

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Speaker:** Before we proceed further, I would like to announce to the House the result of the deliberations of the Business Advisory Committee and the recommendations that it has made to the House. It is proposed to prolong the timings of the sittings, so that the House may get an additional three hours to put through the Transfer of Evacuee Deposits Bill. In view of the urgency of all these measures having to be passed before the 13th evening, the allotment of time and the timings of sittings will be amended from tomorrow as follows. Tomorrow the House will sit from 1 P. M. to 7 P. M. instead of from 2 P. M. to 7 P. M. That would give the House one hour more. The day after tomorrow, i.e. on Friday, the House will sit from 1 P. M. to 7-30 P. M. This does not give one and a half hours, but it gives one hour more, because the House will remember that the discussion on the Industrial Finance Corporation is still going on and we have reserved from 6-30 P. M. to 7-30 P. M. for that discussion. On Saturday, the House was originally announced to sit from one to five. As the House knows, there is the function of the unveiling of the portrait of the Grand Old Man of India, Dadabhai Naoroji. So, we leave some time for that—and the House will adjourn—and meet again from six to seven. So, the Saturday sitting will be between 1 to 5 and 6 to 7 with a recess of one hour in between. That is how it is proposed to provide time for that Bill. No further extension is possible now and I assume that the House is amenable to accepting the recommendations of the Business Advisory Committee.

—————  
PRESS (OBJECTIONABLE MATTER)  
AMENDMENT BILL—Contd.

**Shri Venkataraman:** Mr. Speaker Sir, we have heard three eloquent speeches on the other side and I am almost tempted to say that mine would come after these very elo-

quent speeches as the voice of Mercury after the music of Apollo. Much heat coupled with light was shed in the course of these three learned speeches and I shall endeavour to meet some of the points which have been raised by them.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BEARGAVA in the Chair]

Objection was taken that this House has no competence to have this Bill passed. No less a talented lawyer than Mr. Chatterjee supported that view. The Act has been in force since 1951 and my hon. friend knows that it has not been challenged in the courts so far. There have been cases and prosecutions under this Act, and, I will show later, sentences have been imposed. It was quite open and very easy for the legal pandits to have taken it to the Supreme Court to test the *ultra vires* or the *intra vires* nature of this legislation. The very fact that it has not been done seems to be a categorical reply to the view that this Act, which has been passed in 1951, is entirely within the spirit and the letter of the Constitution.

Then, Mr. Anthony referred to one or two words in section 3 of the Press Objectionable Matters Act, 1951. Sir, you know very well, as a great lawyer yourself, that if there are any offending words in any legislation, the whole legislation does not become void on that account. The Supreme Court may, at best—assuming without admitting the correctness of Mr. Anthony's statements—come to the conclusion that the word 'likely' may be *ultra vires* or that the word 'scurrilous' may be *ultra vires* but the entire Act, the Press Objectionable Matters Act, 1951, as a whole, cannot be *ultra vires*. Therefore, it appears to me that there is no great substance in the points raised by both Mr. Anthony and Mr. Chatterjee that this House will be transgressing the limits set by the Constitution by passing this Act.

[Shri Venkataraman]

Then Mr. Vallatharas—I am sorry he is not here—stated that the spoken word has greater potentiality for mischief than the written expressions. Therefore, he said that it is the spoken word that should be penalised greater than the written word. It does not require great arguments to meet that point.

After all, all the three speeches, as you know, have been distilled from all the speeches that were delivered in 1951 and, if one carefully goes through the reply which the then Home Minister gave to those objections, in what I consider as a perfect piece of parliamentary eloquence, he has completely met each one of these arguments. While the matter which is printed circulates and can circulate—and go round the world even—a speech is only heard by those present. Again a speech, delivered orally, is not preserved but matters which are printed are preserved for eternity. Then, a third factor which makes a very great difference between the written word and the spoken word is that human memory is very short and people who hear speeches forget them almost immediately, but it is not so with the written word. Therefore, it has become necessary to formulate a different kind of legislation dealing with written expressions from that for spoken words. I am not crying to be clever. In fact, this is what the Sub Commission on Freedom of Information appointed by the United Nations found in the course of their report. For the benefit of the House, I shall read only a small portion of it. At page 4 of this report, the Sub Commission says—

“The right of a man to harangue a small group of persons at a street corner is one thing, but the right of a man or group to establish a newspaper, a radio or television station is another matter altogether. Gigantic systems of information present organized society with problems of a different order, quantitatively

as well as qualitatively speaking.”

Therefore, it has become necessary to control, in some measure, the freedom which one enjoys to put a thing in writing, to print and to publish.

The next point which I wish to deal with is whether this legislation is so wide as to deprive the people of India of the fundamental right of their freedom of expression. Dr. Krishnaswami said that the definitions are far wide, as wide as the Pacific. He could have added all the oceans and need not have confined himself to the Pacific alone. On the other hand, it is well established that the freedom of expression has got its own limitations attached to it and that it is not unbridled freedom, and if civilised society in every country has accepted that, then every right to publish is also coupled with a duty to observe certain morals. Again, this great institution, which seeks to protect freedom for the peoples of the world, namely, the United Nations, has a Sub Commission dealing with the various restrictions which have been found necessary. At page 17 of that report, it is stated—

“The exercise of the freedoms referred to in article 1 carries with it duties and responsibilities. It may, therefore, be subject to limitations, but only to such as are clearly defined by law, that is what has been done under the Press (Objectionable Matter) Act applied in accordance with law (that is what is being done by a jury, trial, etc., and not by executive action) and necessary for respect of the rights and reputations of others, for the protection of national security and the prevention of disorder or crime, or for the protection of public health or morals.”

These are accepted in the whole world as necessary duties and responsibilities of the Press and the freedom of the Press is not an unbridled free-

dom, but is coupled with all these duties and responsibilities. If that is true, let us look at section 3 of our Act to see whether it goes beyond the accepted canons with regard to restrictions. The Rapporteur on Freedom of Information looked into the laws of several countries and made a report to the United Nations. He also examined the law of our country and the only criticism that he made in respect of our law—the Press (Objectionable Matter) Act—is this.

I am quoting from the Rapporteur's report.

"Obviously, a balance must be found between the freedom to seek and disseminate information and the necessity of protecting the individual and the community as a whole against misuse of this right. Therefore, most countries have promulgated legislation enabling the authorities to intervene in case of necessity. In Australia the Postmaster-General may withdraw the registration of a newspaper owned by an organisation which seeks to overthrow the government by force, or which contains blasphemous, obscene or indecent material. In the United Kingdom the seizure of seditious, blasphemous or obscene documents is permitted. In Canada it is an indictable offence for a newspaper to publish obscene or immoral material, and in the United States publications offensive to public decency or clearly inimical to national security or public order may be suppressed. In India, the Press Act of 1951 extends the definition of "objectionable matter" beyond the categories generally prohibited in the laws of many countries to "any words, signs or visible representations which are likely to promote feelings of enmity or hatred between different sections of the people of India."

This is the only variation which India has made in respect of the acknowledged restrictions with regard to the freedom of the Press, which other countries, in the context of their environment do not require, namely expressions which are likely to promote feelings of enmity between communities. It is only in this respect that our law may be said to go beyond the limits set by international standards. Other countries have not achieved the international standard, but India has and the only thing in which it varies from international standard, if at all, is on this question of preventing expressions or publication of material which are likely to create enmity between communities.

Then, Sir, the Rapporteur goes on to say:

"It is clear that in such countries the actual degree of freedom depends largely on the way laws of this character are administered and interpreted."

Even the inclusion of these words has not in any way curtailed the freedom of the Press, unless there is abuse or misuse of this power. No such case has been brought by the able opponents of this measure in this House, where actually there has been an abuse of any of the provisions.

I have not got the figures or facts with regard to all the States, but I am naturally conversant with my State of Madras. I shall, therefore, now proceed to show what are actually the sort of cases that have been dealt with under this Press (Objectionable Matter) Act since 1951. I have got figures up to July 1953. In the State of Madras there were 14 prosecutions. 13 of them relate to obscene matter; the other something else. Therefore, this Press Act is actually used in a large measure only to suppress publication of obscene matter. I may also give

[Shri Venkataraman]

some sample of the obscene matters that are published in Madras. I am not going to read the obscene things, but I am going to read only the names of papers and the action taken against them. There is one paper, *Vetrimarasu*, which wrote obscene matters and the case was placed before the Presidency Magistrate at Madras. Government wanted a security of Rs. 2,000 actually the Magistrate ordered a security of Rs. 300. That was in August 1952. Then, one paper which publishes in Telugu, Tamil and Malayalam—*Kalainesan*—was again prosecuted for obscene publications.

**Shri Raghavachari (Penukonda):** How are we concerned with names?

**Shri Venkataraman:** I am giving factual details because there was a charge in your absence on the other side that no facts are given by the hon. Home Minister. I must confess that I am very reluctant to give names and give facts of this kind but it was because the charge on the other side was that no facts are given that I feel obliged and I shall be delighted not to mention names.

**Shri Raghavachari:** They wanted the material, the contents or the names?

**Mr. Chairman:** He is giving the material also.

**Shri Venkataraman:** There can be no two opinions on this matter that if out of fourteen prosecutions, thirteen were for publishing obscene material, this Act has not been abused. You can never say that this Act has been abused or it has been used for political purposes as some body on the other side said that it was intended to suppress the freedom of expression or the criticism of the Ministers and so on. There is no warrant for such conclusions being drawn.

There are a number of other things which have been published and against which the Madras Govern-

ment took some action. One dealt with something like *Lady Chatterley's Lover*—I do not want to give her name and the name of her lover. There is another directly about one person who is an actress. This sort of thing must necessarily be curbed. There can be no two opinions in this House or in this country that we can allow, under the guise or pretence of freedom of expression such scurrilous, obscene and vulgar journals besmear the fair name of the country.

**Mr. Chairman:** Were there convictions in all these cases or securities were taken?

**Shri Venkataraman:** In these cases securities were taken. I can go further and say that in one case after the conviction was ordered the paper continued to publish that the Editor was in jail as if it was a matter for pride. The only way in which these journals could be taught a lesson is to deprive them of the means of publication of such vulgar material.

I was trying to show the number and nature of these cases and the way in which it has been dealt with. We are labouring under a great misapprehension. We think that the liberty of the Press is such that there should be no restriction whatsoever except what the penal law imposes. You perfectly well remember all the arguments which the Home Minister advanced in 1951—the protection of anonymity, the great influence that the Press holds and so on which compels the Government to bring forward a legislation applicable to the Press as different from individuals. As early as 1784, Lord Mansfield said with regard to this liberty of the Press: 'The liberty of the Press consists of saying without any previous licence subject to the consequences of law'. That is the freedom of Press and that is being ensured in our Act. The state of law before this Act came into force was that the Government by

executive action could demand security and could impose pre-censorship and that was objected to as a negation of the freedom of Press. What the Act seeks to do is to give the offender not a punishment in the first instance but a warning and a punishment later. If it were penal law, if a person commits an offence and publishes something which offends Section 3 of the Act, he would be punished straightaway.

**An Hon. Member:** Warning also is a punishment.

**Shri Venkataraman:** Warning is different. It is conviction all the same but it is not a conviction in the first instance. What happens now? The moment he publishes something under the Press (Objectionable Matters) Act, this matter goes up to the Court for a decision whether or not it is an offence and when the Court finds it is an offence, it calls for a security. It does not immediately impose a fine of Rs. 2,000 or 5,000. On the other hand, in ordinary criminal law a person would be immediately fined for the offence which has already been committed. After the security is taken, if further offence is committed, then alone, you will see, any punishment can be imposed under the law. If anything, this is more humane than the Indian Penal Code.

6 P. M.

You also know that any penal statute must have very strict definitions. The objection with regard to section 3, that it is very wide and very strict, will apply equally to the Indian Penal Code. In fact the framer of the Code, Lord Macaulay himself wrote that the definitions have been so framed that it is an offence to dip my pen in my neighbour's ink-pot, and it is an assault if I drive past the street and splash some mud on a passer-by. But no court has punished anybody for assault for driving past the street and splashing mud on a passer-by or for dipping one's pen in his neighbour's ink-pot. Therefore the definition has always got to be very strict so that there may be no loop-hole.

But the way in which it is administered is the greatest test. And the way it has been administered has not been shown to be either arbitrary or very harsh; no case has been brought forward. We have heard the speeches of three eminent and talented men on the other side who would have known of such cases if anything had occurred of that kind. And the very fact that they have not placed any such case before the House shows there is none.

There is another argument advanced, namely that the various Press associations and journalists themselves should frame a code of ethics and that Government ought not to interfere too much. I shall tell you briefly as to what happened with regard to this adventure of trying to get an international code of ethics for the journalists framed by the journalists themselves. The Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information said that an international conference of professional associations and information enterprises should be called for the purpose of framing an international code of ethics for journalists. Five hundred invitations were sent, and only 57 associations throughout the world responded. I am very happy to say that two associations from India responded, one being the Federation of the Working Journalists Associations. But the Newspaper Editors Conference did not, nor any association of the newspaper owners.

If that is the response you are getting in the world in respect of the endeavour to create an international code of ethics, is it not a far cry to depend on voluntary effort to control these scurrilous, vulgar or obscene presses to see that they regulate their conduct themselves? It is in my opinion; not possible in the present state of affairs to trust the professional associations and the information enterprises themselves to frame a code of conduct and to observe it.

The only other matter which I would like to deal with is the

[Shri Venkataraman]

section in which a clear distinction is sought to be made between the rights of the jury and the rights of the judge. It is a well-known principle of criminal jurisprudence that the jury decides on the guilt but the sentence is always imposed by the judge. The jury may make some recommendation but it is not obligatory on the part of the judge to accept that recommendation. The same principle is being imported by this amendment. Nothing new is sought to be made. The only objection, if at all that can be raised, is that even this change can wait till the Press Commission has reported; that since you are awaiting the report of the Press Commission on several matters this also can wait. That is a matter which Government may consider very seriously. If the whole question is going to be reviewed by the Press Commission, and if we are going to have the report of the Commission before we frame the next legislation, it would be better that no changes are made, either by way of giving the right of appeal to Government itself or by way of making this change with regard to the right of the jury to make the recommendation.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** I will not take a very long time because most of the speakers have dealt with the various aspects of the case. But, unfortunately none has tried to touch the question of the constitutional propriety of putting this Act or continuing this Act on the statute book. Our Constitution under article 19 says that all citizens shall have the right to freedom of speech and expression. It is only with this that we are concerned, to which one rider is added by way of clause (2), which says:

"Nothing in sub-clause (a) of clause (1) shall affect the operation of any existing law, or prevent the State from making any law, in so far as such law imposes reasonable restrictions on

the exercise of the right conferred by the said sub-clause in the interests of the security of the State, friendly relations with foreign States, public order, decency or morality, or in relation to contempt of court, defamation or incitement to an offence."

If a trained lawyer reads this sub-clause, he will immediately find that all the restrictions that have been placed or enumerated in this sub-clause are those which are already in existence in the Indian Penal Code and those restrictions having been there, this law appears to be redundant. Inasmuch as you are talking of any preventive to the use of obscene language, publishing obscene literature or publishing obscene matter, you can penalise under sections 292 or 293 of the Indian Penal Code. If there is scurrilous language used against anyone, there is section 499. If you come across seducing of the armed force or police force, there is section 131. There are so many other sections to help you. Then why do you want this new measure to be there to put a stop to the liberty that has been granted to the Press? I must say that something is wrong in our approach to the fundamental rights granted to us by the Constitution. At the time of discussing the Preventive Detention Act also we tried to deal with this. It was said that some fundamental rights are also given to Government to make such important restrictions. It is this article 19 sub-clause (2) which is supposed to give some sort of fundamental right to the Government to impose some reasonable restrictions. If these rights are not imposed the right of the Government lapses. It is from that point of view that this measure is now put before this House. We have to see whether it is essential that the liberty of the Press must be curtailed in this manner. It is quite true that there is gutter press, which we call in

another language 'yellow press'. It is true that this will continue to exist. But, what has the Government done so far to put any restriction whatsoever on anybody entering into the profession of journalism? A man who has studied up to second standard is a compositor and he wants to become a journalist. There is nothing to prevent him and he becomes a journalist. If you want to become a lawyer, some qualification is necessary, so also to become a medical man. But, to become a journalist you require nothing. You may or may not know composition. Therefore, if you want to put any restriction, by way of a qualifying examination it will be a reasonable restriction on this profession. Is this a reasonable restriction that you want to put in for the sake of some people who are ignorant, who cannot understand what the law of contempt is or what is a scurrilous remark, or who are used to black-mailing? If you want to pounce on these people, do pounce by all means under the ordinary law of the land. Do not victimise people who are there to serve you, who want to serve the country, who want to expose facts, who want to place facts before the public so that the public may know, so that the public may be educated. It is to such people that notices are issued every now and then, asking why they should not deposit so much money, why their security should not be forfeited. The poor man is already sweating, is struggling hard to make the two ends meet. You do not know what journalism means. Most of the journalists are making a hand to mouth living, having nothing to fall back upon. It is against such people that all actions are taken. I therefore submit that before the Government proceeds further in this matter, before such a law is perpetuated in our country, they must think a hundred times.

I am coming to another aspect...

**Shri T. N. Singa:** Do you mean to suggest that the standard of journa-

lists here is something extraordinarily low?

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** That is the kind of inference you may be able to draw from what I have submitted. My submission is this. In some cases the standard of these men is very high. But, we have got a sort of Bar Council or Medical Council controlling the entry of a person into the professions. But, in the case of journalism, anybody who wants to become a journalist could become one. We have not got such a system here. That is my submission.

If you want to have some sort of a reasonable restriction, have something of that type, but not of a penal type. Do not say, because you have become a journalist, we will penalise you, you should pay Rs. 2,000 or 5,000. Then see what farce is there. The hon. Home Minister in his usual way, in a very cursory manner says: go to the court, the Sessions Judge deals with the case, there is the jury, the jury returns the verdict. You can sit here and say that all these provisions have been made, without having to face the song. Difficulties arise when you go before the Sessions judge. A High Court Judge, under section 305 of the Criminal Procedure Code is bound to agree with the unanimous verdict of the jury. But, this omnipotent Sessions Judge is considered much more learned than a High Court Judge. He need not accept the verdict of the jury. It is to such a person that you are going. He is a person who is always looking up to the Government for being raised from the Bench of the Sessions court to the Bench of the High Court. This is the person with certain prejudices working in his mind, who has been given the power not to accept even the unanimous verdict of the jury. It will be quite good if it was provided in this that if it is a majority verdict of the jury, or even an unanimous verdict of the jury, the Judge will be bound to accept that. That would serve as some sort of protection to these poor journalists, who are even now struggling. I do not want to use

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

all the eloquence that has been used by the previous speakers. But I want to point out to you that the reasonable restrictions which you want has already been provided for. There is absolutely no necessity for providing another restriction which is not a reasonable restriction. This is not a reasonable restriction. Therefore I oppose this. It is true you have said that this House will decide. It is true that you are **puffed-up** with power. It is true that the brute majority in this House will certainly pass this law. You can turn a man into woman. You can say that all men are women. You can do that.

**Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam):** That is possible now.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** It is possible to say in words. But, it will not make us women. That is why I submit, do not be led away by power that you are going to exercise. The power is there. But, that power must be used on occasions, like a wise man, like a wise lawyer. It is not for you to throw challenges that here we are going to pass it, whatever, happens. You are all wise men here. Touch your conscience and then decide for yourselves whether this measure is necessary for curbing the little liberty that our Press enjoys.

**Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara):** I heard my hon. friend Shri Venkataraman with great respect, but I am afraid he went on roaming all over the world. We have to have our feet firmly on our own ground, the land of Hindustan. We have to learn nothing from the Press of the West. Our Press is clean, noble and has upheld the highest traditions. Our Press was nourished under the black Acts of Hallets, Mudies and other men of the Indian Civil Service who tried to rule this country with an iron hand. Those were the days of forfeitures and seditious arrests and confiscations. Our journalists were reared up in the atmosphere of freedom and they gave a fight to the law and led the vanguard of the Indian Press. Where was the British

Press or the American Press then? Did they shed a tear or say a word of sympathy for us? How many times did they not tell blatant lies where the question of India or Asia or Africa was concerned? The fine platitudes and theories of the United Nations freedom of Information Bureau may be very good to be ventilated on the other fronts of the world, but not on the Indian front. With a few exceptions—which are found in every part of the world—the Indian Press and the Indian journalists have built up and upheld the highest traditions of honour, integrity and patriotism un-mindful of the material values of life, un-mindful of the rupees, annas and pies which are overwhelming the Press of the rest of the world. We are quantitatively and qualitatively and definitely far superior to the Press of the West. Our Press has spread the gospel of freedom, of charity, of fraternity. Mahatma Gandhi's paper *Young India* for example, was the best kind of paper, and the man was ready to face any trial. For the articles published in *Young India* he had to face trial and had to spend six years in jail. Similarly, in 1910 for the articles he had written Lokamanya Tilak was tried by an Indian judge and he had to spend six years in jail in Mandlay. When the sun of Indian freedom was very dark, when the roses of the freedom which we are seizing today were far off, these were the persons who nourished our patriotism.

I have witnessed another great trial—the House will pardon me if I narrate some of my personal episodes—that of B. G. Horniman. I have known him both as a student and as a lawyer who defended him in seven big defamation cases. The Emergency Press Act which came into this House in the year 1931 under the influence of the British Government was a hydra-headed Act. Shri Ram, that noble valiant soul, will be remembered for killing that enormous monster Ravana with ten heads. But the Indian Press had a twelve-headed monster over it. These are the twelve hydra-headed monsters: Press and Registration of Books Act, 1867, Indian States (Protection against



Disaffection) Act, 1922, Official Secrets Act, 1923, Indian Press (Emergency Powers) Act, 1931, Foreign Relations Act, 1932, Indian States (Protection) Act, 1934, Sections 124A, 153A and 505 of the **Indian Penal Code**, 1860.

**Shri N. Somana (Coorg)**: On a point of order Sir. I want to know whether we are discussing the Act of 1931 now.

**Shri Joachim Alva**: I want to tell my hon. friend that the previous speakers had roamed from America to Delhi, and I think I can go into these few periods.

I want to mention that only three Acts out of these have been repealed. There are numerous other State Acts. Some of them have been repealed, but the majority of them have not been repealed.

The House should know the background, and if I have half an hour, I would like to take fifteen minutes to give the background.

Time was in 1930 when the editor of a paper could be put in jail for making an announcement about a meeting to be held in Chowpathy, Bombay, by Mr. Motilal Nehru, who roared like a lion from the Opposition Benches in those days. I have great respect and admiration for my friend Dr. Katju and I would not say a word to hurt his feeling. He was nourished in the chambers of Motilal Nehru. As I was saying, for making a mere announcement in the *Bombay Chronicle*, my late friend Syed Abdullah Brelvi was arrested. Again, Mr. Syed Abdullah had to go to jail in 1932, because he had committed such an offence. This was how the editors had to suffer then. We are trying to avoid a recurrence of the same thing again, and see what are the provisions that are still hanging on under this Act. At the time of the 1951 Bill, we were given to understand that the Act would be in force only for a period of two years. But now we are asked to extend it by two more years, on the ground that the Press Commission is still examining the matter.

It is true that the Press Commission consists of very distinguished

men, and is headed by one of the best judges of the Bombay High Court, and this is really a good sign for the Indian Press. It consists also of very distinguished members of the working journalists' profession, like Shri Chalapati Rau, a man who has spent his time amidst the ink and smoke of the printing factory. There are also men who have been leading editors. My hon. friends Shri T. N. Singh, and Shri Jaipal Singh who have been good journalists themselves are members of this Commission. We are awaiting the report of the Press Commission, and it is said that their report will be ready by June this year. Government may request the Commission to expedite their report, and after it is ready, the Law Ministry will be taking nearly six months over it, and after this, they would come to this House for new sanctions to be forged on the anvil of this House.

Some hon. Members have said that the provisions of the Indian Penal Code are ample. I would only like to reiterate the proposition—and I have been confirmed in this by great jurists and law-givers—that no person, whether he be a Minister, or the President, or the Prime Minister, or a Tukka Ram or any citizen, shall possess more powers than are possessed by an average citizen, who is protected by the law of the land. And what is the law of the land? It is the all-embracing and all-repressive Indian Penal Code. Nobody should be convicted unless he has committed some penal offences, and until he is convicted, he should be able to go and shake hands with any person, even in the precincts of the courts.

I shall quote again a personal instance, to show that the provisions of the Civil Procedure Code are ample and wide enough to convict an editor, to put him in jail and to confiscate all his properties. When Mahatma Gandhi was murdered, I wrote an article in my paper *Forum*, which described Godse as an alleged murderer, and that was treated as a serious offence. I was asked to tender an apology for that. But I refused to tender any apology. But later, on the advice of

[Shri Joachim Alva]

the best legal minds of the Bombay High Court, including Mr. Daphtary who conducted the case against Godse later, I tendered an apology. But in the process, I had to spend nearly Rs. 12,000, and mortgage all my property, and the little income that I got from my paper, already boycotted by the doyens of British and American advertisers and also the big capitalists. Even in such a small case, I had to spend nearly Rs. 12,000 to pay solicitors' fees etc. I would like to mention here that the provisions of the Civil Procedure Code are quite sufficient to extort damages from any editor for any article of defamation or contempt that he writes. If that be the case in regard to unintentional offences, the damages claimed will be much more, in cases where an editor has deliberately and wantonly written an article offending any person, and such heavy damages can be extorted from him even under the civil law. If recourse can be had to the civil law, why should Government want themselves to be armed with the provisions of an Act of this nature?

I say in all humility, that these are the experiences we have passed through. I would like to say in this connection, what happened when I was a member of the All-India Newspaper Editors Conference—I am no more a member of that body. At that time, when I supported the Bill on the floor of this House, I did so for two reasons. If the public were not able to take care of the yellow press, if the editors were not able to take care of the yellow press, who was to take care of it? Obviously, Government had to come in. And for that speech, my esteemed friend, who is no more today and whose death I mourn—I refer to Mr. Sadanand, the father of the *Free Press Journal* of Bombay—moved a resolution in the All-India Newspaper Editors Conference saying that Alva should be sacked from the Conference. I have nothing to say against Mr. Sadanand. As a matter of fact, we all owe a great debt to him for his services to the

cause of the free Press. But others reached out their unholy hands. I did what I thought right. I said that I had been a journalist and had supported the measure. Today, I say Sir, in all humility, why has not the Government tried during these last years to consult the machinery of the All-India Newspaper Editors Conference, to sit in conference with them? It worked very well during the war. The joint consultative machinery set up during the war—the so-called Press Advisory Committees—worked extremely well. When I was arrested for sedition for writing an article, certainly the Bombay Press Advisory Committee like a man struck. And may I pay a tribute to Srinivasan and Brelvi for their efforts in this connection? The prosecution was withdrawn and the popular editors succeeded. I never raised my little finger, but they like the Trojan heroes fought and got the prosecution withdrawn as also the security order imposed upon me.

If our editors are united in the feeling, if the Provincial Press Advisory Committee is united in the feeling that a particular paper has done a wrong, then it is open to the Government to prosecute the editor. It is a system of consultative machinery by which the editors sit in conference where editors are chosen by their own colleagues and some of them are selected by Government. So that if the Government comes forward and says 'Here is an editor who has committed an error. What do you say?', the Committee can consider and say: 'Well, the defamation is not very seditious. This paper must be warned. He shall be excused this time. He shall be warned to behave better'. That, I say, is the best arrangement where erring editors can be warned. If that machinery has failed, well, then Government has no other course open except to fall on their own powers.

After all is said and done, public opinion is something very very strong. We have to take note of public opinion. I would say whether they be Ministers or politicians or others, they have to

have the skin of rhinoceros where public criticism is concerned. We cannot be so touchy about it. We cannot be so sensitive to criticism when a man's wife has been up braided or one's children have been defamed or family fortunes criticised. Hence the errors of politicians and public men have got to be screened, and have got to be screened in a way. Even a man of the stature of Mr. Dalton, a former Chancellor of the Exchequer under the Labour Government, for letting an information slip—unconsciously—had to resign his office. Such great traditions are built up in the House of Commons. Why not public opinion in our country develop likewise? Why not we follow that example? If our politicians or Ministers are most wantonly and maliciously defamed, then the provisions of the Indian Penal Code are there. There is section 499. There are nine or ten exceptions under section 499. After all is said and done, for the offence of defamation to be really concrete, the requirement is there—"in good faith". 'Good faith' means due care and attention. If a journalist has not exercised due care and attention and thereby displayed lack of good faith, he is liable under the law. These provisions are there, and I think the previous speakers are perfectly right on that score. There is section 124A which deals with sedition. Then there is section 131 which deals with offences relating to the army, navy and air force. Then we have section 153A—promoting enmity between classes. If these sections are not enough, if the powerful umbrella of the Indian Penal Code and the Criminal Procedure Code are not enough to protect the citizen, the Ministers, the Prime Minister or the President, then nothing will avail.

After all is said and done, what is the duty of a prosecutor? He puts his case before the court. If it is a good case, he will win; if it is a bad case, he loses. No prosecutor should display undue enthusiasm in firing out the accused. The accused must get a fair trial. However wrong or indecent the offence may, he must have a proper hearing.

I am told that there are certain judgments—of the Punjab High Court and other courts—that these powers are not wide enough to cover all offences. If that is so, it is time we amended the Act. We should amend the Act in essentials and not propose more drastic measures for ransacking the safety of the Press in this way.

There is a provision, section 20, in the old Act, Sub-clause (3) of that says:

"Such officer as may be appointed by the State Government in this behalf shall prepare and make out in alphabetical order a list of persons residing within the State who by reason of their journalistic experience or of their connection with printing presses or newspapers or of their experience in public affairs are qualified to serve as jurors."

I shall take the instance of Punjab. If there is a paper in Simla, if the editor is guilty, why should a man from the other districts of Punjab be brought as a member of the Jury? I really cannot understand that. After all is said and done, an editor has to be judged by his own peers. If he is to be hanged, let him feel that the editors and printers and those connected with the trade in the same place have been consulted. Let him feel that his own kith and kin have fired him. If that is the attitude, why make the laws more drastic and make the provisions so and say this shall be done? Why not have jurors from the same place? Why have them from other places in the State to hang them?

The Indian language Press is suffering under very great handicaps and disadvantages. I pay my respect to it, though it does not speak in the English language. Some of us have been bred in the English language and the English language Press is everything to us. The Indian language Press—the Urdu, the Hindi, the Marathi, the Kannada, the Tamil, the Telugu and the great Bengali language—has been enriched by the writings in the Press. Even the most

[Shri Joachim Alva]

powerful section of the Indian language Press is suffering under very great handicaps. They have not got very influential editors and patrons to back them up. I shall not say a word in their favour if they defame or incite people or set one section against another or disturb the tranquility of the State.

What were the provisions of the Foreign Relations Act? If you say, for example, that King Farouk had many wives or any such thing, the editor of that paper was fired. Let us take the case of the old Princes Protection Act. If you say that the Prince had a harem or that the Raja came in the way of clean administration or that the Prince indulged in unnatural offences, the editor got into trouble. I have handled a case of a husband and wife who had to come away from the State. The Extradition Act was there and it was applied against them. They said rather than go back to the State it was better to commit suicide and quit the world, for the Prince was in love with the wife and he dismissed the husband on the charge that he carried away some cutlery from the palace. If the Indian language papers in those territories mentioned those facts, they got into trouble. I bow my head to the editors of those papers; they have remained unknown to us and they have perished unhonoured and unsung. Though we have suffered a great deal and were handicapped, they have disappeared because they had not enough of money. They contributed to the great freedom movement in a large measure.

The hon. Minister talked of the Punjab. As I said—and I repeat it—I have very great respect for Dr. Katju—I repeat it for his hearing—on account of his great and sound legal knowledge. He talked of blank cheques. These are very dangerous. Blank cheques are becoming really very pathetic and tragic in our history. The blank cheque which Mahatma Gandhi named was perverted

in white hall by the Winston Churchill Cabinet. I do not like to give a blank cheque to any one. If you give a blank cheque to any man you cannot ask the bank not to honour it.

**Mr. Chairman:** Order, order. I request the hon. Member to be relevant. The Deputy-Speaker said that thirty minutes should be allowed in special cases. But, it is not necessary that everybody should take thirty minutes. I would request the hon. Member either to be relevant to the real issues before the House or to close his speech.

**Shri Joachim Alva:** I am talking of blank cheques because the hon. Minister referred to it in the beginning of his speech. I am not irrelevant. It was the hon. Minister who mentioned it in the beginning.

**Mr. Chairman:** Does it mean that all blank cheques in the world will be discussed here? I will ask him to be relevant.

**Shri Joachim Alva:** When blank cheques are issued they can be misappropriated and the bank cannot stop payment. Whatever it is, the freedom of the Press is something very important for us. We do want to maintain the freedom of the Press. I would like to quote some of the passages from the Report of the Press Laws Enquiry Committee. I will quote only one passage. There was one Sir Charles Metcalfe, a member of the Governor-General's Executive Council in the old days and what he said is very important. He asked Macaulay to draft some laws for the Press. I read from page 5 of the Report.

"I think on the present occasion that it will be infinitely better to allow anything to be said that can be said, than to furnish a new source of discontent, by crushing the expression of public opinion. I have, for my own part, always advocated the liberty of the Press.

believing its benefits to outweigh its mischiefs; and I continue to the same opinion. Admitting that the liberty of the Press, like other liberties of the subject, may be suspended when the safety of the State requires such a sacrifice, I cannot, as a consequence, acknowledge that the present instance ought to be made an exception to the usual practice of the Government; for, if there were danger to the State, either way, there would be more. I should think, in suppressing the publication of opinion, then in keeping the value open by which bad humours might evaporate."

I am not reading the whole of Macaulay's views—

"The question before us is not whether the Press shall be free but whether being free it shall be called free. It is surely mere madness in a Government to make itself unpopular for nothing; to be indulgent and yet to disguise its indulgence under such outward forms as bring on it the reproach of tyranny. Yet, this is now our policy."

I quote this in brief to show that these were the days when there were great men before us, who talked of the liberty of the Press, who rather talked of the restraints of the Press, and who also exercised them in a great and novel manner, so that they could hand over the legacy by which we have preserved the freedom of the Press. I wish to urge that the Government should revive it or should exercise greatly the machinery of the All-India Newspaper Editors Conference and, should meet the Editors on a par and thrash out matters. I am incidentally reminded of the distinguished editor, Lala Desh Bandhu Gupta who waged a battle royal for the rights of the Press and also the late Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee. Though they spoke in a different vein and said different things, yet I pay my humble tribute of praise to both of them. As I said, we need a strong Press, but if the Press makes

780 P.S.D.

mistakes, it is the duty of the Press itself to correct them.

Shri Damodara Menon (Kozhikode). My hon. friend, Mr. N. C. Chatterjee, began his speech by regretting that the hon. Home Minister, Dr. Kailash Nath Katju's name will go down in history as the author of two black Acts, the Preventive Detention Act and the Press (Objectionable Matter) Act. The authorship of the Press (Objectionable Matter) Act does not belong to Dr. Katju, but it was his worthy predecessor, who had that distinction, and he was the person who incorporated this measure in our laws and thereby restricted the freedom of the Press. I do not want to repeat the arguments which have been advanced by previous speakers. They have adequately explained why this measure should not be extended any further. The hon. Home Minister, I thought, would give some valid reason for extending this measure, but unfortunately he did not do so. In fact, his speech only revealed the fact that there is no necessity at all for this measure in the present context of the country. We should not forget the fact that this is not an ordinary measure—it is an extraordinary measure which curtails the freedom of the Press. Therefore, if there is no abnormal situation in the country, we must, as far as possible, see that the Bill is not extended. Now, it is not the case of the hon. Home Minister that the situation in the country today even in regard to gutter Press, is worse than what it was in 1951 when the Bill was first introduced and passed. The figures he showed reveal the fact that there has been a lot of improvement. He pleaded—and pleaded very strongly too—that we should not in any way encourage gutter Press. Nobody in this House would encourage it and everybody wants to put down yellow journalism and also gutter Press—there is no difference of opinion on that point. So far as I know, there is no Press or paper which has not come forward and said that they do not want any kind of gutter journalism to be encouraged. It is not on that question that we differ.

[Shri Damodara Menon]

The only question we have to consider is that by passing a measure like this, we will be putting fetters upon real, honest journalism, journalism of a superior variety which we must all nourish and encourage, because without that freedom this country cannot thrive. After all everybody knows that democracy depends upon free and fearless criticism and if we start putting fetters upon free criticism, democracy will not thrive in this country; it will vanish. Therefore, what we have to consider is whether this measure will not fetter honest, free and fearless criticism. That was the reason why the Press throughout India unanimsly opposed this measure when it was first introduced. Rajaji at that time, it will be remembered stated that he was surprised to find an array of all the Press in India pouring hatred on him. Why was it so? Are all these gentlemen so bad? Why were gentlemen of the Press so angry at this measure? It was not because, as I stated, they wanted yellow journalism to flourish in this country. But they felt that their freedom was being curtailed.

The hon. the Home Minister today asked: do you want the provisions relating to security to be withdrawn? Yes, the Press wants that there should be no security. They want punishment of an erring editor. If an editor publishes obscene matter, by all means let him be prosecuted in a court of law and let him be punished. But the demand of security is a threat that will really curb the freedom of the Press.

Now my hon. friend Mr. Venkataraman stated that pre-censorship is bad. Of course, we have not introduced pre-censorship by this measure. But in a round-about way pre-censorship works. As we all know, people who have invested large sums of money in a press will be not only very careful, but extra-careful in allowing any kind of very violent criticism of any Government, in view

of the provisions of this measure. Therefore, censorship comes on an honest fearless editor, not from the Government, but from the owner of the press. That is the worst aspect of this Bill. Therefore, by its non-provision in this Bill we have not escaped pre-censorship.

Another very bad aspect of this Bill is what the hon. the Home Minister himself pointed out during the course of his speech. He referred to the strikes that are going on in this country. Recently we had the sugarcane growers strike. Suppose a paper features an item of news like that, it may be taken that it is an incitement to some of these offences enumerated under section 3. Is it the intention of the Home Minister to prevent such kind of featuring, or such kind of the Press to present news of importance before the public in a proper way? Therefore, Sir, this Bill is not as innocent as the hon. Home Minister or my hon. friend Mr. Venkataraman wants to make out. I say that the hon. Home Minister, by introducing the present Bill, has gone one step further than his predecessor. He has introduced some amendments which make the provisions of this Bill more devastating and to some extent far more stringent. My hon. friend Mr. Venkataraman admitted that.

Regarding the trial by jury—I am referring to section 4 of this amending Bill—that is section 20, sub-section (4) has to be substituted by it. The duty of the jury is only to decide whether any newspaper news-sheet, book or other document placed before it contains any objectionable matter; that is what they have to decide. Previously they could even decide whether there was any necessity for demanding any security. That right is now taken away. You will remember what Rajaji said when he was replying to the debate when the Bill was discussed in 1951. He said the most vital part of the Bill is the trial by jury. He said 'I would go

further to say, at some future time I know the organised Press will frame its own code of professional ethics and discipline and appoint its own council for discipline and ask the Government for statutory powers to execute its decisions regarding breaches of discipline by anybody irrespective of the fact whether one is a member of the organisation or is kept out'. Rajaji, therefore, visualised such an honourable place for the Press. The hon. Minister said that it was a pious wish; it would never materialise. I do not share his pessimism in this matter. What we have to consider in this matter is this. Rajaji in appointing the jury was giving the right to the Press to go into the matter and if they are themselves satisfied that there is no objectionable matter, as also that there is no necessity for any security, it was open to them to advise or give such a verdict to the Judge. The hon. Home Minister is taking it away. I am glad my hon. friend, Mr. Venkataraman said that this amendment was not necessary. I hope that the hon. Home Minister will be willing to accept it. What does he gain by that? In any event if the District Judge feels that the advice given or the verdict given by the jury is not acceptable to him, it is open to him to refer the matter to the High Court. Why do you restrict the power of the jury? In any case, you are not going to be affected. If a jury gives not only a verdict as to whether a matter is objectionable, but also goes further and says that there is no necessity for demanding any security, even then the District Judge can disagree and take up the matter to the High Court. Why are you now, by this amending Bill, restricting the powers of the jury? In the same way, why are the Government now taking upon themselves the power to appeal against the decision, and take the matter on appeal? I am sure that when the first Bill was introduced, this was deliberately omitted because the Government should not appear as if they are very anxious—they are very

vindictive—in the matter. If the District Judge finds there is no case for either demanding of security or taking any other measure, the Government should not on their own accord take the matter in such a serious manner as to go on appeal. I am afraid, our Government is becoming more and more sensitive to criticism. That is why they want all these restrictions to be placed. It is not because they want to curb the yellow press; if that is so, everybody in this House will be with them; ordinary law is sufficient for that purpose. They are now becoming more and more sensitive to severe criticism; that is clear from the hon. Home Minister's speech; that danger is developing and we must, all lovers of freedom in this country must, see that such a development does not take place.

There is also another amendment suggested in this Bill. It refers to section 2 of the Act, "Unauthorised newspaper" has been defined in the parent Act and "any newspaper in respect of which security has been required under this Act but has not been furnished as required". Now, the present amendment says that any news-sheet which does not contain the name of the printer or publisher will also be an unauthorised news-sheet. I want the Home Minister to explain to the House why he wants to extend it further. This is a very dangerous thing. Because, when a newspaper has committed an offence by publishing an objectionable matter, security is demanded. And when security has not been furnished and it publishes anything, it becomes an unauthorised newspaper. Normally, therefore, it is a guilty press that will come under the definition. But if unfortunately a press which has not been guilty of any such violation, which has not published any unauthorised matter as defined in sub-section (j), even then that press may come under the mischief of this Act if it merely publishes a news-sheet without the name of the Press. If a News-sheet is published without the name of the printer or the publisher, ordinarily there is

[Shri Damodara Menon]

a law to punish it. And the punishment is not so severe. There is a Registration of Press Act. Under that you can take action and the offending press can be punished, if you adduce evidence that a news-sheet was published without the name of the press that printed it. Therefore, when there is provision under another law, and that provision does not give a heavy punishment like this where forfeiture and all these things are coming in, why are you importing this amendment into this Act thereby making it far more stringent? Even if an innocent paper without knowledge publishes a news-sheet or something in which the name of the printer does not appear, you can bring it under the Act. It may not have committed any other offence like publishing obscene things or anything which you deem objectionable under the Act. That is why I say that this amending Bill is not so innocent as the hon. Minister would try to make out. He says they are very minor amendments. I say they are very major ones.

He himself states in the statement of objects and reasons that the Press Commission is enquiring into the matter. Let us await their decision. And if it is found there is necessity for us to make a law which probably will be in keeping with the Home Minister's desire, let us have it. But let us await the opinion and recommendation of a body that has been created by the Government. It has been our experience when such bodies are created and they submit their reports to the Government. The Government does not ordinarily accept their recommendations and act accordingly. We know that in 1947 the Press Enquiry Committee Report came, and Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, the then Home Minister found it not possible to accept their recommendations. They never said that there should be any security demanded of any press. They never recommended that there should be a separate law for the press. They said the ordinary law will do; if you want to have the most stringent law, make it, but let

it be in the ordinary law; there is no necessity for us to have a special law like this. That was their recommendation. But Government did not implement those recommendations. In a similar way probably, I am afraid, the Home Minister feels that the recommendations of the Press Commission may not be in keeping with his own desire. That is why he is hastening with this measure under the plea that they are minor amendments. I am afraid these amendments are not minor at all.

Sir, I do not want to take more time. Before closing I want to make an appeal to the Home Minister. After all he knows that the Press in this country is a responsible Press. It does not indulge in violent criticism or even scurrilous criticism. It takes a considered view of things and we can be proud of the Press. If it is so, it must be the endeavour of the Home Minister, as has been suggested by Shri Rajagopalachari to create a body within the journalistic profession who will see that scurrilous journalism, yellow journalism as well as obscene literature are not published, and if as has been suggested by his predecessor that body is invested with the powers of taking action against erring newspapers, I think it would be a far more healthy measure than a Bill of this nature, which we do not find in any civilised country of the world. Therefore, I request him to withdraw this measure and await the recommendations of the Press Commission. If possible, if he is not so pessimistic as he appears to be, he may try and create a body as was suggested by Rajaji, among the pressmen themselves who will see that proper standard of journalism is maintained in the country.

श्री एम० पी० मिश्र : सभापति जी, बड़े गौर और आदर के साथ मैं ने मंत्री जी का भाषण सुना। आप जानते हैं कि चार वर्ष से इस बिल को ले कर इस भवन में, इस सदन में बड़ी बड़ी लड़ाइयां हुई हैं, और आज जब मैं बोलने के लिये खड़ा हूँ और आप सामने हैं



तो मुझे वह दृश्य याद आ जाता है जब राजा जी के जमाने में, आप भी उन लोगों में थे जिन्होंने बड़ी सस्ती के साथ इस बिल के खिलाफ इस ऐक्ट के खिलाफ, विचार प्रकट किये थे। मैं ने सोचा कि आखिर आज इस बिल को फिर लाने की जरूरत क्यों पड़ी? मैं ने काटजू साहब के भाषण को बड़े आदर के साथ सुना। उस के पहले मेरे मन में एक बात आई। यह कानून अपने तौर से २९ जनवरी, १९५४ को खत्म हो गया था। सरकार ने, उस को संविधान के अन्दर जो अधिकार है उस से, आर्डिनेन्स बना कर इस को जिलाया है। मैं, अब से कहना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसे अहम मामलों में, ऐसे कानूनों को जो कि जनता के मूलाधिकारों से सरोकार रखते हैं, आर्डिनेन्स के जरिये नहीं जिलाना चाहिये। आर्डिनेन्स बनाने का हक सरकार को संविधान ने दिया है, लेकिन इस की विशेष मंशा तो यह है कि ऐसे वक्त में जब पार्लियामेंट अधिवेशन में न हो, और सरकार पर कोई बहुत बड़ा खतरा आ जाय, या ऐसी कोई जरूरत आ जाय जिस के बिना देश का काम न चल सकता हो, सरकार आर्डिनेन्स बना सकती है। लेकिन नवम्बर के सेशन में पार्लियामेंट को इस बिल पर विचार करने का समय नहीं मिला और आर्डिनेन्स के जरिये इस को जिलाया गया। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सदन इस बात पर भी गौर करे कि आर्डिनेन्स किन किन मामलों में लागू किये जा सकते हैं। ऐसे कानूनों के लिये जो कि जनता के मूलाधिकारों से सम्बन्ध रखते हैं, उन को आर्डिनेन्स के जरिये जिलाने का तरीका मेरी राय में बहुत खराब है।

खैर, जब होम मिनिस्टर भाषण कर रहे थे तो एक दुःखद घटना इस सदन के भीतर हो गई। मैं ने देखा कि पार्लियामेंट के कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी के मेम्बर विशेष तौर से होम मिनिस्टर का भाषण सुनना बर्दाश्त नहीं कर रहे हैं।

वह चीखते थे, चिल्लाते थे, और जब उन को हमारे डिप्टी स्पीकर ने मना किया, एक बार नहीं, दो बार नहीं, कई बार, तो और चीखने लगे। और आखिर में नतीजा यह हुआ कि वह उपाध्यक्ष पर आक्षेप करते हुए भवन से बाहर निकल गये।

मैं सोचता था कि यह कानून है किस के लिये। होम मिनिस्टर ने अपने भाषण को बड़ी होशियारी से तैयार किया था। और उन्होंने उन लोगों का नाम नहीं लिया जो कि यहां से भाग गये। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर सरकार को किसी से डर है, इस देश को अगर किसी से डर है, भारत की आजादी को किसी से डर है इस देश की नई आजादी और लोकतन्त्र को किसी से डर है तो वह वही लोग हैं जो कि इस भवन से भाग गये हैं। लेकिन हमारे होम मिनिस्टर ने काटजू साहब ने अपने भाषण में उन का कहीं नाम नहीं लिया। हमारे दूसरे दोस्त बेंकटरामन साहब ने भी मद्रास की मिसालें दीं कि केवल इन्डीसेन्ट और स्करिलस बातों को, भद्दे और अश्लील पत्रों को रोकने के लिये वहां अखबारों के खिलाफ कार्रवाई की गई। इस देश में आज एक नहीं कई पार्टियां हैं, एक कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी है, दूसरी तरफ आर० एस० एस० है जिस को राष्ट्रीय स्वयं सेवक संघ कहा जाता है, एक और उसी से निकला हुआ दल है जन संघ। यह इस देश में ऐसे दल हैं जिन का लोकतन्त्र में विश्वास नहीं है, इन तीनों दलों के अलावा और छोटी मोटी पार्टियां भी हैं जो खुले आम कहती हैं कि उन का लोकतंत्र में विश्वास नहीं है, प्रजातन्त्र में विश्वास नहीं है। यही नहीं कि उन का प्रजातन्त्र में विश्वास नहीं है बल्कि यहां प्रजातन्त्रात्मक तरीके से जो सरकार कायम है इस से किसी को इन्कार नहीं हो सकता कि सन् १९४७ से और विशेषकर सन् १९५२ से जो सरकार यहां पर कायम है वह प्रजातन्त्रात्मक तरीके पर बनी है उ

[ श्री एम० पी० मिश्र ]

में उन का विश्वास नहीं है। वह सरकारें जनता की राय से बनी हैं वे जोरतन्त्रात्मक सरकारें हैं।

7 P.M.

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. Member may continue tomorrow.

*The House then adjourned till One of the Clock on Thursday, the 11th March, 1954.*

---