

[Shri M Kalyanasundram]

raising it here because the Minister concerned has not even condescended to stay for two minutes more to listen to this important question. Anyway, it is my duty to bring to the notice of this House the ghastly attack on our diplomatic personnel in Washington as reported in the press. A young officer has been attacked in a very gruesome manner. It is, however, not the only incident. This House is in session. Should we not even feel concerned about it? Should we not express our sympathies for the officer who is suffering for no fault of his, for being just an Indian, for being an officer serving the Indian Mission in Washington?

This is not the only incident. A series of incidents have taken place in some of the important cities of the Western world—the so-called free world. Is there so much of inefficiency in Washington that protection could not be given to our officials? Even after the incident they have not been able to identify the culprits. The culprits have not been apprehended. I do not know what is our Government doing in these matters so as to give a feeling of confidence to our staff in foreign countries? I do not know the action being taken by our Government so as to give confidence to our people in other countries to make them feel that their interest will be safe. As things stand it seems there is an organised gang being helped by the foreign forces. Our Government is even unable to tell the country which are those forces behind this tragic incident.

Inside the country the railway accidents are attributed to sabotage. Our Home Ministry has not been able to identify those who are responsible for that. Are they really unable to identify those forces or do they want to conceal them? This is a question in the minds of the people of our country. Therefore, I will request the Government to make a statement in

this House and allot some time to discuss this matter.

I will submit further that the Government of India must take up the matter with the Governments concerned and let this House know what those Governments have to say in this matter—whether those Governments will be in a position to give protection to our diplomatic personnel in their countries or not?

I request the Govt to place the facts before this House.

17.38 hrs

MOTION RE STATEMENT ON
"SAMACHAR" BY THE MINISTER
OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING—*Contd.*

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER Now we take up discussion on Samachar. Shrimati Pravathi Krishnan may speak.

PROF P G MAVALANKAR (Gandhinagar) I am on a point of order. Kindly listen to me. I am not using the time for making a political speech.

It is not that you have given permission for 377 but the hon Speaker gives permission every day, that I accept. Therefore, whosoever were permitted were making speeches—short or long. My point of order is that for the last one week continuously I have been giving notices as per prescribed rules before 10 O'Clock in the Notice Office on some of the subjects. I am not mentioning even those subjects which are as important, if not more important, as the subjects already covered by 377 for the last one week. I am not complaining against the Speaker. My complaint is different. That unlike in the past, I have been watching for the last one week, I have not been informed by the Office whether my 377 has been accepted or not.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER. May be, that may be under consideration

If you are not informed either of having been accepted or rejected, the inference should be that they are still under consideration I know how many 377 notices are there—hundreds of them

PROF P G. MAVALANKAR
I would only say we should be told of its acceptance or rejection

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER It should be presumed that they are still under consideration

Before Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan starts speaking, I may say, we have now started at 1740 We have one hour and 10 minutes for this discussion according to our time allocation It means that we can go up to 650 The Minister will take 1/2 an hour Suppose he starts at 6-15, we are left with only 35 minutes

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contd) I have to reply also

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER We will sit till 650 and finish this We have to cut down the time of the other members if he wants his right of reply

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN (Coimbatore) Mr Guha has had a full innings, may I have a partial innings I will cut short my speech

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER We must cut short the time of the Members

SHRI SAMAR GUHA It does not look nice if I don't say a few words

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER All right, Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN—Mr Deputy Speaker, Sir, even before the Minister made a statement, we have seen in the Press that the Government was deciding upon restoring the *status quo ante* as far as Samachar is con-

cerned, splitting up of Samachar and bringing it back to the original position It is really amazing that with a view to setting right what is wrong they are going in for another wrong I cannot understand this position at all They set up a Committee. That Committee gave a report and the Minister said this in his statement

'The Committee gave its report and soon thereafter the Government had the benefit of the reactions of the Press and the public in general in formulating their approach to the recommendations that have been made'

I am very happy that the Minister does not accept the recommendations of the Committee, I am not in tune with them. What we see is that the reactions of the newspaper employees and the democratic sections of the people are totally opposed to what the Government has thought fit to decide You have achieved a milestone in restoring the freedom of the press but in so doing you are throwing the news agencies back into the hands of the big monopoly press This position is totally un-acceptable to the working journalists and non-working journalists and employees of the newspapers and news agencies I was really surprised yesterday by my friend Mr Somnath Chatterjee's tight-rope walking when he said he did not agree, but he added so on and so forth We have seen in the Press that a member of the Central Executive Committee of his party Mr Kolhatkar has said that they are against restoring *status quo ante*, they are against Kuldip Nayar Committee's recommendations and what they want is one single agency with more funds and viable and under democratic control

17 45 hrs

[SHRI M SATYANARAYAN RAO in the Chair]

That is to diffuse the influences that are there in Samachar Nobody here in this House can hold a brief for Samachar Everybody knows how Samachar was brought about, everybody knows what type of agency it

[Smt. Parvathi Krishnan]

was; everybody appreciated the fact when the Committee was appointed that it was to be gone into and the era of Samachar as it was, would come to an end as the era of the emergency came to an end. I am very seriously concerned now with this decision of the Government which has nothing in common with the general sentiments of those who are concerned with mass media in this country and those who are the recipients of the materials that emanated from the mass media.

What happened, for instance, after emergency came into being? The loss of Samachar in 1976-77 was Rs. 78 lakhs which was made up by the Government by giving a subvention of Rs. 50 lakhs. When the estimated loss for 1977-78 is Rs. 90 lakhs and the economic of the Samachar is this.

Then the expenditure on the language wing is at present Rs. 60 lakhs as opposed to an income of Rs. 14 lakhs. Now, after pooling the technical equipment, manpower and everything this much of loss is there to-day. Now you say that you want to separate this again and you want to go back to the status quo ante. Then what happens? You will have to pump in more and more money. Therefore Government influences will grow. Is this the freedom of the press that you are promising us? Is this the opening to complete freedom of the press? No, Sir. I cannot accept it.

In fact, the users have already said plete freedom of the press? No, Sir, I is what happens. No agency can defy the great Ministry of Information and Broadcasting under Shri Lal Krishna Advani because they will be dependent on Government's subscriptions to survive. That is why I say this cannot be the freedom of the press.

On the other hand, if you have a single viable news agency, which is run by the employees which will also have on the Board of Directors representatives of the users, representatives

of the working journalists and the non-journalists employees and eminent people, for instance, Sangeet Natak Akademy and from other cultural organisations and other eminent people in the field of literature and of mass media, certainly, there will be some guarantee, some help towards guaranteeing us the freedom of the Press.

Then, A.I.R. and T.V. can step up their subscriptions but unless and until the subscriptions of the news agencies are linked with the income of the newspapers, the gross income, as has been done with regard to the salaries and the emoluments of the employees; unless that is done, you cannot expect the news agencies to be independent of the various influences that are there. For instance, to-day, what is the gross income of a paper like the Times of India from the vast advertisements that they get? It is as much as Rs.25 crores. And yet, what is their contribution to the news agencies in terms of their cost of production—only 1.5 per cent. Even to-day, the newspapers give more commissions to the vendors per copy than what they subscribe to the news agencies. How can a news agency become independent? How can a news agency become economically viable? Therefore, this diffusing of the limited resources that we have will certainly not be proper. I do not want to go into this much more as my hon. friends, Shri Mavalankar and many other speakers have also spoken about it.

I would only like in this connection to answer a point that was raised by my hon. freind Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta who is conveniently not here. He talked about competition, healthy competition. Only if there is competition according to him can news agency flourish. He forgets how these news agencies were being run in this country. He forgets the way in which the UNI had been brought into being by the same forces which were behind the PTI. That only led to such distortion in the news even in the old days. I would like to remind this House that

the PTI, in the name of competition, killed the late Chief Minister of Tamilnadu, Shri C.N. Annadurai two days before he died. Is this the competition? Similarly, in the name of competition, the UNI started the Bangladesh war before it actually broke out scoops—scooled—and is this competition? No, Sir. It is not a question of competition. It is only a question of seeing that the maximum news coverage reaches the maximum number of people in this country in the best possible way.

Therefore, if you want to guarantee that, you cannot go back to the *status quo ante*. Even in Samachar, pooling all the resources—you have only seventy bureaux in the country—may of which are run by the Teleprinter operators. And the tele-printers themselves are junk. And, therefore, Sir, many of our newspapers in the regional languages hardly get any news. That is why there is a fear—and a genuine fear—that when this decision has been taken will there be the danger of domination of the Hindi part of the news agency which means the papers of regional languages will suffer. Even when there were three agencies functioning one knows very well that out of the 700 newspapers in the country only 300 subscribed to these new agencies and only 81 subscribed to the two news agencies and these 81 also were going on with kind of musical chair. When the bills of the UNI went up they cancelled their subscription with them and started subscribing to PTI and vice versa. Do you want to go back to that distortion and leave these agencies to the mercy of these big monopolists. I would like to remind Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta and bring to the notice of the hon'ble Minister that when you talk in terms of competition, the reason for the theory of competition is exactly what is being put forward in the dissenting note to the Kuldip Nayyar Committee report. It is very revealing. I quote:

“.....It is now virtually impossible to deal effectively with any inefficient or unprofessional employee

...in this situation the only safeguard to the customer is effective competition between the two-pledged agencies.”

In other words the theory of competition being put forward by the employers is to hold a sword of Democles over the employees.

This is all that I have to say on the question of competition and that is why I would request the Minister that he should take up what the Press Commission said in 1954, namely, work out the scheme of an autonomous Corporation, set-up a body that will be independent of all influences, namely, governmental, communal such as the R.S.S. or whatever it may be and in the mean time re-structure the present Samachar. Expand it. Let the employees run it and give attention to all the news so that there will be a guarantee that the maximum amount of news goes out to the maximum number of people in this country. Therefore, increase the number of bureaux, improve your technical equipment and at the same time in the non-aligned pool—through the other international agencies—see that there is proper international coverage. I would like to conclude by saying that when I say this I am also taking up a stand already reflected in the Report itself. I would quote from the rejoinder that Shri Kuldip Nayyar has made to this dissenting note:

“Some of us were in favour of one trust with three autonomous news agencies—English, multilingual and international—with a common board of governors, common administrative set-up, common budget and common cadre of employees. We thought that the problem of resources force us to combine as many factions as possible while maintaining the autonomy of the three agencies. But when there was strong objection from some members, we tried our best for a consensus until the last minute. I sincerely believed that Shri Irani and Shri Sarkar would come to accept the re-

[Smt Parvathi Krishnan]

commendations which other members had collectively made "

Therefore, Sir, when we are talking about this single agency with these three arms we are only reflecting the views of the majority in the Committee and at the same time the majority opinion being expressed by the Indian federation of working journalists and the non-journalist newspaper employees who after all are fully representative of the employees in this very important and vital industry in building up freedom of thought freedom of expression and freedom of the Press in the country It is with this view that I have proposed an amendment which I have moved

"That for the original motion the following be substituted namely

"This House having considered the statement made by the Minister of Information and Broadcasting in the House on the 14th November 1977 regarding Samachar' recommends that the Government do take immediate steps to bring forward legislation to make news-agencies as statutory corporations under broad democratic control on the lines recommended by the Press Commission, 1954 "

I request the hon Minister to accept this amendment I have moved this amendment in the light of immediate restructuring of Samachar in order to guarantee total independence of the existing arms in the Samachar and at the same time ensure pooling of resources and improving the network of the bureau that are here in the country

SHRI PABITRA MOHAN PRADHAN (Deogarh) I rise to congratulate the Minister for his statement I have yesterday very attentively listened to Mr Stephen and Mr Lakkappa and I have just now heard the speech of Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan They are

not in favour of dissolving Samachar. Their plea is that if you dissolve it and the four constituent news agencies are reverted to their status quo ante, then the purpose will not be served, but I see it otherwise

This Samachar was created with a view to serve a dictatorial regime of the previous government So, it should not be allowed to exist In my opinion any government supported agency will be the creature of the government, whatever the government desires it would give out, it would give only that much news which is censored finally by the censoring officer The news is censored by the agency So if this agency is retained the country will not enjoy the benefits of a democratic press, a free press So it must be dissolved and after dissolution the employees who were brought from the four old dissolved agencies should be reverted to their own agencies But there is a doubt whether those agencies may be recreated or not

18 hrs

I think those agencies will be created and if created I do not know whether those agencies will accept the employees who had been brought from those agencies and utilised in Samachar My prayer and suggestion is that after they revert to their old agencies the extra emoluments salaries amenities and benefits which they were getting in Samachar shall be protected in their own agencies after their reversal Here, in Samachar they were getting something more salary more benefits and more facilities So those agencies may not be able to give the same because in the meantime they have been put to financial difficulties Their offices have been dissolved and their finances have been shattered It is proposed that upto three years the Government will give subvention Within three years, they cannot revive their finances and economy to such an extent that they can go on paying the extra pay which

was given by the Samachar and also other amenities and facilities. So, I suggest that the Government should give this subvention or aid upto a minimum period of seven years, during which, we may expect these agencies may make up this shortage.

As I have said earlier I once again say that I very attentively heard the Members on the Opposite side. They have said that Samachar at present is a better organisation, better spread out throughout India and that Samachar is giving a true picture of everything. They gave the example of recent cyclone to this. They have also said that if these four agencies are restored they will be economically very weak and that therefore they must not be restored and that the present status-quo should be maintained. The Samachar should be retained and maintained. It is their argument and it is because they in their Government formed the Samachar. Therefore they have the firmness and to have it. As I have said earlier I say again that any Government agency cannot serve better than the private agencies to serve with news in a democratic country even though they become financially weak and may not have their employees throughout the length and breadth of the country. Supposing as they say if this Samachar is retained so far as the Government is concerned, for collecting information it will be a redundant one a duplicate one. The Government has got Information and Broadcasting department. They have their Radio Agencies throughout the length and breadth of the country. If the Government desires to get any news national or state news they can get it over phone. They can daily disseminate the news three four five or seven times as and when they like. Nowadays on behalf of the government, they have got various agencies beginning from the village policeman to the village level worker, chowkidar and village revenue inspector. From these persons they can get news daily three or four times. They have the machinery to dis-

seminate this news to the entire nation any number of times as they desire during day and night. If Samachar is retained, it will be a duplicate and costly machinery. So, this must not be retained and the four agencies should be restored. With these words, I once again welcome the minister's statement.

SHRI SAUGATA RAY (Barrackpore) Sir, at the end of the day, I am sorry I have to do something which I do not like, viz, oppose a proposal brought forward by Shri Advani known for his sweet reasonableness all over the country. We had the privilege of supporting him when he brought the Prevention of Objectionable Matters Act. We congratulated him when he allowed time to the opposition on the radio during the last Assembly elections. But today he has brought forward a proposal behind which I cannot find any logic or rationale. As I thought over it, I only came to the conclusion that politically he is anti-merger. He is against the merger of RSS with Jan Sangh. He is against the merger of Akhil Bharatiya Vidyarthi Parishad with Yuv Janata. He is against the merger of Bharatiya Mazdoor Sangh with Hind Mazdoor Panchayat. He is against the merger of Hindustan Samachar with Samachar. So, he is against any merger. That can be the only logic.

Let us see the background of this decision of the new government. After coming into power, they appointed the Kuldip Nayar Committee which completed its work in record time by holding 18 sittings and submitted a report. Mr Advani has chosen to ignore the majority decision of this committee and accepted the minority decision given by Shri C R Irani and Shri A K Sarkar both of whom can be called the representatives of the monopoly press. Why did he advise the Samachar Chairman to break it up into four agencies? After the revocation of the emergency did the four

[Shri Sangata Roy]

news agencies represent to him that they want to go back to the status quo ante positions? Did they file any suit in the Supreme Court asking back their properties? They did not do any such thing. With his sweet reasonableness, gentle persuasion and a little pressure, Mr. Advani told them, "I do not like that you remain one. You go back to your former position". He says, Samachar was a product of the emergency. I agree during the emergency, news was distorted and Samachar helped to do so. But does he want to go back on everything done during the emergency? Does he want to go back on the land reforms, on the giving of house sites to Harijans, on the setting up of rural banks? I do not think so. So, this logic that just because it happened during the Emergency and so it is bad cannot be very well founded. Samachar was a good thing done at a bad time by a bad man. That is all I can say. And it is for a good man like Mr. Advani to keep up the good thing and continue with the Samachar. But he has not done so. Now what is the reaction of the country to Mr. Advani's decision? Four of the members of the Kuldip Nayyar Committee—Mr. Mankekar, Mr. Barpuje, Mr. Nikhil Chakravarty and Mr. Munagokar—have come out against this decision. Eminent journalists, Mr. Romesh Thapar, Mr. Chanchal Sarkar, Mr. C. G. K. Reddy, Mr. C. Raghavan and Mr. Abu Abraham, openly opposed this decision. None of these are Congressmen and many of them suffered during the Emergency at the hands of Samachar.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chirayinkil): Mr. Reddy was involved in the Bareda Dynamite case.

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: Mr. Reddy is famous for his Baroda Dynamite case probe. And the people who work in the Samachar, what have they to say? The Indian

Federation of Working Journalists said:

"In the name of competition there will be duplication now as has been the case before frittering away the limited resources. As for the foreign coverage, the restoration of status quo ante will further increase inter-dependence of trans-national news agencies which the Government of India have pledged to fight from Lima to Colombo in all the non-aligned conferences."

This is the reaction of the country. The most important point that we have to study now is whether this decision increases the freedom of the news agencies and whether it increases the viability of the news agencies which is the most important criterion that is to be judged at the present moment. What was the position of these four news agencies before they were merged into Samachar? The PTI had a paltry capital of Rs. 4.5 lakhs which had been eaten away to the risk of third parties, viz, the employees. The UNI had a capital of Rs. 3.5 lakhs which had been eaten away much to the risk of the employees. You know, the UNI was taken over due to the initiative taken by Dr. Roy, our then illustrious Chief Minister. And the big monopoly newspapers who had originally subscribed to UNI did not invest much money in it. Even the Statesman which was one of the founders of the UNI withdrew from the UNI when the subscription rates were raised. The Samachar Bharati had a capital of Rs. 26 lakhs and that had also frittered away and Samachar Bharati had written to the Government: "Please take us over." About Hindustan Samachar, Mr. Advani can tell us better. It is only with the dedicated workers of the RSS who worked without salary and for propagating thought on Hindu Rashtra that the Hindustan Samachar was surviving. It could not be called a news agency. It was only a missionary organisation doing missionary work with missionary zeal. I have no quarrel with them. This was the con-

dition of the viability of the news agencies. Even after the merger, *Samachar* continued to lose and I think the estimated loss to *Samachar* at the end of the year 1978 will be to the tune of Rs. 82 lakhs.

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN:
It is Rs. 90 lakhs.

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: Rs. 90 lakhs to be exact, as Mrs. Parvathi Krishnan has pointed out. It is in the Report also. So, what I want to stress at this point is that the viability of the news agencies is directly related to the freedom of press. If one has to be really free, one has to be viable. That is, as you say political independence is not complete without economic independence. Similarly, the news agency cannot be really free unless it is cut off from the apron strings of the patronage of either the Government or any monopoly news papers. This is the point I want to stress. If we have to achieve viability, splitting up will not solve the problem; on the other hand, splitting up will fritter away the scarce resources already accumulated. Splitting up will not make for strong news agencies. It will create weaker news agencies which will have to depend on the Government. The main point here is, as the Committee on Newspaper Economics which was set up by the Government of India has said, that we have to raise the subscription rate for big newspapers. If *Samachar* is split up and if the 4 agencies go back to their original owners, it will not help matters.

For a newspaper like the one in my hands, the hawkers get 10 paise; and the news agency's share comes to less than 0.5 paise, not even to 1 paise. My appeal to Mr. Advani is to raise the subscription rate to make the news agency viable. Only a news agency which is not dependent on Government or on revenues from AIR or the TV can be really free. With such a news agency Government cannot do any arm-twisting, nor can the mono-

poly Press do it. The split-up news agency will be entirely at the mercy of Government and of the subscribers, viz. the monopoly Press. It is with these words that I appeal to Mr. Advani, to his reasonableness, and to this experience of journalism. Let us have a national news agency. Let us not make this a party issue. In every country of the world, they have set up a national news agency which covers all the places in the world with stringers, and with people to cover all places of the world. On the other hand, PTI, before merger, had representatives only in 70 districts out of the 300 districts in India. Let us have a viable news agency. Only United States has 2 news agencies viz. Associated Press and UPI; Britain has only one viz. Reuter; Soviet Union has Tass France has AFP, Japan has Kyodo, Italy has Ansa and FDR has Deutsche Press. They have spent all their energy and all their money for this purpose. Newspapers have pooled their resources. They could have total coverage inside their country as well as total coverage outside their country. We should have a news agency about which we can be proud of. I do not know whether it is too late, at this stage, to ask Mr. Advani to revise the decision of splitting up *Samachar*. But I still appeal to him, even if he sticks to his decision and makes it a prestige issue, that this split-up must stay. Since Government has taken a decision let him ensure that the news agencies have viability and an elected board of directors, with representatives of mainly journalists and journalistic interests. Let him ensure that none of these news agencies survives on the subsidies from Government.

While ending, I again repeat my plea to Mr. Advani with the hope of having a national news agency in future. Let us consider how we can re-structure *Samachar* and strengthen it so that it can really be a news agency we can be proud of, which can really contribute to the Non-Aligned News Agencies Pool can represent the

[Shri Saugata Roy]

voice of the Third World, and really serve as a source of pride to India.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now the Minister Mr. Advani.

श्री विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा (दक्षिण दिल्ली) : सभापति महोदय, हम भी बोलना चाहते हैं, 2, 3 मिनट का समय दिया जाना चाहिये।

सभापति महोदय : मल्होत्रा जी, अभी 10, 12 लोगों के नाम हैं, बोलने के लिये और आपका नाम 10वां है। अगर आपको समय दिया जायेगा तो और लोग भी बोलना चाहेंगे।

श्री विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा : 2, 2, 3, 3 मिनट हरेक को दीजिये।

सभापति महोदय : 2, 3 मिनट में कोई अपनी बात समाप्त नहीं कर पाते। आपसे पहले बोलने वाले श्री दुर्गाचन्द, डा० रामजीसिंह और बहुत से लोग बैठे हैं। इस तरह से बहुत समय लग जायेगा। आपकी बात तो मिनिस्टर साहब कवर कर लेंगे। इसलिये भ्रष्टवाणी साहब अब आप बोलिये।

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री (श्री लाल कृष्ण भट्टवानी) : सभापति महोदय, सरकार ने जो बयान दिया है, उस पर तीन प्रतिक्रियाएं सम्भव हो सकती थीं। पहली प्रतिक्रिया तो यह कि यह बयान ठीक है, समाचार का गठन एक गलत कदम था और इसलिए उसे विचटित करना उचित है। दूसरा दृष्टिकोण यह भी हो सकता था, जो श्रीमती पार्वती कृष्णन् ने व्यक्त किया, कि समाचार उसी प्रकार से गलत था, जिस प्रकार इमर्जेन्सी गलत थी, और इसीलिए समाचार का भ्रन्त करने का सब लोगों ने, उसी प्रकार स्वागत किया, जिस प्रकार उन्होंने इमर्जेन्सी के भ्रन्त का स्वागत किया था।

लेकिन तीसरे दृष्टिकोण की मैंने अपेक्षा नहीं की थी। मैं सोचता था कि मेरे कांग्रेस के मित्र इसी दृष्टिकोण को अपनायेंगे, जो श्रीमती पार्वती कृष्णन् ने अपनाया। लेकिन मुझे ताज्जुब हुआ इस बात को देखकर कि स्टीफन साहब ने शुरू किया और श्री सीगत राय ने भ्रन्त किया, और दोनों ने केवल सरकार के निर्णय की आलोचना की, बल्कि बड़े जोरदार ढंग से समाचार के गठन का समर्थन किया और कहा कि समाचार का गठन एक बड़ा महत्वपूर्ण कदम था, बहुत अच्छा कदम था, और इमर्जेन्सी में अच्छे बुरे जितने भी काम हुए थे, सरकार उन सब को खरम कर रही है।

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN: I am sorry, I did not say that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is not referring to you. He is referring to Shri Stephen and Shri Saugata Roy.

SHRI L. K. ADVANI: What I have said is that I was expecting that the kind of criticism I would face would be the one that has been voiced by Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan, and that I can understand and appreciate. Because, that criticism is based upon the acceptance that the creation of *Samachar* was bad, but what the Government propose today is not right. This is your stand, which I can understand and appreciate. But what I cannot understand and what I cannot appreciate is what Shri Stephen says and what Shri Saugat Roy says.

मुझे इस पर विरोध ताज्जुब इसलिए हुआ, क्योंकि मैं पिछले सात माठ महीनों से बड़े ध्यानपूर्वक यह देखने की कोशिश कर रहा था कि कांग्रेस पार्टी इस बारे में क्या सोच रही है। हम लोगों ने इस बारे में विचार करने के लिए एक कमेटी बनाई। उस कमेटी के कुछ लोगों ने एक मत दिया है और दूसरे लोगों ने दूसरा मत दिया है। लेकिन एक बात ध्यान में रखने योग्य है कि

कुलदीप नायर कमेटी एक बात पर सर्व-सम्मत है कि समाचार का गठन एक बहुत गलत बात थी। उसमें नेजारीटी और माइनारिटी में री-स्ट्रक्चरिंग के बारे में मतभेद है कि री-स्ट्रक्चरिंग कैसे होनी चाहिए लेकिन समाचार के गठन के बारे में मतभेद नहीं है, और मैं सोचता था कि जब देश भर में इतनी सारी चर्चा हो रही है तो कांग्रेस पार्टी का भी मत कही दिखाई या सुनाई देगा। एक बार सुना दिया जिसमें फ्राट एम पीज ने सरकार के ऊपर यह आरोप लगाया वक्तव्य देकर कि सरकार इस मामले में ढील कर रही है और वह जानबूझकर के ढील कर रही है। मैं तो पढ़ कर हैरान हो गया। नेशनल हेराल्ड में वह काफी थी कालम हैडलाइन के साथ छपा और वबटिम उनका बयान छपा।

एक माननीय सदस्य : वह कांग्रेस एम-पीज कौन है ?

श्री लाल कृष्ण भद्रवानी : मैं बताता हूँ। वे कांग्रेस के ४ एमपीज इस प्रकार हैं—

पहला नाम है श्री बेदव्रत बरुआ

एक माननीय सदस्य : वह अन्तिम है, बाद में जोड़ा गया।

श्री लाल कृष्ण भद्रवानी : श्री संतोष सिंह, गुणानन्द ठाकुर, वीरेन्द्र सिंह, फ्राइ एच खाँ, ए हूमैन, कल्पनाथ राय, श्याम लाल यादव और नारायण चन्द्र पारासर। (ब्यवधान) देखिए, मुझे आपके आपसी झगड़े से कोई मतलब नहीं है। मैं तो इतना जानता हूँ कि फ्राट कांग्रेस के एम पीज ने यह बयान दिया और उस बयान में वे क्या कहते हैं कि :

'If the Janata Government were anxious to avoid suspicion about its goal, it should restore P.T.I. and U.N.I., only taking due precautions

2724 L.S.—11

to safeguard the Hindi and Indian language news agencies."

They further say:

"Failure to follow this simple and natural course of action would only expose in its true colour the real intention of the Janata Government despite its platitudinous tongue-in-the-cheek pronouncements about anxiety to restore full press freedom."

और इसका लम्बा वर्णन है जिसका साग यह है कि समाचार को गठित किया गया था कंट्रोल करने के लिए, यह आप को पता है और आप का भी उद्देश्य यही दिखाई देता है जो पिछली सरकार का था जिसे आप न्यूज मीडिया को कंट्रोल करे, इसलिए आप इस को बनाए रखना चाहते हैं।

अब कोई कह सकता है कि एम पीज काउन्ट नहीं करते हैं,

You might say they are insignificant people, but I take it seriously. I wish this charge had not been levelled at me or at the Government that we are taking a political decision.

मैं तो यह कहना हूँ इस वक्तव्य को आप देखें और इतना ही नहीं, मेरे पास एक दूसरा वक्तव्य भी है, उसको सुन कर तो आप को और भी ताज्जुब होगा। वह वक्तव्य अक्टूबर का वक्तव्य है, कोई बहुत पुराना नहीं है। उस वक्तव्य में कहा गया है :

"Speaking in my individual capacity, I certainly stand for competitive news agencies."

Who says this? This is said by no less a person than the Leader of the Opposition Shri Yeshwantrao Chavan, while he was addressing the AINEC.

ए फ्राट एन ई सी ने प्रस्ताव पास किया उस दिन कि स्टेटसको एंटी रेस्टोर करो। यह एंडीट्स बाडी है और उसमें कोई जनता पार्टी का बहुमत नहीं है। उस में कौन लोग हैं यह आप जानते हैं। उन्होंने जिस दिन प्रस्ताव

[श्री लाल कृष्ण अडवानी]

पास किया उस दिन श्री यशवत राव चव्हाण बहा गए हैं। नयी दिल्ली में 2 अक्टूबर को यह मीटिंग हुई थी और जब वह बहा गए तो उनसे पूछा गया कि न्यूज मीडिया के बारे में कांग्रेस पार्टी का क्या मत है तो उसका उन्होंने जवाब दिया

'Before taking any decision on the subject during the winter session of Parliament, Mr Chavan said that his party would like to know what the Government was thinking about the matter'

कि हम अपना निर्णय तब लेंगे जब गवर्नमेंट अपना फैसला कर लेगी और उस से पहले

In my individual capacity, I can say that I stand for competitive news agencies'

अब बोलिए मैं क्या कहूँ इसको सिवाय इस के कि कांग्रेस पार्टी आज अग्र विरोध कर रही है ता सिवाय पोलिटिकल डेमीशन के और कोई बात नहीं है कि आपने निर्णय स्टेटसको गेटी का लिया, हम उसका विरोध करेंगे। इस का क्या कोई और एक्सप्लेनेशन दिया जा सकता है ? उसीलिए मैंने प्वाइंट ऑउट किया, राज्य सभा में एकमात्र पत्रकार जो कांग्रेस पार्टी की ओर से बोले उन्होंने कहा कि सरकार ने जो निर्णय किया है वह अच्छा किया है लेकिन मुझे खेद है इस बात का, श्री सीगत राय बोल रहे थे तो उन्होंने कहा कि हमने आपका स्वागत किया था जिस दिन आप वह रिपील बिल लाए थे, हमने स्वागत किया था आपका जिस दिन आप प्रेस के मामले में कानून लाए थे लेकिन आज आप अचानक गवर्नमेंट निर्णय करने जा रहे हैं, आज आपकी स्वीट रीजनेबलनेस उल्टा काम कर रही है। मैं आशा करता था कि इस मामले में भी मतभेद हो सकते हैं, हमारे यहाँ भी मतभेद हैं। आपने स्वयं कुलदीप नैयर को नोट किया। हमने उनकी बात नहीं मानी हैं। हमने ईरानी की बात भी नहीं मानी है। जितनी

बाते उसमें कही गई है, उनको आप पढ़िये, मैं उनसे सहमत नहीं हूँ। उन्होंने जिस प्रकार से पत्रकारों के बारे में कहा है, जिस प्रकार से भाषायी एजेंसीज के बारे में कहा है, उससे मैं सहमत नहीं हूँ। हमारा बयान उससे असहमति को दर्शाता है। जो मेजरिटी रिपोर्ट है उसके तथ्यों से मैं सहमत हूँ, वह मेरे ध्यान में है लेकिन मैंने अपने बयान में कहा है कि इस समय सरकार का दायित्व बहुत सीमित है। यही कारण है कि श्री सोमनाथ चटर्जी ने यहाँ पर मेरा समर्थन किया। वे मेरी सारी बात से चाहे सहमत नहीं होंगे उनका और हमारा दृष्टिकोण मिलता नहीं है लेकिन उन्होंने इस बात को स्वीकार किया कि समाचार के गठन में बहुत गलत चीज थी। मैं और भी उदाहरण दूँगा कि प्रेस की पर्वस्थिति स्टेटसको गेटी प्रेस के लिए अच्छी थी क्या ? मैं नहीं बहता कि वह अच्छी थी लेकिन जिस समय मैंने प्रिवेशन आफ पब्लिकेशन आफ आब्जेक्शनेबिल मटर्स ऐक्ट का रिपील किया मैंने उस समय स्टेटसको गेटी का गेट्टा कर दिया। वह कानून जो था वह अखबारों के ऊपर सरकार का नियन्त्रण देता था। अग्र अखबार जनता के हित के खिलाफ बात कर, जिस भाषा में आप बोलते हैं, तो आप उसको रोक सकते थे लेकिन आप कहते हैं कि उसको लेकर वापिस उन पत्रकारों को दे रहे हैं ता इस प्रकार की लाजिक दूसरी जगह भी एप्लाइ हो सकती है। इसीलिए मैंने बार बार साफ साफ कहा है कि सरकार जब कहती है कि हम पूर्वस्थिति पर लाना चाहते हैं ता हम इसको प्रथम कदम मानते हैं। हम यह नहीं कहते कि पूर्वस्थिति बहुत अच्छी थी। मैं स्वयं एक पत्रकार हूँ, मैं जानता हूँ कि न्यूज एजेंसीज की क्या दशा है, प्रेस की क्या दशा है।

जहाँ तक बायबिलिटी की बात कही जाती है, किसी कमजोरियों की बात कही जाती है वह कमजोरियों की बातें केवल न्यूज एजेंसीज के साथ ही लागू नहीं होती हैं

बल्कि सारे प्रेस के साथ लागू होती हैं। थर्बन थारिएटेशन जो है वह केवल न्यूज एजेंसीज के साथ नहीं बल्कि सारे प्रेस के साथ लागू है। जितनी भी सारी बातें, सारी कमजोरियां आप गिना सकते हैं वह प्रेस के लिए कामन है। इसका एक मतलब तो यह है कि इन सारी कमजोरियों का दूर करने के लिए हमारा दायित्व है कि हम कानून पास करें लेकिन हमारी सरकार इस मत की नहीं है। हमारी सरकार मानती है कि मीडिया अच्छा या बुरा

they should be allowed to fend for themselves and the Government should have a kind of helping role

थोड़ा सा डायरेक्शन दिखा दिया जाये, इतना ही कर दिया जाये लेकिन

Essentially the Press should be allowed to grow by itself

उसमें कहा पर हम कस्ट्रेंट्स लगाने जायेंगे। हमारे स्टीफन साहब ने एक शब्द का प्रयोग किया और उन्होंने कहा

Creation of Samachar was the natural evolution

एक सहज स्वाभाविक विकास की प्रक्रिया है लेकिन यह किस हिसाब से विकास था ?

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI That was there in the Report of the Press Commission

SHRI L K ADVANI Because they committed the same mistake by saying that the Press Commission wanted one agency you also repeat the same thing

So far as Mr Stephen is concerned I am afraid he said something very categoric

मेरे पास स्टीफन साहब की स्पीच है— उन्होंने कहा है कि एक दिशा धारण बंद रखी है, यह नैचुरल-इवोल्यूशन का कोर्स है जिसके अन्तर्गत इस एजेंसी का गठन हुआ। मेरा कहना है कि यह नैचुरल-इवोल्यूशन नहीं था स्वाभाविक, सहज विकास की प्रक्रिया नहीं थी। यह तो जानबूझ कर लाई हुई

विकृति थी। श्री सोमनाथ चटर्जी और श्री समरगुह ने तो इलैजिटिमेंट-प्रोडक्ट कहा था, मैं उन शब्दों का प्रयोग नहीं करूंगा, लेकिन यह वास्तव में प्रेस स्ट्रक्चर का डिलिब्रेट डिस्टॉर्शन था। मैंने "डिलिब्रेट" शब्द का प्रयोग इसलिए किया कि उसके पीछे एक भूमिका थी। वह भूमिका क्या थी—उस का उल्लेख हमारे व्हाइट पेपर में आया है—1 जन को एमर्जेंसी घोषित हुई, जुलाई में तत्कालीन प्रधान मंत्री के कक्ष में एक मीटिंग होती है, जिसमें फैसला होता है कि न्यूज एजेंसीज को री-स्ट्रक्चर करना चाहिये। उसके बाद एफ इन्टर-डिपार्टमेंटल ग्रुप बना, उस ग्रुप ने नवम्बर में अपनी रिपोर्ट दी और उसमें क्या कहा—

"In view of the public purpose involved, the best course would be to nationalise the news-covering business. Thus, it would not be necessary to provide for licensing or regulation of news agencies to keep up the proposed body. The financial ownership must entirely be of the State. The Government share-holding may be hundred per cent and there may not be any private share-holding

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI This is by whom?

SHRI L K ADVANI This is an inter-departmental group set up by the Government in my Ministry. I am not going into the names of the officials who are there. I am merely referring to the governmental thinking at that time. This was the direction in which the country was moving

PROF P G MAVALANKAR (Gandhinagar) What was the public purpose?

SHRI L K ADVANI That was for the then Government to decide

The Samachar did not come into being as a natural evolution. It was

(Shri L. K. Advani)

certainly not a natural evolution. It was a deliberate design to make the news agencies serve as tools of the then ruling party for purposes of political aggrandisement.

मैं बिलकुल स्पष्ट शब्दों में कहता हूँ— उसके बाद कैबिनेट में मामला गया और न केवल कैबिनेट में यह प्रपोजल गई, बल्कि फार्मली आर्डिनेंस भी ड्राफ्ट हुआ, उसकी कापी मेरे पास है, कि आर्डिनेंस के द्वारा इन चारों न्यूज-एजेंसीज को नेशनलाइज कर दिया जाय और उसके बाद यह तय हुआ कि अभी आर्डिनेंस की जरूरत नहीं है—

Other method may be adopted to bring them together. The bulk of it is in the White Paper. I have said it. It may not have been drawn to the attention of the people

लेकिन यहाँ पर जब कहा गया कि स्वाभाविक विकास की प्रक्रिया थी, नैचुरल डेवलपिंग हो रहा था—इसलिये मैं इस बात का यहाँ पर उल्लेख कर रहा हूँ। मैं यह मानता हूँ कि समाचार का गठन सरासर गलत था, गैर स्थिति में हमारे सामने कोई दूसरा आण्डन नहीं था, मिबाय इस के कि सबसे पहले पूर्व-स्थिति पर आया जाय। उसके बाद मैंने अपने बयान में साफ किया है कि आगे चल कर ये जितनी एजेंसीज है—

I have always emphasized this.

"The Government have, therefore, come to the conclusion that at the moment the Government's role in the matter should be limited simply to the setting right this aberration. News agencies forced to merge under pressure and against their will during the Emergency should be allowed to function independently as they were doing earlier. It was then open to them, if they so desire, to cooperate or come together in order to ensure that they are able to play more effectively the

pivotal role expected of them in the press set-up."

"Government feel that having created a climate of freedom, they should leave the development and expansion of news agencies to the press and the agencies themselves."

The logic is very simple. There is no complicated logic about this decision.

यह इतना सरल लाजिक है, मोघा लाजिक है कि जिसके कारण मुझे इस बात की आवश्यकता महसूस नहीं हुई कि मैं अपने बयान में यह कहूँ कि कम्पोटीशन होना चाहिये या नहीं होना चाहिये, कम्पोटीशन होना जरूरी है या जरूरी नहीं है—इन बातों में जाऊँ। मैं यह जानता हूँ कि 1952 में जब प्रेस कमीशन बना था, तो प्रेस कमीशन ने इस बात पर बल दिया था कि न्यूज एजेंसीज में कम्पोटीशन होना चाहिए, और मजा यह है कि यह 1952 की रिपोर्ट है लेकिन 22 जूलाई, 1971 का पार्लियामेंट में एक सवाल पूछा गया था जिसमें यह पूछा गया था कि प्रेस कमीशन ने जो रिक्मण्डेशन किये थे, उनके बारे में सरकार का क्या मत है। न्यूज एजेंसीज के बारे में जो प्रेस कमीशन की रिक्मण्डेशन कोटेड है, वह मैं पढ़ देना चाहता हूँ। सरकार की ओर से कहा गया है :

"The Commission referred to major news agencies operating in this country and the third which has to develop and say that however objective a news agency tries to be, there are certain drawbacks which arise from a monopoly which could be obviated only by a competitive service available freely to all users."

What does the Government comment on this? The Government has accepted this recommendation. Some more news agencies have since come up. This is July 1971. This is the very Government, the same Government and that Government accepted the recommendation of the Press Commission. The Government announced it

to Parliament. It has accepted it earlier. It might have given only reiteration. It has already accepted it in the form of a news agency. Competition is a must; competition is necessary and should be there and they call it a natural evolution. Mr Saugata Roy tells me that we are out to destroy everything, even the good things done during the emergency and he regards it a good thing. It was, therefore, very readily that a person who was in the then Government Mr Chavan, and who felt that everything done during the emergency that was wrong should be left out. He indistinctly said: So far as I am concerned, as an individual, I am in favour of an objective news agency.

SHRI SAUGATA ROY You are making casual remarks

SHRI L. K. ADVANI I am not making casual remarks. I am merely saying that that remarks were not casual; it reflects a mind.

कि भई दो एजेन्सिया नही होगी। अब आप इमजेंगी की बात छोड़ दीजिए। इन मान फ्राट महीनों में क्या हुआ है। मात, फ्राट महीनों में समाचार की जो खबरें हैं उन पर क्या प्रतिक्रिया होनी है, बताएं। प्रतिक्रिया यह होती है कि अगर सौगता राय जी की खबर उस दिन नहीं छपती है, तो वे कहते हैं कि इन विजिबिल सेंसरशिप चलती है और मावलंकर जी भी यह कह सकते हैं कि इनविजिबिल सेंसरशिप चल सकती है और अहवाणी साहब तो बहुत रीजनबिल हैं लेकिन अन्दर से कह देते हैं कि इस खबर को मत छापो और अगर हमारी पार्टी और हमारे गोयल साहब की खबर नहीं छपती है, तो वे कहते हैं कि आपका जो यह 'समाचार' है और आपका जो आकाशवाणी है, इसमें पुराने इस्टाब्लिशमेंट के, पुरानी सरकार के लोग बैठे हुए हैं और जब तक उनको नहीं निकालेंगे तो यही होता रहेगा कि हमारी खबरों का ब्लैक आउट कर दिया और यह नहीं छपा और वह नहीं छपा।

पिछले दिनों में जितनी शिकायतें मूनता रहा हूँ उन शिकायतों से मैं कभी कभी थोड़ा परेशान भी हो जाता हूँ लेकिन बहुत बार मुझे लगता है कि इसका कारण यह है कि 'समाचार' की क्रेडिबिलिटी अभी बन ही नहीं पाई है और इन मात, फ्राट महीनों में भी 'समाचार' की क्रेडिबिलिटी नहीं बन पाई। कभी कभी बिल्कुल फ्राईनरी जर्नेलिस्टिक एडिटोरियल लैस हो जाती है Even that is seen with suspicion.

और किसी में भी ऐसी गलती हो सकती है। हमारे यहां आकाशवाणी में भी गलती हो सकती है। मैं आपको बताऊँ कि परमो राज्य सभा में जा डिपेट हुई, तो रात्रि की पौने नौ की और ना बजे की रिपोर्ट में एक शब्द भी उनके बाग में नहीं आया। मैं मन में सोचने लगा कि अगर किसी मंत्री या भाषण आ जाता और बाकी का कुछ न आता, तो कितना बड़ा नुकसान होता और यह अच्छा ही हुआ कि पूरी की पूरी डिपेट का ब्लैक आउट हुआ। इसमें इनफार्मिन्स भले ही चाहिए हों लेकिन कम से कम किसी की नीयत पर शक तो नहीं होगा। इसलिए मेरा आग्रह इस बात पर है कि इन 8 महीनों में भी 'समाचार' की क्रेडिबिलिटी नहीं बन पाई और उसका एक ही कारण है कि एक ही एजेन्सी थी। अगर दो एजेन्सिया हो तो अगर एक ने नहीं छपा, तो दूसरी छाप देगी और अगर दोनों ही किसी खबर का ब्लैक आउट करती हैं, तो यह मान लिया जाएगा कि यह कोई महत्व की बात नहीं थी क्योंकि दोनों को ही उसमें वजन नहीं दिखाई दिया। इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि कम्पीटीशन का जो मुद्दा है, वह कुछ मामलों में महत्वपूर्ण है। एक बार क्रेडिबिलिटी इस्टाब्लिश हो जाए, एक बार वह सेटिल हो जाए और एक बार इस बात को स्वीकार कर लिया जाए, जिस बात पर प्रेस कमीशन ने बहुत बल दिया था कि न्यूज एजेन्सीज में एडिटोरियल की पालिसी नहीं होनी चाहिए तो मेरी बात में यह ठीक

(SHRI L. K. ADVANI)

होगा। प्रेस कमीशन ने जो इस बारे में कहा है, उसको मैं कोट कर रहा हूँ :

"On account of... comments, there is a widespread agreement that news agency should eschew any comment in their service and we accept this view."

Not only this much.

"The privilege of commenting should be left to newspapers, but what has happened without condemning or justifying the event, a certain amount of objective reporting explaining how it came to happen would appear to be legitimate."

कितना भागे बढ़ जाते हैं प्रेस कमीशन के लोग।

और इसी कंटेवस्ट में कहते हैं—

"To say that one person made an impressive speech or that another let loose a tirade would be expressions of personal comment."

अर्थात् यह न्यूज एजेंसी में यह एक्सप्रेसवट नहीं करते कि वह यह लिखे कि

So and so made a very impressive speech and so and so let loose a tirade. These are really subjective judgements.

और न्यूज एजेंसी ने यह अपेक्षा करें वह स्टेपल ब्राफ दि माइण्ड भी करे, स्टेपल ब्राफ दि न्यूज भी करे या हार्ड केबल्स या कमेन्ट्स को न्यूजपेपर्स पर छोड़ दें।

हमारे समाचार के लोग क्या करते हैं। एमर्जेंसी के समय के बढ़िया उदाहरण कुलदीप नायर कमेटी ने दिये हैं। उनमें सबसे बढ़िया उदाहरण यह है जो कि मैं समझता हूँ कि क्वांटिक होगा। चुनाव के दौरान महीने पहले 16 नवम्बर, 1976 को—

"On 16th November, 1976, the Samachar released the results of a

'nationwide survey' made through crews of Samachar reporters trekking the towns and villages in high hills and flat plains who took the pulse of hundreds of men and women... from the heights of Kashmir to the coasts of Kerala and from salubrious Shillong to sun-baked Bikaner..' Large contingents of the Samachar reporters are said to have interviewed countless people from different strata of society in all corners of India and came to the conclusion that country did not want elections and wanted to 'consolidate the gains of Emergency'."

See the kind of stupidity that resulted. No lesser word can be used for this

इसलिए यह देखा कि समाचार के बारे में यह मान लिया गया है कि वह ब्राइडियल पालिसी भी बनाये, एमर्जेंसी को भी सपोर्ट करे तो इसलिए समाचार को बिचरित करने के अनादा कोई चारा नहीं है, कोई घ्राणन नहीं है।

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: This happened because of Emergency, not because of Samachar.

SHRI L. K. ADVANI: The Samachar was there because of Emergency. All this happened because of Samachar.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Did you prefer competition between the same language agencies or between different language agencies?

SHRI L. K. ADVANI: Really the statement of the Government does not refer to this issue; we have not gone into this question. But by and large I would say that the Press Commission's view in this matter is sound; right from 1952 to 1971; it continues to be round till this day. There is no change. There was a proposal for an autonomous corporation. It was only with reference to PTL, not with reference to all the news agencies in this country being combined under

an autonomous corporation. I feel that this is a matter which should remain open. I am open on that.

इसलिए मैं अपेक्षा करता हूँ कि अब जो प्रेस कमीशन बनेगा और जिसकी हम कल्पना कर रहे हैं, वह प्रेम कमीशन उपयोगी होगा और इस प्रश्न पर फिर से विचार करेगा और यह देखेगा कि वास्तव में जो स्थिति हिन्दुस्तान में है, उसमें न्यूज एजेंसी का आदर्श स्ट्रक्चर कैसा होना चाहिए। आज मैं आदर्श स्ट्रक्चर की कल्पना नहीं कर रहा हूँ।

This is not the ideal solution. I say that this is the only solution, but this is not the ideal structure of news agencies.

अब सोल्युशन गीर सिन्धुएशन में फर्क करने से दूसरा अर्थ निकल जाता है। आज की स्थिति में जो कदम उठाये जा सकते थे और जो कदम मही थे वे सरकार ने उठाये। मैंने अपना मत व्यक्त किया। मैंने अपना मत कैसे व्यक्त किया। उसका कारण यह है कि कुलदीप नायर कमेटी की रिपोर्ट के बारे में समाचार की मैनेजिंग कमेटी ने एक प्रस्ताव पास करके हमको लिखा कि सरकार का इससे बारे में क्या मत है और सरकार का जो भी मत होगा उसमें हम सहयोग करने को तैयार है। तो हमने श्री कुलदीप नायर कमेटी की रिपोर्ट और बाकी सब बातें देखने के बाद जब अपना मत बनाया, जैसा मैंने वक्तव्य में कहा है कि देश भर में कुलदीप नायर कमेटी की रिपोर्ट पर जो प्रतिभियाएँ हुईं, उनको देखकर हमने जो मत व्यक्त किया और उनको लिखकर भेजा कि हम उसको कार्यान्वित करेंगे, उस पर काम करेंगे, मुझे नहीं लगता कि इसमें कोई गलत बात है। और अगर गलत बात है तो आप यह कह सकते हैं कि आप छोड़ दीजिए, कुछ भी करिये, चलने दीजिये। ऐसा भी कोई नहीं कहता, बल्कि कहते हैं ऐसा करो, वैसा करो, कोई कहता है कि अटर्नामस बाबी बनाओ, कोई कहता

है कि दो में स्प्लिट करो, कोई कहता है कि 3 में स्प्लिट करो। अपेक्षा सरकार से है। जब सरकार कुछ करने जाती है तो और करने के लिये केवल एक मत व्यक्त करती है तो कहा जाता है कि थ्राम टुबिस्टिंग है, वह तो झूठली करते थे, ये सोफिस्टिकेटेड ढंग से करते हैं।

This Government does not believe in any kind of arm-twisting.

यह सरकार किसी प्रकार का दबाव प्रेस पर नहीं डालना चाहती है, मैं खुले रूप से और न गुप्त रूप से। इन 7, 8 महीनों में, मैं बड़े गर्व और विश्वास के साथ कह सकता हूँ कि कभी किसी पत्रकार पर या किसी प्रेस पर किसी भी प्रकार का दबाव सरकार की ओर से नहीं आया। कई चीजें ऐसी हुईं होंगी, जो हमको पसन्द नहीं आती, लेकिन उन्हें स्वीकार करते हैं।

एक बात की जरूर खुशी हुई। आज श्री सींगल राय ने हिन्दुस्थान समाचार की बड़ी तारीफ कर दी। थ्रार० एस० एस० की जब बात आती है, मैं यह मानने लगा हूँ कि जब किसी के पास कोई तर्क नहीं होता है, तो थ्रार० एस० एस० का नाम आ जाता है, चाहे वह रिलेवेंट हो या न हो। लेकिन वह एक प्रमाण बन गया है हमारे लिये कि जब कोई थ्रार० एस० एस० की बात करे, तो उसका कोई तर्क नहीं है। लेकिन जहाँ तक हिन्दुस्थान समाचार का सवाल है,

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: The Hindustan Samachar was not at all viable.

SHRI L. K. ADVANI: I know it, I fully know it and what he says, is correct.

वह एक मिशनरी जील से काम करने वाले लोग थे, इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं। लेकिन मिशनरी जील काहे के लिये था? इस बात के लिये था, जिस बात का मुझे अफ़सोस होता है कि सारे देश में 30 साल तक समाचारों का विकास इतना

[Shri L. K. Advani]

बने, लेकिन केवल अंग्रेजी समाचार एजेन्सीज बनी रही। किसी ने भाषाई समाचार एजेन्सी शुरू करने की कल्पना नहीं की यह सिर्फ हिन्दुस्थान समाचार ने की। यह मिशनरी जिल है कि भाषाई समाचार एजेन्सी भी होनी चाँहिये, अग उनमें था तो गलत क्या था? श्री एस० एम० झाटे, जो उसके फाउण्डर थे, जिनका नाम इसमें है, या श्री बालेभर अग्रवाल अगर किसी समय अर० एस० एम० से थे तो क्या अपराध हो गया? मैं नहीं मानता हूँ। मैं कहता हूँ कि हा, सही बात है, गलत बात नहीं है। आप गलत बात मत करिये। आप इस बात को देखिये कि काम क्या करते है ?

मैं यह मानता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्थान समाचार अगर अपनी खबरों में वायस बना लेता है, जिम को एक आइडियोलोजीकल वायस कहते हैं, अगर नेता भी तो कौन उसकी खबरें लेता? कोई खबर नहीं लेता। आपको यह जानकर खुशी होगी कि हिन्दुस्थान समाचार की खबरें हिन्दुस्थान में न केवल 110 अखबार लेते थे, बल्कि आकाशवाणी और आल इंडिया रेडियो भी लेता था। आप यह समझते है कि वह गवर्नमेंट उनकी आइडियोलोजी में विश्वास करती थी, जो उनकी खबरें लेती थी? यह तथ्य है, जिनको अगर आप मानें तो यह जो एक कमान पोलिटिकल एग्युजेंट होते हैं, उनमें आप इन्डलज नहीं करें।

Then you will argue on the basis of logic

और इसीलिये मैं यह मानता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्थान के अन्दर न्यूज एजेन्सीज जब तक भाषाई भाषाओं में नहीं बढ़तीं, और उन्होने केवल हिन्दी में नहीं किया, 10, 11 भाषाओं, इन्क्लूडिंग मलयालम, में खबर देने की कोशिश की। बड़े-बड़े अखबारों के पास सीमिन साधन होते है, उनके भी बहुत सीमिन साधन हैं।

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: What will happen to the programme of supply-

ing news in regional languages.

SHRI L. K. ADVANI: This is what is exactly in my mind.

मुझे और सरकार को तब तक संतोष नहीं होगा जब तक हिन्दुस्तान में भाषाई पत्र अपना स्थान प्राप्त न कर लें। केवल हिन्दी ही नहीं, हिन्दुस्तान में जितनी भी भाषाएँ हैं, मैं चाहूंगा कि मलयालम में मनोरमा को, और मातृभूमि को खबरें मिलें, बंगाल में खबर बगला में मिलें। हिन्दी में खबरें मिलने का क्या मतलब है? इसमें भाषाई पत्रों से भी मैं अपेक्षा करता हूँ, एजेन्सीज से भी अपेक्षा करता हूँ कि वह इस दिशा में कदम उठावेंगी। हमारी सरकार की ओर से तो इस नीति की घोषणा की गई है कि भाषाई ढंग से एजेन्सीज के विस्तार से जो कुछ कदम उठाये जायेंगे, उसमें हमारा सहयोग रहेगा।

एक चीज बाकी रहनी है, जिसके कारण बहुत सारे जो समाचारों के अन्दर काम करने वाले पत्रकार थे और कर्मचारी थे, उनके मन में चिन्ता थी, जिम दिन मैंने कुनदीप नायर कमेटी की घोषणा की थी, उसी दिन उन्होंने चिन्ता व्यक्त की थी। मैंने कहा था कि हम जो भी निर्णय करेंगे, उससे पत्रकारों के उस स्थान में कोई कमी या अन्तर नहीं होगा, जो समाचार के गठन के कारण स्वाभाविक रूप से बन गया है, और जो लॉग बहुत समय तक बहुत बुरी स्थिति में काम करते रहे थे, उन्हें जो सुविधायें मिल गई है, हमारी कोशिश होगी कि उनकी वे सुविधायें बनी रहे।

इसलिए मैं नहीं समझता कि सरकार ने जो व्यवस्था की है, उससे और उदार कोई व्यवस्था हो सकती है। हमने कहा है कि एक तरफ हम उनकी डायनामिज्म को खत्म नहीं करना चाहते है, और दूसरी तरफ कोई सबसिडाइज्ड एजेन्सी नहीं बनाना चाहते हैं, जो सबा-सर्बदा सरकारी डोल्ब पर चलती रहे। आखिर जो एक एजेन्सी

बनाई गई है, वह कौन सी वायबल बन गई है? उसमें कितना घाटा हुआ है। अगर हम चार एजेंसियां बनायेंगे, तो उनमें डायनामिज्म और एंटरप्राइज आयेगा, उनमें जूम आयेगी जिसके कारण वे बेहतर काम कर सकेंगी। हम ने कहा कि हम छ माल के लिए इतना आयवासन देते हैं कि उनके वर्मचारियों को तकलीफ न हो, लेकिन वे कुछ काम करे। सरकार नेवल डाज देती रहे, यह हमारा मत नहीं है। इसी कारण हमने कुछ निश्चित घोषणाएं की हैं।

हम यह भी समझते हैं कि किमी न्यज एजेंसी को वायबल और आत्म-निभर बनाने के लिए अन्ततोगत्वा उस के सब-स्क्राइवर्ज-अखबार वाला, विशेषकर बड़े अखबार वालों और आल इंडिया, रेडियो का उचित शेयर देना होगा। हम आल इंडिया रेडियो के सबस्क्रिप्शन को रेशननाटज करने की वाशिष्य कर रहे हैं। लेकिन मैं बड़े अखबार वाला से भी यह अपेक्षा करता हूँ कि वे उचित शेयर देगे।

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN That is why I suggested that it should be linked up with their gross income as is done in respect of emoluments

SHRI L K ADVANI Various suggestions have been offered. The Prime Minister himself has spoken about the possibility of a cess

अनेक प्रकार के सुझाव आये हैं। पिछले दिनों मुझे कुछ पत्रकारों में मिलने का मौका मिला, जिन्होंने अन्य बातें कहने के अलावा यह भी उल्लेख किया कि आप जो विज्ञापन नीति बना रहे हैं उसमें आप छोटे पत्रों को देंगे, मध्यम दर्जे के पत्रों को देंगे, इत्यादि, यह तरीका ठीक नहीं है, उसके बजाये खुल्लम-खुल्ला जैसे मार्केट में एडवर्टाइजमेंट दिया जाता है, वैसे दीजिए। वह एक सम्मेलन था, जिसमें मुझे इस विषय पर बोसने का मौका मिला। मैंने कहा कि

मैं विज्ञापन की बात तो नहीं कहना चाहूंगा, लेकिन एक बात जरूर कहना चाहूंगा कि पत्र या प्रेस बाकी इंडस्ट्री की तरह नहीं है और अगर कोई दूसरा उन्हें बाकी इंडस्ट्री की कैटेगरी में मानता है तो कम से कम यह सरकार नहीं मानती है। यह सरकार ही नहीं, एनलाइटण्ड डेमाक्रेसीज भी नहीं मानती है। इंग्लैंड में 1974 में एक रायल कमीशन आन दि प्रेस बना था। इसी साल उसने अपनी रिपोर्ट दी है। उसमें वहा की न्यूजपेपर पब्लिशर्ज एसोसियेशन ने एक बात कही है

'Nevertheless a newspaper is still a piece of private property with public responsibilities, and the issue at the heart of the present enquiry is whether such a hybrid can survive under modern conditions. Is a press with is run on strictly commercial lines now capable of discharging its public functions

SHRI SAUGATA ROY Mr Chairman, Sir, we have already exceeded the time for which the House was extended. The time need to be extended further if Shri Advani has to continue

MR CHAIRMAN Mr Deputy-Speaker was in the chair when the time was extended. He has not fixed any time. Anyway, the hon Minister may conclude as he has covered almost all the points

Let us agree or disagree. It is very difficult to convince them

19 hrs

SHRI L K ADVANI I have convinced them

मैंने उद्धरण का हवाला इसलिए दिया क्योंकि इंग्लैंड में भी यह माना जाता है कि चाहे प्राइवेट प्रापर्टी हो लेकिन उसकी पब्लिक रेस्पॉसिबिलिटी है और इस पर सन्देह व्यक्त किया गया कि क्या आज की

[Shri L. K. Advani]

स्थिति में यह सम्भव है यह जो "प्राइवेट प्रापर्टी वाले है वे कोई पब्लिक रेस्पॉन्सिबिलिटी फुलफिल करेंगे, उस पर प्रेस कमीशन से कहते है कि

"There is thus a concensus shared by almost all of those who gave evidence that the press should neither be subject to State control nor left entirely to the unregulated forces of the market."

स्टेट कंट्रोल भी नहीं होना चाहिए लेकिन अगर कोई मानता है कि अनरेगुलेटेड फॉर्सेज आफ दि मार्केट के ऊपर छोड़ देना चाहिए तो वह भी गलत है और जो बात इंग्लैंड के लिए कही गई है मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे यहाँ तो उस से कई गुना अधिक अप्लीकेबल है। यहाँ पर तो प्रेस की पब्लिक रेस्पॉन्सिबिलिटी बहुत ज्यादा है, कई गुना ज्यादा है उनसे और इमीलिंग सरकार उसके बारे में तटस्थ और उदासीन नहीं हो सकती है। हम यहाँ मानते है कि यह जाँ है इट इज फार दि मूमेंट। इस समय पूर्व स्थिति स्थापित करना है लेकिन उसमें जितनी कम-जोरियाँ है उन कमजोरियों को दूर करने की दिशा में हम कोशिश करेंगे, लगातार लगे रहेंगे और मुझे विश्वास है कि प्रेस कमीशन जो हम गठित करने जा रहे है वह इस दिशा में बहुत सहायता करेगा।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now we have to deal with the Substitute Motion. Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta is not here. But still I have to put the motion to the vote of the House.

The question is:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Minister of Information and Broadcasting in the House on the 14th November, 1977 regarding "Samachar", urges

upon the Government to set up a Parliamentary Committee in pursuance of the recommendations made in the Kuldip Nayar Report to go into the reasons for indulging in professional misconduct by some journalists and some newspapers during the period of emergency."

(1)

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall now put Substitute Motion moved by Shri Yuvraj to the vote of the House.

The question is:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Minister of Information and Broadcasting in the House on the 14th November, 1977 regarding "Samachar", urges upon the Government to implement the recommendations of the Kuldip Nayar Committee within a month." (2)

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Vinayak Prasad Yadav is also not here. I have still to put the Substitute Motion to the vote of the House.

The question is:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"That House, having considered the statement made by the Minister of Information and Broadcasting in the House on the 14th November, 1977 regarding "Samachar", recommends to the Government that:—

(a) proper legal action should be taken against those who had exerted force and pressure on different news agencies against their will to merge into one news agency in order to establish Government monopoly on the news media; and

(b) the news agencies should be reorganised in such a manner that neither the Government nor the capitalists could have a hold over them." (3)

The motion was negatived

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Samar Guba is also not here. I have to put the motion, substitute one, to the vote of the House.

The question is:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Minister of Information and Broadcasting in the House on the 14th November, 1977 regarding "Samachar", recommends to the Government to set up a Committee of three eminent retired Journalists to go into the cases of professional misconduct and excesses indulged in by some journalists and newsmen during Emergency, in violation of the code of conduct voluntarily evolved for the guidance of the pressmen by the former Press Council and for suggesting remedia, measures for future and also to name those journalists and newsmen who refused to abide themselves by their accepted code of conduct." (4)

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan, are you withdrawing the Substitute Motion?

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN: I am not withdrawing. I have asked the Minister to accept it.

SHRI L. K. ADVANI: I am not accepting it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall put the substitute motion to the vote of the House.

The question is:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Minister of Information and Broadcasting in the House on the 14th November, 1977 regarding "Samachar", recommends that the Government do take immediate steps to bring forward legislation to make news-agencies as statutory Corporation under broad democratic control on the lines recommended by the Press Commission, 1954." (5)

Let the lobby be cleared.

PROF P. G. MAVALANKAR: There is no quorum. Kindly ascertain whether the quorum is there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The lobby is cleared. There is no quorum.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: The House should be adjourned.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN (Cannanore): If the quorum is not there, the voting can be held over till tomorrow.

PROF P. G. MAVALANKAR: Kindly don't decide the issue because there is no quorum.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No question of deciding. Quorum has been challenged. There is no quorum. When there is no quorum, there is no question of putting it to the vote.

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN: This only shows how much the ruling party is interested in restoring the freedom of the Press. Obviously they treat it with scant consideration and disrespect. Even the Movers of the Substitute Motions are not there. I am really surprised about this. There is no quorum. It is a very sad commentary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It will be taken up tomorrow.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: Am I to take it that because there is no quorum you are adjourning the House?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, yes. There is no quorum. That is why the voting will be taken tomorrow. I am adjourn-

ing the House now to meet tomorrow at 11 A. M.

19.08 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, December 2, 1977/Agrahayana 11, 1899 (Saka).