे। लेकिन इसमें सदेह नहीं कि यह मामला खतरे में खाली नहीं है। जहाँ मैं चाहता हूँ कि उस की इन्तजामी का कोई उपाय किया जाय, साथ साथ मैं यह भी चाहता हूँ कि समाचार भारती का इस तरह में पुनर्गठन किया जाय कि सरकारी नियन्त्रण उस में न आय। मैं इस बात पर बहुत जोर देना चाहता हूँ। जहाँ मैं बदइन्तजामी का विरोध करता हूँ, वहाँ इस का फायदा उठाकर, आप उस पर हावी हैं यह मैं नहीं चाहता। आपसे बड़ा सावधान रहना पड़ता है, खास कर इन्दर गुजराल जी से। जैसे—

सबु प्रेस मुसल प्रेस

इस का मुसल प्रेस जायगा। यह मैं विनम्र नहीं चाहता हूँ। इसके बारे में समय हो तो यह जयप्रकाश जी से बात करे।

श्री आई० के० गुप्तावरल : आप बात करे।

श्री सबु लियेये आरका खान करने में क्या रिश्कत है ? क्या आपको इन्दिग जी डाट एगो ? समाचार भागनी के बारे में प्रेम स्वतन्त्रता के लिये और पत्रकारों के बुनियादी हितों की रक्षा के लिये यदि आप उनसे बात करेंगे तो प्रधान मंत्री शायद नागब नहीं होगी। आप डरते क्यों हैं। अगर मुझे मौका मिला तो मैं भी बात करूँगा।

सभापति महोदय सबु लियेये जी ने जो रेज्यूशन पेश किया है पहले मैं उसको मजदूरों के लिये हाउस के मामले पेश करूँगा।

सवाल यह है

This House disapproves of the Press Council (Amendment) Ordinance, 1974 (Ordinance No 3 1974) promulgated by the President on the 28th June 1974 "

The motion was negatived

सभापति महोदय अब मैं प्रेम कमिशन (अमेन्डमेन्ट) बिल, 1974 पर गौर करने के लिये जो प्रस्ताव है उसको पेश करूँगा।

सवाल यह है

That the Bill further to amend the Press Council Act 1965 as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration "

The motion was adopted

सभापति महोदय इस बिल में कोई एमूड-मेंट्स पेश नहीं किये गये हैं इसलिये मैं क्लॉर्कजी की मजूरी के लिये पेश करूँगा।

सवाल यह है

"That Clauses 2 to 4 Clause 1 the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill "

The motion was adopted

Clause 2 to 4, Clause 1, Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill

SHRI DHARAM BIR SINHA I beg to move

'That the Bill be passed

MR. CHAIRMAN Motion moved

"That the Bill be passed "

Shri Sarjoo Pandey

श्री सरजू पांडे (बाबूतपुर) : सभापति महोदय मैं समझता हूँ वर्गीय समाज में जहाँ पञ्जीपनि हैं और मजदूर हैं वहाँ प्रेम की स्वतन्त्रता नाम की कोई चीज नहीं है। मेरे खयाल में हमारे देश में उन्होंने पेंस को निकलन का आजादी होनी चाहिए जो देश के मजदूर वर्ग के उम्पीडन शोषण अत्याचार का वर्णन करते हैं। हम इसी तरह की प्रेम कमिशन का भी गठन करना चाहिए जोकि इस उद्देश्य की पूर्ति कर सके। प्रेम स्वतन्त्रता के नाम पर तमाम तरह के रूढ़ी और खराब लोगों को इस बात का अधिकार देना कि वे मजदूरों के हितों का विरोध कर समाजवाद की बुनियादी नीतियों का विरोध करें और देश में पञ्जीवादी अर्थ-व्यवस्था का प्रचार करें—इस तरह को आजादी का कोई अर्थ कम से कम मैं मानूँगा।

नहीं समझता है। यह बात मैं इसलिए कहना हूँ कि जो भी भ्रष्टाचार है उसको धाप देखें कि वह कितना गम्भीर, झूठा और बाह्यमान प्रचार करने है लेकिन जो सही बातें हैं जैसे रजबूगो के उत्पीड़न, भ्रष्टाचार और शोषण की बातें हैं या देश के लिए जो कांस्ट्रिक्टिव काम हैं उनके लिए भ्रष्टाचारों में कोई स्थान नहीं रहता। ना मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस बिन्दु में ता' सिर्फ नैशनल के टाइम एक्मटेशन का सवाल है लेकिन अगर हम देश में सही माने में समाजवाद माना है तो उन तरह का बाता-छरण तैयार करना होगा। हम देखते हैं कि जनता बुराई जन्दी सीखती है अगर बुरा बातों का प्रचार किया जाये तो बटो में ही वह सारे देश में फैल जाती है लेकिन भ्रष्टाचार का प्रचार करना सम्भव नहीं हो पाता है। इसलिए स्वतन्त्रता के नाम पर, बिचार स्वतन्त्रता प्रेम स्वतन्त्रता और दूसरी तमाम तरह का स्वतन्त्रता—यह स्वतन्त्रता देश को कहा न जायेगी—यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। स्वतन्त्रता का भी कोई अर्थ होना चाहिए। आप बिचार स्वतन्त्रता देने के लिए तैयार हैं दुनिया का कोई पूँजीवादी वर्ग इसको देने के लिए तैयार नहीं है। यह बिचार स्वतन्त्रता और दुनिया भर की स्वतन्त्रता का झूठा नारा दिया गया है। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप कोई ऐसा कांस्ट्रिक्टिव बिल लावें जिसमें देश में सही माने में मजदूर वर्ग के हित में बात करने वाले भ्रष्टाचार छू सकें। आज के भ्रष्टाचार आजादा के नाम पर दुनिया भर की फिजूल बवाल की बातें छापते हैं पैसा लेकर लोगों की बातें छापते हैं बिम्बा का गाली दिलाता हो तो पैसा दे दो

वह छाप दिया जायेगा, किसी की, बुराई करानी हो तो पैसा दे दो वह छाप दिया जायेगा इसी तरह से मुझे मालूम है कांग्रेस में एक गुट दूसरे गुट को गाली देने के लिए भ्रष्टाचार के लोगों को घर पर बुलाकर खाना खिनाता है, चाय पिनाता है। (अध्यक्षान) आप लोग क्यों टल्का कर रहे हैं? मैं वह कह रहा हूँ कि स्वतन्त्रता के नाम पर भ्रष्टाचारों में इस तरह की बानें छपी जाती हैं इसलिए भ्रष्टाचार बड़ी रहने चाहिए जो कि देश की बुनियादी नीतियों का प्रचार करे और उन तमाम भ्रष्टाचार पर पाबंदी लगानी चाहिए जो प्रजातन्त्र का विरोध करने हैं मेक्सेनेरिज्म का विरोध करने हैं और आदेश में पूँजीवाद का प्रचार करने हैं। ऐसे भ्रष्टाचारों को हम देश में बन्द कर देना चाहिए।

सभापति जी आप जानते हैं इस देश में भ्रष्टाचार किम तरह में चलाये जाते हैं। आपने देखा कि रेलवे स्ट्राइक के टाइम पर सारे भ्रष्टाचारों में कहलवा दिया गया कि मारो रेल गाड़िया चलन, रही। मैं आपका ज्यादा समय नहीं लेना चाहता मैं यही कहना चाहता हूँ कि आकाशवाणी, भ्रष्टाचार और यह प्रेम कोसिल इस तरह की बननी चाहिए कि सही माने में देश की भावनाओं को यकन किया जा सके, जनता में सही बात का प्रचार हो सके। यह प्रेम नैशनल ऐसी बने जो देश को ठीक दिशा दे सके—यही मेरा समाव है।

श्री भूलचन्द डागा (पार) : सभापति जी मैं केवल यह सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ कि इस प्रेस कोसिल को इफेक्टिव और फोर्मल बनाया जाये। अगर यह प्रेस कोसिल इफेक्टिव नहीं है

[श्री मूल बन्द डागा]

फोर्सफुल नहीं है तो इसकी स्टैट्यूटरी बँकिंग क्या है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ आपका इस तरह की इस्टीमेशन जो काम करती है उनके पास पब्लिशमेंट की क्या पॉर्स होती है ? उनके पास यह पावर रहना बहुत जरूरी होता है। धारने जो प्रेस कौंसिल के लिए एडिक्स और मारन्स रखे हैं उनको कैसे मैनटेन किया जायेगा ? दूसरी बात मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि इसमें जो जर्नलिस्ट्स होते हैं, एडिटर्स होते हैं उनमें बहुसंख्य किसका होना चाहिए ? मैं समझता हूँ बहुमत जर्नलिस्ट्स का होना चाहिए। मैं पूछना हूँ अगर आजादी नहीं रही तो फिर जिन्दगी का मजा दो क्या है। मैं पूछना हूँ यह लोग क्या करते हैं ? यह कुछ लोगों की ही खबरे छापते हैं, उन्हीं की बातों को सुनते हैं लेकिन इस देश के बग़ैर लोगों की बात कौन सुनेगा ? इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस प्रेस कौंसिल का आप इफेक्टिव और फोर्सफुल बनाये ताकि स्वतन्त्र रूप से जनता के जो विचार हैं उनको प्रकट किया जा सके।

SHRI DHARAM BIR SINHA Mr. Chairman, Sir, about *Samachar Bharti* Shri Limaye has raised certain points I can only say this that he himself is aware that various State Government hold 75 per cent of shares in *Samachar Bharti*. Although we know that there have been complaints of serious lapses about *Samachar Bharti*, to which Shri Limaye has made a reference, we could not interfere into the working of it because of the fear of being charged with interfering with it. That is why we have withheld the temptation of action in this regard.

I would definitely seek his cooperation and help, indeed if he also would

be able to persuade Shri Jayaprakash Narain in this connection. We would also try our best to put *Samachar Bharti* on healthy lines.

I would like to say one more thing. I refer to what my friend, Shri Pandey said in regard to the newspapers and bias in political reporting. All I can say is that my party the Congress Party or for that matter, this Government has had no mercy. We ourselves have suffered more from political bias against us from the newspapers. Not only to-day but even during the last three to four years. The problems within my party and the Government are magnified hundred times even thousand times in the newspapers. That is all what I have to say.

MR CHAIRMAN अब मैं इस बिल का मजरी के लिए पेश करूँगा।

मकाल यह है .

'That the Bill be passed'

The motion was adopted.

1649 hrs

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE DIS-
APPROVAL OF INDIAN IRON
AND STEEL COMPANY (TAK-
ING OVER OF MANAGEMENT)
AMENDMENT ORDINANCE.

AND

INDIAN IRON AND STEEL COM-
PANY (TAKING OVER OF MA-
NAGEMENT) AMENDMENT
BILL

MR. CHAIRMAN.

अब धारम बिर सिन्हा स्टील कम्पनी में सम्बन्धित एडिमेंस जिन पर श्री मधु निमये का स्टैट्यूटरी रेजोल्यूशन है, गौर किया जायेगा।