

In respect of the branches of the above banks in area IV, the rates according to Government's modified decision will continue to apply.

- (v) In regard to class C and class D banks [other than those mentioned in sub-paragraph (iv) above and a few which have entered into agreements with their employees, displaced banks and banks incorporated in Travancore-Cochin (except the Travancore Bank,) the rates prescribed by Government will continue.
- (vi) In the case of class D banks, excluding those in Travancore-Cochin State and displaced banks, the provision that from the 1st April 1959, they should automatically step into class C should be set aside. The position of these banks at the end of March 1959 should be examined afresh for determining whether they should be promoted to C class.
- (vii) Banks incorporated in the Travancore-Cochin State (excluding the Travancore Bank) should implement the Government's modified decision subject to certain modifications.

In view of the special problems of banking in the Travancore-Cochin State, a Commission may be appointed to review the entire banking situation in that State. If no Commission is appointed, the position of class D banks in the State should be reviewed as at the end of March 1959 along with other class D banks.

(viii) The United Bank of India which has been exempted under the Government's modification order, should implement the Sastry Award as a class B bank with effect from 1st August 1955, subject to certain conditions. Its financial position should be reviewed by a tribunal not later than three years.

(ix) Agreements entered into between the Bank managements and the employees in the case of seven banks should be ratified by Government and enforced.

Government have decided to accept in full recommendations of the Commission on the substantive terms of the award. Necessary legislation for the purpose of implementing those recommendations will be introduced shortly. The Commission has made certain recommendations relative to the cost structure of the banking system such as a possible upward adjustment in the rates charged on loans and advances, concerted action by banks to enforce floor rates on some categories of advances as well as ceilings on deposit rates, control over emoluments of higher executives etc. These are separately under the examination of Government and appropriate action will be taken in respect of them.

The Report is being released for publication. Government are grateful to Justice Gajendragadkar for the exhaustive, painstaking and expeditious enquiry conducted by him. They particularly appreciate his successful efforts in bringing the parties closer together and trust that this spirit of accommodation and cooperation will govern the relations of the employers and employees in the banking industry in the future. That way lies their well-being and the prosperity of the country.

MOTION RE. REPORT OF PRESS
COMMISSION—Concl'd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now resume further discussion on the Report of the Press Commission. Out of 12 hours allotted for the discussion on the motion, about eight hours have already been taken up till the 20th August 1955 and about four hours more now remain.

Today being the last day of the discussion on the motion may I know how long is the Minister likely to take?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Dr. Keskar): I would like to have about one hour

Mr. Speaker: That means the discussion will go on for three hours more, when the Minister will be called upon to reply. The motion and the amendments thereto will be put to vote at about 4 P.M.

Thereafter the House will take up the Abducted Persons (Recovery and Restoration) Continuance Bill, 1955 for which three hours have been allotted.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): On Saturday afternoon, when the House adjourned, I was referring to the unholy alliance between the political lords and the Press barons which augurs ill for the growth of a robust democracy in our country. This alliance must be broken. Such a divorce is the *sine qua non* for the survival of the freedom of the Press and for the promotion of the wider national interest. Failure to do so or even apathy towards this fundamental problem will sap the lifeblood of this young democracy and lay the foundations of a totalitarian order or an oligarchical dictatorship.

[**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair**]

Unless this primary task is accomplished, we shall not see a great editor or a great newspaper in our midst. I hold fast to the belief that a great editor and a great newspaper are of no less importance to our present and to the future of our country—no less important than a great President or a great Prime Minister or a great Leader of the Opposition. May be, this is a forlorn hope. Perhaps the age of independent editors, the age of great editors has gone; the age of cold calculators and hot advertisers and covert censors has come. Have we not seen in our own day and very recently too, the spectacle of a widely circulated English daily shutting its mouth on Prohibition as soon as Government advertisements were cut off? Don't I know myself Governments—Central and States—coaxing, cajoling, purchasing and buldgeoning the Press

barons, editors and working journalists? *Sama, Beda, Dama and Danda*—all are being employed by the Government.

A Minister telephones or rings up a proprietor or editor or a Press agency to play up or play down or black out some news and lo and behold!—it is done. A managing editor and one of the directors of the PTI was included twice or thrice in delegations to the United Nations and soon after that a magical effect was observed in the apologetic tone of his paper's criticism of the Government. This paper was perhaps one of the few dailies in our country which wrote no editorial article on the medicopolitical murder of Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee. Our All India Radio shared that distinction in that it too disposed of the matter in a casual one-line news item though when Minister Gopalswami Ayyangar passed away, unfortunately for our country, AIR for nearly three or four minutes lauded him as a great statesman and what not. Not that I did not appreciate the effort of AJR on this latter occasion. But I mention this only to illustrate the morbid tendency of the Government to dragoon publicity media and to press them into their service for their base and ignoble ends without much thought for national sentiment or public interest. I have seen AIR and PTI saying not a word about the PSP and Communist provincial conferences while on the same day giving not less than 300 words for a not so very bright speech of chota Minister somewhere. Newspapers often take the cue from the AIR and PTI. An Indian newspaper with mass circulation cannot hope to exist or flourish if it does not publicise Ministers of the Government. Their publicity comes next only to film stars, jockeys and sportsmen—Ministers whether their performance be good, bad or indifferent and other politicians only in their less discreet or more dramatic moments.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Kamath has already taken fourteen minutes the other day.

Shri Kamath: I took only eleven minutes the other day.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Office records are to be preferred. I do not think the hon. Member can go on.

Shri Kamath: I will take only four more minutes; that is all. I am sorry my friend has left. I would have requested Shri Tulsidas—he has left his seat.....

An Hon. Member: He is there.

Shri Kamath:..... I would request him to tell us later when he speaks on this subject the story of the Bharat Combine of newspapers in Bombay in which I learn he too had his fingers burnt in the process.

I shall now refer to another undesirable and harmful tie-up of our two national agencies—PTI and UPI—with the two foreign agencies—Reuters and *Agence France Presse*. There are two other smaller agencies like APA and UPA functioning in this country. The role of the Information Ministry and the Communications Ministry in this connection hampers the growth of Asian news agencies on a healthy competitive basis and retards the free flow of world news, is contrary to the spirit of Bandung and is hardly in consonance with the 4th *tatva* of Pancha Shila—mutual equality and benefit—which should animate the relations between the Pancha Shila countries the majority of whom are Asian countries. In any case they are not British or Western European or American countries.

Here is Press Information Bureau's hand-out on Goa today—the latest hand-out on Goa. It is all British and American Press reactions. Why should we depend for foreign news on Reuters and *Agence France Presse*? In this age of Asian resurgence—which the Prime Minister often talks about; he often repeats that Asia is on the march and Asia is not to be dictated to by Europe or America—why should not we encourage Asian news agencies like Kyodo, Antara (Indonesian) and New China News Agency. There

are big newspapers in Japan. Their circulation exceeds that of British newspapers. Three Japanese newspapers—*Asahi Shimbun*, *Mainichi* and *Yomiuri*—these three put together have a circulation of nearly fourteen million which is more than the circulation of six British newspapers put together. But unfortunately, because of the policy followed by our Government with regard to the rate system, cable rates, wireless rates,—there are other matters—Asian news agencies cannot compete with those established news agencies like Reuters and *Agence France Presse*. Reuters was pampered by the British Government and the pampering is going on even today. I would suggest that the Government should extend such facilities to these Asian news agencies too so that we can get the real and correct news and information and so that our country may also be properly represented in foreign countries. They should extend to these news agencies facilities for relaying news from New Delhi direct on our wireless to the Asian centres without the messages going by the overland lines from here to Bombay or Calcutta. Secondly I would suggest a substantial reduction of Press cable rates. The reception charges on foreign press messages on the wireless must be lowered immediately. If these things are not done, all this talk about Bandung, *Panch Shila*, Asian resurgence, "Asia is on the march" and our support of Asian freedom and African freedom will be empty chatter—not to be taken at its face value.

As I am pressing against time I will only state the points and then conclude. My friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee rightly condemned the other day the deal that U. P. I. has entered into with a cotton magnate. He said that it had virtually passed into the hands of the cotton magnate because he had full power in all matters.

An Hon. Member: The magnate's name?

Shri Kamath: I do not want to mention the name—all right, he is

[Shri Kamath]

one Shri Karnani. In this connection I would only ask the Government to render assistance to the U.P.I. to tide over their present financial difficulties. The Press Commission has suggested a long-term interest-free loan to the P. T. I. but no such loan has been suggested by the Press Commission to the U. P. I. Why this discrimination? The U. P. I. has served the national cause and over freedom movement since its inception. I would, therefore, ask our Free India Government to assist the U. P. I. in its present financial difficulty. I would also ask the Government not to advance any loan to them unless the U. P. I. in their turn agree to terminate this shabby deal with the cotton magnate and take steps to put the U. P. I. on a sound Trust form of management basis as suggested by the Press Commission.

There is the third agency also, the *Hindustan Samachar* a small news agency, struggling for the last 5 or 6 years. It is run on co-operative basis. It is a co-operative venture of working journalists. There is only one thing that I would suggest in this connection and that is, the Minister might consider helping this agency in a small way. Wherever there are A.I.R. regional centres the regional news at these centres could be taken from this agency because it is a multi-lingual agency and it serves newspapers in about seven languages of our country. I have seen two or three papers in different languages served by this agency; but I understand that they serve in about seven languages of India.

Lastly, Sir,—I will conclude in a minute or a minute and a quarter—about the Press Council. I would suggest that the Press Council which has been recommended by the Press Commission should not only formulate a code of ethics for working journalists but it should formulate a code for advertisers also. While I am on this subject I may suggest that while 40 per cent. newspaper's space has been

suggested as a ceiling for advertisements by the Press Commission, not more than 15 per cent. should be the ceiling for ministerial publicity in the papers, and for the Opposition there must be a floor of 5 per cent.; otherwise I see no hope for democracy in our country. There must be a ceiling for the Government and floor for the Opposition.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): Will there be individual allotment for members of the Opposition?

Shri Kamath: I would prefer to have more and more of More.

Shri S. S. More: Some of the Members are appropriating here also.

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): Misappropriating, rather.

Shri Kamath: I would, lastly.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: How many 'lastly'?

Shri Kamath: This is the last 'lastly'. Sir, on Friday you gave 22 minutes to some Members.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But, today is the last day. The hon. Member wants to speak on the last day, he must remember that.

Shri Kamath: Sir, I will not repeat a single point.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member always speaks very relevantly.

Shri Kamath: Sir, I will finish in 40 seconds. A European friend once asked me: "Why is there so much ministerial publicity in your papers? Your papers are well run on the whole, but why is there so much accent on Ministers and governmental activities unlike our papers in Europe and America?" I only said it might be democracy's growing pains and subside after a time.

I suggest that in our country there should be a school for journalism—I do not know whether the Press Commission has recommended this or not.

Shri S. S. More: Why not for politicians also?

Shri Kamath: I would suggest that every university must have a faculty of journalism. Nagpur has it already.

Then I come to minimum wages for journalists. Although I support that proposal I would also make it clear that the Government's policy has been very shilly-shally on this minimum wage business. I would ask the Government to formulate a national minimum wage policy and not merely discriminate in favour of this or that category. The other day a very modest proposition of mine on the minimum wage—I mean my amendment to Shri D. C. Sharma's resolution—was defeated by the Congress benches, and we on this side were convinced that the Avadi hoax was buried with full honours in Parliament House. It is very unfortunate, but I hope that the Government will take note of this.

Shri S. S. More: Is Parliament House a burial place?

Shri Kamath: I would also like to suggest that all the legislation coming under this Report should also apply to Jammu and Kashmir and not merely to the rest of India. I would now conclude, Sir, with this observation which cannot be bettered:

"It is only in freedom that we shall survive. It is only by a readiness to search out and publish the truth whatever its implications, to enter into frank debate between governed and governing and between nation and nation, to challenge, to criticise and propose, and to offer to the test of world opinion the principles by which we seek to guide our affairs that freedom and democracy can flourish."

Shri Gadgil: I must in the first place congratulate the Government on placing this Report for a discussion in this House and also on having stated that by and large it is going to accept most of the recommendations and if there are certain recommendations still left out, they are the ones which Government is considering and want some indication as to the views of this House. It is from

that point of view that I propose to confine myself only to three recommendations: one relating to minimum wages for the journalists, secondly, about price-page schedule and the third about the organisation of a news services.

Before I take up the question of price-page schedule I should like to pay my compliments to the Chairman of the Commission—who, unfortunately, is no more—and other members, who have done the job very excellently. I have noticed certain criticism in respect of certain points and views expressed by the Commission, but my own experience, which is not inconsiderable with respect to working in commissions and committees, is that I have never found a commission's report written so well, with such a poise, such impartiality and judgment. Sir, our's is a democracy.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Hazari-bagh West): No.

Shri Gadgil: You are in a hopeless minority. If it had not been a democracy you would not have been here.

Shri Kamath: There are too many of you.

Shri Gadgil: The point is that we have to consider this great institution which is compared to the fourth estate of the realm from that importance. The main idea is that the Press is as important as the defence forces of the country and as we cannot be too cautious or too careful about the defence forces, similarly, we cannot be too cautious or too careful about the way in which we deal with our Press. Although I am for nationalisation in most of the industries I am not for nationalisation and State control so far as the Press or the newspaper industry is concerned.

Shri Kamath: Thank you.

Shri Gadgil: It is because I think that for successful operation of a socialistic State freedom of the Press is the only safeguard. That is my conception of socialism where criticism is free and frank but within the

[Shri Gadgil]

limits of the provisions of the Constitution. From that purpose we have to see whether the existing state of affairs, so far as this industry is concerned, is all to the good. We have found that since the abolition of the price-page schedule, many language papers have gone out of existence. I can give this House a list of 27 papers which have gone out of existence since the Commission was appointed. We are more concerned today, for the purpose of educating the masses, with the particular instrument or instruments which we should use. The radio is one; the public platform is another, but the most important instrument is the newspaper. An Allahabad poet has said:

‘सींचा न कमान को न तलवार निकालो,
तोप हो मुकाबिल तो अखबार निकालो।’

If you want to meet the guns, have a newspaper. I think I cannot improve upon that couplet. Therefore, we have to see that we have as many papers as possible, and from that point of view, if we compare the percentage of literacy in this country and the actual number of newspapers and the wide circle of readers they reach, I think it will show a very sorry state of affairs. I know the recommendation of the price-page schedule has created quite a stir. Let us consider it dispassionately. During war-time, there was price-page control. Then it was relaxed. Then again it was imposed in April, 1951, and continued till September, 1952. But it was not only on the ground of scarcity of paper that it was imposed and continued. To some extent, scarcity was a factor, but later on, those who were opposing the price-page schedule system were themselves asking for it because newsprint was not available at a reasonable price.

In this connection, I might invite the attention of this House to certain facts which are to be found in the *Indian Press Year Book, 1954*. In October, 1951, the President of the newspaper Editors' Society tried to have newsprint at a lower price, not that

there was any scarcity in the world market—newsprint was in abundant supply—but he wanted it at a lesser price and he wrote to the President, British News Supply Co., in Britain and tried to have it. He did not succeed at it. Not only that. When, a few days before the general elections, the Government relaxed certain rules and allowed newspapers to print extra pages with respect to election propaganda, he protested. It was only when the prices went down suddenly that the Society turned round and asked the Government to remove the price-page schedule, thereby showing that they were kicking the ladder whereby they rose to prosperity. The association which concerned itself with the language papers protested against this through its President, Mr. A. R. Bhatt who has done very good work in connection with this Commission. What was the attitude of the Government? What was the attitude, at any rate, of one of the members of the Government, when Government was trying to help small-scale industries and showing great concern? I will read the answer given by the Minister of Commerce and Industry in the month of July in the Rajya Sabha. When the Members there pleaded for a price-page-schedule, he said: that he "is already very much worried about the control. Somebody said it might help smaller newspapers. It might or it might not, but we are not here to help the smaller men; if we help smaller men somebody will come and accuse the Government of interfering with private initiative". Soon after that, price-page control was abolished. I want to know what is the range of English or the big papers and what is the clientele served by the smaller papers. You will find that if we want to reach the masses, then the papers published in big towns or capital cities of the constituent States or from Delhi cannot cater to them. The result, as I said, was that price-page-schedule was abolished. The objection was that when the price-page-schedule came, the sales of many papers went down. It is not a fact.

I have got figures from the Audit Bureau to show that during the effective period of six months, that is, from July, 1951 to January, 1952 when the system worked completely for that period, those papers which complied with the schedule increased their sales and probably wiped out their losses and started gaining a little, but those papers which persisted giving the same number of pages and increased their price, even in their case, the loss was considerable. Only one paper suffered what may be called a loss which is worth noting, and that was the *Hindustan Times* of Delhi. It was not because of the introduction of price-page system but because of the fact that the *Times of India* came to be printed from New Delhi or Delhi. There were two other Tamil papers which suffered but they started suffering even before the introduction of the price-page system. So it cannot be said without any dispute that the price-page system was responsible for loss of circulation.

The point really is that if we are anxious that this great national institution should be as broad-based as possible and that the newspaper should reach as wide a range of readers as possible, we cannot do it except by the introduction of the price-page schedule. It is not something that this country is alone having. That system prevails even now in England and when only recently some announcement was made by the Minister that this control is to go, the reaction is worth studying. I will just quote from the *Daily Telegraph*; it wrote:

"There is little jubilation in Fleet Street, and still less wherever else newspapers are produced. What has gone wrong? Have the newspapers suddenly got cold feet now that freedom is in sight, or is the freedom offered in fact a sham?"

Then, in the *Daily Mirror*, it was said:

"A state of confusion exists over the future of newsprint sup-

plies for your papers owing to the greed and irresponsibility of *The Times* newspaper.... A scheme was worked out. But it meant that EVERYONE who uses newsprint had to agree to it. Only one firm stood out....."

The other comments also show that even in England, the land of classical policy of *laissez faire*, they have not taken kindly to this, and they still want that the Government should not be doctrinaire but should be more realistic and should introduce something like a regulation with respect to the pages that are to be printed.

What I am making out is that in the best interests of this country, when we are entering on a very big scheme of economic betterment, we must secure the co-operation of the people and that co-operation cannot be secured unless we reach every citizen and convince him, and our means of propaganda are as wide and varied as possible. I am not for decrying the Press itself in a dogmatic manner. I differentiate between the English Press and the language Press. The English-knowing population is just a little above 3 per cent. whereas the total population which may be called literary is about 19 per cent. We have to cater for the 16 per cent. English has, no doubt, importance today; but gradually that importance will go and the Hindi newspapers will be more and more in prominence and will naturally earn more popularity. Same is the case with other language papers. I therefore suggest by way of a concrete proposal that this system of price-page schedule must be accepted in principle. So far as the language Press is concerned, it must be brought into existence immediately; what the price-page schedule should do in any particular period of time is a matter for further investigation. But it should not be more than 2 annas for 8 pages, it may be 4 pages on an average for 1 anna or 8 pages on an average for 2 annas. The schedule may be varied if prices fluctuate.

[Shri Gadgil]

When the price-page schedule was abolished, papers in Surat, Ahmedabad, Bombay and Poona have suffered very much and the competition has been a cut-throat one. I will give only one example. There is one paper called *Lok Manya* from Baroda and another paper called *Sandesh* from Ahmedabad. *Sandesh* purchased *Lok Manya* and started selling both with 10 pages for one anna. If six issues are sold by way of wastepaper, the man gets 5 annas. So, the net result is for one anna he gets 10 pages a day throughout the week. It is impossible that any such thing can be economic.

It has been stated that price-page schedule will stop the growth of newspapers. It is just the other way. As I said, if we encourage the language press, the growth will be greater. It has also been stated that it is against democracy, that it is impracticable, this, that and other. I shall only quote from no less a personality than the late Mr. Sadananda who was the father and founder of Free Press Journal and I say there can be no other person who had done so much in the field of journalism. He said:

"Control in the form of a price-page schedule was not an interference with the freedom of the Press. Planned economy and planned conduct of an industry called for that; the selling price of a newspaper had to cover the cost of newsprint, cost of distribution and also to contribute towards the newspaper production cost; that uneconomized circulation schemes should be prohibited and that a surcharge on airborne copies should be levied."

As regards the statement that price-page schedule is anti-democratic, he has also said that it is a right step:

"Control is no interference with the freedom of the Press. It serves the cause of democracy...." and so on and so forth.

All I want to show is that there are certain people interested in this

industry and this industry has become, not a public service, but something which is looked upon as an instrument of power to influence the Government and if possible to earn some profit; and, journalism which has been looked upon as a great mission has now become a profession.

One has to consider whether this price-page schedule in the circumstances in which we find ourselves is not absolutely so necessary. Take the English papers. In the matter of English papers, I suggest that no paper should be sold for less than 2 annas for 8 pages and when the number of pages goes to 12, the price going up to 2½ annas. What is far more important is that the advertising supplements must be prohibited. It works in a variety of ways to damage the entire industry. The small papers do not get the advertisements, because the advertisements appear in the supplements of big papers and the whole thing is spoiled. My submission is that in this there should be flexibility. I am not suggesting that price-page schedule should be there till eternity. I am definitely suggesting that it should be there for a period of five years; Government should be on the watch and see how far the papers that were losing have come up and raised their standard. I am sure that if the space is less, quality improves. Speaking about the English Press *Economist* says that in spite of the fact that there was regulation, the British Press survived and it could be run on profit, because the space was controlled. We are following Great Britain in many things; let us follow Great Britain in this also. We will find our Press doing the job much better.

To help the industry further the policy of advertisement by the Government must also be suitably amended.

So far as the price-page schedule is concerned, I want to say that this is not against democracy. This does

not interfere with the freedom of the Press. This will not stop the growth. On the contrary the growth will be much more and at a higher rate. The cause of democracy will be served. All that will happen will be that certain newspaper magnates might have less profit. I warn the Government that today these papers are acting in such a manner that they can make or unmake a public man. If you allow this concentration of power by not introducing price-page schedule, all the smaller concerns will go to dogs and a few but unfaithful people, 10, 15 or 20 of them, will remain in possession of this great instrument of propaganda and knowledge; and Knowledge is Power. They can make and unmake Government. Everybody knows how Lloyd George was hurled out of office by a combination of papers in England. The Press is very powerful and its importance cannot be belittled. Therefore, in any scheme of national things, we must see that it is properly regulated and that its economies work in a satisfactory manner with a view to gain the maximum from the national point of view.

I submit that the other question about crossword puzzles is really important. Crosswords have constituted the Cross for the small-scale papers. We must have a messiah to save them and I hope that that role will be played by my hon. friend Dr. Keskar.

Shri Kamath: You want to put him on the cross?

Shri Gadgil: I think you do not know your Bible very much.

Shri Kamath: Will Rev. Gadgil teach me?

Shri Gadgil: The point is that the puzzles and competitions conducted by these people are irrelevant and purely selfish.

The last point on which I want to speak is about the organisation of the news agencies. There is a controversy about certain statements made in the report itself. I do not care whether these statements are

substantially correct or they are the result of some misrepresentation or misappreciation of evidence. What I am concerned with today is, what should be the character of the news agency? I cannot put it better than it has been done in the report itself. It says:

"We are convinced that it is essential, especially in the present international and national circumstances, that the news agency should work at the maximum efficiency and integrity and for this purpose, we recommend the setting up of public corporation to take over the running of the P.T.I. A public corporation formed otherwise than on the basis of a co-operative effort by the newspapers may be open to the danger of newspapers not taking a service from them. The corporation has therefore to be built up on the present foundations, whatever may be the changes in its control and operation."

They have also indicated the lines on which progress has to be made. To leave the news service in the hands of a concern of the type we have in the P.T.I. is not advisable. May be that the concern at present may be running all right. They have just come to some agreement with their employees. That is neither here nor there. The main point of national interest is whether the newspapers themselves should run the services or whether there should be a public corporation, not under State control. I have made that clear and the report has also made it abundantly clear, that it should not be under the control of the State. But, it is equally important that it should not be a proprietary concern in which things can be arranged in such a way as to be helpful to the big and very much unhelpful if not positively hurtful to the small ones. From that point of view I suggest that the course suggested by the Commission should be approved. I am not saying here and now there should be a public corporation of this type or that type.

[Shri Gadgil]

What I am making out is that in the national interests and in the context in which we find ourselves nationally and internationally, an organisation of the type suggested by the Press Commission is absolutely necessary.

I have not much to say. But, I still want to make it abundantly clear that, although the amendment suggested by my party is general acceptance of the recommendations of the Press Commission, from the view point of democracy, from the view point of using this instrument recovery of greatest importance in the realm, that the price-page schedule should be introduced immediately so far as the language papers are concerned. I do not want the Government to carry the impression that the House is accepting the amendment in a general way. But, specifically, on these questions, the House has pronounced itself overwhelmingly in favour of improvement of the wages of the journalists and the price-page schedule.

So far as the wages are concerned,—one minute and I shall have done—these must be related to the social function journalists are discharging and they are expected to discharge. General capacity, mental equipment and risk inherent in the profession, certain intellectual conveniences that are absolutely necessary for the newspaper people to keep them up-to-date, all these factors must be taken into consideration before a minimum scale is drawn up. I am not insisting that there should be one scale throughout this country, because this is a big country and there is a variety of circumstances. In the Central Pay Commission we conceded that in Madras there can be a separate scale. When you fix that scale you have to take into consideration all the relevant factors which have been mentioned there and some of which I have mentioned here. If the concern makes some profits the minimum wage must go up and it must be a fair wage. If the concern makes still more profit, it must be a living

wage. The minimum must be there whatever the economic position of the concern. Whatever they get above may be tacked to the prosperity of the concern itself. I submit that just as a soldier is not admitted in the army unless he has so much height and so much girth in chest and is healthy, there must be a scheme under which the journalists should be trained. They must be equipped for the job. Just as we cannot recruit without proper training, because it is a matter which concerns national existence, similarly if we accept the importance of this industry, nobody should enter this industry unless he satisfies some minimum qualifications and requirements. By all means let us help young men by giving them suitable opportunities to secure these qualifications if they are fresh people or by giving them an opportunity to train themselves if they are already in.

Shri Venkataraman (Tanjore): My esteemed friend, Shri Gadgil has elaborately dealt with certain aspects of the recommendations of the Press Commission. I propose to confine my remarks to that portion of the Press Commission's recommendations which relates to the conditions of employment of the working journalists and journalists generally.

You are aware that even though much less influential and much less important sections of the industry in the country have been very well regulated up to this date there has been no regulation of the conditions of employment in one of the most important industries, namely, the press. I know people will object to my using the term industry with regard to the press. But, it is no more and I dare say no less than that, when once it becomes one of the means for earning one's livelihood and making money out of it.

The amendment which my hon. friend Shri Raghuramaiah has put in represents the general consensus of this House, that is to say, that the

House desires that the recommendations of the Press Commission should be implemented in general. There may be differences of opinion in respect of particular suggestions contained in the report. For instance, with regard to the Press Council, there may be differences of opinion whether the Chairman should be nominated by the Chief Justice of India or by somebody else, because personally I do not like the judiciary to be brought into all these things. Or, there may be difference of opinion whether Rs. 10 should be charged per ton of newsprint consumed or whether Rs. 5 should be charged. But, by and large, this House desires that the major recommendations of the Press Commission should be implemented and that too without any delay.

So far as the conditions of employment of the working journalists are concerned, it has been suggested by the Press Commission itself in its report in para 636:

"We suggest that the proposed legislation for the regulation of newspaper industry should embody our recommendations with regard to (1) notice period; (2) bonus; (3) minimum wages; (4) Sunday rest; (5) leave; and (6) provident fund and gratuity."

It is not open now for anybody to argue that no legislation is required in respect of the regulation of conditions of employment of the working journalists. I would appeal to the Minister to bring forward a Bill embodying the conditions of employment of the working journalists. I have half a mind to myself to present to the House a Private Member's Bill styled "Working Journalists (Conditions of Employment) Bill." That Bill, in my view should contain the following subjects for regulation. Firstly, the Bill should provide for the fixation of the wages, and grades and scales of pay. It should also provide for the hours of

work, rest periods, holidays with pay and also leave.

1 P.M.

It is sometimes said; why should you bring forward a bill only for the sake of the working journalists fixing their minimum wages by statute? You can as well do that for the bidi workers or for any other class of employees. The criticism misses the point here because every category of employee has today got a legislation to protect him. You have got the Plantation Labour Act for the plantation workers. You have got the Factories Act to protect the workers in the factories. You have got the Shops and Establishments Acts in various States to protect the conditions of employment of the clerical employees. Similarly, an all-India Act to protect the conditions of employment of the working journalists is not only necessary, but highly desirable. There may be ways in which the working journalists may be able to have their scales of pay fixed other than by statute. I am referring to the recourse to the Industrial Disputes Act which is now open to them, but that is a long and a very tedious process. Disputes will have to be raised where none exists. Governments will be called upon to refer those disputes to the tribunals. The tribunals will take their own leisurely time to give their decisions. Appeals and then further appeals to the Supreme Court are all in the game. It is not at all necessary to force the journalists to go through this tortuous process before getting their elementary demands fulfilled.

And then, Sir, you will recall that wherever a commission or a committee has gone into the conditions of employment and recommended a certain scale and wages, then that substitutes a reference to the industrial tribunal itself. Here in this case when a commission presided over by a person of such great eminence as Rajadhyaksha, whose knowledge of not only law but of industrial relationship is not equalled by anybody else in India, has made, after exhaus-

[Shri Venkataraman]

tive enquiry into the relative pay scales in this country, a minimum wage applicable to the workers. I plead in the name of this House that it should be accepted. It would almost amount to an insult to refer this matter again to a regional board or a regional committee necessarily consisting of inferior men than those who constituted the Press Commission. It would amount to a contempt to the memory of that great man to say that what he has recommended after an exhaustive enquiry should be re-examined by inferior, smaller man constituting regional boards.

My hon. friend Shri Gadgil slipped when he said that different scales of pay should be recommended for different areas. It is totally incorrect. The administrative services have the same scales of pay all over India with only varying local allowances. The Post and Telegraph employees have the same scales of pay with local variations in allowances only. Similarly, the railways have got the same scales of pay. The Commission itself has recommended that there can be local variations in allowances. In areas where the population is less than one lakh, they have recommended Rs. 25 as allowance. In areas where the population is between one and seven lakhs, they have recommended Rs. 50. In metropolitan towns they have recommended an additional amount of Rs. 50. And the metropolitan towns are Madras, Delhi, Bombay and Calcutta.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam):
Not Hyderabad?

Shri Venkataraman: Hyderabad comes under the second category, that is those with a population between one and seven lakhs. We may want some other centres to be included, but that does not mean that the Commission has not gone into it. The very suggestion that these minimum wages prescribed by the Commission should be referred to a regional tribunal or a regional board is so abhorrent to those who have been connected with

the conduct of industrial disputes before tribunals.

The second question which the Bill should deal with is that relating to bonus. The industrial dispute which was raised by the employees of the *Times of India* in Bombay went before the tribunal and the industrial tribunal, being a subordinate organisation to the All-India Appellate Tribunal, applied quite inappropriately the formula which is applicable to the textile and other industrial undertakings for the purpose of determining bonus. The All-India Appellate Tribunal has enunciated a formula as to what is available surplus and has said that the available surplus should be distributed as bonus in respect of industrial employees. They have provided for four to six per cent., on working capital, reserves and so on. They have also provided for rehabilitation at a particular percentage, being a multiple of the original cost. That is totally inapplicable to an industry like the press industry where intellectual work is as important, if not more, than the mechanical work of bringing out the paper. That is why Shri Rajadhyaksha, with his wide experience in dealing with problems relating to labour disputes, has suggested a different formula for the determination of bonus. The Commission has said that the capital invested should be given a maximum of four per cent., to start with, then the available surplus should be distributed between the three agencies, that is, the employees, rehabilitation and the shareholders, and bonus should be determined on that basis. Unless legislation is brought and the scheme recommended by Rajadhyaksha is given a legislative sanction, the employees in the journalistic profession will be compelled or will be obliged to follow the formula given by the industrial tribunal relating to industries and they will suffer as a consequence of that. Therefore, in the Bill which I hope Government will bring forward very soon, there should be an adequate provision for a different method of calculation of bonus as

suggested in the Commission's report itself.

Then, with regard to the hours of work. I know that in Madras there are newspapers where the hours of work at night are longer than the hours of work in the day. People start work at half past eight in the night and go on till half past five in the morning, and the usual protection which even an ordinary worker who works in the night time gets is not vouchsafed to these employees. It is therefore necessary that in the Bill provision should be made for regulation of the hours of work and also for the spreadover. It may be that a person may be asked to work for six hours, but though he may be called to do that six hours work between 6 A.M. and 12 in the night, the spreadover is so oppressive that the hours of work do not really matter and the oppression would be very great. Therefore, it is very necessary in an industry like the press that the hours of work and the spreadover should be carefully determined.

Then, the Commission has recommended holidays with pay, leave, provident fund and gratuity. All these must find a place in the Bill regulating the conditions of employment of the workers in the press industry so that they may get all these benefits statutorily.

There are one or two things which I would like to add,—and which are not found in the Press Commission's report,—in order to make this code dealing with the employment and conditions of labour of the press employees and the journalists complete. The first thing that I would suggest is that the provisions in the Payment of Wages Act should be incorporated in the Bill which I do hope Government will bring forward soon. The Payment of Wages Act provides for payment to the employees on the 7th of every month or on the 10th of every month, depending upon the total number of people employed. I know that in Madras the pay of these employees—or salary as it is 'dignifiedly' called—is being distributed four times in the course of the month. It is not even a

weekly wage. It is given at the option and at the sweet will and pleasure of the press owner. The poor employee cannot have recourse to any authority, and he has either to take it or to leave the service. If the Payment of Wages Act were extended to them, they would get their pay, whatever it is, on the due date, and there will be at least a little amount of certainty that they will draw their meagre pay on the defined date.

I also understand that there is a magnificent system of fines and deduction. Whenever the superior, the boss of the show, is dissatisfied with the work of the employees, he deducts it is a deduction for bad quality work wages on the plea that it is a fine or it is a deduction for bad quality work performed by them. They may be cases of exceptions, and they may not be the rule, but still a law provides only against exceptions. The Indian Penal Code is only to prevent a few criminals committing crimes. Similarly, the law should provide against the abuse by those few people who break the law. So, I would suggest that in the new Bill which Government propose to bring they should incorporate the provisions contained in the Payment of Wages Act, and make it a self-contained code.

The Commission also recommended that in the new industrial relations Bill which was expected to be brought before this House, the conditions of employment of the working journalists should be brought in and regulated thereunder. We are far far away still from the promised Bill. The Labour Relations Bill which was first introduced in the House in 1950 has long since been dead and buried. The new Bill which my esteemed friend Shri V. V. Giri brought has completely vanished into the thin air. We ourselves shrank from the size of a colossus to that of a pigmy, and suggested a few amendments to the Industrial Disputes Act; they are not even published. I do not know at what stage it is.

Let us not wait for something which Government propose to do in respect of labour. It is good to have a self-

[Shri Venkataraman]

contained Act in respect of certain types of employment. In the proposed Bill regulating the conditions of employment, I would strongly urge that the standing orders relating to classification of employees, disciplinary action, etc. be included.

I have heard the complaint that the industry cannot afford to pay the minimum wages recommended by the Press Commission. It is a very familiar argument which has been repeated time and again. If you read the history of industrial progress and development, not for a long period, but from 1939 up to date, you will find that in spite of the strongest protest from influential quarters against increase in wages, the industry has progressed, and progressed fast and very well too. To quote only a few figures, the average wage of a press worker in 1939 was Rs. 332.7 annually. In 1952, the wage of the press worker was Rs. 1121.7 annually. I ask you how many presses have closed down and what calamity has occurred in this country as a consequence of this rise in wages. Let us not merely be hustled into wrong decisions by interested propaganda.

There is a great wisdom in paying high wages. You know the expression 'economy in high wages'. By payment of proper wages, you are able to extract the best quality work from the work-people. Otherwise, you only lead the horse to water, but you never make it drink. Therefore, I would appeal to Government to see that when the new Bill is introduced, it contains all these provisions relating to their employment, their conditions of service, their leave, their gratuity, their pensions, bonuses etc.

There is only one other thing I want to refer to. If you look into the history of legislation in respect of the journalists in all the countries of the world, you will find that they have been treated differently and as a special category. I am reading from the UNESCO publication entitled *Legislation for Press, Film and Radio*. On page 403, summarising the legisla-

tion in other countries, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation has made this very wise observation:

"Under certain systems, special advantages more extensive than those enjoyed by ordinary employees are conferred upon journalists. These may be sanctioned by the law itself. For instance, certain Latin American countries have enacted legislation in favour of journalists, which is in some cases very detailed and far-reaching, and offers special benefits, more particularly in the form of protection against the risk of sickness or disability, dismissal or retirement. In Brazil, professional journalists, who must be of Brazilian birth and nationality, enjoy very considerable tax exemptions.

In France, the law of 29th March, 1935 conferred on journalists substantial advantages which at the time were far in advance of general social legislation."

There is also an indemnity for dismissal, which may be by way of damages.

I would also urge that along with protection to the working journalists, protection be given to the editors themselves. The Commission have recommended that the editors should be appointed on contract; and if during the term of the contract, the paper changes its policy and the editor is obliged to leave on that account, damages should be payable to the editor. That is the type of legislation that prevails now in Europe and in many important countries. In the French Act, there is a clause which says that if the editor is compelled to espouse the views which are contrary to his own and which at the time of his employment he did not intend to espouse, then he has every right to terminate his agreement and claim damages:

"It is intended to safeguard the journalist's independence, his free-

dom of thought and his moral rights."

It constitutes what has been called 'the freedom of conscience'. In the Bill which Government propose to bring, I would strongly urge that a similar clause be included, so that the editors are also protected against unfair treatment or dismissals arising out of differences of opinion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Jaipal Singh.

Shri Dabhi (Kaira North): You promised me yesterday that you would give me an opportunity to speak.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I cannot keep up my promise.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): On a point of submission. Up till now, only one Member of the Communist group has been called. I would submit that all sides of the House must be given adequate opportunity to speak.

Several Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Communist Member will certainly get a chance.

Sardar A. S. Saigal (Bilaspur): We have already submitted our names.

Shri Dabhi: I have moved an amendment.

Several Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. I will call all thirty Members simultaneously! Now, I am not speaking from here, except when I have to intervene to restore order. I do nothing more than that. Therefore, I am not a competitor in the field. I am only trying to distribute the time. There are as many as 50 names. As the debate draws to a close, larger and larger numbers of chits are pouring in. The other day I thought I should reserve this day for a few people who wanted to speak, of course, representatives from various groups, Shri Dabhi wanted to speak for only ten minutes. But here twenty 'Dabhis' have come. All the same, I was trying to distribute. I have no partiality, no pre-

ference for X, Y or Z. I will give the Communist member a chance; I cannot forget him nor her.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): May I know whether those persons who have sent chits earlier will get preference?

Several Hon. Members: No.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Banaras Distt.—Central): Why not?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I can only say this much. It will facilitate matters for whoever be in the Chair, if all hon. Members who want to speak, even at the beginning of the debate, send their chits, so that time may be allotted to those who are well acquainted with the subject; the others will have a chance on another occasion and so on. All hon. Members cannot be allowed to speak on the same topic, because the time is limited. But if hon. Members withhold their names and come in at the end as representatives of groups, it embarrasses the Chair, whoever might be the occupant of the Chair for the time being. Therefore, it is rather difficult for the Chair. Instead of my being able to speak, I am here 'mum' merely regulating the debate, and apportioning time. That is my unfortunate misfortune. It is not that I am distributing money or wealth or anything of that kind. Often, I have to quarrel with hon. Members, my dear friends, denying them opportunities.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: On a point of submission.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. lady Member, who is on the Panel of Chairman, may come and sit here.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Certainly. But the point is that always our group gives the names absolutely at the beginning. So on this point there is absolutely no difference; therefore, there is no question of our sending in names at the last minute.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am always giving opportunities to the Communist Members—as many names as are

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

given. But the hon. Member cannot dictate to me that they must be called in a particular order. (*Interruptions*).

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: We never do that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Nobody need be in haste.

Shri Dabhi: I hope you will keep your promise.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: My promise is without consideration and I cannot keep the promise.

Shri M. D. Joshi (Ratnagiri South): May I make a submission?

Several Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I can only hear one hon. Member at one time. In this way, time is being wasted.

Shri M. D. Joshi: Since this debate began, some of us, who have been connected with this profession, wanted to say a word or two. I have been trying from Saturday and I am not sure whether today I will get a chance during this short space of time. Since you do not hold out any promise, it is very difficult to know.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I called Shri Venkataraman, because he is the editor of a journal. I called Shri Gadgil who said he had experience of this. I had called only journalists.

Shri S. S. More: He has no experience.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, I have called Shri Jaipal Singh, who was a member of the Commission. I will call every hon. Member.

Shri M. D. Joshi: May I request that the time may be extended?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, Shri Jaipal Singh. Hon. Members may be brief so that other hon. Members may have an opportunity.

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): I do hope you will be a little indulgent towards me because of the fact that I am one

of the signatories to a Minute of Dissent to the Press Commission's Report. Members have been trying to claim that they should be heard because they are editors. I was also an editor and am still an active journalist. I do not know whether one of these days we could claim to catch your eye, I do agree with my hon. friend, Shrimati Renu Chakravarty, that in a matter, when the views of the Treasury Benches seem to be already known, the correct thing would be to let Opposition views be heard more. That is very very important. You will find that in essence this is exactly what the Commissioners have done. They have tried to hear all points of view, and while I say this, I would like to add my own personal tribute to the work of the Commission, though I myself was a member of it

Something has been said, and quite rightly, about two members who are no more. But I would like very much to stress that the entire Commission together with its secretariat, worked as a team. We were a heterogeneous body; there were rebels like myself and the hon. Member for Banaras Distt.—East—Shri T. N. Singh.

The Press barons have had the impertinence to let the country, as it were, be misled into thinking that their viewpoint was not represented. Was there not a member on the Press Commission itself to represent them—who was of that species. Were they not all of them called to answer questionnaires? They were even invited to appear before the Commission from the very start. But from the start, they began to create difficulties. There was opposition; there was non-cooperation. As a matter of fact, one of them is promenading about in this metropolitan city as a 'martyr', as it were, because he was not called a second time. May I tell the country that it was the same gentleman who had the audacity to tell people in this great city that he wanted to see what the Commission would do? He was not going to reply to the questionnaire of the Commission; he was not going

to appear before the Commission either. It was only when we held out the threat of the magisterial authority the Commission under the Commission of Inquiry Act that he climbed down.

I want to appeal to the Members here, as well as to the country, if I may do so, that very little purpose would be served by our resorting to mud-slinging. There is plenty of material in the Report itself for justifying that course of action, but I think the Government should not waste time in doing that. There is abundant material on judicial evidence, as it were, before the Commission. Now, if the Government are a responsible Government.....

Babu Ramnarayan Singh: No.

Shri Jaipal Singh:... if the Government are a democratic Government, it is the obvious duty of Government to strengthen the 'fourth estate'. My hon. friend from Poona—Shri Gadgil—said that the Press must be kept as free as possible. I would like my friend on the Treasury Bench to give a reply to the Minute of Dissent, to which I am also a signatory with three others. They talk of the freedom of the Press and the freedom of democracy. Why are they abridging it?

My attitude in this matter of the freedom of the Press has been consistent from the very beginning. When the Constitution was first amended, I opposed it. Then again, there was another amendment; I opposed it, and hence, in conformity with my consistency, I am a signatory to the Minute of Dissent. Now, I do not want to argue, because arguments have been given on the floor of this House before. But I want to continue by paying a compliment to the foreigners who appeared before the Press Commission. It is a remarkable thing, Sir, that the foreigners gave their fullest co-operation, gave us all the information we had asked for, whereas our own countrymen, these press barons, put all sorts of difficulties in our way. It took us a long time to have a qualified accountant and auditor to go into the capital structure of these various

barons. Since these Press barons have had the impertinence to attack the Report, all that I ask—in fact, I insist along with my colleague, the hon. Member for Banaras Distt.—East—is that the entire evidence be published. Let the country know that these people are not patriots such as they promenade about places in the name of patriotism saying we do this, we do that. Let the country know the actual facts how they have been getting sweated labour from the journalists. This is not the occasion, since you are going to limit my time, for me to go into the details. But, let me tell you I was shocked to find out how much of sweated labour there was in the Press industry. The sooner the ruling party that is talking about the socialistic pattern puts this matter right the better it is for itself at the next general election.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Shri Jaipal Singh: My friends across the Table will find out when they will be put to the test about their profession of being socialists, how they want to introduce the socialistic pattern of society. Here is a case of a judicial body that has come to a definite conclusion that there is sweated labour in the most important instrument of democratic education, education for democracy and democracy for education. Here things have been exposed. Let my friends on the other side make up their minds to publish every piece of evidence that was before the Press Commission and they will be compelled to come to the conclusion that the recommendations of the Press Commission must be implemented as fast as possible.

Now, my hon. friend, Shri Venkataraman, has quite rightly pleaded for a new deal, a better deal for the working journalists. I agree with him fully. Although I have agreed to the figures that have been recommended, I want to make a confession here that I tried hard with the other Commissioners for higher minimum wages but I did not succeed. At any rate, I had to yield to them because I felt that perhaps—especially with due

[Shri Jaipal Singh]

respect to Justice Rajadhyaksha, the Chairman—he knew things better and I was perhaps in the wrong. My suggestion might have been too heavy an incidence on the industry.

Let the Press business be considered as an industry and immediately you will find how it stands along with other industries. We have several industries in this country. What are the industrialists? Are they industrialists or financiers? What are they? You will find that in this, by and large, these 'Press Barons' are not press industrialists but they are financiers. Their only interest is finance; how much they can mulct out of the sweat-ed brow of the workers. Here again, I repeat, by way of contrast, it is remarkable how the papers owned by foreign nationals stand out. They are a shining example to the—shall we say—heights the Indian papers should achieve. I would like hon. Members to realise that in the conclusions we reached we were thinking not so much of the big papers. We were confronted with the problem of democracy, of literacy reaching the masses; we were concerned more with the education of the ordinary masses, that is to say, masses in the rural areas. Now, today, the general picture is, there is no such thing as the rural paper. There are any number of districts with no papers at all. That situation has to be altered. How can we achieve results? We came to a certain conclusion, a conclusion that has already been emphasised by my hon. friend from Poona; to us it seems to be the immediate method. There may be other ways; we do not dispute that. But, the language Press must grow. If, as has already been said, the co-operation of the ordinary man—and India is a rural country—the ordinary rustic has to be elicited, if he is to appreciate the problems that are before the country and the problems of administration, and if the administration itself wants that person to respond, the only solution is the development of the rural Press. And, in all our thinking, the bigger

problem before this country has loomed large; the question of the metropolitan papers is not a big problem as such. That is a problem only, as it were, for safeguarding this country's citizens against abuses of the Press Barons.

It has been argued, and sometimes justifiably, that Acts do not make men good. But, on the other hand, I think we have got to have Acts of Parliament to make newspapers good at least. If you cannot make them good, you can at least punish the *badmashes*. The laws are there, at least, to indicate to them that there are certain things that the country will tolerate; other things which these sinners, these racketeers do will be put down heavily. I am not one who throws mud at the Press barons unnecessarily. There were certain conditions—and many of my friends on the Treasury Benches are responsible for some of the questionable activities of these Press barons as they were parties to them. That was past history. That is why I again emphasise, let us not live in the past. The question is what is the problem now and how are we going to face the present situation and how are we going to go ahead.

The Press Commission Report has exposed certain things. Now, it is for Government to have the courage to go forward either with executive or legislative action. In the matter of the minimum wages, for example, I hear whispers of the so-called wages board. That is only funkling the issue; that is just procrastinating the problem. The Government must immediately take action in such a fashion as the Press Commission Report has recommended.

Shri Venkataraman has already mentioned that in Justice Rajadhyaksha we had the most experienced person in this country about labour matters. It was his opinion also like the rest of us that the correct procedure would be to have certain things done immediately. The other day,

my hon. friend the Minister when answering a question, said that I was obsessed too much with this question of priority. I asked the question about the Press Council. I want him in his reply to tell the House what the priorities are. That will put the Treasury Benches to the test, whether they mean action, how soon, how delayed or whether they mean no action at all. Let my hon. friend in his reply tell the House what are the priorities because the Press Commission has given a series of priorities. There is the Press Council; there is the question of the Registrar; there is the question of, shall we say, the minimum wages and so forth. There is a definite priority indicated; I am not saying it has given them as one, two and three. The way the edifice has to be built has been indicated in this report and I think in fairness to this House and the country—it is a very difficult problem, this problem of rural India—it is essential that the Government should in the reply to this debate tell us exactly what are the priorities and how soon these priorities are to be implemented.

I know we cannot change India overnight by legislation. We are taking certain actions against human beings; some of them are heavily entrenched and it is quite a problem how we are to handle them. At the same time, let me, all the while condemning them, be generous to them also. Many of them, as I have said, earlier, have been given the cue by the ruling party in the country. I think there has to be a change in attitude. I do hope Government will print the whole evidence. We shall find that many of these newspaper proprietors came before us; we asked them questions; they mentioned the highest in the land right down to the bottom and said so and so asked us to do this and we did it. I mention this....

Shri Joachin Alva (Kanara): May I ask the hon. Member whether it was the decision of the Commission not to publish copies of the evidence or is it of the Government?

Shri Jaipal Singh: My friend is a journalist—I hope he is still a journalist—and he will realise that certain kinds of evidence none of us would like to see printed or put before the public. For example, when we were investigating the question of a particular thing we were shocked to hear the evidence. We could not read—it was impossible to read more than two or three lines. The material that was placed before us was so shocking. I do not think I have any right to ask the Government to publish it. I think that matter may be left to the Minister. Since the whole body of evidence is before him and, on behalf of the Commission, if he can—I do think he is competent to do it,—let him say whether it should be printed or not. But, my own personal view is that they should not bar publishing it. Left to ourselves these things can be before us so that we may come to our conclusions. I do think that it is the opinion of the Commissioners as a whole that they should not be put in the wrong, by only certain things seeing the light of day. For example, today, all your interested parties are going round the countryside and they are blacking out your debates and so forth. Let the evidence be there. Let the people themselves see the things as to whether the conclusions the Commission has come to are justified or not. Let us face facts, because in our conclusions we have not been able to, and we could not obviously have been able to, give the details as to why we came to certain conclusions. Take for example, the question of the P.T.I. and the U.P.I. Here about the U. P. I. certain things have been said. I am not denying those things, but the question is this. The Commissioners have made a definite recommendation about the U.P.I. that the U.P.I. must be assisted. The whole question is the mess it has gone into, the further mess perhaps it has jumped into, and I want to know why the Government did not go to their rescue. The Commissioners have asked the Government, and this is the only way you can rescue the U.P.I. You have to go to its financial assets

[Shri Jaipal Singh]

tance. Have we to wait for a debate, public debate, here before that assistance is given? Can you blame the U.P.I. that it had to go to somebody, however undesirable that person may be—he might be a financier or a prospective Pressman. I do not know who he is, but his name has been mentioned here.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Why did it get into this state? Why was it necessary for it to rush to a capitalist?

Shri Jaipal Singh: Because the Government would not do its obvious duty. That is the position. We have made it very very clear that the news agency should not be State-owned. When financial assistance is given, there should be no strings attached to it, and we gave the example of both the P.T.I. and the U.P.I. The position about *Hindusthan Samachar* is given in a subsequent paragraph and it has been clearly stated that Government should go to the rescue of this particular news agency. I suppose that Government stands on its dignity and thinks: why should we go? Let them come to us. I think the U.P.I.—I do not know who its directors are—did not approach the Government, and they were put in an awkward situation. But I submit that we do not have to wait to go to the patient just before he is breathing his last. If the fourth estate is as important as to make Government acknowledge its importance as Government quite apart from other problems it may have, is it not in the interests of the administration itself that the fourth estate should have a healthy life? If that is the case of one of the news agencies, which is tottering and is about to succumb, is it not the obvious and spontaneous duty of the Government to go to its rescue?

Shri Joachim Alva: Does it apply also to newspapers in distress?

Shri Jaipal Singh: The Commission maintains that the industry must be competitive and there is no question of bolstering up any newspaper that cannot stand on its own legs. That is the reason why we have gone against

all the unfair practices of crossword puzzles and various other things like wrong type of advertisements, cheap revenue, etc. We want that a Press must be able to survive on its own strength. It must be able to live on its own health without any, shall we say, governmental interference, be it even aid. We have certainly made a suggestion that Government should devise some method whereby newsprint is readily available and not at blackmarket rates. At the present moment, my friend knows only too well that newsprint comes by and large from foreign countries and we are not yet in a position, despite the fact that there is a newsprint factory in Madhya Pradesh, to meet even our elementary requirements. That being the case, we do not want that the smaller papers in particular should be the victims of great paper monopolies and the like.

In conclusion, what I want to say is this. Government must also consider itself subject to the recommendations of the Press Commission Report. My friend from Poona had hinted or suggested in fact that he did not want to nationalise the Press. The Press is a medium of conveying news. So is the All India Radio. Why should the All India Radio be at the hands of the Government? I contend that on the logic of the entire Report and not just an isolated instance, the general pattern of the Report is such that the A.I.R. should be run by a corporation, so that its services are available to everybody, not only to our friends on the Treasury Benches. Take a sample survey of the news that is doled out every day and work it out statistically and analyse what percentage of sycophancy is there in regard to the news that is given for our friends on the other side. I am not necessarily pleading for the Opposition. In my attitude there is no question of the Opposition, but I think this is a national question.....

Shri M. D. Joshi: May I enquire from my hon. friend whether he himself has not several times taken part in the A.I.R. programmes?

Shri S. S. More: Does that mean that the Opposition have?

Shri Jaipal Singh: I think my friend has not the capacity to understand my English. What I said was that the A.I.R. at the present time is a direct governmental instrument of dissemination of news, but once it becomes a corporation, it is non-governmental. I think my friend has broadcast in the B.B.C. and perhaps he knows about the A.I.R. It is not that I am saying anything against the A.I.R. as such, but the role that it is playing is not a democratic role. It has become a governmental machinery and its services are not as readily available to the Opposition. Now, what is democracy? My friend from Poona had a gibe at Babu Ramanarayan Singh saying "You are here because of democracy". I should like to tell my Congress friends here my conception of democracy: Democracy is where the minority of one shall be heard. Are you doing that?

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Meerut Distt.—South): We are hearing him.

Shri Jaipal Singh: Fortunately I am not in the minority of one, but I have a good many.....

Pandit K. C. Sharma: None here.

Shri Jaipal Singh: At least my followers are sitting ahead of me.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This is an instance of the leader being led.

Shri Jaipal Singh: In conclusion I appeal to the House to appreciate the difficulties that the Press Commission Report had—opposition of the Industries, non-compliance of its requirements and the time factor. The Royal Commission, which had to handle a much smaller subject, took much more time, whereas here it was an uncharted field. We were up against the lack of proper statistics. Even when we examined the Audit Bureau of Circulation, so many irregularities were pointed out to us. We go to metropolitan places like Calcutta and ask one proprietor; why do you inflate

your figures of circulation? Blatantly, shamelessly he tells us: if the other fellow can inflate, why should not I? I only mention this to make us aware of the fact that we have got certain kinds of human beings in this country—it does not matter who they are—and it is these people whom we have to handle. That being the case, let there be no mistake about the problem that we have to handle, and that problem being in the charge of certain people, the whole question of dissipation or diffusion of capital is raised. I am not one who would say that just because you diffuse capital, you have found the remedy. I am not one who believes in that way. They are cleverer than you are. But the fact is this. Let us have legislation as far as possible so that the gross abuses and the exploitation that have been going on all these years may be stopped. These things are to be stopped immediately so that there may be a brighter future for the Press industry as a whole.

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta South-East): A big South Indian newspaper which has every reason to be alarmed at the labours and the findings of the Press Commission has described it as 'portentious inquest'. Now, that was a fit of venomous sarcasm but without realising it, and certainly without meaning it, through that sarcasm that paper told the truest truth. It was an inquest and an inquest presupposes a corpse. Certainly when the soul of missionary zeal and the spirit of idealism has departed from our Press, what is it but a corpse?

Sir, the findings of the Press Commission reveal that it is not only a corpse but it is a putrid corpse at that. Is there any doubt that for democratic functioning a Press of this kind is hardly sufficient; for democratic functioning we need an independent Press and a fair presentation of news? But the circulation figures do show that there could not be expected any independence and fairness from this kind of a Press. We have seen the figures both as regards the English Press and as regards the language Press. The

[Shri Sadhan Gupta]

figures are appalling. It shows the concentration of circulation in a few hands. But what is more appalling and what has not appeared in the Press Commission's report is that all these various newspapers controlling the bulk of the circulation have one particular political bias. It is a bias largely in favour of the Government party. I am not making a point at the expense of the Congress Party. But I am sure that even a democratic congressman will agree with me that that is not a healthy state of affairs. It is not a healthy state of affairs in which the public are told only of the Congress point of view and no other point of view. That is unhealthy even to the conception of democratic Congressmen.

This is our Press and there is no wonder that we do not find our Press reflecting the struggles and exploitations and the trials and tribulations of the exploited class. There may be a workers' strike, a peasants' struggle, a struggle of the middle-class employees or of the refugees but till it assumes gigantic proportions, you will find not a word about it in the Press. The other day in Calcutta, a British gentleman in a British bank abused an employee, saying: 'Bloody Indian'. The Calcutta Bank and its branches had a strike over this but nothing appeared in the Press in Calcutta till a settlement was reached and then too there was no news why the strike took place. This is the way in which the struggle of the democratic section of the people is presented by our Press. But I find that the Press boosts the activities of the proprietors who may have no public importance at all.

Government also steps in with its own contribution for the purpose of destroying fairness and independence. The Press Commission has found that the Information Ministry of the Government usually boosts up the activities of the Ministers with a view to advertise the person rather than the work done by the person. It has also pointed out the disastrous conse-

quences of the advertisement policy pursued. A journal advocating democratic causes which is branded as Communist will not get an advertisement from the Government. Many States had the temerity to admit before the Press Commission that that is their policy: they do not advertise with communist or communalist papers. The democratic opinion throughout the country will be grateful to the Press Commission for bringing out the utter absurdity and the utter undemocratic character of this policy. They have clearly laid down that advertisement policy should not be influenced by the political opinion of the journal; it may be influenced by the pre-judicial activity carried on by the journal, if any, but if prejudicial activity is not carried out by the journal it should not be influenced by the political opinions of the journal.

From this mess, the Commission has attempted to find a way out. It has attempted to find a way out by regulating concentration of ownership, by curbing the quest for profit, by trying to secure independence and fairness in the Press and a high standard of journalistic ethics. Various measures have been suggested which I have not the time to deal with. Many of them have been exhaustively dealt with by speakers who preceded me and I will just advert to some of them.

Take the case of the working journalists. If we want an independent Press, we want an independent corps of journalists. We expect a high standard from them and for that purpose, they must have a decent education; they must be well-read and they must be up-to-date in the affairs of the world. Can we expect from a man who is always plagued with the worries of daily life that he would come up to that standard? What is the condition of our journalists? The ILO Conference at Geneva found that the condition of teachers and journalists, particularly in Asia, was deplorable. We need not go to Geneva for that purpose; we have ample instances in our own country.

We know that in certain cases, the pay of the journalists has been ten months in arrears and then an offer has been made to them to make up these arrears by a magnanimous and magnificent instalment of Rs. 5 a month. We know how they are wantonly dismissed without any show of giving them a chance of finding out an alternative employment. The Press Commission has pointed out how the claim to promotion of competent journalists has been overlooked and the relations of Press barons put over their heads ignoring their claims. It has also pointed out how there is no scheme of any retirement benefit in many of the journals. I ask you: is that the ideal condition for getting a high standard of journalism from the journalists?

2 P.M.

The Commission has made various recommendations for the purpose of improving their lot: minimum wages, bonus, retirement benefit, scheme for promotion, leave and so forth. There is at once a hullabaloo raised by the Press barons that these things are impracticable. Why? May I ask, what has the Press Commission done? It has not given the journalists the moon, so to say the minimum wage prescribed is Rs. 125 and dearness allowance of Rs. 25. In metropolitan towns, the total emoluments laid down come to Rs. 225 and nothing more. Now, in Calcutta an investigation was held in pre-war cost of living of a middle class employee's family by the organ of the British interests—*Capital*, and *Capital* found that the pre-war cost of living was Rs. 60 for a middle class family. To that Rs. 60 an important industrial tribunal had added Rs. 10—a reasonable amount—by way of house rent, because the *Capital* had assumed that every employee had his own house to live in. That makes Rs. 70 as pre-war cost of living for a middle class family. The cost of living index of Calcutta is now over 380 and so the actual cost on pre-war level would come to Rs. 267 in Calcutta. Similarly,

in Bombay, the Chairman of this very Commission had conducted an investigation into the lives of middle class employees of the Central Telegraph Office at the pre-war level and found that the cost of a middle class employee is 80 per cent. higher than the cost of a working class employee. The investigation carried out by Mr. Justice Divatia into the cost of living of working class employees reveal that the cost of living of a working class employee at Bombay in pre-war prices—at index 100—was Rs. 55. Now, at that rate the cost of living in Bombay of a middle class family at pre-war prices would be Rs. 55 plus 80 per cent. and that makes Rs. 99. Therefore, just now it would be near about Rs. 300. Now, where is the unfairness in fixing Rs. 225 in places like Calcutta and Bombay, I ask you? Is it sufficient to place the journalists at this level? Even at this minimum can we expect a very high standard of work from them? Yet the Press barons have set their face against this recommendation also. Sir, I would urge upon the Government to brush aside those objections and immediately proceed to implement the recommendations. There should be no truck with the suggestion of a Wage Board to settle the minimum wages. The minimum wages have been settled by the Press Commission and the only thing to be done is to make an enactment implementing it all over the country and not to leave the journalists to the dilatory tactics of the Press barons in having a Wage Board.

In this connection I also want to say that certain Press barons had resorted to threat in order to coerce the Government and the people. They have resorted to threats of closing down certain newspapers and of retrenching their employees. I hope the Government will take stern measures to make them desist from this course of action; because, it is clear that it is done not out of consideration of economy but out of considerations of malice and nothing else. They can satisfy all the demands of the working journalists and they can satisfy them even in spite of the price-page

[Shri Sadhan Gupta]

schedule; but, they are trying to achieve their end by coercing the Government and the people by threats of throwing huge numbers of people out of employment. I hope the Government will take a stern attitude as regards this also.

I now come to the price-page schedule. Shri Natesan had been very vehement about it; but, more than Shri Natesan's sound and fury, damage, I think, has been done to this aspect of the Press Commission's recommendation by the gentle doubts which Acharya Kripalani has thrown on it. With great respect to him, I appreciate his motives in hesitating to support it because he wants the reader to have a cheap paper. But, the question is not of cheap or expensive paper but the question is purely of economics. Who will pay for the paper? It is quite clear that if you supply 8 pages for an anna or 10 pages for two annas the value of the paper does not come from the price; someone else has to pay it. Who pays it? It is either the advertiser who pays it, or the crossword puzzles which pay it, or the money of the cement and textile lords which pay it or the astrological predictions which pay for it. I would ask: is it not better that the reader should pay for his paper than the paper should be paid through crosswords, through the cement or textile lords, through advertisers or other sources or by playing to the superstitious tendencies of the people? The question is not of cheap versus expensive paper. The question is whether we want a cheap, slavish, and vice-ridden Press or a free and fair Press. The question is whether we want paper from a free Press at a fair price. That is the entire question involved in the price-page schedule. This price-page schedule is essential for the improvement of working journalists: because, its absence is driving the Indian language papers to desperation.

Now, there has been a suggestion that the Government should accept this schedule in principle and then

implement it by itself. That is a very dangerous suggestion; because, if we leave the implementation entirely to the Government's discretion, it will be defeated by the bureaucrats in the official machinery and we shall never have it implemented. So, my suggestion is, I urge that it should be implemented in consultation with the parties interested—that is to say, the Indian and Eastern Newspaper Society, the Indian Language Newspapers Association and the Indian Federation of Working Journalists.

Then I come to the news agencies. I do not want to add or repeat the arguments advanced about the P.T.I. and the U.P.I. as to why they should be reorganised. Only I want to answer Shri Natesan's point that all the vices that the Commission has pointed out were due to the old management, or they were a legacy from the old management. I cannot understand how partiality to directors in the matter of giving news service and in the matter of not realising their dues can be a legacy from the past. I do not understand how a director can be allowed to avail of "A" service by paying "B" or "C". I would urge upon the Government to discover the evidence of at least that insolent director—or at least reveal his name—who defied the Press Commission and had to be ordered out for his insolent behaviour.

I would also request that the reorganisation should not be left to the volition of the P.T.I. or U.P.I. and some kind of compulsion should be exercised by Government to make them reorganise themselves; because, we cannot leave our news agencies in the hands of private persons or in the hands of one person as in the case of U.P.I. and thereby let them lead the people of this country astray.

I shall now come to the point made by Shri Kamath about the foreign news agencies.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member has got only two minutes more.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: No, Sir; it cannot be.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am looking at the watch only; I am not doing anything else.

Shri Kamath: He may be given more time, as a Member of the opposition.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: I want half an hour.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Not half an hour, but 20 minutes. The hon. Member's party already had 34 minutes. Now with the 20 minutes for you, it would be 54 minutes.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: Regarding news agencies, it is a calamity that we have to depend for foreign news on a foreign news agency, an imperialist news agency. We depend on Reuters. They tell us that in Malaya, the bandits are fighting with the civilisers; that in Kenya the Mau-maus are murdering the Europeans. What is the position? They say that there are bandits in Malaya and Mau-mau murderers in Kenya. We are not told what cruelty is perpetrated on the people of Malaya and how hundreds of thousands of Kenyans are murdered by the British troops. We are not told of that. Can there be any surprise, any wonder that we are not told of that? Look at the way in which the struggle against colonialism and our own struggle in relation to Goa are represented. On the 16th August last, a despatch from Reuter was published in Australian and British papers. It says:

"Goan villagers attacked demonstrators with heavy sticks and took pamphlets and Indian flags from them."

We know who these villagers are. They are hooligans of the Portuguese power. They are described as Goan villagers as if they are patriots. What is the source of this news or outlook? That is clear from an editorial passage and I will read it:

"An unpleasant tinge of humbug pervades this proposed invasion of

Goa by 300 non-violent Indian volunteers."

It further observes that this method recalls Hitlerian tactics, and then remarks:

"This is a deplorable way to celebrate India's Independence. It would be tragic if the respect which Mr. Nehru has earned were to be undermined by the means employed by his countrymen to coerce one of India's small neighbours."

Dr. S. N. Sinha was complaining about the gutter Press, the gutter Press of the west, but what I have quoted is not from the gutter Press but from an editorial appearing in the *Yorkshire Post*, the paper of Sir Anthony Eden, the Prime Minister of the chief country of the Commonwealth to which we are proud to belong. Now, the Goan hooligans are villagers; the Malayan patriots are bandits, and the British murderers are civilisers, and the Kenyan patriots are murderers. That is the thing which we see from Reuters. What is the kind of thing they send out? I shall give another instance. The United Press of America, while sending a despatch on Kashmir said that the "valleys of Kashmir were drenched with the blood of Muslims murdered by the Indian Army". What is more mischievous? Do you know where they sent it? They sent the despatch to the Middle East and our Embassy in Cairo, I understand, intercepted that despatch. We want the Government to do something about it and to see that we do not receive news which is coloured through Reuters' eyes but that we get true news through Indians; they must see that the correspondents of our own news agencies are posted in world capitals and in East Asia and Africa where struggles are brewing. We want the Government to see that it checks the activities of the foreign Press in the matter of slandering our country.

I now come to the Press laws. I cannot deal exhaustively with it but I will just touch certain aspects. The

[Shri Sadhan Gupta]

Press Commission, unfortunately in a majority report, has supported the amendment of the Constitution but I would urge the Government to accept the recommendations of the minority because the minority represents the people who are more competent to speak about the troubles and tribulations of the Press. There was no justification to introduce, in an amendment of the Constitution, the question of public order, because that is too wide a thing. There was still less justification to curb the freedom of the Press on the ground of relations with foreign States. The most objectionable thing is the Press (Objectionable Matter) Act. It permits the demanding of security, it permits the Government to appeal when the court has refused to order security and it is very strange that the Press Commission has upheld this part of the law. I pay a tribute to the authors of the Dissenting Minute who have done a good thing, who have done a great thing, by emphasising the necessity of the freedom of the Press and the necessity to let the Press (Objectionable Matter) Act lapse. It is clear that if you hold a threat of demand of the security, if you hold the threat of financial ruin upon the Press, the Press will be very chary of speaking independently. Therefore I wish this Act is repealed.

Though we may not agree on every point with the Press Commission's report, though we differ in approach on many points, yet, the Press Commission did an honest work and it has done a very great service to the cause of democracy in our country. But let us not be lulled into complacency. Let us not be lulled into thinking that if the Press Commission's recommendations are implemented all will be well. In spite of devices, in spite of the appointment of a Press Council, in spite of the devices suggested by the Press Commission for the securing of independent news, vested interests may worm into the Press Council and into other institutions and pollute the whole atmosphere. Therefore, what is required is the vigilance of the

people. If the vigilance of the people is not there, then it may happen that the Press Council and all the other instruments designed to secure the freedom of the Press will be captured by the antisocial elements, by the Press barons or their minions, and that way we shall lose the freedom of the Press. Therefore, I would ask the people to remain vigilant and ever keep vigilant as to how the Press is behaving and how the authorities who are to preserve the fairness of the Press are behaving.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Dabhi.

Shri E. N. Singh (Ghazipur Dist.—East Ballia Dist.—South West): I have been waiting since Friday.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What can I do? I am also calling one after another.

Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad): The time-limit was 20 minutes each.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Ten minutes now.

Shri Dabhi: Is it for me only?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members by themselves could cut short the speeches.

Shri Dabhi: I thank you for the opportunity given to me for placing before this House the views of the newspaper readers whose very existence seems to have been forgotten by all the hon. Members except the hon. Members who preceded me and who wants that the readers should pay more. Out of the several and innumerable topics which have been dealt with by the Press Commission, I shall confine myself only to three topics which vitally affect the reading public, and these topics are: price-page schedule, objectionable advertisement and cross-word puzzles. Whatever so many hon. Members might have said about the price-page schedule, there is no doubt that there is a divergence of opinion not only among the reading

public but among the journalists themselves. This is what the Press Commission itself says at page 74, para 211 of the Report:

"In the evidence that has been placed before us, there has naturally been considerable divergence of opinion regarding the imposition of a price-page schedule. The division of opinion has not been according to the size of the paper or its standing. The proposal has been opposed by many large papers and supported by at least one of them. Similarly, while many small papers have welcomed the idea, and the Indian Language Newspapers Association has strongly supported it, there has been opposition from this group also."

It seems that the Commission has not tried to ascertain the views of the newspaper readers who are mainly concerned with this question of price-page schedule. I am of the opinion that practically every hon. Member to the introduction of the price-page schedule provided that there would be no increase in the current prices of standard newspapers. I am afraid that practically every hon. Member who has spoken on this Bill has supported the introduction of the price-page schedule, but nobody has taken the trouble to present to the House the facts and figures and point out what will result from the introduction of the price-page schedule, whether it would result in the increase of the prices of the existing newspapers, whether it would have any effect on their circulation etc. Nobody has tried to give any clear idea on this point.

Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru): It is left to you.

Shri Dabhi: The Commission has not only said that there should be price-page schedule, but it has stated that the schedule should be three pies per page of the standard size. The Commission has admitted.....

Dr. Keskar: What has the Commission exactly said?

Shri Dabhi: At page 75 they say:

"A price-page schedule based on a price of 3 pies per page of standard size may prove adequate " etc.

Dr. Keskar: It is only by way of illustration.

Shri Dabhi: At another place they have indirectly admitted that it is going to raise the present prices of the newspapers. It is very difficult for any unbiassed person after this to exactly give his opinion as to whether it would be desirable to introduce a price-page schedule or not, especially if it is going to increase the present prices of the newspapers.

I agree that it is absolutely necessary that any cut-throat competition which in the end would result in the elimination of newspapers which have less resources should not be allowed; but at the same time we should see whether the introduction of the price-page schedule would bring the prices of the newspapers to a level which the ordinary reader would be able to bear or not.

After stating that "the development of journalism in our country has not been adequate in times of population," that the circulation of both English and major Indian language newspapers is mainly confined to urban areas and that it is very necessary to increase the circulation of newspapers in rural areas, the Commission, at page 20, para 52, say:

"The reasons for their not going in for newspapers at present are many. The most common is, of course, the cost of the newspaper and the inability of the household to spare the necessary amount."

Again, at page 21 in the same paragraph they say:

"There is obviously a real need for papers to be priced lower than they currently are."

[Shri Dabhi]

Therefore, the Commission has not only stated that there should be no increase in the prices of the newspapers, but they should be lower than what they currently are. Then again, at page 21, para 53, they say:

"Convincing proof, if proof were needed, of the scope for expansion if prices can be reduced, is provided by the experience of certain newspapers in Bombay and Delhi which claim to have succeeded in securing very large increases in circulation when they reduced their prices without reducing the number of pages, as can be seen from Table V and VI below;" etc.

In these tables it is shown how the circulation of the papers rose very high when their prices were reduced. There is another instance showing the effect of selling price on circulation. At page 61, para 165, it is said:

"The two leading Tamil papers *Swadesamitran* and *Dinamani* in Madras raised the price of their papers from 1 anna to 1½ annas. The result was a drastic fall in circulation in both their cases."

Again at page 60, para 162, it is said:

"Circulation is the key to the economic success of a newspaper. An increase in circulation reduces the cost of production per copy and thereby increases the net return."

I would leave it to the hon. Members to see whether these facts and figures given by the Commission itself go to show that there should be an increase in the prices of the newspapers, in case any price-page schedule is introduced. For my part, I have no objection to the introduction of this price-page schedule, if it is necessary; but we have to see what effect it would have on the purchasing power of the people and whether there would be an increase in circulation. These two things, we have to see. The Commission has stated that the most common reason for the people in

rural areas not going in for newspapers is the cost of the newspaper and the inability of the household to spare the necessary amount. Therefore, when we refer to the price-page schedule, we have to look to the consequences or results of its introduction.

My hon. friend Shri Shah deprecated the cut-throat competition among certain newspapers and I also agree with him. He referred to certain newspapers in Ahmedabad; but as it is likely to have some wrong impression upon the Members of this House, I would state certain facts with regard to these newspapers. My hon. friend Shri Gadgil also referred to these newspapers. The facts are these. There are two very old dailies in Ahmedabad and about two or three years ago, two more dailies were started. It has been stated that there is competition between these four papers. There is no doubt that there is competition going on between these four papers; but the facts are these. In the first place, all these four papers publish crossword puzzles and so all the four of them are equally responsible for this state of affairs. Then, there is another important fact which has to be noticed. Before the two new papers entered the field, the price of the old newspapers was 2½ annas per copy. After the new papers came into the field, the price of all the papers has been reduced to 1½ annas per copy of 8 pages. We do not want to have cut-throat competition, but at the same time we want some competition to be there, so that the readers also might be benefited. I am sure that if the two new papers had not come into the field, the price of the old papers would have continued to be 2½ annas. Therefore, while deprecating cut throat competition, we do not want to discourage real and healthy competition. I hope that the Government would take into consideration all these factors and also that it will not forget the readers.

The Government is going to bring forward a Bill in connection with the

subject of crossword puzzles. I am not going to say much about it. The name given to this new Bill is "Prize Puzzle Control Competition Control Bill". It seems that Government do not want to ban the crossword puzzles, but they want to have a control upon this, while many important newspaper agencies, the working journalists and the public at large want that this evil should be totally banned, I do not know why Government wants only to control this evil. I hope Government will see their way to put a total ban on an evil by which everybody hopes to become rich overnight, but actually nobody does. So both from the point of view of its moral and financial effect on the public, it is high time that the crossword puzzles are put an end to.

Lastly I want to say a word about objectionable.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up; Shri M. D. Joshi. The hon. Member will confine his speech to ten minutes.

Shri M. D. Joshi: One would have supposed that the recommendation of the Press Commission on price-page schedule would be welcomed by the lesser fry and would be objected to by the bigger newspapers. But going through the comments and reactions, one finds very intriguing remarks. One of the biggest papers, the *Times of India*, welcomes this. It says:

"The Commission's proposal to reintroduce a price-page schedule is welcome, inasmuch as it will eliminate competition and divert the energies of smaller papers to the improvement of quality."

Strangely enough, the *Free Press Journal*, which reduced its price from two annas to one anna and gave very hot competition to the bigger papers has opposed this. It says:

"The Commission's suggestion for the resurrection of the price-page schedule in the newspaper industry strikes us as something incomprehensible."

Further on, it says:

"It is difficult to see how the Press Commission which specifically discourages the private motive in the newspaper industry should impose restrictions on healthy competition which will be as much in the interest of the newspapers as of the readers"

to which my hon. friend Shri Dabhi referred.

The same thing is repeated in two or three other places. So, readers like me, as well as those who are connected with the newspaper profession like me, are wondering whether it is in the interest of the smaller papers or in the interest of the larger papers.

But reading between the lines we can find that what the *Times of India* means is that bigger papers would like to be left alone with their present prices and with their present pages and the smaller papers like the *Free Press Journal* who are giving them competition will be reduced to a smaller size and thereby competition from them will be reduced. This is the obvious meaning of the remarks of the *Times of India*.

Let me now come to the position of the weeklies. This is a very large class. The Press Commission has dealt with the cases of 330 dailies, belonging to the English as well as the Indian languages. But the weeklies are 1189 in number and the fortnightlies are 379. The weekly journals are in a very sad plight. None the less they have served the country well as the dailies have done. The dailies maintain pride in having held the banner of freedom aloft and having continued the struggle for freedom; but the small and humble weeklies, published in small towns, some of them even in villages, have served the country to the best of their ability. On the contrary, their task was more difficult. They had to face the wrath of Government, petty Government officials, and they had continuously to struggle against oppression, unnoticed in higher quarters.

[Shri M. D. Joshi]

In my own district, which is a corner of India, there were fifteen papers working at one time, practically every taluk town having a paper of its own. About seven or eight of them have disappeared on account of difficult circumstances and others are struggling very hard. What is the condition of an ordinary district paper, I mean the weekly district paper? Its editor, mostly, is not a professional man; he is an amateur following some other profession. He is generally a pleader. In many cases he is the proprietor, the editor, the news-getter, the reporter, a social worker all bundled into one personality at the same time.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem):
And salesman!

Shri M. D. Joshi: And also a salesman sometimes. You can imagine how difficult a task it is for such a man, especially when he has to face the wrath of the petty local officials. How are we going to help these people? It is a totally unequal fight. It is a fight against a mighty machine. It is a like a fight, if I may use an analogy between the small village industries and the heavy industries. As the small village industries were being threatened of being swamped by the bigger industries, so the smaller newspapers are being threatened with extinction within a very short time unless something is done to help them. I turned the pages of the Press Commission Report and I was disappointed to find that nothing has been suggested, perhaps, because nothing could be suggested. The only suggestion is that in the case of Government advertisements, some consideration should be shown to these papers. We are thankful for this suggestion. But what happens? The Press Commission narrate a very sad story. The States did not pay attention to the enquiries of the Commission as regards the Commission's questionnaire for a very long time and generally the response was not very cordial, nor very heartening. The same is the experience in regard to

the attitude of the State Government towards these papers. The papers are made use of for propaganda; when the State Government requires, it takes the aid of the weekly papers. But, when the weekly papers are in difficulties, Government sits tight in its place. It does nothing. I shall explain this. I am speaking from personal experience. I have been editing a small paper at Ratnagiri for the last 24 years. I have seen the ups and downs of journalistic existence. Even today I am editing that paper. I belong to the party in power and I am considered by the people to be in a privileged position. But, what is the experience?

Shri B. S. Murthy: Do you belong to the ruling party in Ratnagiri?

Shri M. D. Joshi: Don't quarrel over words, please, if you think I go wrong here or there. Please do not break my chain of thought. I appeal to you, as my time is short.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: May the hon. Member live long.

Shri M. D. Joshi: I shall live long. But I am nearing my end here just now.

What is our experience? The petty district officials have devised a very queer way of effecting savings perhaps wanting to be patted on the back by the State Ministers. The district officials send us advertisements of 'applications invited' and formerly they were paid for. Now, they write out the advertisement and below, they write two lines: 'this may kindly be published as a piece of news.' A very fine way of depriving poor weeklies of a small revenue! As the Press Commission has pointed out, advertisement revenue is about 5 per cent. to 7 per cent. Government advertisements are less than that. However, Government advertisements go to raise the status of the papers. This has been pointed out by the Press Commission. Suppose my paper, which has a circulation of about 5000, does not get that advertisement, people

who read my paper think that it is no use reading this paper, because we do not get this information which is important. Therefore, I cannot refuse to publish that even if the district official plays a trick upon me. If I refuse, some other journal will step in and will give unfair competition to me. I therefore, submit that some method must be devised in the matter of these advertisements. It is true that revenue from advertisements is a very small part of the total revenue. But, it has its own importance.

I have to thank the Information Department of the Government of India for giving all facilities to the district papers. But, they will have to go a long way in order to make the task of the district papers easier. I have to make three or four suggestions, which I shall do briefly because my time is very short. As regards the supply of information, we have to depend mostly on the dailies and sometimes also on the radio. The rule as regards radio information is that the news broadcast on the radio should not be published within 24 hours. My paper is published once a week. Sometimes, there are occasions when every important news is announced over the radio and I cannot make use of it without infringing the rules and publish it in the next morning. The circumstances compel us to infringe the rules. We have to, because, if we do not, people will think that such an important news which was announced on the radio last night is not in the paper. I appeal to the hon. Minister of this department or the Communications department to see that this rule is relaxed. News announced on the radio should be available to us as a matter of course to be published within 24 hours. There is no meaning in this rule. News which is broadcast to the whole world is withheld from the papers for 24 hours.

I would appeal again to the Information department and the Minister in charge to supply us news in

tabloids, especially on the day previous to the publication of the paper. That would facilitate the task of the weekly newspapers who have not got the advantages of the teleprinter. As regards teleprinters, I would appeal that teleprinters in devanagari should be made available for the small papers in the district towns if possible. If that is not possible, at least the P.T.I. and other news agencies should be advised by the Press Council which will come into being, to supply news to the weekly newspapers at cheaper rates. That would somewhat lighten their task. Otherwise, the weekly press will suffer as they have suffered for so long. My hon. friend Shri Dabhi has referred to the crossword puzzles. I shall leave that out and I shall refer to one baneful thing namely the astrological predictions.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): Is not astrology a science as any other science?

Shri Altekar (North Satara): It creates a fatalistic pattern of society.

Shri M. D. Joshi: It may be a science; it may not be a science. But, astrological predictions are definitely a bane to the reading public. That is my considered opinion. The Bombay Legislative Assembly very recently, and also the Bombay Council, have passed a resolution recommending to the Government of India to undertake legislation to ban crossword puzzles, I would also appeal to the Government of India to undertake legislation to ban simultaneously astrological predictions also. Because, astrological predictions have a tendency to create a fatalistic tendency in the minds of the young men. Every college student carries his own horoscope in his pocket and consults a weekly paper, some worthless trash and thinks that he is going to become a rich man.

Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur-cum-Purnea): Every Minister also does like that.

Shri M. D. Joshi: If the prediction is bad, his heart sinks.

[Shri M. D. Joshi]

There is nothing so evil as an astrological prediction.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Deshpande: he promised to finish in five minutes.

An Hon. Member: You do not call back-benchers.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not know who is a back-bencher and who is a front-bencher.

Shri G. H. Deshpande: (Nasik Central): I assure you, Sir, that I will not exceed the time. I rise at this fag end of the debate simply to voice the feelings of the journalists from my constituency. I come from a district town where an attempt is being made for the last few years by a colleague of mine to conduct a decent Marathi daily paper. I know from personal experience, being associated with him very closely, how difficult it is in these days to conduct any paper against these big combines and chains of papers. They are in a very advantageous position. For these people who are conducting the language papers with a certain definite mission, it has become very difficult to continue in the field. A number of papers have been closed. Others that are carrying on are doing so at a great cost. Unless and until favourable circumstances are created by special legislation and the language papers are given some protection, it is absolutely impossible for them to develop their activity. I do not understand how unless and until these papers are given protection and allowed to develop on proper lines we can expect the successful working of democracy in our country. Those who have opposed the proposal for a price-page schedule have not suggested any alternative. Is it possible, I ask, for the language papers to continue in the present circumstances without any protection, and is there any other remedy which can bring about this result except the price-page schedule as suggested? That proposal ought

to be considered and given effect to. Unless and until that proposal is given effect to, nobody can say how the interests of the working journalists also can be protected, because when I say that the language papers must be developed, I know very well that those who are working in language papers are paid very badly, they are paid meagre wages. They do require better treatment. But those papers cannot give them better treatment. Unless and until they get some protection from these big chains and big combines. And that is why I want to state before this House that practically everybody who is working in this field with some definite mission, and not with a view to earn money only, is of opinion that the time has come today when everybody must consider this situation seriously. If we do not take any action in time, one knows not what will happen to our press.

No doubt, for the present in spite of all these things, there are some very good papers in India today. I do not mean to say that every paper that is going on today is going on without any particular mission, but the tendencies that we come across nowadays, if allowed to continue in the same fashion as they are going on today, are bound to go on deteriorating and it is bound to be more and more difficult for the language papers and papers with definite missions to continue on sound lines. And that is why I want to state before this House that very soon these two important suggestions of the Press Commission must be given effect to. That alone will give protection to these papers which are carrying on their mission with some sacrifice.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Raghunath Singh. Hon. Members will see whether I am calling back-benchers or front-benchers, cross-benchers or middle-benchers.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह: मैं भारतीय भाषाओं के समाचारपत्रों की अँर से कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। मुझे यह कहना है कि दश में २२२ समाचारपत्र

हैं जिनमें से २५६ भारतीय भाषाओं के हैं। इनके सम्बन्ध में बहुत कम बातें यहाँ उपस्थित की गई हैं।

डा० कैसकर : २२० से ज्यादा हैं।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : नहीं, २५६ भारतीय भाषाओं के पत्र हैं। इनके सम्बन्ध में मैं केवल दो बातें आपके सम्मुख रखूंगा। एक तो एंवरटिजमेंट के सम्बन्ध में हैं। रिपोर्ट के पंज ५५ पर एंवरटिजमेंट के सम्बन्ध में जो थोड़े से सुझाव पेश किये गये हैं, मैं उनका समर्थन करता हूँ। समर्थन करने का आधार यह है कि एनुअल रिव्यू जो समाचारपत्रों का इस वक्त होता है, वह ११ करोड़ रुपये हैं। उस ११ करोड़ रुपये में ५ करोड़ रुपये सिर्फ विज्ञापन से आता है और ६ करोड़ रुपये सम्प्रक्रियण से। ४ करोड़ रुपये एक्सपेंस की मद में आता है जो कि स्टाफ की सैलरी और छापाखाना इत्यादि में दिया जाता है। केवल ५५ लाख रुपये सम्पादकीय विभाग

के वेतन में जाता है। इस प्रकार से आप देखेंगे कि हमारे जो समाचारपत्र हैं उनकी ५५ प्रतिशत आमदनी सम्प्रक्रिया से होती है और ४५ प्रतिशत आमदनी एंवरटिजमेंट से। लेकिन अगर आप जापान की हालत देखें, हालांकि वह एक छोटा सा देश है तो आप उलटी बात पावेंगे। वहाँ सम्प्रक्रिया से ६२ परसेंट आमदनी होती है और एंवरटिजमेंट से केवल २५ परसेंट आमदनी होती है।

इन बातों को देख करके हमारे प्रेस कमिशन ने दो सिफारशें गवर्नमेंट के सामने रखी हैं। एक तो साइज आफ दी पेपर के ४० परसेंट से ज्यादा उसमें एंवरटिजमेंट नहीं आने चाहिये और दूसरी बात उन्होंने एक श्रेष्ठ दिया है। श्रेष्ठ में २ रुपये पर सिगल कालम पर प्रति इंच होना चाहिये। उसके परचात, हर पांच हजार कापी के ऊपर उन्होंने एक श्रेष्ठ दिया है। वह रेट स्ट्रक्चर इस प्रकार है :

Maximum basic charge	Rs. 2-0-0
First 5000 copies	Re. 0-6-0
Next 5000 copies	Re. 0-5-0
Next 5000 copies	Re. 0-4-0
Further copies	Re. 0-2-0

Subject to a maximum of Rs. 15 per single column inch.

per single column inch plus.
per mille per single column inch.
—Do—
—Do—
—Do—

इस प्रकार अगर पेपर का सर्कुलेशन १५ हजार का है तो उसका एंवरटिजमेंट रेट होगा ६ रुपये ११ आने और अगर २० हजार हुआ तो रेट होगा ८ रुपये ६ आने। इसके परचात वह २ आने प्रति कालम प्रति इंच लेंगे। इस तरह मैंने हिसाब लगा कर देखा है कि तीस हजार के ऊपर छापने की कॉस्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन बन आना प्रति सिगल कालम पर इंच आयेगा। अगर दो पैसे उसको बांटने का अर्थात् डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन आफ दी पेपर का रख लें तो आप देखेंगे कि दो पैसे डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन का, एक आना कॉस्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन का, इस तरह से कुल ६ पैसे होता है, दो पैसे पर कालम पर इंच फायदा होता है। अगर प्रेस कमिशन के इस सुझाव को मान लिया जाय तो हमारे न्यूजपेपर्स के भाड़े लोग आज हस्ता करत हैं कि रेट ठीक नहीं हैं। उनसे बात कहना है कि कॉस्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन और

डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन को लगा लेने के बाद भी आपको २२ परसेंट फायदा होता है। लिहाजा हमको इस सिफारिश को मान लेना चाहिये।

हमें यह देखना है कि हमारे एंवरटिजमेंट से किस प्रकार के होते हैं। आप किसी भी पेपर को उठा कर देख लें, करीब करीब ६० परसेंट एंवरटिजमेंट जो समाचारपत्रों में निकलते हैं, चाहे वे पत्र अंग्रेजी के हों, हिन्दी के हों या और दूसरी भाषाओं के, पार्शिएली फारन या कम्पलीटली फारन एंवरटिजमेंट से वह भर होते हैं। इसका अर्थ यह हुआ कि जितने समाचारपत्र हैं, उनकी में इनकम विदेशों से होती है। इस सम्बन्ध में महाभारत का एक किस्सा याद आ जाता है। जब भीष्म पितामह महाभारत के युद्ध में घायल होकर बाणों की शय्या पर लेटे गये तो सार लोग उनके इर्द गिर्द

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

इकट्ठा हो गये। उन्होंने बड़े अच्छे अच्छे सिद्धान्त बतलाये। उनकी व्याख्या की। उस जबसर पर भीम ने भीष्म पितामह से पूछा कि महाराज जब द्रोपदी का भरी सभा में चोर लौं चा जा रहा था तो उस समय आपकी यह विशुद्ध वाणी कहां चली गई थी? भीष्म पितामह ने उसका उत्तर दिया कि जो दूषित रक्त मंत्र शरीर में जब तक दिद्यमान था, वह जब मंत्र शरीर से निकल गया है और इस कारण मंत्री वाणी शुद्ध हो गई है। इसी प्रकार मैं कहता हूँ कि अगर यह फार्मन मनी हमारे पेंपर को और हमारे माइंड को कंट्रोल करेगा तो यह विष एक दिन हमारे नाश का कारण बनेगा। इस वास्ते मैं कहता हूँ कि एंक्वैरीटिवमेंट के बारे में प्रेस कमिशन की जो रिपोर्ट है उसको मानना चाहिए।

दूसरी बात मुझे पी० टी० आई० के सम्बन्ध में कहनी है। इस समाचार एजेंसी की दश भर में संख्या १६२ हैं जहां से वह समाचार दती हैं। इन १६२ एजेंसियों में से १५२ एजेंसीज हिन्दुस्तान में हैं और बाकी दस एजेंसियां ब्राउटसाइड इंडिया जैसे सीलोन, टोंकिया आदि में हैं। पी० टी० आई क्या है? यह तो एक बोर्ड से एंजीपीटियों और सरमायदारों का अड्डा सा हो गया है। वह जिस को चाहें उसको रलें और जिसको चाहें उसको खत्म कर दें। साथ ही साथ आपको यह भी दर्खना है कि जो भारतीय पेंपर्स हैं उनमें से ४९ पेंपर अंग्रेजी के हैं। बाकी सारे भारतीय भाषा के पेंपर जिनकी कि संख्या १९९ हैं, वे भी पी० टी० आई० को सम्बन्धित करते हैं। आप पी० टी० आई० के रेंट शैड्यूल मुलाहिजा करिए कि वह चीज क्या है। वह अपने शैड्यूल ए, शैड्यूल बी और शैड्यूल सी के अनुसार चार्ज करता है। लेकिन मैं अभी उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपको उदाहरण देकर साबित कर दूंगा कि जिन पेंपरों के डाइरैक्टर्स पी० टी० आई० के हैं, उन पेंपरों को कम देना पड़ता है और जिनके डाइरैक्टर्स पी० टी० आई० के नहीं हैं उनको दुगना तक और उनकी अपेक्षा अधिक देना

पड़ता है। मैं इसके प्रमाणस्वरूप आपके सामने उदाहरण उपस्थित करता हूँ। सी० क्लास शैड्यूल में आने वाले लोगों में हमारे सेंट गोविन्द दास का समाचारपत्र "जय हिन्द" जबलपुर से निकलता था। उनको २००० इंचार रुपये पर सर्विस दी जाती थी। नागपुर से "नवभारत" निकलता था। उससे सर्विस का १२५० रुपये लिया जाता था। कोयम्बटूर से "नवा इंडिया" जो कि तामिल का पत्र है उसको ९००० रुपये देने पड़ते हैं। बड़ोदा से एक अखबार निकलता है उसको १५०० रुपये देने पड़ते हैं। और त्रिवेन्द्रम से निकलने वाले को ६०० और "समाज" 'मातृ भूमि' कीलक 'नवभारत' से १००० रुपये लिए जाते हैं। क्यूलोन से 'कांटायम', 'हिन्दुस्तान' (सिन्धी बम्बई) ५५० रुपये और इन्दौर से जो पेंपर निकलता है उससे ५५० रुपये और दिल्ली से जो पेंपर निकलते हैं, अर्थात् कॅंपिटल सिटी से जो पेंपर निकलते हैं उनसे केवल ३५० रुपये ही लिए जाते हैं। आप ही इंसफ कीरये कि जो आदमी दिल्ली, बम्बई, कलकत्ता या मद्रास में रहते हैं उनको चीप रेट पर सर्विस दी जाती है जब कि सैकड़ों भारतीय समाचारपत्रों को जिनको गरीब कारतकार, मजदूर तबका और रिकशा वाले पढ़ते हैं और जो कि हमारे भारतवर्ष के लोकतंत्र की रीढ़ हैं उनसे हम अधिक हिस्सा से अपनी सर्विस का चार्ज करते हैं। उस रीढ़ को हम को सस्ते से सस्ता समाचार पत्र पहुंचाना चाहिये। उन को साधन सुलभ करना चाहिये। लेकिन होता इस का उल्टा है। इसीलिये मैं आका ध्यान इस तरफ आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। साथ ही इस के वास्ते मेरा एक सुझाव है। सुझाव यह है कि समाचारपत्रों को सर्कुलेशन की बेसिस पर या रायल्टी के बेसिस पर मूल्य पी० टी० आई० को देने चाहिये। जैसे मैं उदाहरण दूँ। टाइम्स आफ इंडिया का सर्कुलेशन है ५५,००० और वह दते हैं ६,०५० रु० माहवार, अर्थात् ९ परसेंट। युगान्तर बंगाल का है, उसका सर्कुलेशन है ६४,९००, उस को देना पड़ता है, २,९०० रु० अर्थात् ९ परसेन्ट। आप हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स पढ़ते

हैं। उस का सकुलेशन है ४५,०००, वह देता है ४,९०० रु०, अर्थात् १.२ परसेन्ट। एक अखबार है नैशनल हेरल्ड, उस का सकुलेशन है ५,०००। उस को देना पड़ता है २,६०० रु०, अर्थात् १.२ परसेन्ट। टाइम्स आफ इंडिया १ परसेन्ट, युगान्तर १ परसेन्ट, हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स १.२ परसेन्ट और नैशनल हेरल्ड को १.२ परसेन्ट देना पड़ता है। इसी तरह से इलाहाबाद से एक अखबार लीडर निकलता है। उस का सकुलेशन ६,००० है। उस को १७ परसेन्ट देना पड़ता है। इसी तरह आप देखें कि एक पेपर है मनोरमा।

3 P.M.

श्री जांगड़ (विलासपुर—रीवात—अनुसूचित जातियाँ) : साप्ताहिक।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : जी, उस को ६०० रु० देना पड़ता है जबकि उस का सकुलेशन २५,९२६ है। पूना के सकाल का सकुलेशन २०,००० है। पर उस को सिर्फ ७५० रु० देने पड़ते हैं। क्योंकि उन के चलाने वाले पी० टी० आई० के डाइरेक्टर हैं। चीफ वें डाइरेक्टर हैं इस लिये उन को कम देना चाहिये। मेरा समय समाप्त हो रहा है इस लिये इस विषय में ज्यादा न कह कर मैं यही कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आप समाचारपत्रों को जीवित रखना चाहते हैं तो उन को रायल्टी या सकुलेशन के बीस परसेन्ट पर समाचार का मूल्य देने चाहिये।

इस के बाद मैं दूसरी बात आप के सामने रखता हूँ। हमारे यहाँ जो न्यूजप्रीट इम्पोर्ट होता है वह बहुत कम है। केवल ६४,००० मीट्रिक टन पर इजर। होता क्या है कि जो बड़े पेपर हैं वह आर्डर देते हैं। उन्होंने आर्डर दे दिया २०,००० टन या २४,००० टन का। लोग अधिकतर कागज कॅनाडा, फिनलैंड या नार्वे, स्वेडन से मंगाते हैं। नार्वे से तो कम ही आता है। स्वेडन, फिनलैंड और कॅनाडा से ज्यादा आता है। जब बड़े बड़े पेपर आर्डर देते हैं तो उन को लगभग ६ आ० पाँड दाम देना पड़ता है। लेकिन जो हमारे छोटे पेपर हैं, हिन्दुस्तानी समाचार या भारतीय भाषा के पेपर, वह जब उसी कम्पनी को आर्डर देते हैं तो उन से ५ आ० और ७ आ० पाँड तक चार्ज

किया जाता है। मैं आप से कहता हूँ कि जो पेपर ऐसे हैं जिन को ६ आ० पाँड देना होता है वह दूसरे पेपरों के मुकाबले में जिन को ७ या ८ आ० पाँड देना होता है ज्यादा कम पैसे में बिक सकते हैं। टाइम्स आफ इंडिया और हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स किसी भी सस्ते रेट पर अपने समाचारपत्र बेच सकते हैं। इस के लिये मेरा एक यह सुझाव है कि जो फारन पेपर हर साल बाहर से इम्पोर्ट होता है उस का इन्वयोरन्स इंडियन बीमा कम्पनियों में होना चाहिये। ताकि जो हमारे इन्वयोरन्स का रुपया है वह बाहर न जाये। दूसरा सुझाव यह है कि उसका डाइरेक्ट एक्स्पेंज होना चाहिये। इस के माने क्या हैं कि जब हम नार्वे को आर्डर देते हैं, कॅनाडा को आर्डर देते हैं तो हम डालर के भू जाते हैं या स्टर्लिंग के भू जाते हैं। डालर या स्टर्लिंग के भू जाने से बैंकों का कमिशन भी हमारे ऊपर लाद दिया जाता है। इस लिये हमारा एक्स्पेंज डाइरेक्ट होना चाहिये। हमारा तिक डालर या स्टर्लिंग से नहीं होना चाहिये।

आखीर मैं मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि बापान ने पेपर के मामले में इतनी तरक्की क्यों की। इस का कारण यह है कि वहाँ के जितने समाचारपत्र हैं उन की ५० प्रतिशत शेअर, उस समाचारपत्र में काम करने वाले हैं, उस के स्टाफ में हैं, उन के हुआ करते हैं। केवल २० परसेन्ट शेअर आउटसाइडर्स के होते हैं। हिन्दुस्तान में क्या है कि वैन आफ पेपर्स थोड़े से पूंजीपतियों के हाथों में हैं। उन का इन्टरस्ट तो सिर्फ मुनाफा कमाने में है। जैसा मेरे लायक दोस्तों ने कहा कि आज जो लोग दिल्ली में रहते हैं उन को मालूम होगा कि कच्ची रोज घर घर घूमता है और पुराने अखबार १२ आ० से खरीदता है। मैं चलेज कर के कहता हूँ कि आप ६ आ० पाँड कागज खरीदते हैं और १०, १२ आ० से कच्ची को बेचते हैं। मेरे ख्याल से इस प्रकार से हमारे धन का, हिन्दुस्तान की लक्ष्मी का अपव्यय नहीं होना चाहिये।

प्रेस कमिशन की रिपोर्ट एडवर्टाइजमेन्ट के बारे में जो है वह स्वीकृत होनी चाहिये।

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

इस तरह से मैंने चार बातें आप के सामने रखीं। पहली एडवर्टाइजमेंट के बारे में, दूसरी कि पी० टी० आई० को सर्कुलेशन बॉसिस पर चार्ज करना चाहिये, तीसरी यह कि आज जो आर्टिस्ट नार्थ स्वेडन आदि बाहरी देशों को दिखे जाते हैं उनका डाइरैक्ट एक्सेन्स होना चाहिये, न कि पॉड और डालर से लिंक हो, चौथी बात यह कि जिस रेट पर बड़े से बड़े समाचार पत्र को कागज सप्लाई होता है, उसी रेट पर छोटे से छोटे पत्र को भी सप्लाई होना चाहिये और सारी सुविधाएँ एक ही मिलनी चाहियें।

Shri Damodara Menon (Kozhikode)

In the short time at my disposal, I do not want to go over many of the points that have already been covered by my friends. I want to emphasise only one or two aspects of the Press Commission's report. At the outset, let me point out that during this debate there was one particular feature which appeared to be very revealing, and that was that there was almost complete unanimity of opinion with regard to the recommendations contained in the Press Commission's report. Almost all Members, save for a solitary exception, that is, Shri Natesan, supported the recommendations.....

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): Singled out.

Shri Damodara Menon:..... wholeheartedly. Therefore, it would be comparatively easy for the hon. Minister to accept them *in toto*.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: You have made it very easy for him.

Shri Damodara Menon: In the course of his opening speech, the hon. Minister stated that tentative conclusions have been reached with regard to the major recommendations of the Commission. He did not reveal to us what those tentative conclusions were. But I hope that they must be in consonance with the views expressed here, if they are to be reasonable. If the hon. Minister's tentative conclusions are, as I say, reasonable, than they must really

undergo no change at all because, as they are they will be in consonance with what has been expressed here.

After having said this, I now want to say a few words about the language papers. I myself have been connected for a long time with language papers in my own district. I know the conditions under which I worked. Many hon. Members here have stated, and Shri Jaipal Singh who was a member of the Press Commission has also stated, that it was the primary consideration of the Commission to encourage language papers. And that is the correct attitude towards the development of healthy journalism in the country and for the development of democracy.

We have to reach the people in our villages, and once we have launched the system of adult franchise, it is necessary to educate our masters. Only a very small percentage of the population of this country read the English dailies. So, if you really want to have healthy democracy here, a democracy in which enlightened public opinion will mould our policies, then it is necessary for us to educate the people in our villages, and for that it is necessary to develop the language papers.

But the condition of language papers today is extremely pitiable. For improving their condition, the Press Commission has made certain recommendations. You cannot isolate one recommendation and say you will implement that particular one. That will be useless because only if these recommendations are taken as a whole is it possible for us to give any relief to the language papers. I want to read out one particular recommendation of the Commission, and Government's statement thereon. The recommendation is as follows:

"More than half the circulation of the papers is concentrated in the major towns and capitals of States and the penetration into rural areas is very small. Even the production of newspapers is primarily confined to the metro-

politan towns and major cities. The Commission feel that the number of newspapers in the country should be greatly increased and that more newspapers should come up in the district towns."

Government's own remark about that, given in the statement they have laid on the Table of the House, is this:

"Government agree that the conditions of starting and running newspapers should be such as to encourage the growth of more newspapers, particularly in the district towns, and would be glad to promote measures which would promote such environment, in a democratic manner."

I am glad the Government feel that they must encourage language papers and that it is their policy to do so. Now, if they are keen on doing that, they have no escape from accepting the other recommendations of the Commission. Short of subsidising district papers, which would certainly be undemocratic, as has been pointed out by the Commission itself, and by a distinguished journalist who was a member of the Commission, Shri Chelapathi Rau—subsidising a newspaper is an undemocratic measure and we do not want that—if they do really feel that it is necessary for them to encourage the development of language papers, they have to accept the other recommendations of the Commission which are on the subjects of price-page schedule, State trading corporation for newsprint, re-adjustment of the advertisement allotments and rates, elimination of unfair and restrictive practices and a reasonable scale of tariff for news services. All these recommendations, therefore, will have to be accepted in toto if they are keen—and they say they are keen—on developing language papers.

Now, about the conditions of the working journalist in the language papers. I know that the quality of journalism required for language

papers is probably a very tough one. I have personally worked in a language newspaper and that is why I am saying that a person who goes and works in a language paper has to equip himself at least with a great deal of proficiency in two languages. He must know English very well, and he must know the language of the paper, in which he is working. Normally, all the messages come in English; he has to translate them at top speed so that the paper may come out in proper time. This translation has often to be done in very difficult circumstances. As we know, many of the technical terms have to be translated on the spot at top speed. Therefore, I am saying that a journalist who is working in a language paper in a district has a great deal of difficulties. In spite of all that, they get an absolutely miserable pay. Very often, they get Rs. 30, Rs. 40, Rs. 50 or Rs. 60. That is the average rate. Except a few newspapers, all the rest are paying very very pitiable salaries to these people. I find in the recommendations of the Commission that a basic salary must be fixed. They have fixed Rs. 125 as the basic salary. I hear that there is a rumour that the Government, in fixing the minimum salary, are taking into consideration the circumstances in each district; they are reported to be having some kind of regional approach to a minimum wage. That is a wrong approach. It must be possible for the Government to have a minimum wage for every journalist, whether he is in the districts or in the capital towns of the States. If they do not do that, I am sure the quality of journalism in district papers will be absolutely bad and it will deteriorate. I may tell you that if the quality of journalism in the district papers is bad, it will poison the very source of our democracy. Today we want to attract talent in the district papers, and for that it is highly necessary that we give the district journalists at least a living wage. Therefore, I am opposed to this kind of rumour. I invite the Minister to make a categorical statement about it in his reply. This regional approach regarding

[Shri Damodara Menon]

basic salary must be given up, and I hope that he will find no difficulty in accepting the unanimous verdict of this House, as revealed in this debate, that the recommendations of the Press Commission must be accepted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Dr. Krishna-swami.

Shri Matthen (Thiruvellah): My State is neglected.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: His State is already represented.

Shri Matthen: Not my State.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. I cannot go on in this manner. I have only been calling here names and not States. What can I do?

Shri Matthen: We are neglected every where.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order I cannot be bamboozled like this. I have tried to accommodate all hon. Members.

Shri Matthen: Except from Travancore-Cochin.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. I have not been talking here myself except when I am forced to intervene and say a few words. I have been allowing hon. Members who wanted to speak, to speak. But hon. Members should not begin to challenge what I am doing. If one State cannot be represented, what can I do? Every State from all the 27 States cannot be represented. I have been trying to give chance to speak to members who are journalists. Dr. Krishnaswami also is a journalist. Then it was said that employers had been neglected. But when Shri Natesan spoke about employers in a few words, immediately there was a hue and cry.

Shri Natesan (Tiruvallur): I am an employer.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Of newspaper?

Shri Natesan: Not newspaper.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Therefore, hon. Members will wait with patience. All that I can do, I am doing. I cannot be hustled into a particular course of action. I will have my own way; here-after I will close both of my ears and I will only look at Members and then call them.

Shri Lakshmayya (Anantapur): I am a small journalist. I may be given a chance.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All right. Next time when this comes up.

Dr. Krishnaswami (Kancheepuram): At this late hour, it only remains to underline certain aspects of the Rajadhyaksha Commission's recommendations which, I trust, Government will bear in mind before they decide to implement them.

I should like, at the outset, to point out that the Rajadhyaksha Commission owes its genesis to the agitation that was carried on by the employees of the Press Trust. Had the management settled the dispute in time, it is quite probable that we would not have had any Commission to inquire into the doings of the Press.

Several Hon. Members: No, no.

Dr. Krishnaswami: I know the urge, I know how it came about, I know what was the catalytic force that moved the Government to constitute this Commission. The PTI workers agitated their grievances and this aroused the slumbering conscience of people in high circles. It was this that was responsible for the Commission being appointed. Had the management of the PTI settled these disputes in time it is probable that we would not have had this Commission.

Shri B. S. Murthy: No, no.

Pandit K. C. Sharma: He is entitled to his views, though he is in the wrong.

Dr. Krishnaswami: All that I am saying is that while the attitude of the management was marked by

obstinacy in this case, this obstinacy has had a beneficial social consequence unintended no doubt. We have had a Press Commission, which, apart from making recommendations, has thrown a penetrating light on the dark structure of journalism in our country.

I do not propose to take up the time of the House on the question of minimum wages, but I should like to point out one aspect of the recommendations of this body on wages. The Rajadhyaksha Commission, in considering the wages of journalists—rightly—has considered this question not from the narrow point of view of manager and employee but from the larger angle of what is to be the status of journalism in the future, how journalism should get its recruits and what types of inducement should be offered to journalists so that new and better entrants may enter journalism. I think it is a proper approach. But when we come to practical details, I hope we will bear in mind some of the aspects which my hon. friend Shri Gadgil, has indicated and which cannot possibly be ignored, particularly as we are having a very large and diversified journalistic structure. What the Commission has emphasised—and this has been overlooked in this debate—is the status of journalists. Sometimes it happens that in some of the prosperous newspapers journalists are given liberal salaries and allowances, yet nevertheless they do not enjoy a proper status.

But, listening to this debate—and my hon. friend the Minister of Information and Broadcasting would also have had, I suppose, the similar thoughts—certain obvious questions surge up to one's mind. What is to be the future of our national news agencies; what steps are we to take to strengthen them—the Press Trust of India and the United Press of India; how much financial assistance should we give them; how should they operate so as to benefit the small scale newspapers? What is to be our attitude to the price-page schedule question; what is to be the role that the Press Council is expected to perform?

No intelligent patriot will deny that we should have a stable and a sound financial national news agency which would be expected to perform not only a great educative role within India but also to expound our viewpoint and appreciation of events to the outside world. Hon. Members here have been talking of the Press Trust of India opening a branch in Brazil, opening a branch in Latin America, in Chile and various other countries of the world. No doubt, the Press Commission itself has gone into this matter fairly fully and has recommended these agencies opening branches. But, may I ask this pertinent question? How is this to be achieved? Have our agencies the finances to open them and what steps do the Government intend taking to strengthen the agencies because, obviously, if they are not going to be given what I would call unconditional assistance for the purposes of expansion, the Press Trust of India will be an anaemic creature and the United Press of India will languish and probably die soon?

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: What is your suggestion?

Dr. Krishnaswami: My hon. friend should have the patience to listen before he attempts to interrupt. It is only after he has heard me that he will understand what my solution is.

I should like to place before this House the complaints that have been made against Government by those interested in the news agencies. There is a genuine complaint about the wireless reception charges that the Press Trust of India and the United Press of India have to pay. I should like, for the benefit of the House, to give certain revealing figures which shocked me when I first came across them but which I verified and found to be quite correct. In the United Kingdom they have what is known as the licence system. They charge for this licence only £20 per annum to the Press Association for obtaining news through wireless from abroad. In Holland it is as low as £9; in Pakistan it is as high as £675, that is about

[Dr. Krishnaswami]

Rs. 9,000 but here, since it is on a wordage basis we charge the Press Trust of India a little over a lakh of rupees per year and the United Press of India about Rs. 45,000.

If we are genuinely interested in strengthening these news agencies, if we want these agencies to flourish and if we want them to have access to different types of agencies—I understand that Reuters' agreement with the Press Trust of India is going to be terminated by the end of this year and unless we are careful Reuters may drive a very hard bargain—it is time we strengthen some of our agencies, no matter what our differences of opinion might be with the management—that can be remedied by legislation—it is time we put these two agencies in a better financial position.

I put this proposal to the Minister of Information and Broadcasting. Let him introduce the licence system for these two agencies and let it be confined to national agencies which are distributing their news to a sufficient number of newspapers. This by itself would give strength to our agencies and would also help to cut down their running costs.

I should like to refer in brief to the Rajadhyaksha Commission's recommendations relating to how far there ought to be a revision of rates charged by different departments. These national news agencies impinge on three departments of the Government of India. There is the Communications Ministry; there is the Information and Broadcasting Ministry, which is in charge of the All India Radio, and there is the External Affairs Ministry. Obviously, on this matter, unless we have a government policy instead of having a departmental policy, nothing will be done. The time has arrived when we should have a firm declaration as to what the policy is going to be on issues pertaining to rates to be charged by the Government.

The Rajadhyaksha Commission, for instance, dealing with the All India Radio has given a formula for determining rates which it recognised as proper. It suggests a formula whereby the rates which the All India Radio should pay to these news agencies for obtaining news should be higher. I want to ask this question. Is the Government going to accept the formula; has it an alternative formula? I do not suggest that the Press Commission has said the last word on this subject. But, surely, Government must have considered the positive recommendations of this Commission and the best appreciation of Rajadhyaksha and his colleagues would be not an uncritical acceptance of their recommendations, but a critical examination of the recommendations and the implications of such recommendations being considered by this House. Suppose for a moment it is found that on a commercial basis Government departments cannot give adequate assistance to the exigencies, what is there—and I am putting this question to the Minister for Information and Broadcasting—what is there to prevent unconditional assistance being given to these news agencies? Look at this matter from a slightly different angle. The Information and Broadcasting Minister, according to a statement made only six months ago, said that he was anxious to have radio sets in villages subsidised at the taxpayer's expense. The dissemination of news is a part of mass education and unconditional assistance given for the purpose of expansion of such education would certainly be socially desirable. We give, for instance, unconditional grants to Universities for the purpose of furthering higher education and a similar sort of principle can be worked out even in the case of news agencies subject to their putting their houses in order—so that they may be put on their feet. The Rajadhyaksha Commission has pointed out that the rates charged to newspapers in future should be on the basis of charging for service on a graded scale based

on daily net sales. I wish this recommendation would be implemented by the newspapers. I wish larger newspapers would have the good sense to implement this recommendation immediately. Such a recommendation, if implemented soon, would tend to strengthen smaller newspapers and to ease the burden on the smaller newspapers, and would help to distribute equitably the burden on all papers.

I am not committing myself to the proposal of a public corporation, this will have to be considered with care. But, I should like to point out to the hon. Minister that there is a genuine feeling, a widespread feeling in many parts of the country that the smaller newspapers have no chance of getting control of the management and that it is only the big few alone that are able to control the Press Trust of India. I make this proposal to him. I would like him to turn it over in his mind. Every newspaper which is a subscriber to the news agency, irrespective of whether it is big or small, should be *ipso facto* considered a shareholder of the news agency and should have the right to vote and thus there would a possibility of smaller and independent papers influencing the policy of the agency. There may be various other methods of achieving this object. But, this is one of the ways of giving a positive sense of confidence to the smaller newspapers that they will not be squeezed out and that there would be a chance of their really playing a great part in shapping...

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: You well know that on page 238 the Commission says that the small newspapers can, if they so choose, elect the entire directorate.

Dr. Krishnaswami: But they have not taken shares. That is my point.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: One hundred and thirty newspapers have only 214 votes between them and many of the smaller newspapers are shareholders and they have half the directors even now.

Dr. Krishnaswami: Not all of them. There is the possibility of any paper taking shares. I found out that only recently some have taken shares. I do not like to be interrupted because I do not have the time.

Shri Joachim Alva: The plums of directorship are wrested by the big newspapers.

Dr. Krishnaswami: That is exactly what I am grumbling about it. I know what the troubles are because I conducted a daily newspaper and I know the difficulties; but I cannot consider our woes now; I only say that there ought to be a better balance between the larger and the smaller papers, that there ought to be some way found of getting more equitable representation for the small shareholders.

I pass on to the price-page schedule question. It is not customary in this House Sir, to refer to articles that are published in the daily Press, but without infringing the etiquette of this House, I may point out that the best defence of unlimited page has appeared in the *Hindustan Times*, in an article by 'Touchstone'. There are powerful arguments that he has advanced; no one denies the force of the arguments that economies of the large-scale managements should not be sacrificed, that restrictive practices should not corrode the newspaper world and that the consumer should not pay higher prices because of restraints put upon newspapers. But critics of the proposal of the price-page schedule have not distinguished between the long-term and the short-term effects. They ignore two aspects which the Rajadhyaksha Commission had in view. The first is the need for assuring the consumer greater freedom of choice by assuring a variegated expression of opinion which will come into being as a result of price-page schedule being introduced. The second is—and this is an important factor which I am sure my hon. friends would take into account—that strange developments have taken

[Dr. Krishnaswami]

place in the under-world of journalism today. Today, for instance, a new phenomenon that stares us in all its hideousness is the managing editor in the world of journalism. These men are not only in control of large papers but are nominally editors, enjoying the status which the craftsmen and the artists should have. If the price-page schedule is fixed as a short-term measure—and I am not in favour of its being introduced as a permanent measure—it will not only help the small newspaper but also improve the status of the journalist. At certain levels of prices the small man's editorial quality and ability would give him a distinct advantage. The managing editor may have advantages in the technical production of the paper but will not be able to exercise the same influence because of more effective competition from the editor who is unattached to financial strings. The evidence given before the Royal Commission on the Press by Lord Layton is revealing. Lord Layton has protested against newsprint control, but he at the same time had the fairness to bring to the notice of the Royal Commission on the Press in the United Kingdom the report of the UNESCO on the Press, Radio and Film, in which it is pointed out that in recent times, as a result of newsprint difficulties, there has been a good deal of compression and a great deal more of skill displayed. What I am suggesting is that, as a result of this effective competition, the managing editor would be forced to divest himself of a good deal of his authority over the craftsman and the position of the small journalist would be much better; there would be, as a result of this variegated expression of opinion, a much better development in our journalistic world. Slimming is not only good for Eve; it is also good for our newspapers.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Slimming is good for Adam also.

Dr. Krishnaswami: Adam has a tendency to adiposity and therefore it is difficult for him to practise slimming.

I am not saying that in the long run, the consumer should not get what he wants. This price-page schedule would be of some utility, at least in the short run and help in the long run to provide the country with a large number of independent papers.

I have not the time to refer to the recommendation regarding the Press Council at length but I should like to make one observation. The Press Council should only be an advisory body and not a statutory body and I have strong reasons for making this suggestion. They may be clothed with the powers of an enquiry commission, but they should not be an absolutely privileged body. After all, remember that we have in our country what is known as the A.I.N.E.C. When that body was started, we all thought that it would lay down criteria of journalist ethics to be followed. But now that hope has not been fulfilled.

Acharya Kripalani: Why?

Dr. Krishnaswami: My hon. friend has not followed the import of my observations. When the Press Council is formed as an advisory body, it would have a much greater influence than if it is a statutory body with absolute privileges. After all, in the world of journalism, what is needed is the force of example. If the Press Council consisted of eminent men like the late Mr. C. Y. Chintamani, it would have greater value than if it consisted of panjandrums nominated by the chief justice of the Supreme Court. We have to take into account the journalists' feelings; we have to realise that the solutions that we are thinking of must be such that the impulse to create better standards must come from the profession. We must make it impossible for the so-called big man, who depends on finance to exploit public opinion. At the same time we have to understand that it is difficult to lay down standards as in the case of the medical or legal profession, and any attempt to do so would only lead to a total infringement.

ment of the Constitution. There would be obviously different standards depending on the person in charge of a paper. What the Acharya thinks as proper to publish in his paper, I may not think proper to publish in my paper. What I express in a violent language.....

Pandit K. C. Sharma: Are there no minimum standards of decency for the Press?

Dr. Krishnaswami: I do suggest that these views should be taken into account and in deciding about the Press Council, we should bear these factors in mind. The Rajadhyaksha Commission, as I pointed out, has done a signal service in exposing many of the defects of our journalistic structure. But it has concluded its enquiry with an observation, a pertinent observation, which I hope the House will bear in mind. In spite of all its defects, the Indian Press is still a good Press. This gives us ground for hope, because if it had said that the Indian Press was beyond redemption, there would have been no need for Parliament to discuss anything, there would have been no need on our part to suggest anything constructive. I hope that the Government will move as quickly as possible to stabilise the financial position of the national agencies without making them always live from hand to mouth and then expect them to pay their employees liberally and at the same time perform their task efficiently.

Dr. Keskar: I have been listening to the great debate that has taken place for the last two or three days, and it gives me great pleasure to note that there is a practically unanimous, and if not completely unanimous, an overwhelming majority opinion which appreciates the work of the Commission. A number of Members,—more especially my friends opposite,—in trying to speak, were trying to make out as if the Commission is a body which has fallen from somewhere and the Government are trying to avoid implementing the recommendations of the Commission. I

might remind them that it is the Government which has appointed the Commission, it is the Government which has made a very careful selection of the members. We have had full confidence in the impartiality and also the competence of the people we appointed.

Shri Jaipal Singh: Thank you.

Dr. Keskar: We did not appoint them in order to shelve the Report. If it had been so, we would have found some means of not appointing a Commission.....

Shri Kamath: So much pressure was brought to bear on Government.

Dr. Keskar: There is pressure always exerted from our friend, Shri Kamath.

Shri Kamath: I am proud of it.

Dr. Keskar: I might say here that I highly appreciate the work that all the members of the Commission have put in. There are three members on the Commission who differ from Government. My friend, Shri Jaipal Singh, very aptly took the opportunity of attacking the Government or what it did and what it did not do, but I like it and I hope he will do it again.

Shri Jaipal Singh: Thank you.

Dr. Keskar: When appointing the Commission and trying to put in people who were not simply going to say 'Yes' to Government, we have had as a member the chairman of the P.S.P. We put them in, knowing that they are opposed to the Government, knowing at the same time that they will express objective and impartial opinion in the interest of the country and in the interest of the Press. Therefore, it is no use trying to attack the Government saying that the Commission has submitted its report but we are not doing anything. The Commission's report, because it is a very important report, had to be considered very carefully for the reason that it concerns not only the Press as an industry but also the question of freedom of the Press.

[Dr. Keskar]

Before answering many of the points raised by hon. Members, I may say one thing here. The report of this Commission or any other commission except one which has been appointed with the specific purpose of giving an award, is a recommendation or it contains a series of recommendations which should not be taken in the nature of an award. No Commission which has been appointed in this way expects that its report is taken as an award and that every comma and every fullstop must be implemented without delay.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

It is because the Commissions realise—even if the Commissions do not realise, Government have to realise—that in practically implementing any proposal, there may be practical difficulties which may not be before the Commission. I make bold to say that a number of members of the Commission and the Chairman—they themselves—realised it. I remember while discussing with the Chairman, he put forward his view in so many words: "This is a whole which we want to put before you; it is possible that there may be some difficulties but that is for you to judge. The ideal solution is that it should be implemented as far as possible in your opinion."

Hon. Members quoted from the Commission's report. I would say to them that the Commission's recommendations should be taken most seriously by all of us. But we cannot say that because the Commission has recommended, it must be done. I would say to them: in all the cases, let us think of all the things that can be said for and against and take a decision on merit, objectively and not simply say: because the Commission has said this, we should agree. Also that because the Commission has done it this way, we should take it very seriously and not reject a recommendation or modify it. We should not say that because the Commission has made a recommendation, let us accept

it; let us not discuss the pros and cons.

I might here say one thing more regarding this particular Commission. The terms of reference of the Commission were very wide. In giving these terms of reference to the Commission, we originally thought that the Commission might choose and pick out the most important for the amelioration of the Indian Press and might put in the background those which would take a long time. For instance, there was the industrial aspect of the Press—the question of a newsprint factory and the manufacture of newsprint. Therefore, the terms were made wide in the sense that they may take the most important and give a decision or recommend what they considered to be proper as quickly as possible. I remember in my talks with the Chairman, he gave another approach which I later recognised as probably right. He said, "It is not possible for us to pick and choose; we have been given certain terms of reference and we have to give our views regarding all the matters referred to therein. It may not be possible for us to say that we will leave aside some and concentrate on others." Probably, in that matter we were a little unfair to the Commission and it might have been better if we had given the Commission probably the most important matters regarding the Press, so that they would have been able to give them much more time and attention and deal with them even in greater detail than they were able to.

In the discussion here, every hon. Member referred to the freedom of the Press. It is naturally one of the most important points and the Commission has repeatedly referred to it. Without mentioning generally about this fundamental principle, what do you mean by the freedom of the Press? We all know that it is purely a democratic concept. Freedom of the Press is not a thing which exists in a totalitarian country.

Shri Kamath: We are a democracy, aren't we?

Dr. Keskar: Nor, does it exist in a country which has got a monarchy which is not of a democratic type. When we say freedom of the Press, we generally assume it to mean as it is recognised in democratic countries. You want, I want, Shri Kamath wants—all of us want freedom of the Press and I would, therefore, respectfully submit to him that in any matter which concerns the freedom of the Press, we must proceed carefully. In any case, he may not give me that much credit, but we want to proceed very carefully and see that in trying to put checks on what may be malpractices or what may be monopolistic tendencies we do not infringe on the right of the Press to speak out what it considers proper. And that is one of the reasons why in taking any decision, we have got to be very careful to see that in putting checks we do not check the Press altogether. That is necessary because sometimes friends are inclined to think or take it as accepted that freedom of the Press means criticising the Government.....

Babu Ramnarayan Singh: Yes.

Dr. Keskar: My friend confirms it and that is why it is necessary for me to explain it further. It is not a question of simply criticising the Government; it is a question of expressing freely what one thinks even if one supports the Government.

Shri Kamath: Criticise the Opposition also.

Dr. Keskar: I might read out an interesting paragraph from the Commission's report—paragraph No. 925:

"In this connection we must mention the opinion that has been expressed by quite a number of journalists as well as by others that in order to succeed, a paper must be extremely critical of what the Government does. This, they say, is a legacy of the past when every good nationalist paper would criticise the Government

all the time. The readers, they complain, have got so used to "blood and thunder" editorials that a sober appraisal is looked upon by the public with disfavour and praise of Government activities is suspect. Judging from the behaviour of many papers, we are driven to the conclusion that whether the public want it or not, the newspapers themselves have come to believe that blind criticism of those in authority will sell their paper much better than a rational policy.....". And therefore they do it.

The Commission has very honestly put it. But whenever I find my friends saying something about the freedom of the Press, they take it for granted that the freedom must mean only criticising Government. If you support the Government or say that the Government is telling the truth, there must be something suspicious about it. Let us not take that definition of the freedom of the Press. It should mean—when you consider that the Government has done something right to support the Government or approve of what it has done and when it had done something wrong, then to criticise it freely and frankly and even if necessary vehemently. I think this will be borne in mind while talking about the freedom of the Press. I may say, therefore, that when we were thinking of the freedom of the Press and of the recommendations of the Press Commission in that light, we have tried to see that we should not do anything which will—though it may do good and appear to do good at present—in the long run work against free expression of opinion by papers or other organs of public opinion.

The reason why I have to say this is this. In the Press Commission's report and others also, Government is asked to do a number of things regarding the industry, regarding price-page schedule, regarding newsprint and regarding so many other things and also regarding the monopolistic

[Dr. Keskar]

tendencies of some of the Press people. Government has to interfere. If I take what hon. Members here have said, Government has to interfere in a number of cases and very frequently. But they have to do it in such a way as not to interfere with the expression of opinion of those people and I submit this is not something easy. This has to be watched very carefully and whatever steps we take should be such as will give people encouragement to express what they feel is right whether the Government likes it or not. So, I would submit that one of the reasons for all this very careful weighing of the Press Commission's Report has been this important consideration.

There is another general observation which I would like to make here. A majority of the Members have spoken of the Press and—they might not have meant it—the general impression which I formed, and which I found also on reading the summary given in the papers is a kind of condemnation of the Indian Press as a property of the Press barons or whatever other names might have been given to them. There might be such people. But, let us be fair to the Indian Press; because, any kind of such sweeping generalisation would not be doing justice and would be condemning large numbers of good papers simply because we find that there are large numbers of bad papers. Let us strike a balance between both. I, personally, would like to say here that I cannot condemn the Indian Press in that way because I feel that there are good and bad papers. I would like to condemn bad papers but I would, at the same time, like to pay a tribute to the good papers. I would like here to quote small extracts from the Press Commission's Report. As far as fairness of news is concerned, the Press Commission in paragraph 922 of its Report says.

"In the very large number of newspapers studied and the variety of topics in respect of which the study was carried out,

there have been very few instances where a report has been twisted and only some cases where the comment has been, to some extent, unfair in the light of our definition."

The second is about standards of journalism and they say in paragraph 945:

"In concluding this survey of the performance of the Press, it is necessary to state that the well-established newspapers have, on the whole, maintained a high standard of journalism. We are glad to state that they have avoided cheap sensationalism and unwarranted intrusion into private lives. They represent a decisive majority of the total circulation in India."

Lastly, they say in paragraph 1018:

"by and large the responsible section of the Press has not done anything of which this country need be ashamed. Indeed we may go so far as to say that the conduct of the Press has on the whole been such as to do credit to any country in the world."

Now, I have not had that much opportunity of going into the various papers of the Press Commission Act, but I would certainly like to say here that, from what little I know of journalism, I know there are first class papers in our country of which any country can be proud. There might be sensational papers and there might be bad papers also; but, when we condemn the bad papers we should not try to generalise and condemn the Press as a whole.

There was a reference,—more especially by my respected friend Acharya Kripalani,—about the standards of journalism having fallen off. He said that journalism was formerly a mission and it is no more a mission now and that it has become a means of making profit. There is no doubt that journalism is no more a mission. If we are strictly accurate then we

cannot say that journalism was a mission even before 1947. Even before we had a number of papers that were just newspapers. They purveyed news and tried to do it in the manner that they considered right. There might have been some that were right and there might have been some that were wrong; but I agree that before 1947 we had a large number of papers that had a mission and that, not only because of their mission but also because of the great patriots and personalities who were their editors, reached a standard of journalism which, especially as far as writing leading articles and expressing opinions are concerned, will not be reached or will hardly be reached by anyone during these days or even later. This is quite true. But, we have to face the reality. There was a mission—I might say an all pervading mission—before this country prior to 1947. Everyone,—or at least most of the people in this country,—had one engrossing passion that the country should be free and a number of people thought that it could be freed in this way or that way and in their own light they tried to put forward what they felt about the freedom of the country and how it can be achieved. After 1947 it is not possible to say that every person in the country will have that particular mission before him; because we have to remember that until that time....

Acharya Kripalani: I thought that we had an agreed mission when you passed a resolution in the Congress about the socialistic pattern of society. I think that as greater idealism than mere nationalism.

Dr. Keskar: May I say that there is also the Congress pattern for the Congress Party; the socialistic pattern may be a mission to the Socialist party and the communistic pattern may be a mission for the Communists. It is a Party objective. What I say is, in India, before 1947 there was a general absorbing passion in the minds of the public for this country to be free and there was hardly anybody in this country who did not want that.

Therefore, anyone who worked for that mission had a general public sympathy. Political parties, however great or small they might be, cannot expect that support and sympathy which they got before. This is not the only thing. We have to remember also.....

Shri Sadhan Gupta rose.—

Dr. Keskar: I am sorry I cannot yield. If he wants I will answer questions at the end; but will he allow me to develop my arguments?

The second thing is that, before—and even uptill now—in India there was illiteracy and there was also non-development of reading habit which we had to contend with. For example there was a tremendous difference between the reading public in this country 25 or 30 years back and the reading public in Europe or America some 25 or 30 years back; because, there was a great deal of illiteracy. Why it was there, I need not say and you know the reasons for that. The non-development of reading habit is also an important matter which we should not neglect. It is something which exists even now. This is another reason why large circulation and development of the newspaper as a business did not take place in this country much earlier than it took place; for example, in Europe or any other country.

There is also the question of the development of newspapers catering only for news that is taking place. Now, we are having a simultaneous increase. There is increase in the number of readers and at the same time there is the development of newspaper as a business and increased circulation. I am not supporting or decrying this. I am just stating a fact as to the reasons why this has taken place and, however, much we might deplore—and I also deplore the change from what was once a mission to what is now simply a profession—the change, it has to be accepted and it is not possible for us to say that hereafter newspapers should again become missions.

Acharya Kripalani: At least they should not be frauds.

Dr. Keskar: I agree that they should purvey correct news.

I am only arguing the reason why it is no more a mission now.

4 P.M.

Another general point to which I would like to make a reference is regarding the question of monopolies. Practically all the speakers have referred to the question of monopolies and the development of monopoly. Now, there is no doubt that the emergence of newspaper as a business has led to certain tendencies which you find in other businesses also. The tendency to try to increase the circulation and get profits and also to get a larger and larger share of that particular market is there. But, the trend is only gathering momentum in our country. No doubt, the trend of modern business is affecting our country also and we see this in the springing up, especially during the last 5 to 10 years, of chains and combines or, what is called, the simultaneous publication of newspapers that is coming up. It has increased very much. There is no doubt that this will affect the newspaper industry greatly. There is no doubt also that this problem will have to be seriously tackled but I would like this to be stated in its correct perspective in the sense that we are not already in the grip of complete monopoly. The monopolistic tendencies, as the Press Commission has rightly stated, are increasingly becoming evident in our country, and the measures it has suggested are more of a preventive nature than of combating actual monopolies which are much fewer here than they are in other countries. I agree with them that the monopolistic tendencies should be combated and we should see that they do not come in the way a fair Press. We should see that the measures are more of preventive nature than of

actually combating the monopoly. The Commission has suggested two or three ways for that. There is the Press Council which should take up this question and suggest to Government what should be done about monopolistic effects which might come before them. Secondly, they have suggested also the price-papers schedule and they have also suggested actions to be taken against the challenge of papers as they exist. I was referring only to those general subjects. I will come to them later on again.

I will now take up one question before I come to the questions to be taken up for legislative action or what action Government should take. I would like to mention one important point. Shri Jaipal Singh, a Member of the Commission, has said a large number of things that were before the Commission and were discussed by them and he has thrown a challenge to Government that the evidence should be published. I might say here that regarding this matter the Press Commission itself has given in paragraph 23 the reasons why they felt that the evidence had to be taken *in camera*. I had quite a bit of discussion with the late Chairman, and this question of evidence—whether the evidence should be published or not—was also discussed with him. One of the important points to be remembered is that a large number of people were given the definite and formal assurances that their evidence will not be published, and on that assurance, they gave their evidence. I personally do not feel that it will be good if we say now: "Very well, let us now publish the evidence." I can agree that they can be published if there is a time-lag.

Shri Jaipal Singh: Is there an objection on the part of the Government to publish the evidence where this assurance was not given? Where evidence was taken *in camera*, where evidence became confidential, very well, do not publish them. But would Government undertake to publish the rest of the evidence, namely, the

financial structure, all this hanky-panky business? Because, there was no assurance given by the Commission that those things would not be published.

Dr. Keskar: I am not aware whether assurances were given about categories of evidence. I personally have absolutely no objection. From the very beginning I asked the Chairman whether the evidence should be published, but he said: "We have given such assurances" and asked if in the light of such assurances it would be right to publish the evidence! I further said that if the Commission were able to get from some of the witnesses the consent that they have now no objection to the evidence being published, I would certainly not mind it. Even now.....

Shri S. S. More: May I know whether there is any list of special witnesses who were given such an assurance that their evidence will be treated as confidential? Otherwise, there is no point in making a distinction between witnesses whose evidence can be published and those witnesses whose evidence is not to be published. We must get the complete picture.

Dr. Keskar: It was a general assurance; I think there were witnesses who said they did not mind the evidence being published, and there were others who, though they were willing to discuss certain matters thought that others might take advantage of it when the evidence was published and so they were not ready to have them published. I do not know whether it was proper or improper. It was not I who gave the assurance. It was the Commission which gave the assurance. It is no use blaming them for giving the assurance. But I am prepared to consider this matter if I am told that the people who gave evidence have no objection in general.

Shri S. S. More: If public interest demands, it should be published.

Dr. Keskar: There is no use arguing it with me. In fact I am indifferent if evidence is published, but the question has to be seen this way: the Commission did something and it

is now for Government to see whether we can go back on the assurances and if so under what conditions it can be done. It is no use simply asking the Government to get the evidence published now.

Acharya Kripalani: I agree that the evidence is to be considered confidential if an assurance to that effect has been given. But if some interested parties attack the Commission itself and say, such and such evidence was given or not, or considered properly or not, it becomes necessary to publish the evidence for the sake of truth. Certain individuals have issued pamphlets saying that the Commission did not go into certain matter and their views were not taken. Therefore, it becomes necessary to publish the evidence. Otherwise, I agree with the hon. Minister that the evidence should be considered as secret and should not be published.

Shri Jaipal Singh: In fairness to the hon. Minister, may I support him in the attitude he has taken when he said that certain people did not mind the evidence being published? He is quite right there. But he is quite wrong in thinking that we gave an assurance to everyone. It is not true. If he will read the report a little more carefully he will find that this happened only after October, 1953, only after a certain stage.

Dr. Keskar: I am only referring to the general question whether evidence can be published or not. As I said, I have a very objective view of the matter. I was giving a summary of my talks with the Chairman even before the work began, and I think we should not treat this matter lightly. If somebody challenges the evidence before the Commission by giving what he said or what he is purported to have said,—certainly that question would arise as Acharya Kripalani put it, but I was just mentioning that it is not right and proper for Government just to publish the evidence at this stage without taking all these matters carefully into consideration.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything on record to show that certain assurances

[Mr. Chairman]

were given to certain witnesses that their evidence would not be published?

Dr. Keskar: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: If it is on record then how can the evidence be published without their consent?

Dr. Keskar: It is on record. There are various categories of recommendations made by the Commission, but, as I said, I will not deal very much with those recommendations which are general and which are meant for the general improvement of the Press and with which the Government is not directly concerned. I will take up those recommendations in which the Commission said that the Government should take legislative action. There are about five recommendations of this type. Firstly, the service conditions of working journalists; then the revision of the law regarding the Registrar of the Press, but I do not consider it a very important recommendation; it is a minor recommendation. Then there is the recommendation about the regulation of economic aspects of the industry by price-page schedule, and the constitution of a Press Council. As far as the question of service conditions of working journalists is concerned, I would like to remind Members that when introducing the Bill for the application of the Industrial Disputes Act to working journalists, I gave our general approach to this question. We entirely agree with the Commission that journalists should work under proper conditions. They should have a fair deal. There is no question about this and Government have made it clear even before this debate took place. Regarding the working out of a plan as to how service conditions of working journalists can be improved, I would like, at the outset, to emphasise one point, and that does not affect what I shall be saying later. It is this: for the working journalists to be given the powers and the rights of workmen—it was one of the main objectives and the Commission has also emphasised it—the details of ameliorating their con-

dition should be worked out not purely by statute but also by themselves, by collective bargaining. It is one of the important things to which a Member of the Opposition made reference. I entirely agree with his suggestion that, as in most other industries, collective bargaining is a thing which will have to be brought into action in order to settle large numbers of details regarding the working conditions etc. All things will not be and cannot be left to statute, because there are a number of things about which the statute cannot see at this moment what should be done. Therefore, I have always presupposed that as in other industries, collective bargaining should not be lost sight of.

I am mentioning this not as to what we are going to do today, but I am saying that this should be always considered. Some people consider that everything about journalists should be done by Government and by statute. I do not think that it is right. It is in the interests of journalists themselves that everything should not be done by statute and Government. A number of things will have to be done by them and I am sure they will do it; there is no need to encourage them to do it; but there should not be too much reliance on statutes. Having said this, I should not be considered as saying that Government is not trying to do what the Press Commission has said. I am saying that we have generally accepted the recommendations of the Press Commission. We have accepted the recommendations of the Press Commission because as the Commission itself has said, this is a peculiar profession. It has been up till now not treated as workmen. It can be treated like others and given the right of collective bargaining, or such other powers. Therefore, it does require that certain basic things must be done, certain basic legislative action must be taken, so as to give them a kind of push for further amelioration of the conditions and other things; and afterwards they will not need continued legislative support.

But they will take whatever action is proper under the Industrial Disputes Act or under the Services of the Working Journalists Act, which may come into force later. (*Interruptions*) Hon. Members are not even allowing me to elaborate what I am saying. This is necessary in order to give them greater power of bargaining regarding the question of conditions.

As far as the conditions are concerned, I would like to remind Members that these are the main things which the Commission has recommended. I am talking of the heads: minimum period of notice for retrenchment, payment of gratuity, provision for leave with pay, maximum hours of work, compensation for retrenchment during transitional period, minimum wages to be determined and provident fund. These are the various heads under which they have made some recommendations and they have asked that this should be put into some kind of legislation. Generally speaking, we accepted in principle the recommendations of the Commission and at present Government is working out the draft legislation for this purpose, which I hope to introduce in this House very soon.

A lot of discussion has taken place in this House regarding the minimum wage. A number of Members have uttered warnings and Mr. Jaipal Singh has uttered a very serious warning as to whether we should do it this way or that way. I agree that it is a very important recommendation and it has to be taken up with the importance that it requires. When we have to bring forward any legislation regarding minimum wage for an industry and discuss how it shall be done, we have to take into consideration the fact that up till now we have had minimum wages only for the sweated industries. When I am talking of minimum wage, I am talking of statutory minimum wage.

Shri Jaipal Singh: This is a sweated industry.

Dr. Keskar: It should apply to other section of the Press workers also and not only to journalists. But up to this time only certain industries which were declared to be sweated industries were given statutory minimum wage. So, when taking up any legislation regarding minimum wage, we have to see what implications there will be and what effects it will have on minimum wages in other industries to provide for which we will have to bring forward legislation again. All these factors have to be taken into consideration.

Shri Kamath: Have a national minimum wage.

Dr. Keskar: The national minimum wage is being considered. but the national minimum wage cannot be discussed with the Press Commission's Report.

My point was that this is not a decision which can be taken suddenly. Before we pass an Act for minimum wage, we have to see what effect it will have on other industries. It should be framed in such a way that the principle which we accept for one industry like this can be accepted with some modifications for other industries also. All these will have to be taken into consideration. But, as I said, we have generally accepted the principle underlying this recommendation for improving the conditions of working journalists and I hope we will be able to bring a Bill before this House very soon.

There has been mention by many Members about the financial effect on the newspapers of the implementation of the service conditions, linking the question of price-page schedule with the proposal for improving service conditions. Though the Commission has not directly linked these two questions, they have also agreed that there is a certain cause and effect and there will be some financial effect on papers due to rules and regulations that might be framed for improving their service conditions, I personally agree that there will certainly be some effect and that inter-linking of these

[Dr. Keskar]

two questions cannot be completely ruled out. Though technically it may not effect, practically speaking, there is no doubt that the smaller papers will be seriously affected unless that recommendation is taken together with the other one; but that will have to be considered separately.

I now come to the other very important recommendation about the price-page schedule. There is a lot of controversy about this in the Press and in this House. I heard all the Members referring to it very seriously and I agree that this is probably one of the two or three most important recommendations of the Commission. We have to take into consideration, first of all, the reasons which the Commission has mainly put forward. It says, this is something which will help the smaller and medium-sized papers. When we take up the discussion and study of this suggestion regarding price-page schedule, we had to go into it very thoroughly and see that the objective which has been mentioned, namely, to help the smaller and medium-sized papers and check monopolistic tendencies is achieved. I do not mind saying that we have not been able to come to any decision yet; in this regard the discussion that has taken place here will certainly help us very considerably in coming to a definite conclusion regarding this matter. I may add that, in order to be thoroughly well-informed, before coming to a decision, we have called both the groups of newspapers which were for and against and heard their views and thrashed out the whole question with them and got all the facts and figures. Over and above this, we have had the benefit of the views expressed in this House and I am sure that they will help us in coming to the right decision very soon.

I now come to the question of the Press Council. I may say at the very outset that we agree with the principle of the Press Council and at present we are engaged in drafting the

details of procedure, how the members ought to be recruited and other relevant questions. I hope to be able to bring up before the House a Bill...

Shri Kamath: Next Session?

Dr. Keskar: As soon as possible, in whichever Session it may be. I have every hope, personally, that the Bill will be ready very soon. This Session is going to be a pretty long one and I have every hope that we will be able to bring the Bill before this House in this Session itself. But it should be remembered that this is not simply a question of settling the constitution of the Press Council, but also the financing of the Press Council about which the Press Commission has made certain recommendations which had to be discussed also with the people concerned. This might take a little more time, but we have welcomed the suggestion of a Press Council. I might say that Government is very pleased that there can be a body which will take up all these very difficult and complex problems of codifying journalists' ethics and many other related problems and which will lighten the burden of the Government to a great extent. It would certainly be of great help to us. Therefore, there should be no suggestion of the Government in any way trying to delay the proposal about the Press Council.

My hon. friend Shri Jaipal Singh referred to the question of priorities. He had also put a question as to when we are going to bring up this question. I might inform him, if he wants to know the priorities, that we give priority No. 1 to the service conditions of the working journalists, priority No. 2 to the price-page schedule and priority No. 3, to the Press Council. But, I think the priorities will not have much meaning because most of the things will come practically together. There is going to be very little delay or time lag between them.

Shri Damodara Menon: What about the State trading corporation for newsprint?

Dr. Keskar: I am coming to every one of the important points. The question of State trading for newsprint has been before us. I do not mind telling you that this is not something about which we have been delaying to come to a decision in the sense that it is linked up with another question. We are now trying to put a newsprint factory in the country. We are examining both the suggestions together. Obviously, it will be an advantage to see how much newsprint we can produce immediately in the country and how much we will have to import. I may assure the hon. Member that this question is also engaging our very serious attention.

There are a number of matters which are not questions for legislation, but which are for executive action. I would like to refer to two questions because a number of Members have referred to it—they have been saying before, they have repeated it here—that is about the Government policy regarding advertisement and publicity. This matter has come up here before: during the Budget discussion also it came up. I would like to reiterate a few things in order to remind hon. Members. My hon. friend Shri Kamath and some others also have referred to the sins of commission and omission by the various State Governments. It is not possible for me to reply on behalf of the State Governments. These are subjects, however justified they might be, which can be discussed and decided in the State Legislative Assembly. I need not remind hon. Members that the States are autonomous so far as this subject is concerned. Even if I may say something, they are at liberty to accept it or reject it. It will not be fair on my part to try to say anything on that subject because I am not well up with the facts. The hon. Member is certainly at liberty to raise the question here; I would also submit that if these questions are raised there, it will be more proper and right. When he referred to the happenings in Madhya Pradesh....

Shri Kamath: My complaint was against the P. T. I., not against the Government.

Dr. Keskar: The P.T.I. is not a Government department. I can speak only for the Central Government. Take the question of advertisement policy. There have been many criticisms that Government tries to give advertisements to papers and tries to influence them or subsidise them. I have spoken many times about this matter. I remember sometime back a Member of this House, while speaking, said that Government is giving advertisements to papers which support it. I told him at that time that as a matter of fact the largest number of advertisements go to a paper which is consistently criticising the Government.

Shri Gadgil: That also is bad.

Dr. Keskar: I agree; that is so.

Shri Sarangadhar Das (Dhenkanal-West Cuttack): That is by way of appeasement.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: Is he a Press baron?

Dr. Keskar: Appeasement does not work; even then we are continuing.

During the last year or two, we have taken certain steps so far as these advertisements are concerned, keeping in view two objectives. One is to see that in the distribution of advertisements, the burden shifts from the English papers to the non-English papers, that is, Hindi, Gujarati, Marathi and other languages papers get more advertisements from Government than the English papers which have been getting a lion's share. I do claim that we have successfully advanced this policy, because during the last two years alone, of the money that the Government is spending on advertisement, more than 55 or 60 per cent. has gone to the non-English papers now. Unfortunately, the number of papers is extremely large. If we take the papers all over India,

[Dr. Keskar]

there are thousands. It is not possible for the Government which spends a small amount on advertisement, notwithstanding any criticism here, to distribute considerable sum of money to the various language papers for advertisement. Therefore, the money that is distributed does not come to much, I am sorry to say. But, we are trying to see that we give more and more to the non-English papers and less and less to the English papers.

Shri Kamath: Are there really thousands of language papers or only hundreds?

Dr. Keskar: The second point—I will not be able to go into the details of the advertisement policy—is to see that the papers, simply on the basis of circulation, do not get a lion's share of the advertisements. A kind of vicious circle had cropped up. A paper gets more advertisement because it has more circulation. On the basis of Government advertisements, the circulation goes up. That had been happening and it led to a kind of monopoly of a small number of papers getting all advertisements Government or non-Government. We are trying to see that, in giving advertisements, though circulation is taken care of, simply because some papers have got the largest circulation, they alone do not get the advertisements, but others also get a fair share of it. Due to want of time, I will not be able to say more on this subject just now.

I come to the other point about the publicity unit.

Shri Joachim Alva: Before the hon. Minister passes to the next point, may I ask, do Government still persist in giving Government of India advertisements to foreign advertising agencies?

Dr. Keskar: We have been advertising through practically all advertising agencies. I won't be able to say offhand whether any one of them is foreign. But, our policy is to have

more and more of our advertisements through our agencies.

I will say a word about the P.I.B. Shri Kamath was very severe about the P.I.B. because the P.I.B. gives hand-outs. We are living in an age of democracy. One of the tenets, or probably the most important tenet of democracy is for the opposition parties to attack the Government in season and out of season. They are legitimately attacking it. They have got to because they have to unseat the Government, they have got to see that the majority is converted into a minority and they have to come to power. It is quite legitimate and they are entitled to do it. The actions of Government are criticised day in and day out, and I am sorry to say in a large number of cases, wrong! When wrong things are quoted as facts, I think it is the duty of the Government to put before the public the right facts. I would say that an anti-propaganda is there. I am not complaining against that. But, I say that so long as that anti-propaganda is there, it is the duty of the Government to put before the public right facts, and nobody can take exception to it. Because, if they say something against the Government, Government has every right to justify what it is doing. You can certainly controvert it. I will give one very interesting example only. You may call it an exaggerated example. Some two years ago a paper wrote—I am talking of the time when the Damodar Valley Corporation's construction work was going on—saying that there had been great corruption and mismanagement, that one of the pillars of the Tillaiya dam was sinking, that the whole dam was leaking and that the river was flowing through. Government had to issue a note which was handed out to all the papers, with a diagram showing that the Tillaiya dam has no pillars, it is just a wall, and that secondly there is no leakage but there is a seepage which takes place in all concrete dams. I am giving an extreme example, but scores of such examples.

are taking place every day and it is the duty of the Government to see, as it is the duty of the Opposition parties to see, that they have their say, that Government also has its say. I would go further and say that if the kind of wrong propoganda against Government had not been done, there would not be need for the P.I.B., and I will be the first person to ask the Government to scrap the P.I.B. Shri Kamath was saying that the P.I.B. hand-outs go to the press. According to him, we have seduced the barons, yet there are a large number of non-barons also and they are not seduced by Government and they will be the persons who can tell you whether what Government gives is objective and correct or not. I challenge him to show that the hand-outs that we give do not give facts, that they give something which can be considered to be tendencious material.

Shri Kamath: Doctored material.

Dr. Keskar: The third thing he says is about ministerial publicity. That is a very sore point always, that ministers should be given publicity.

Acharya Kripalani: May I suggest that is what the Commission said? We have only repeated it and pointed out that there is too much publicity. It is not the Opposition Members who say that, if you read the report properly

Dr. Keskar: I have read the report very carefully and they do not say that we should try to leave to the press completely whatever has to be done. I myself had long talks with the Commission. The Commission was not against Government giving hand-outs, but the Commission has said that Government should give hand-outs only in cases where there is imperative need to do so, and I might say we only try to correct wrong facts, and we do not try by the hand-outs only to praise the Government. If that were so, I would agree with Acharya Kripalani and I would also myself criticise that sort of thing.

The third thing is about ministerial publicity by the press. He was saying that one of the reasons, or rather the evidence, for saying that the Government has seduced the press barons, is the large amount of publicity that the Ministers get in the press. We do not issue any fiat about ministerial publicity. My friend will also accept that whether a Minister does right or wrong, it is bound to get publicity in the press. How can I blame the press if it gives publicity to it? He was quoting foreign papers. I also read foreign papers and very carefully. I would like him to take the papers in America, a country where the press is considered to be very free and try to analyse the percentage of space occupied by Government declarations, by declarations by Ministers, by declarations by the President of the United States. He will find that it is very much more than in India. You will find that most of the important American papers give two full pages to declarations by the Government, by the President of the United States. They have to give it because, after all, they are important statements, they affect the country, they affect international relations. It is not possible for us to say that the press should let them down. I do not mind the press also giving full publicity to what Shri Kamath says. They should do it, and I would certainly ask the press people to take great heed of what Shri Kamath says and resist the seduction of Government. To that extent, I agree with him.

Shri Kamath: Hear, hear. Something at last.

Dr. Keskar: But unfortunately in this matter I am not trying to justify what the press is doing because I do not mind if the press prints as little of Governments activity as possible. I am not at all asking the press to publicise Government's activity.

Shri Kamath: Let the press take note.

Dr. Keskar: Let it do what it likes.

Shri A. M. Thomas: But the public are interested.

Dr. Keskar: I have not much time, I am sorry, but I have to deal with a very important matter. It is the question of the news agencies. The Press Commission has talked of the news agencies. Lots of things have been said against the news agencies here.

Shri Kamath: Indian and Foreign

Dr. Keskar: I keep the same objective and open mind regarding the question of the press. I must say that our news agencies are not bad. They might have done bad things and the Press Commission have pointed them out, whether it is the U.P.I. or the P.T.I. I would say that the P.T.I. for example in trying to stand on its own feet in separation from Reuters, has done something which is meritorious. We should give even the devil its due and we should not simply go and attack the P.T.I. because some directors have done something. We have to see.....

Acharya Kripalani: We have no objection if you call it a devil and give it its due.

Dr. Keskar: On the question U.P.I. also Acharya Kripalani quite rightly referred to the good service it did before. I personally am not taking up the cudgels on behalf of the P.T.I. or the U.P.I. Both are private organisations and our dealings with them are only as clients and nothing more. But if I try to condemn the P.T.I. I will give the good and bad points. The same thing applies to the U.P.I. Government has carefully looked into whatever the Commission has said about both these bodies, but I will remind hon. Members here as to what the Commission has said. The Commission says, that a public corporation formed otherwise than as suggested by them on the basis of a co-operative effort by the newspapers may be open to the danger of newspapers not taking the service from them. The Corporation has, therefore, to be built up on the present foundations, whatever may be the changes suggested. And then, they further go on and say:

"We feel confident that the spirit of public service which induced a number of newspapers to subscribe the capital required for taking over the Associated Press of India at a time when Reuters were no longer interested in running, would persuade them today, when Press Trust of India is in difficulties; to agree to the transfer of the organisation as it stands to the new public corporation. Ultimately the purpose of the agency is only to serve the newspapers, and its success depends solely on the disinterested manner in which they further their common interests....."

At the end, they are saying:

"We trust that our recommendations would appeal to the shareholders of the Press Trust of India and that they would agree to the transfer of the agency to a Corporation set up as suggested by us."

What I am trying to emphasize is that in this question the Government is not in a position to impose its will on either the P.T.I. or the U.P.I. Legally also it is not possible for Government to do it. Constitutionally it is not possible. At the same time, the Press Commission has been very careful in repeating two or three times that their appeal is to the shareholders of the P.T.I. because they themselves feel that any agency which by governmental order is transformed from one shape into another will indirectly or otherwise come under Government control or influence, and they are very careful that it should not happen. I myself would not like to take any step which would give rise to that charge that Government is trying to indirectly get hold of the agencies. Already, even without this there is a charge and if that is done, then there will be a greater charge. I would therefore ask Members to bear this in mind when they ask the Government to convert the P.T.I. and the U.P.I. into trusts or corporations, that the

Press Commission itself has not made the appeal to Government. They have made the appeal to the shareholders of P.T.I. and to their good public sense. Naturally, Government has conveyed to them what they feel about the matter, and they have also conveyed to them what the Press Commission has written about both of these bodies. Government will try to see whatever they can do in the matter but I am afraid it will not be possible for us to—what should I say—take the big stick and try to do something which might though it might shatter the present structure also not help in creating a new structure and that itself is not something which might be desirable in the interests of a free press. I hope that wiser counsels will prevail that something useful, beneficial and good will come out, and that a structure which will create in the public mind a confidence in both these bodies will be created ultimately by the shareholders of both.

Shri Jaipal Singh: May I ask my hon. friend to enlighten me on one point which I raised in the course of the debate? Is my hon. friend not going to take the initiative if the other people are stupid enough to do the wrong thing? (*Interruption*)

Dr. Keskar: I am not able to accept that suggestion. The Press Commission has not given us various alternatives, saying if they do not do this, you do this, or any such thing. I have tried to see the approach of the Press Commission, and I find that it is more that they want the shareholders themselves to do it. And I would not like to take any step on behalf of Government which can be called a strong step, and which might infringe on the freedom of the press. I personally would not like to do it, because I know hon. Members opposite will attack the Government whichever way we take action, saying that even that way also we are infringing on the freedom of the press.

Shri Gadgil: When it is a question of providing cheaper service in non-scheduled areas, Government ought to take that initiative.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: If the P.T.I. or the U.P.I. does not carry out the recommendation of the Press Commission in regard to the reorganisation of themselves, then would Government withdraw all assistance to them for at least by withdrawing all assistance, it is possible to bring them round and make them accept the recommendations?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister has already expressed his view on this matter.

Dr. Kasker: I do not agree that I should say, if you do not do this, we shall withdraw the teleprinters and other services. But I might inform my hon. friend that the Press Commission has made recommendations for giving larger subscription both to the U.P.I. and the P.T.I. and we have conveyed to both the bodies that until Government are satisfied that they are taking steps in the right direction. Government do not propose to give any of the increased subsidy that has been suggested by the Press Commission to be given to them. But I do not think that it would be a right step for us to say, all right, tomorrow we shall stop whatever subscription we are giving even now, unless you do what the Press Commission has asked you to do. I think we should not try to create a crisis by which our news agency would be closed down. That will not be a right step, in my opinion.

So, I have dealt with most of the important points mentioned by my hon. friend, excepting....

Shri Kamath: What about the foreign news agencies like the Reuters and the AFP?

Dr. Keskar: We are not taking any service from the Reuters.

Shri Kamath: The P.I.B. depends on it.

Dr. Keskar: I would now like to say just a word each on the views expressed by hon. Members—I cannot say, of all Members, because so many persons have spoken, and it is not possible for me to deal with all of them.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

First, let me say that Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy has made a number of suggestions. I compliment him for the very excellent speech he has made. One or two of his suggestions are very interesting, and I would assure him that I shall certainly look into the suggestions that he has made.

Shri Joachim Alva has made a suggestion for liberalising the membership of the Indian and Eastern Newspaper Society. Now, the Indian and Eastern Newspaper Society is not a body over which Government have any control. I hope that Shri Joachim Alva's suggestion will be borne in mind by the Society people themselves in order to make that Society a body which covers the whole press rather than an exclusive body of people in which case they will not have that authority to speak on behalf of the proprietors which they will have if their membership is wider.

A number of suggestions have been put forward. I have noted all of them. There are also some suggestions which have nothing to do with the Press Commission's report directly, but indirectly they may have something to do. I shall certainly look into them, and wherever possible try to implement them.

Lastly, I might say that all the matters dealt with in the Press Commission's report.....

Shri M. P. Mishra (Monghyr North-West): You have not said anything about crossword puzzles.

Dr. Keskar: About crossword puzzles, as you know yourself, legislation is being thought of, and it will very soon come before the House.

Government are at present engaged in drafting legislation for whatever recommendations are there which have to be implemented by the legislation; for executive action also, there are one or two matters about which I made a reference.

As a whole, I think Government can legitimately claim that they have tried to carry out or put into effect the recommendations of the Commission. I know Members are not satisfied. Some hon. Members have been saying, that we have unduly delayed the implementation. I say again that taking into consideration the seriousness of the recommendations and their wide and complex nature, the delay is a justified one. In fact, if by delaying it, we come to a wiser and better decision, which will help us in giving effect to the Commission's report in a more effective way, then I think you will also agree that the delay was justified.

I therefore again commend my motion to the House.

Shri Kamath: Do Government propose to give facilities to Asian news agencies and break the monopoly of the Reuters for foreign news?

Dr. Keskar: I have noted that. I am sorry I was not able to refer to all the suggestions. But I have noted them.

Shri Kamath: What about managing editors?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All has been said for three days on this side. The hon. Minister has noted everything.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: May I ask one question?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No further questions should be asked now. It will become endless.

Out of all the amendments, I shall choose the amendment moved by **Shri Raghuramaiah** and put it to vote first.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Will you not put the others?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is open to the Chair to choose any amendment it likes and put it to vote first.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: But that is a later amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Whether it is later or earlier, I can choose any of the amendments, and put it to vote first; and then I can put the other amendments to vote, if they are not barred.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: What about the other amendments?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the other amendments are barred, then they cannot be put to vote. (*Interruptions*). Order, order, there is no use arguing like this. Hon. Members, whenever they come into the House, must always carry with them the *Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business*. I am not going to be hustled by all these arguments. It is open to me, when there are a number of amendments, to choose any amendment and put it to vote first. As for the other amendments, if they are barred, they would not be put; if they are not barred, then I will put to vote such portion as is not barred. What is the good of quarrelling again and again with the rules. I will put to the vote the substitute motion of Shri Raghuramiah.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: Can this substitute motion be put to vote? It says only 'as early as possible'. It is too general and vague.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I rule, that is absolutely right. If the hon. Member does not agree, he can come and sit here and give the ruling. (*Interruptions*). Let us not make this a classroom.

The question is:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted:

"This House having taken into consideration the Report of the Press Commission, generally ap-

proves its recommendations and requests the Government to take steps to implement the same as early as possible."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So far as the other amendments are concerned, they are also substitute motions. In so far as they are not barred, and if they want anything more to be added or tacked on to this, I have no objection to put them to vote. Hon. Members may help me to do that.

Does any hon. Member want to throw out the motion which I have just put to vote? I do not think any hon. Member would like to do that.

Now, I shall take up the other amendments. First, there is Shri Thimmaiah's amendment. Does he want to press it?

Shri Thimmaiah (Kolar-Reserved—Sch. Castes): No. I do not press it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then there is Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy's amendment. Does the hon. Member want to press it?

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member evidently wants to add something to the motion which has been adopted, and he has given certain recommendations in particular under items (a) to (h) of his amendment.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: How can this be put to vote? This is evidently barred. The original motion has been substituted now.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall treat all those portions which are not covered by the substituted motion as having been moved as amendments to this substituted motion. I waive the rule in this respect. Therefore, it is open to the House to have the substituted motion, and the others also.

I shall now put it to the vote of the House.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: There are so many Committees meeting. Many Members are absent for having the vote.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members are excepting too much. Anyway, I will have the bell rung.

Government have promised that they will consider all those recommendations. Why only these?

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: They may consider them for a number of years.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That at the end of the substitute motion, the following be added:

"Particularly the recommendations relating to—

- (a) amelioration of the conditions of the working journalists in respect of pay, promotion, leave and security of service;
- (b) setting up of a Press Council, with statutory protection and powers and charged with the duties to safeguard the freedom of the Press, to ensure high standards of public taste and regulate the conduct of the Press by formulation of a

code of journalistic ethics, and to improve the methods of recruitment, education and training for the profession:

- (c) reorganization of the ownership, structure, management and finances of the newspaper industry;
- (d) introduction of price-page schedule to eliminate price-cutting competition of big papers.
- (e) setting up of advertising Council consisting of newspapers, advertising agencies, advertisers and Government representatives to advise on the ethics of advertising, and to organise market research and to carry on readership survey;
- (f) establishment of a state trading corporation to handle newsprint;
- (g) setting up of a public corporation to take over the P.T.I.; and
- (h) reorganisation of news agencies."

The Lok Sabha divided: Ayes 23;
Noes 134.

Division No. 2

AYES

Basu, Shri K.K.
B oovarasahasamy, Shri
Chakravartty, Shrimati Renu
Chowdhury, Shri N.B.
Das, Shri B.C.
Das, Shri Sarangadhar
Gopalan, Shri A.K.
Gupta, Shri Sadhan

Gurupadaswamy, Shri M.S.
Kamath, Shri
Kelappan, Shri
Kripalani, Shrimati Sucheta
Menon, Shri Damodara
More, Shri S.S.
Narasimham, Shri S.V.L.
Rao, Shri Gopala

Rao, Shri T.B. Vittal
Reddi, Shri Eswara
Rishang Keishing, Shri
Shastri, Shri R.R.
Siva, Dr. Gangadhara
Swami, Shri Sivamurthi
Waghmare, Shri

NOES

Achal Singh, Seth
Agarwal, Shri H.L.
Akarपुरi, Sardar
Altekar, Shri
Alva, Shri Joschim
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
Badan Singh, Ch.
Barman, Shri
Barupal, Shri P.L.

Bhakt Darshan, Shri
Bidari, Shri
Borkor, Shrimati Anussayabai
Boroobah, Shri
Bose, Shri P.C.
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri
Chaliha, Shri Bimalaprasad
Chanda, Shri Anil K.
Chandrasekhar, Shrimati

Charak, Th Lakshman Singh
Chatterjee, Dr. Susilranjan
Chaturvedi, Shri
Das, Shri B.K.
Das, Shri Ram Dhani
Das, Shri S.N.
Deb, Shri S.C.
Deogam, Shri
Desai, Shri Khandubhai

ri
ote

Deshmukh, Shri C.D.
 Deshpande, Shri G.H.
 Dholakia, Shri
 Diwan, Shri R.S.
 Dube, Shri Mulchand
 Dubey, Shri R.G.
 Dutta, Shri S.K.
 Dwivedi, Shri D.P.
 Dwivedi, Shri M.L.
 Fotedar, Pandit
 Ghose, Shri S.M.
 Hasda, Shri Subodh
 Hem Raj, Shri
 Hembrom, Shri
 Ibrahim, Shri
 Iqbal Singh, Sardar
 Jaipal Singh, Shri
 Jajware, Shri
 Jata, -vir, Dr.
 Jayashri, Shrimati
 Jena, Shri K.C.
 Jena, Shri Niranjan
 Joshi, Shri Jethalal
 Joshi, Shri M.D.
 Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra
 Kajrolkar, Shri
 Kale, Shrimati A.
 Kamble, Dr.
 Karmarkar, Shri
 Kenkar, Dr.
 Khan, Shri Sadath Ali
 Khedkar, Shri G.B.
 Khongmen, Shrimati
 Kirolikar, Shri
 Krishna Chandra, Shri
 Lakshmayya, Shri

Laskar, Shri
 Mahodaya, Shri
 Majhi, Shri R.C.
 Malliah, Shri U.S.
 Masuodi, Maulana
 Matthen, Shri
 Mishra, Shri L.N.
 Mishra, Shri Lokenath
 Mishra, Shri M.P.
 Morarka, Shri
 More, Shri K.L.
 Muhammad Shafiq, Ch.
 Muthukrishnan, Shri
 Nair, Shri C.K.
 Nathwani, Shri N.P.
 Nehru, Shri Jawaharlal
 Nehru, Shrimati Shivravati
 Neswi, Shri
 Pande, Shri C.D.
 Pataskar, Shri
 Patel, Shri Rajeshwar
 Patel, Shrimati Maniben
 Prabhakar, Shri Naval
 Raghunath Sahai, Shri
 Raghunath Singh, Shri
 Raghuramaiah, Shri
 Ram Dass, Shri
 Ram Saran, Shri
 Ramaswamy, Shri S.V.
 Rao, Shri
 Rao, Shri Rajagopal
 Raut, Shri Bhola
 Ray, Shri B.K.
 Roy, Shri Biswa Nath
 Sahu, Shri Bhagabat
 Sahu, Shri Rameshwar

Saigal, Sardar A.S.
 Saksena, Shri Mohanlal
 Samanta, Shri S.C.
 Sanganna, Shri
 Sen, Shri P.G.
 Sen, Shrimati Sushama
 Sewal, Shri A.R.
 Shah, Shri C.C.
 Sharma, Pandit K.C.
 Sharma, Shri K.R.
 Siddananappa, Shri
 Singh, Shri Babunath
 Singh, Shri H.P.
 Singh, Shri L. Jogeswar
 Singh, Shri M.N.
 Sinha, Dr. S.N.
 Sinha, Shri B.P.
 Sinha, Shri Jhulan
 Sinha, Shri Nageshwar Prasad
 Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
 Sinhasan Singh, Shri
 Subrahmanayam, Shri T. J.
 Suresh Chandra, Dr.
 Swaminadhan, Shrimati Ammu
 Tandon, Shri
 Thimmaiah, Shri
 Thomas, Shri A.M.
 Tiwari, Shri R.S.
 Tiwary, Pandit D.N.
 Tyagi, Shri
 Upadhyay, Pandit Munishwar Dutt
 Upadhyaya, Shri Shiva Datt
 Vaishya, Shri M.B.
 Venkataraman, Shri
 Vidyalankar, Shri A.N.

The motion was negatived.

5 P.M.

Deputy-Speaker: The other amendments are all barred.

**ABDUCTED PERSONS (RECOVERY
 AND RESTORATION) CONTI-
 NUANCE BILL**

**The Minister of Works, Housing and
 Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh):** I beg

to move:

"That the Bill to continue the Abducted Persons (Recovery and Restoration) Act, 1949, for a further period, be taken into consideration."

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till
 Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, the
 23rd August, 1955.*