

RESOLUTION RE. NATIONALISATION OF FILM INDUSTRY

DR. (MRS.) MANGLADEVI TALWAR (Rajasthan): Sir, with your permission I beg to move the following Resolution:

"That this House is of opinion that the film industry in the country should be nationalised".

This is a very wide subject which has been debated in the past in both Houses of Parliament and different people have expressed their views. A resolution was moved and adopted regarding films in this House on 6th May 1965. India is a vast country and various media of communication such as newspapers, radio and even television are available to the people but they have a restricted approach. Silver screen is one of the miracles of modern technology. One film can be shown to millions of people both inside and outside the country of its origin. It is the cheapest and easiest media of relaxation, recreation, education and spread of culture.

The film industry in India is the second largest in the world next only to the U.S.A. More than 20 lakhs of people see films every day and more than 2 lakhs of people are employed in this industry. The chief centre of this industry is Bombay, although Calcutta and Madras play an important part. Recently Hyderabad, and Mysore have also established studios. There are proposals from different State Governments to help the film industry to open studios for regional films for the benefit of the people of those States. A sum of more than Rs. 80 crores is invested in the industry. By way of taxation, entertainment tax and other taxes the State Governments earn a considerable sum running into crores of rupees every year as revenue. Films are a good means of getting foreign exchange. They are exported to the Middle East African countries, Latin

America, Mauritius, Trinidad, Ceylon and Burma. Outstanding films are shown in London and New York. In the Soviet Union our films are more popular than any other country. It is said that a famous film story writer had gone to Russia some five years ago and he did not know the language of the people nor did they know him. He could not make them understand as to which country he came from. He showed his Gandhi cap but that had no effect on the people but a bright idea dawned on him and he began to sing "आजाद हो" and they all jumped. The people surrounding him said: 'Oh'. Raj Kapoor has come to Russia.'

Films have a profound effect on the people in general and youth in particular whose minds are more receptive and impressionable at this age. It is a powerful medium and has gripped the mind of our younger generation. Most cinema halls are crowded to capacity as people in thousands go to see films. When good films are shown, tickets are sold in the black market. It shows that this medium of entertainment has become extremely popular in our country.

The Government have been alive to the increasing importance of this medium and are producing good documentary films on different subjects especially on the achievements of the Government in the different fields of industries. The Government of India have also established a Children's Film Society with headquarters in New Delhi. The society has produced some very good documentaries and films for children, and they are also shown in the different schools in Delhi at reduced rates. In 1960 the Government established a Film Finance Corporation, Limited, and funds are allocated to different producers who are given loan on a nominal interest to produce films of their choice. Similarly the Government of India have established an Indian Motion Pictures Export Corporation in order to export films to the different parts of the world. This shows that like the

private sector Government also attach great importance to this industry.

Important developments however have taken place in the film industry during the last three decades. Earlier the producer could produce good films based on Indian culture acted by talented new stars in simple surroundings. I am mention अकृत नया acted by Devika Rani, कनन by Lila Chitnis and there were many others They were real hits Many such pictures could be mentioned The cost of production of films was comparatively low Later when the industry expanded and stars grew in numbers, the senior and experienced artistes began to have 'star value' The successful stars began to take huge sums of money at the time of getting the contract signed This practice of taking lakhs of rupees as black money has given rise to the worst type of monopoly in the industry Because the producer has to and must spend large sums of money to get the celebrated stars to make his film a success The contract is usually signed long before the film is actually produced. At the time of signing the contract the terms are settled regarding the amount of black money which is paid at that time and the white money, which is only a small portion of the whole sum, is paid at the time of Muhurt The Government of India have established a Film Institute at Poona and have bought the famous Prabhat Studio to train people in acting, dancing and other art subjects connected with the film industry The House will be surprised to know that not a single person passed from this Institute has got any contract in the film industry so far A man or a woman born or related to a particular family of celebrated star only can get easy access to it Since the producers have to pay large sums of black money, they and the distributors have developed an excessive profit motive There is a tendency to create, and cater to a taste based on excitement Exploitation of sex appeal is increasing every day.

Even the titles of the films are showing this tendency, for instance

दिल लिया दद लिया, नई उमर की नई फसल, मेरा महबूब, प्यार मुहब्बत etc etc This tendency has a detrimental effect on the minds of the younger generation Large posters, Madam, verging on obscenity are displayed everywhere, in the different parts of our country. According to psychologists, audio-visual media are the strongest media to affect the human mind In the past, Herr Hitler had used this media to turn young Germans into violent Nazis Mr Mao Tse-Tung is using this media today to turn teen-agers Chinese into rebellious Red Guards Whether we agree with their ideology or not, Hitler did it as head of the Government, and now Mao Tse-Tung is doing it Now somehow they had the authority, Madam, to lead their young and old people in whatever way they liked. But I would like to know, Madam, what authority our producers and the people who are connected with the film industry have to turn young Indians into a violent anti-social mob? This is creating very great distress in our country

Now the excessive money earned in the film industry by stars, the producers and others is another evil It is a different type of evil in the sense that there is disparity of wealth among the people connected with films Extras and other workers in the film industry are paid miserably, meagre sum, and the Stars earn a great deal of money and it is creating a kind of crisis in their own lives and the lives of the young people of the country The younger people copy the style of clothes, the hair-do, etc. of the cinema stars In fact, the actors and actresses have profound influence on the teen-agers But it is a matter of great regret that the idols of millions should have their feet of clay deep down in the earth.

[Dr. (Mrs.) Mangladevi Talwar.]

As stated above, box office hits need not depend on sex appeal.

झनक झनक पायल बाजे and दो बीघा जमीन are good examples of such films. Even in America, where technological excellence is supreme, British films are greatly admired and they are very popular. They are simple but well acted films.

At present we are inclined to imitate the American movies. Our film music is getting Westernized, and twist tunes are invading our homes. The young people, particularly the teenagers, think that it is a part of their accomplishment to be able to twist and do other allied things. Pictures showing crime and violence are getting very popular.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): The 'twist' dance is a sort of dance and makes a great appeal to the men-folk.

DR. (MRS.) MANGLADEVI TALWAR: Recently I saw a demonstration in Delhi which depicted the scenes enacted in the film प्यार किये जा in which Sashi Kapoor is sacked by his employer and he collects riff-raffs and has pitched a tent outside the residence of his employer. Vulgar abuses are hurled at the employer, and even a threat to abduct his daughter is thrown at him. This very scene, this very acting, this very theme was enacted by the students at the Delhi University campus not very long ago. Other pictures like हम कहां जा रहे हैं, हस्तमे हिन्द, लुटेरा, सात समुन्दर पार, गंगा जमना, तीसरी मंजिल, फूल और पत्थर, यह जिन्दगी कितनी हसीन है only preach vulgarity, obscenity, violence, burning of Government property, looting, etc

شری عبدالغنی : مسٹر کیا آپ یہ بتا سکتے ہیں کہ کتنی فلمیں ایسی ہیں جن کو ہماری سرکار نے انعام دیا ہے۔ کیا وہ اچھی فلمیں ہیں۔

†[श्री अब्दुल गनी : सिस्टर क्या आप यह बतायांगी कि कितनी फिल्में ऐसी हैं जिनको हमारी सरकार ने इनाम दिया है। क्या वह अच्छी फिल्में हैं ?]

DR. (MRS.) MANGLADEVI TALWAR: Madam, the Government have recognised the need for control over the film industry from the very beginning. Two Enquiry Committees, one in 1927-28 and the other in 1949-51, were constituted to go into the whole question of the film industry. The Cinematograph Act of 1952 was an outcome of these enquiries. The provisions under section 5(b) of this Act, the words "decency and morality" are too wide and relative. The Censor Board have not been able to regulate any of the evils that are at present prevalent.

Madam, I would like to read an extract from what is published in the 'Current' of the 12th of this month. It is about an imported film called 'Young Cassidy'. This is the extract.

"Young Cassidy

Don't our Film Censors know their job?"

the paper asks. Then it says:

"Last week I went to the Metro Cinema for a charity premiere. There I saw the trailer of 'Young Cassidy'.

The trailer showed Cassidy socking policemen on the jaw, dragging mounted policemen down from their horses, throwing stones and smashing shop windows.

†[] Hindi transliteration.

Presumably this picture, with more such shots extolling violence and disregard for law and order, will be most popular at the cinema when it comes.

But what are our Film Censors doing? Instead of cutting out scenes of a low-cut blouse, which shows a slightly exposed woman's breast, or over-romantic scenes of passionate kisses, * * * it would be more appropriate if they concentrated on cutting out these scenes of violence at a time when mob fury in India is so difficult to control. Our Film Censors don't seem to know their job."

(Interruptions)

Madam, take the case of Russia. There are many languages and nationalities there similar to our own, but they have made films that have created a good impact on the minds of the people. We are heading towards bad times, and I feel that this drastic step to control the film media should be taken if we want to save our country from destruction and complete ruin.

I am not for nationalisation of all industries indiscriminately. We have accepted the policy of mixed economy, and this should be a part of that policy. Madam, the Government have already taken a drastic step in this direction. The Ministry of Commerce about two months back, has taken export of films from private parties. Now films can only be exported through the Indian Motion Pictures Corporation which is a government concern as stated before. Government have already got the All India Radio under their control in order to project the Government's activities and for broadcasting news. A few years ago the Government wanted and decided to introduce television in the country. Then many private parties in India and abroad offered to the Government to start the making of television sets and studios in India. They were prepared

to do it with their own finance and control. But Government rejected their proposals and decided that since television is motion pictures and makes a direct appeal to the listeners, television should remain in the hands of Government. I feel that if T.V. can be under the control of Government there is all the greater reason for motion pictures to be under the control of Government.

Madam, to avoid damage to the industry and also hardship to the people connected with it, this nationalisation that I am pleading for can be planned as a phased programme. The Government should, in the first instance, establish suitable modern studios at Delhi, Lucknow and Jaipur. Rajasthan has been a very popular place for film shooting. *Mughul-e-Azam* has many of its good scenes from Rajasthan. The picture *Jhansi Ki Rani* was also shot at Jaipur in parts. Once the studios are established many producers who have experience and want to make good films, would come forward. The Film Finance Corporation Ltd. can help them with funds. Artistes can be recruited from the Film Institute, Poona, and talented people can also be found in the Universities and other places. Bina Rai was a find from a women's college at Lucknow by Kishore Sahu and she acted as heroine in her very first picture *बनबोरा बट*. The celebrated stars of today have entered the industry without any prior training. They have made good because they are talented people and have had the opportunity to develop their talent. Dara Singh has become a star overnight because he is a wrestler. There is no dearth of talent in our country and given the opportunity they can flower into stars and directors. There are excellent dancers everywhere and there is no shortage of musicians either. Thus slowly—and not too slowly either, because our needs are very urgent—but surely, the Government should work towards the goal of nationalisation and when the time is ripe, they should take full control of the film

[Dr. (Mrs.) Mangladevi Talwar.] industry. The dangerous situation in the country demands that this drastic step should be taken as soon as possible.

With these remarks, Madam, I commend my Resolution for the unanimous support of all hon. Members of this House, belonging to all parties. Thank you.

The question was proposed.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Lakanath Misra.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): Madam Deputy Chairman . . .

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया (मध्य प्रदेश) : यह एक अभिनेता से शुरू किया जा रहा है क्या ?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Because he has had experience in this line.

श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र : पहले तो अभिनेता की हैसियत से दूसरे जो सब से बड़ी अपोजीशन पार्टी है उसके स्पोक्समैन की हैसियत से ।

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया : वह अनुभव भी है, अभिनेता होने का भी अनुभव भी है आपको ।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Say something about films.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have experience too?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Madam, I listened with rapt attention to the remarks of the mover of the motion which were half audible and half inaudible.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Why with rapt attention.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Because I thought she might be putting for-

ward some salient points which I might have to deal with. After what I have heard from that speech it has become very evident to me that she has no idea about the film industry except that of a spectator, one of the audience.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar): As if you have been a proprietor of film industry.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I have been an artiste, an actor, a hero in a film and I have been the assistant director in one film. I have a lot more of experience particularly in the film line.

AN HON. MEMBER: Since you have given it up, it is all the more necessary to nationalise it.

DR. (MRS.) MANGLADEVI TALWAR: I would like to know the name of the film in which the hon. Member acted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him speak. He will give his experiences as actor, director and so on.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: This is the second time, Madam, that I am speaking on the subject of . . .

DR. (MRS.) MANGLADEVI TALWAR: What is its name?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: She wants to know the name of the film in which you acted.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: That film's name is "Lalita." It is an Oriya film and a full length one. In that picture I was the hero.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We would like to know whether he was a better hero there or here.

AN HON. MEMBER: In both places.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Madam, after the hon. Members know the background that . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Was it a box office success?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Yes, at least we got back the money that we had spent.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members want to see that film.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Madam, that was fifteen years back. I left films fifteen years ago.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If Maharani Gayatri Devi and you go back to films, it will be good.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Please do not bring in that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, it will be very good.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Madam, it has become almost a fashion for those in the ruling party to vie with each other in talking about nationalisation.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Now the Swatantra Party's view is coming out.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Pardon? I would request Shri Sheel Bhadra Yajee . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: To have "sheel".

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: . . . to have a little patience. If he understands things his interruptions will not be necessary. I hope he understands something of what is being spoken on the floor of the House. If he does not understand I suggest it is better if he leaves the House without interruptions.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him go on. He has not started his arguments.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Madam, he does not understand anything about nationalisation. He does not

know even the A B C of the film industry. I would always relish interruptions from those who know something of the film industry. I would relish that even from the hon. Member and if there is any point in his interruption I will try my best to explain the position as it is.

Madam, as I was saying, many Members of the Congress Party who call themselves progressive or who want to appear progressive, vie with one another in bringing forward Resolutions which they know will ultimately not be passed, just to give the impression to the country that they are progressive elements in the Congress Party. I think the mover of this Resolution wants to be counted as one of them.

Madam, the most influential media of mass communication as all hon. Members of the House know, are, first the radio, second newspapers and third come films. Now, the radio in India is in the hands and complete grip of the Ministry under our Minister in charge of Information and Broadcasting. The Committee that had been set up by the same Government has suggested that it should release itself out of the grip; it should come under a Board; it should not remain nationalised as it is because of the ill influence, because of the too many frequent speeches made by Ministers and other things that are being broadcast. Now if they shift their forum I have nothing to say. If they shift their forum, and if they want to come as heroes and heroines on the screen, the Ministers becoming heroes and the Lady Ministers becoming heroines, I have nothing to say. They might shift their forum because once it is nationalised it is only these heroes and heroines that you will see; nothing else. It will be all documentaries with Ministers being shown even when they open some bakery somewhere, or some hotel somewhere else and some railway station at some other place.

(Interruption by Shri Sheel Bhadra Yajee)

[Shri Lokanath Misra.]

You must be audible if you interrupt.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Orissa has produced a hero.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: We have produced a hero who has not got entry into the films yet.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But you have not produced a heroine.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I think West Bengal will probably supply us with that.

(Interruptions)

Madam, if there are interruptions, it must be one at a time.

Now, I was talking about the All India Radio. There has been a very sincere attempt by the Committee set up by the Government and it has suggested that there should be an autonomous body to govern the All India Radio, that the All India Radio should release itself from the tight grip of the Information and Broadcasting Ministry. That is a very correct thing. If that is so in respect of the All India Radio, how can there be now an attempt to get hold of the film industry also which comes third in the list? I have my other reasons also against this proposal but this is one of the reasons. If whatever is now under the control of the Government is sought to be taken away to an autonomous body how can there be now an attempt or argument in favour of further nationalisation of other mass media of communication?

Now, Madam, I will come to the art side of it, to the technical aspect of it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do you know that nowadays all the film stars have decided to canvass support for the Prime Minister?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Not for the Prime Minister; for your friend, Mr. Krishna Menon. I do not know what is the relationship between

Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon and the film artistes that some of them have made statements that wherever Mr. Krishna Menon might stand for election they will canvass for him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This time it is the Prime Minister.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: All right; let us not bring politics into this. At present I am talking about the technical aspect of the films. Madam, if you look into it in detail as to how a film is produced you will appreciate that a lot of personal human touch is necessary for the successful production of a film. There are many persons involved in it. First of course is the producer. Now the Government might replace the existing producers if this is nationalised. But next comes the Director. The third is the Art Director, the fourth is the Music Director, the fifth is the Dance Director. Apart from these there are other technical persons in charge of each item. For shooting the cameraman is necessary; the electrician is necessary who would have to find out what light is necessary for each individual face depending upon the complexion, colour, setting and many other things. Then we require the Sound Engineer and his assistants, then musicians, background singers and various others. And the most important and the last are the actors and actresses. We have been seeing that even the steel industry is not being ably and efficiently managed and run because of the impersonal administration, because of the approach. Even a mechanical thing cannot be run without personal touch. Here the only tools, the only instruments which produce the films are all human beings and everything depends upon their mood. If a particular artiste in the last minute, after all the other details that are necessary have been done, goes on to the set and if the particular scene demands that he should weep and he is in no mood to weep, he has to be made to weep. Of course the artificial devices are there; in this case putting glyce-

rine into the eyes but putting glycerine into the eyes does not make a man behave in the same way as he behaves while actually weeping.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hypocritical part they can play very well.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: The putting of the glycerine might be done very well by the hon. Minister but can you extort sighs from the hero or the heroine? It cannot be done by extortion. What has to be done is that the artiste has to be left to his own mood. He must come in a mood to work, to act. It is not just manual labour. It is not just like your asking somebody to carry your bag from your big limousine to the air-conditioned compartment or to the aircraft.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do you mean to say that Mrs. Nandini Satpathy cannot weep whenever she is called upon to do so?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: That they might on the platform in public meetings but when you face a camera it is very difficult. It is much more difficult than even facing the House. A Minister might face the House and acquit himself creditably but once he is before a camera, he might look like a coward. Once you know what facing the camera means, then only you can understand.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW (SHRI C. R. PATTABHI RAMAN): Perhaps my hon. friend will focus less light on us. This is not our Resolution and I will attempt to persuade the mover at the proper time to withdraw it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He is saying how after nationalisation you will come into the picture.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has given out the case and you now know what it is.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Madam, it was a foregone conclusion because no Government dare attempt nationalisation of the film industry, much more so our Government.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: I will convince you how and when it would be nationalised.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is running out, Mr. Misra. It is only 15 minutes under the rules.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: If you think there are not many speakers, I might . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are quite a number of speakers including Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Really? My hon. friend has started taking interest in this?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Surely, although I do not go to films.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Madam, as I was saying, this personal human touch has to be there and I do not think there is anybody even in the film industry today who could take up an appointment under the Government as Director in charge of this particular films division and run it efficiently because it depends on so many factors, as I said, beginning from the hero and heroine right down to the technicians. So if you try to take over the film industry you will probably be sabotaging the entire industry. Our film industry is considered in the world as one of the best film industry. Our films have been getting awards, international awards and our heroes and heroines are also given awards for best acting.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am sure one we have here.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Soviet films.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: For documentaries, mind you, not for full-length pictures. I gather all this

[Shri Lokanath Misra]

information also even though I am in politics. The Soviet cinematograph technique is much ahead of us. So is the U.S.A.; so is the British but whatever technique we have, with the limited technique we have because of the stringent foreign exchange position and so many other factors, we are doing our best and we are producing best pictures to compete in the international market. So, do not cripple that also. You will be crippling that. You cannot compete. If you nationalise this industry you can never compete in the international market. I am sure about it, because the artistes will not have that emotion which they have now. Now, if you want to standardise art, emotion, culture, aesthetics, everything in life, I do not know if in the country the time will come when the Government would like to nationalise families, and restrict and regulate gradually, step by step, the relationship between even husband and wife. I do not know that. If you start nationalising culture, art and all that, there may be a doubt in the minds of a section of the people in India that you may nationalise anything.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Except wife everything should be nationalised.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will give you five minutes more.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Now, Madam, when something is being talked about very sincerely, you know the standard of interruptions coming from the other side.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: We know the standard of the Swatantra Party also.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Do you really know the standard of the Swatantra Party?

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Yes.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: You must have been surreptitiously connected with the Swatantra Party, then.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: I hate that Party.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I know you have changed Parties so many times, but I have never seen your name in the Swatantra Party. You must be surreptitiously in the Swatantra Party. I have seen your name in so many other Parties.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Come back to the Resolution.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Condemned Party is the Swatantra of the Rajas and Capitalists.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You talk on this Resolution, if you have anything further to say.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Now, Madam, we passed in this House a Resolution recommending to the Government that a committee be set up. We passed it a long time ago. I think we passed it some two years back. It is definitely a great disrespect to the House that the Government has not yet formed that committee. What has happened to the Resolution? Mr. M. P. Bhargava moved a Resolution in this House and we passed it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: About what?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: About the Cinematograph Committee the hon. Minister must be knowing it. Let him explain why there has been such a delay in implementing a Resolution of this House. Can I take it for granted that the Government does not pay as much respect to this House as to the other House in implementing the directions of this House? It was a definite direction. There was nothing wanting in between. The Government had accepted it and we had

voted unanimously for the Resolution. In spite of that, there has been a tremendous delay. I do not know what has been the cause of the delay. (*Time bell rings*) Now, Madam, whatever little time is left . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is over.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: After all these interruptions, if I may speak out ultimately I would say that I can never favour this Resolution. This is against democracy. This is an attack on our democratic traditions and on our culture.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: And also on Fundamental Rights?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: And, therefore, I am very much against it. I vehemently oppose this Resolution.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr Bhuwarka will speak after the lunch hour. The House stands adjourned till 2.30 P.M.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at half past two of the clock, **THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI TARA RAM-CHANDRA SATHE)** in the Chair

श्री रामकुमार भुवालका (पश्चिमी बंगाल) : माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदया, माननीय डाक्टर तलवार ने फिल्म इंडस्ट्री को नेशनलाइज करने का जो प्रस्ताव सदन के सामने रखा है मैं उनका सम्मान करते हुए इसके विरोध में खड़ा हुआ हूँ ।

देश में जो भी इंडस्ट्री या कारखाने हैं उनको अपने तरीके से चलते रहने देना अच्छा है कारण यह है कि उन कामों में हर समय नवीनता आनी रहती है रोज रोज कम्पी-टीशन के कारण नई-नई चीजे पैदा करना उनका काम हो जाता है नहीं तो बाजार में माल बिकना मुश्किल हो जाता है । फिल्मों में भी यही बात है । नई-नई पिक्चर बनाने के लिये काफी उन्हें सोचना पड़ता है । तो

मेरे विचार से कोई भी इंडस्ट्री या कारखाना चलाने वालों को मौका मिलना चाहिये कि वह साधारण तरीके से काम को आगे बढ़ाते रहे । अगर हमेशा यह बात उनके सामने बनी रहे कि हमारी इंडस्ट्री या कारखाना सरकार ले लेगी तो कोई भी काम करने को उनका मन नहीं करेगा ।

सदन के माननीय मेम्बरो को याद होगा कि 1962 ई० तक काफी कल कारखाने बढते रहे लेकिन 1962 ई० के बाद से रुकावटें आनी शुरू हुई । चीन का झगडा, टैक्सो का बढ जाना, सरकार की नीति बदलते रहना, रुपयों का अभाव, इन सब कारणों से देश में नये कारखाने जमाना नहीं होते पाये और उन में से एक-दो को छोड़ कर बाकी बड़े-छोटे या बीच के जो कारखाने हैं वे बहुत ठीक से नहीं चल पाते हैं । इन में से कुछ का उदाहरण मैं आपके सामने रखता हूँ ।

मेरे सामने इंडियन मोशन पिक्चर्स एक्सपोर्ट कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड की रिपोर्ट है । उसमें उन्होंने दिया है कि 1963-64 ई० में 1,67,892 रु० 97 पैसे का घाटा हुआ और 1964-65 ई० में 1,51,265 रु० 29 पैसे का घाटा हुआ । इसका क्या कारण है? उन्होंने रिपोर्ट में कारण भी लिखा है और उनकी स्पीच में भी लिखा है । तो इससे यह पता चलता है कि हमारे काम चलाने का तरीका बहुत अच्छा साबित नहीं हुआ ।

अभी मेरे सामने एक कटिंग है जिसमें यह है :—

"Government factory produced 7 fans in four years—Bhopal, May 3. A Government-owned factory in Dewas, near Indore, established in 1959, produced only seven table fans in the first four years against its capacity of producing 7,200 table fans and 2,400 ceiling fans during this period."

Set up at a cost of Rs 7,40,000, the factory was also expected to

[श्री रामकुमार भुवालका]

produce 2,400 fractional motors in four years, but its output was only 600 motors.

These facts are revealed in the report of the Public Accounts Committee of the Assembly.

The report has also said that the factory was able to sell till March 1965 only 90 fractional motors at a total cost of Rs. 15,000.

The seven table fans could not be sold.

According to the manager of the factory, there was no demand for the products because they were not according to the standard.

After the factory was taken over by the Small Industries Corporation, it produced during 1965 only 62 fractional motors.

The sale during the year, however, totalled Rs. 9,000 while the salary and allowance bill for the year was Rs. 72,000.

The factory used raw material worth Rs. 94,000 during 1961-62, 1962-63 and 1963-64.

The purchase of raw material in these years, however, valued at Rs. 2,86,000.

A nut and bolt training-cum-producing unit set up in Vidisha cost the Government Rs. 1,13,800 up to March 1965. The unit had a capacity of producing 3,505 quintal of nut and bolts, drawing and barbed wire and other articles annually, but the total production during the last three years was only 1,485 quintal. This means that only less than 2 per cent of the producing capacity was utilised. The unit was scheduled to train 60 people each year but it imparted training only to 29 persons in three years."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): You refer to the film industry. You come to the point.

श्री राम कुमार भुवालका : मैं बोल रहा हूँ मैं नेशनलाइजेशन न करने के बारे में बोलता हूँ। मेरा बोलना यह है कि नेशनलाइजेशन न हो मैं नेशनलाइजेशन करने के विरुद्ध हूँ। अभी मेरे पास और बहुत सामान है।

यह एकानामिक एंड साइंटिफिक रिसर्च एसोसियेशन की रिपोर्ट है उसमें उन्होंने दिखाया है कि कारखानों में क्या सेल हुआ है और क्या कॅश क्रेडिट बढ़ा है। भारत एलेक्ट्रॉनिक्स में कॅश क्रेडिट बढ़ा है 5 टाइम्स और सेल बढ़ा है ढाई टाइम्स। इसी तरह से दूसरे कारखाने हिन्दुस्तान कैबिल्स लिमिटेड में सेल हुआ है 2 टाइम्स और कॅश क्रेडिट बढ़ा है 12 टाइम्स। और इसी तरह 13 कारखानों का टोटल यह है कि कॅश क्रेडिट बढ़ा है साढ़े चार टाइम्स और सेल हुआ है आधा टाइम्स। तो मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान में जो अभी कारखाने चलते हैं जो इंडस्ट्रीज़ चलती हैं उनको उसी माफिक चलने देना चाहिये। इस तरह चलने से उन में नवीनता आती है और उनका काम आगे बढ़ता है। हमें पता लगता है कि सरकारी मशीनरी कारखाना चलाने में उपयुक्त साबित नहीं हुई है। वह सारा काम ठीक से चला सके। बार-बार कहा जाता है कि सरकार को कारखाने का या बैंकों का नेशनलाइजेशन कर लेना चाहिए। लेकिन कहने वालों को पता होना चाहिये कि बिना सरकार की आज्ञा के एक भी काम नहीं होता है जैसे कि नये कारखाने बनाने के लिये माल खरीद करने के लिये स्थायी बैंक से लेने के लिये माल के भावों के लिये और माल को बेचने के लिये सरकार का हुक्म लेना पड़ता है। इतनी कठिनाई है फिर भी काम चलाने वाले सारी बातों के होते हुये भी उसको चलाने की कोशिश करते हैं। आपको मालूम है कि रोज रोज चीजों के दाम बढ़ने से तथा

घनसख्या के बढ़ते रहने से देश में जो भी चीजों की पैदावार होती है उसके होते हुये भी चीजों का अभाव रहता है। सरकार अभी तक इतने दिन हो जाने पर भी एक भी चीज का दाम कम नहीं कर सकी है। क्या कारण है ? इसका यही कारण है कि सरकार की नीति बराबर ऐसी रही है जो कि स्थिर नहीं है जोकि निर्धारित नहीं है।

इसलिए मेरा यह निवेदन है कि डा० तलवार ने जो प्रस्ताव रखा है उसको वह विदड़ा करे क्योंकि आज फिल्म इंडस्ट्री एक ऐसी इंडस्ट्री है जिनमें कई वर्षों से लाखों करोड़ों आदमी काम कर रहे हैं। वह काम करने वाले अपने आप उसको आगे बढ़ाते हैं। नेशनलाइजेशन के बाद क्या होता है यह आपके सामने है। आप देखें कि आज के अखबार में क्या आया है कि जीवन बीमा निगम को 65 करोड़ रुपये का घाटा है।

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरङिया :
कुल।

श्री रामकुमार भवालका आज के पेपर में है। 65 करोड़ रुपये का क्यों घाटा हुआ उसका कोई कारण होना चाहिये। घाटे का कारण इसमें दिया है। तो मेरा कहना है कि अभी फिल्म कंपनियों में भी फायदा नहीं है। मैं किसी भी रकम का नेशनलाइजेशन समद नहीं करता और मैं समझता हूँ कि फिल्म इंडस्ट्री में बहुत सुधार होना चाहिये। यह जरूरी है और मैं डा० तलवार का तहेदिल से आभार मानता हूँ कि उन्होंने इस बात को सोचा कि फिल्म इंडस्ट्री में सुधार होने की जरूरत है और बहुत ज्यादा सुधार होने की जरूरत है। क्योंकि उन के कारण हिन्दुस्तान के हमारे वाशिंगटन को बहुत अच्छी शिक्षा नहीं मिलती है। हमारी गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से जो डाक्यूमेंटरी फिल्में होती हैं उनमें शिक्षा मिलती है। यह अच्छी बात है। इसलिये इस उद्योग में सुधार होने का मैं पक्षपाती हूँ। बस, इतना ही मैं कहना चाहता हूँ।

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरङिया :
उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदया, फिल्म उद्योग का राष्ट्रीयकरण करने के बारे में जो प्रस्ताव रखा गया है उसके लिये मैं प्रस्ताव कर्ता को धन्यवाद इस बात के लिये देता हूँ कि इसी बहाने फिल्म उद्योग के बारे में चर्चा करने का अवसर मिल गया। मगर प्रस्ताव जो रखा गया उसका मैं विरोध करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ।

महोदया, इस देश में प्रत्येक काल में कोई हवा चलती है और उस हवा के अनुसार अगर वह हवा गलत भी हो उसका प्रभाव गलत भी हो तो उस प्रवाह में बह कर के अपने आप को प्रतिष्ठित करने की भी एक परम्परा हो गई है। डा० तलवार ने भी उसी तरह जो राष्ट्रीयकरण की हवा देश में बह रही है उसमें अपने आप का मेल बिठाने के लिये फिल्म उद्योग का राष्ट्रीयकरण करने के सबंध में अभी प्रस्ताव रखा है। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदया, जब हमारी सरकार के द्वारा जो कारखाने में बनने वाली चीज हैं उनका भी ठीक से निर्माण नहीं हो पाना जो ऐसे उद्योग हैं जिनका कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन कम होना चाहिये वह विदेशों के मुकाबले में दूने से अधिक पड़ता है—हिन्दुस्तान शिप-यार्ड का ही नमूना लें जिसकी पूंजी 9 करोड़ थी और सबमिडी दी गई 9 करोड़, इस तरह के एक नहीं अनेक उद्योग हैं जिनमें केवल मैकेनिकल काम करना पड़ता है जिसमें किसी कला की विशेष आवश्यकता नहीं पड़ती है उसमें भी हमारी सरकार के बहुत इफिशियेंट कहे जाने वाले कार्यकर्ता लें उनको सफलतापूर्वक नहीं चला सकते। तो ऐसी स्थिति में क्या बिसमिल्लाह खा की शहनाई का राष्ट्रीयकरण होगा? क्या लता मंगेशकर के गले का राष्ट्रीयकरण होगा? क्या दिलीप कुमार की नज़ाकत का राष्ट्रीयकरण होगा? या पंकजमलिक की जो बड़ी अच्छी जोरदार वाल्युमिनस आवाज थी उसका राष्ट्रीयकरण होगा? मुझे समझ में नहीं आता कि अगर इन कला के कामों का भी राष्ट्रीयकरण करना

[श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चोगड़िया]

प्रारम्भ हो गया तो उपाध्यक्ष महोदया, हमें हमने देश से कला का लोप कर देना चाहिये। तब इस देश में कला रहेगी नहीं। अगर कला का राष्ट्रीयकरण होना हमारे देश में प्रारम्भ होगा तो हमारे यहां सेक्रेटरी साहब का आर्डर जायेगा कि इस टाइप में यह फिल्म बननी चाहिये चाहे उसका मूड हो या न हो चाहे गले में वह बारीकी या खमूसियत हो या न हो। के० एल० सहगल मर गये मगर आज भी उनसे बढ़कर अच्छा गायक कोई नहीं निकला। उन्होंने कोई राष्ट्रीयकरण के भरोसे में अच्छा गाना नहीं गाया। तो ऐसी स्थिति में इस भाव से कि हमारे यहां आजकल फिल्म निर्माता केवल पैसा प्राप्त करने का लक्ष्य लेकर ही चल रहे हैं कि किसी तरह से हमारे यहां पर ज्यादा से ज्यादा ग्राहक देखने आयें इस भयंकर प्रवृत्ति के लिये अगर हम कला के राष्ट्रीयकरण की बात कहते हैं तो मैं इसको उचित नहीं समझता। महोदया, जैसा कि पूर्ववक्ता महोदय ने स्पष्टीकरण किया हम अपने यहां अपने फिल्म उद्योग के माध्यम से अपने देश का स्तर ऊंचा उठा सकते हैं। इसी दृष्टि से कि हमारे यहां देश में भी उस स्थिति का निर्माण हो हमने एक फिल्म सेन्सर बोर्ड भी कायम किया है। मगर सेन्सर बोर्ड स्वयं अपने दिमाग में स्पष्ट नहीं है कि हमारे देश की संस्कृति क्या है हमारे देश में लोगों को ऊंचा उठाने के लिये किस तरह के फिल्मों का निर्माण होना चाहिये, हमारे देश में किस तरह की कला का प्रदर्शन होना चाहिये कि जिससे कि हमारा देश शक्तीशाली बने। फिर उसके नहीं होने के परिणामस्वरूप डा० तलवार को यह कहना पड़ा कि "टिविस्ट" आजकल शुरू हो गया तमाशा, गाना, नाचना इस तरह का हो गया, छोटी बच्चियां और बच्चे और बड़े भी वही प्रेम के गाने गाते हैं और उन सब बातों का समाज में जो खराब असर पड़ता रहा है उसका प्रवाह इतना तेज होता जा रहा है कि उप सभाध्यक्ष महोदया, आपके हमारे न चाहने पर भी

आपके और हमारे बच्चे उस प्रभाव में बहे जा रहे हैं जिसको हम रोक नहीं पा रहे हैं। यदि आपके हमारे बच्चे बच्चियां, लड़कियां, इस तरह के चुस्त कपड़े पहन कर न जायें यदि वे सिनेमा के ऐक्टर्स और एक्ट्रेसज के नाम नहीं जानें तो उनको कहा जायेगा कि तुम बहुत बैकवर्ड हो। आजकल प्रगतिशील की परिभाषा कुछ ऐसी हो गई है कि जो हमारी पुरानी मर्यादाएं देश को ऊंचा उठाने वाली बातें हैं उनके विपरीत काम किया जाय वह प्रगति में आ जाती हैं और उसके साथ बहाव में इस तरह अगर लोगों को बहने दिया जाय तो जरा उलटा बैठना है। तो मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि हम यह गलती न करे चूंकि हमारे फिल्म उत्पादन करने वाले चित्रपट बनाने वाले गलत चित्रों का निर्माण करते हैं और हम उसका कोई इलाज न कर सके इसलिये हम उसका केवल एक इलाज मान कर चलें कि फिल्मों का राष्ट्रीयकरण हो। यह उसका इलाज नहीं। पूर्ववक्ता के दिल की बात उस समय निकल गई जब उन्होंने कहा कि हिटलर ने भी ऐसा किया था और माथ्रो त्से तुंग भी अभी कर रहे हैं। क्या आप हमारे यहां पर वही परम्परा डालना चाहते हैं। हमारी कांग्रेस सरकार पूरे समाजवाद का अपने सिद्धान्त का ढकोसला मारे समाज पर थोपने के लिये राष्ट्रीयकरण करके चित्रों के माध्यम से भी लोगों को केवल उसी के आधार पर काम करने को प्रेरित करेगी। तो महोदया, यह प्रजातंत्र के लिये बहुत खतरनाक होगा। यदि यह कदम उठाया गया तो हमारे यहां पर हिटलर और माथ्रो त्से तुंग की परम्परा चलेगी जिसका हम बहुत विरोध करते हैं जो कि हमारे यहां की संस्कृति के आधार पर हमारे देश की मर्यादाओं के आधार पर कभी भी अनुकूल नहीं बैठता, प्रतिकूल बैठता है। उदाहरण भी इनको दो ही मिले हिटलर ने ऐसा किया, माथ्रो त्से तुंग ने ऐसा किया। आप भी बन जाइये माथ्रो त्से तुंग, आप भी बन जाइये हिटलर। पर उप सभाध्यक्ष महोदया, देश के लिये वह

आदर्श नहीं हो सकते। हमारे देश का आदर्श तो वही हो सकता है जो त्याग के आधार पर चले, प्रजातंत्र के सिद्धांत के आधार पर चले, जाँ मताधिकार के आधार पर हमारे देश में शासन में परिवर्तन लाने की इच्छाओं को मान्य करता हो, इस आधार पर चले। लाठी के आधार पर, बंदूक के आधार पर, गोली के आधार पर और अपने जोर के आधार पर कि हम समाज को इस ढाँचे में बदलना चाहते हैं, चलेगा। तो मेरा कहना है कि हम ऐसे आधार पर अपने समाज को नहीं बदल सकते। परन्तु साथ ही यह आवश्यक है कि आजकल हमारे समाज में जो चित्रपट अश्लीलता का प्रचार करते हैं उन पर प्रतिबन्ध लगायें और हम अपने सेन्सर बोर्ड का दिमाग साफ करें और उनके दिमाग में यह भरे कि हमें अपने देश में किस प्रकार की संस्कृति को विकसित करना चाहिये। क्या हम उस संस्कृति को विकसित करना चाहते हैं जिसमें चुस्त कपड़े पहनने का और अश्लील ढंग के सौंदर्य प्रदर्शन करने का तरीका हो।

श्री रामकुमार भुवालका : चौरङ्गिया जी माफ़ करे जन संघ अभी पन्द्रह वर्ष का बच्चा है अभी उसको बहुत कुछ सीखना है। अभी उसकी शादी नहीं हुई उसके बाद जब बच्चे होंगे तब जनसंघ को अकल आयेगी।

श्री महाबीर प्रसाद भार्गव (उत्तर प्रदेश) : यह थापको कैसे मालूम है कि शादी नहीं हुई है?

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरङ्गिया : जनसंघ चाहे बच्चा हो और हमारे भुवालका जी बड़े हों मगर यह जरूर है कि उनकी भावनाओं को कामोत्तेजक करने के लिये ऐसे प्रदर्शनों को करने की आवश्यकता होगी जो उनकी भावनाओं को उनके अनुकूल प्रेरणा प्रदान कर सके। जनसंघ इसको ठीक नहीं समझता। जनसंघ उनके लिये बच्चा है मगर वह देख रहा है कि इस तरह के कामोत्तेजक दर्शन हमारे देश के लिये घातक है।

श्री महाबीर प्रसाद भार्गव : काफी नटखट बच्चा है।

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरङ्गिया : मगर बड़े बूढ़ों की नकेल डाल कर मही रास्ते पर ले जाने का प्रयत्न करता है। भुवालका जी की कैटेगरी में भार्गव साहब को नहीं डाल सकता कि उनको इतने कामोत्तेजक प्रदर्शन देखने की आवश्यकता है। मगर भुवालका जी की बात दूसरी है। उनके लिये यदि आवश्यकता हो तो इसके लिये दूसरे क्षेत्र खोले जा सकते हैं मगर जनसाधारण के समक्ष ऐसे अश्लील चित्रों का प्रदर्शन करवाना हमारे देश को गढ़े में ले जाना है।

महोदया, प्रस्तावक महोदया कहती हैं कि राष्ट्रीयकरण हो जायेगा तो बड़ा अच्छा होगा। हमारी सरकार कई अखबार निकालती है न जाने क्या क्या निकालती है और सबके सब दिवाले में। जब सरकार अच्छा काम करती है, लोगों को आकर्षित कर सकती है तो क्यों नहीं जो उनके अखबार निकलते हैं वे दूसरे अखबारों के साथ कंपीटीशन में ठहर सकते हैं? इसका कारण यह है कि लोग वही चीज पसंद करना चाहते हैं जो समाज में उस समय प्रचलित है। लोग वही चित्र देखना चाहते हैं जो समाज में उस समय की परम्परा बन गई है। अगर इस परम्परा को सरकार बदलना चाहे तो उसकी जिम्मेदारी वह ले सकती है। मैं एक छोटा का उदाहरण पेश कर देना चाहता हूँ। हमारे यहाँ क्लासिकल म्यूजिक के प्रति किसी का आकर्षण नहीं रहा था लोग भूल जैसा गये थे साधारण सुगम संगीत की बात चलती थी मगर जब डा० केसकर सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री थे तो उन्होंने क्लासिकल म्यूजिक को प्रोत्साहन दिया और लोगों को उसमें आकर्षण मिलने लगा उसके प्रति प्रेम प्रकट करने लग उसकी जो बारीकी है, जो गलाबाजी उसमें होती है उसके प्रति उन्हें रुझान होने लगा। यह क्यों हुआ? थोड़े दिनों तक ठीक नहीं लगा। लोग उसके बाद प्रति दिन उसको सुनते रहे

[श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया]
तो उसके प्रति आकर्षण होने लगा। पहले लोग सीलोन रेडियो लगा कर सुनते थे मगर अब हमारे यहां पर विविध भारती का कार्यक्रम होता है, धार्मिक गीत होते हैं, त्याग की भावना के गीत गाये जाते हैं, देशभक्ति के गाने आते हैं, सब तरह के गीत प्रस्तुत होते हैं क्योंकि लोगों को उनके प्रति आकर्षण होने लगा। तो इस प्रकार की प्रवृत्ति का निर्माण करना यह बहुत कुछ सरकार के ऊपर निर्भर करता है।

हमारे सेन्सर बोर्ड का दिमाग माफ नहीं है। जब हमारी रक्षा करने वाली पुलिस का दिमाग माफ नहीं है कि कौन देशभक्ति का काम करने वाला आदमी है और कौन विरोधी है, तो हमारे सेन्सर बोर्ड का दिमाग किस तरह से ठीक हो सकता है। इसलिए सबसे पहले जरूरत इस बात की है कि हमारे सेन्सर बोर्ड का दिमाग ठीक हो कि हमारे देश में किस प्रकार की फिल्मों का निर्माण होना चाहिये। इसके साथ ही साथ जो प्रोड्यूसर है उनका भी यह कर्तव्य हो जाता है कि हमारे देश के विकास के लिए जिस तरह की फिल्मों की आवश्यकता है, उस तरह की फिल्मों का निर्माण किया जाना चाहिये।

हमारे यहाँ चुम्बन पर प्रतिबन्ध है, मगर चुम्बन के सम्पर्क की जितनी सीन्स हैं, उनका प्रदर्शन किया जाता है, होता है और इसी प्रकार आगे भी होता रहेगा। तो इस तरह के जो दृश्य फिल्मों में दिखावाये जाते हैं वे हमारे समाज के लिए ठीक नहीं है। सेन्सर बोर्ड जहाँ पर चुम्बन का कोई दृश्य आता है उस समय वह पर्दा डालने की बात करवा देता है, लेकिन उसके बाद खडहर में सब कुछ करवा सकता है। एक्ट्रेस अपने शरीर के अंगों को काफी खुला प्रदर्शित कर सकती है, उस पर कोई प्रतिबन्ध नहीं है और इस तरह लोगों की भावना को जागृत किया जाता है। जो गीत गाये जाते हैं, जिन गीतों का निर्माण होता है और जिनसे

जनता में खराब असर पड़ता है, उस प्रकार के गीतों पर प्रतिबन्ध लगाना बहुत ही आवश्यक है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदया, एक बात और है और वह यह है कि जो हमारे फिल्मों में कोई विशेष सीन होता है, जिसके कारण लोग उसको देखने के लिए ज्यादा आकर्षित हो सकते हैं, जो सीन्स कामोत्तेजक होते हैं, उसके पोस्टर प्रचार के लिए छपवा दिये जाते हैं जिससे लोग ज्यादा तादाद में फिल्म को देखने के लिए आकर्षित हो सकें। मुगले आजम की जो फिल्म थी उसका एक पोस्टर था जिसमें मुगले आजम एक महिला को एम्ब्रेस किये हुए है। इस तरह के पोस्टर लाखों की तादाद में सारे हिन्दुस्तान में लगे हुए देखे गये। इसलिए मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह के पोस्टर छपवाना क्या अश्लीलता नहीं है? इसके माने तो यह हुए कि इस तरह के पोस्टर लगवा कर जनता को उत्तेजित किया जाता है, उसकी भावनाओं को उभाड़ा जाता है कि वे इस तरह के कामोत्तेजक मिनेमा को देखें। इसका असर यह होता है कि लोग उस फिल्म को देखने के लिए पागल हो उठते हैं और ब्लैक मार्केट तक में जाकर उसका टिकट खरीदते हैं। इस तरह की फिल्मों को देखने के लिए क्यू लगी रहती है और टिकट मिलना मुश्किल हो जाता है। मनुष्य की कमजोरी की चार बातें बतलाई गई हैं और वे इस प्रकार हैं, काम, क्रोध, मद और मोह और इनमें "काम" का पहला स्थान आता है। आज कामवासना के वास्ते ही ज्यादातर लोग फिल्म देखने के लिए जाते हैं और इसीलिए मेरी प्रार्थना है कि इस तरह की जो फिल्में बनती हैं, जिनसे कामोत्तेजना बढ़ती है, उन पर प्रतिबन्ध लगाया जाना चाहिये हमारे देश में ऐसी फिल्मों का निर्माण होना चाहिये जिससे जनता के चरित्र का निर्माण हो सके और हमारे सैनिक भी अच्छे बन सकें। इसलिए आवश्यकता इस बात की

है कि हमारे देश का जो फिल्म उद्योग है, उसको इस तरफ विशेष तौर से ध्यान देना चाहिये । इसके साथ ही साथ हमारा जो सेन्सर बोर्ड है वह भी इस दिशा में मार्ग दर्शन का काम कर सकता है । जो फिल्म का निर्माण करते हैं, उनको प्रेरणा दे सकता है कि किस तरह की फिल्में बनाई जानी चाहियें और कौनसी नहीं बनाई जानी चाहिये । जो फिल्में देश के हित के लिए हों उनके निर्माण के लिए सेन्सर बोर्ड प्रोड्यूसरों को प्रेरित कर सकता है । अगर हम इस तरह की बात करेंगे तो देश का हित होगा । केवल राष्ट्रीयकरण करने से ही किसी बुराई को दूर नहीं किया जा सकता है । सब मज्जों के लिए "हरं" ही रामबाण दवा नहीं है, इसी तरह से सब चीजों का राष्ट्रीयकरण करके हम सफलता प्राप्त नहीं कर सकते हैं । इसलिए मेरी प्रार्थना है कि इस उद्योग को अगर निजी क्षेत्र में ही छोड़ दिया जाये तो ज्यादा अच्छा रहेगा । लेकिन सरकार को और सेन्सर बोर्ड को विवेक से काम लेना होगा तथा इस उद्योग का मार्ग दर्शन ठीक तरह से करना होगा ताकि प्रोड्यूसर लोग इस बात के लिए प्रेरित हो सकें कि वे इस देश में अच्छी फिल्मों का निर्माण कर सकें । मुझे तो उनकी फिल्म देखने का मौका जब कालिज में पढ़ता था तब मिला था, लेकिन आजकल मुझे फिल्म देखने से नफरत हो गई है क्योंकि हमारे देश में जो फिल्में बनाई जा रही हैं वे जनता में हीन मनोवृत्ति पैदा कर रही हैं और देश नीचे की ओर गिरता जा रहा है ।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : मुझे बहुत खुशी है कि हमारी बहिन मंगला देवी तलवार जी ने अपनी तलवार से राष्ट्रीयकरण का प्रस्ताव ला कर, जो फिल्म इंडस्ट्री है, उसमें जो बुराईया हैं, उन बुराईयों को दूर करने के लिए यह प्रस्ताव पेश किया है । मैं इस प्रस्ताव का स्वागत करता हूँ और समर्थन देता हूँ ।

इस सदन में तीन वर्ष पहले मैंने फाइनेंस बिल पर बोलते हुए फिल्म इंडस्ट्री के राष्ट्रीयकरण की बात उठाई थी तो उस समय जो बड़े बड़े फिल्म उद्योग में लगे लोग थे उन्होंने इसका विरोध किया था । उस समय मैंने यह सुझाव दिया था कि देश के हित के लिए फिल्म उद्योग का राष्ट्रीयकरण कर लिया जाना चाहिये । आज हमारी बहिन ने इसकी क्यों जरूरत है इसके बारे में विशद रूप में बातें बतला दी हैं । लेकिन मैं एक प्रैक्टिकल सदस्य शासक पार्टी का हूँ इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि फिल्म के जरिये से, सिनेमा के जरिये से हमारे राष्ट्र का जो चरित्र-निर्माण हो रहा है जो हमारी योजनाएं हैं, जो हमारी समाजवादी नीति है, जो हमारा सिव्योरलिज्म है उसमें यह उद्योग कहाँ तक सहायता कर रहा है उसका उपयोग ज्यादा से ज्यादा किस तरह से किया जा सकता है ताकि जनता उसकी तरफ खिंच सके । तो यह जो इंडस्ट्री है वह इतनी जबर्दस्त है और यह जो फिल्म का साधन है वह इतना अच्छा है कि हम इससे जनता की भलाई कर सकते हैं ।

हमारे बहुत से सदस्य जानते होंगे कि फिल्म दुनिया में बड़े बड़े कलाकार हैं, डायरेक्टर हैं, ऐक्टर्स हैं और उनको देखने के लिए हमारे देश में जनता की भीड़ लगी रहती है । ये लोग जनता में बहुत लोकप्रिय हो गये हैं और इनको देखने के लिए इतनी भीड़ लगी रहती है जितनी कि राष्ट्रीय नेताओं के लिए भी नहीं होती है । ठीक है हमारे मिश्रा जी ने भी कहा कि कला का राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं हो सकता है । वे तो सब चीजों के राष्ट्रीयकरण के खिलाफ हैं । इसलिए कला की ही बात नहीं और कला का राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं होता है और न ही दिमाग का राष्ट्रीयकरण होता है । उन्होंने मूड की बात कही तो मूड का भी राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं होता है । लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमें फिल्म उद्योग का राष्ट्रीयकरण करना चाहिये । हमें भात

[श्री शीलभद्र याजी]

बेचने और रोटी बेचने वालों का राष्ट्रीयकरण अभी नहीं करना चाहिये बल्कि जो मूल उद्योग हैं, जो बेसिक इन्डस्ट्रीज हैं उनका पहिले राष्ट्रीयकरण करना चाहिये।

आज हमारे देश में एक परिकल्पना चल रही है। जो हमारी सरकार है—मैं कांग्रेस पार्टी की बात नहीं कह रहा हूँ—उसकी जो मूल नीति है दोनों हाउसों ने, दोनों सदनों ने पास की है कि इस देश में समाजवादी समाज की स्थापना होगी और हम यह व्यवस्था प्लानिंग के जरिये करेंगे। यदि हम फिल्म उद्योग का राष्ट्रीयकरण कर लेते हैं तो हम इसके जरिये और ज्यादा प्रेम और मुहब्बत का संदेश भी जनता में फैला सकते हैं। मैं यह नहीं कहता हूँ कि इसमें प्रेम और मुहब्बत नहीं रहे मैं इसके खिलाफ नहीं हूँ लेकिन उसको इस रूप में कर दिया जाये ताकि जनता को उससे ज्यादा से ज्यादा फायदा हो सके।

हमारे मिश्रा जी ने ऑल इंडिया रेडियो की बात उठाई। ऑल इंडिया रेडियो सरकार का है और रहेगा। उसको अलग नहीं किया जा सकता है। यह यू० के० नहीं है कि उसको लिए एक अलग से कम्पनी या कारपोरेशन बना दी जाये; यह तो सरकार के हाथ में ही रहना चाहिये और उसको निजी कम्पनी के हाथ में नहीं दिया जाना चाहिये और दिये जाने की जरूरत भी नहीं है। इसलिए हम कहते हैं कि जो ऑल इंडिया रेडियो है वह सरकार के हाथ में ही रहे और इसके अलावा जितने मोनोपोलिस्ट प्रेस हैं, अखबार हैं देश के कल्याण के लिए उनकी भी जरूरत पड़ेगी और उनका भी राष्ट्रीयकरण करना पड़ेगा।

श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र : क्या आप चाहते हैं कि अखबारों का भी नेशनलाइजेशन कर दिया जाये ?

SHRIMATI LALITHA (RAJA-GOPALAN) (Madras): If you nationalise, how can you have democracy in the country?

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : हमारी बहिन जो बगल में बैठी है वह कंप्यूज माइंड की हैं। समाजवाद का मतलब है "private property itself is theft" यानी निजी सम्पत्ति की चोरी हुई है समाज में।

SHRIMATI LALITHA (RAJA-GOPALAN): What about fundamental rights?

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : आपके दकियानूसी खयालात हैं। जहां तक फंडामेंटल राइट्स . .

SHRIMATI LALITHA (RAJA-GOPALAN): What about the fundamental rights in the Constitution, the freedom of speech?

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : जहां तक कास्टी-ट्यूशन का सवाल है अगर समाजवादी रास्ते में उससे रुकावट होती है तो हमें उसमें रेडिकल चेन्ज करना पड़ेगा। इस चीज के लिए रूलिंग पार्टी को यह जरूरी है कि अगर वह देश में समाजवादी समाज की स्थापना करना चाहती है तो इसको चेन्ज करने के लिए उसे मांस में जाना होगा क्योंकि बगैर देश में समाजवादी व्यवस्था स्थापित किये वह जिन्दा नहीं रह सकती है। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश में जो फिल्म इन्डस्ट्री है उसके जरिये अभी जनता का कितना नुकसान हो रहा है। अगर किसी फिल्म के बनाने के लिए 2 लाख रुपया का ठेका होता है तो रिकार्ड में 2 लाख दिखला देते हैं और बाकी रुपया पलग के नीचे और सिराहने के नीचे कहां कहा रखते हैं। इस रुपये का कोई हिसाब किताब नहीं होता है और जो छोटे छोटे कलाकार हैं उनका शोषण होता है। सरकार को मालूम भी नहीं होता है और सरकार उस रुपये से इनकम टैक्स भी नहीं ले सकती है।

तो मैं यह कह रहा था कि आज जो हमारी योजना चलती है, परिकल्पना चलती है, उसके बारे में लोगो को खयाल ही नहीं है कि क्या योजना है, क्या प्लानिंग है और उसके चलते देश का कैसे विकास हो सकता है। यदि सिनेमा के जरिये हमें लोगो को प्लानिंग माइंडेड बनाना है और जैसी कि सरकार की नीति है, सोशलिस्ट माइंडेड बनाना है, साम्प्रदायिकता से दूर रखना है तो हमें इस फिल्म इण्डस्ट्री का राष्ट्रीयकरण करना पड़ेगा। यदि साम्प्रदायिकता से लोग दूर हो जायें तो गाय के नाम पर, जानवर के नाम पर इस तरह के डिमांस्ट्रेशन नहीं हो सकते। जहाँ इन्सान मरते हैं वहाँ लोग नहीं जाते हैं लेकिन यहाँ गाय के नाम पर इतने लोग आ गये। आज कम्युनलिज्म को दूर करने के लिये, जनता में राष्ट्रीयता लाने के लिये, देश की हिफाजत के लिये, समाजवाद के लिये, लोगो में जागृति लाने के लिये, पैट्रियाटिज्म की भावना लाने के लिये, इस उद्योग को नेशनलाइज करना आवश्यक है। आज देखा जाय तो पैट्रियाटिज्म है कहा, देशभक्ति का कही नामोनिशान नहीं है। आज हिन्दुस्तान में जो कुछ हो रहा है उसको कोई "हां" कहने वाला नहीं है, जितने भी लोग हैं सब उसकी जड खोदने वाले हैं। इससे जनता का दिमाग बदल जाता है और वह यह समझने लगती है कि हिन्दुस्तान में कुछ नहीं हुआ है। जो विदेशी आते हैं वे यह कहने हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान में बहुत कुछ हुआ है, लेकिन हमारे देश के लोग यह कहते हैं कि कुछ नहीं हुआ है। इसलिये यदि सरकार इस फिल्म इण्डस्ट्री पर कंट्रोल कर लेती हैं, इसका राष्ट्रीयकरण कर लेती है, तो उसकी जो मूल नीति है—मैं कांग्रेस की नीति की बात नहीं करता, पी० एस० पी० की नीति की बात नहीं करता, कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी या स्वतन्त्र पार्टी की बात नहीं करता जो सरकार की मौजूदा नीति है, जिसको पार्लियामेंट के दोनों सदनों ने पास किया है उस नीति का यदि अच्छी तरह से प्रसार करना हो तो उसके लिये सिनेमा से बढ़ कर

दूसरा तरीका नहीं हो सकता है क्योंकि फिल्म उद्योग का राष्ट्रीयकरण करके हम ऐसी ऐसी फिल्में तैयार करवायेंगे जो इस उद्देश्य को पूरा करेंगी।

श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र : आप पहले सरकार से कुछ रुपया लेकर के फिल्म बना करके देखिये।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : इस उद्योग में जो 80 करोड़ रुपये की पूजी लगी हुई है और जो इसमें दो लाख वर्कर हैं उनको ही हम क्यों न युटिलाइज करे और यह करना हमारे हाथ में है। हम इसका राष्ट्रीयकरण करेंगे, आज नहीं करेंगे तो कल करेंगे, यह मिनिस्टर साहब नहीं करेंगे तो दूसरे करेंगे...

श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र : नहीं, आप जब बनेंगे तब करेंगे।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : हम जब बनेंगे तब आप वहाँ बैठने नहीं पायेंगे। हम दूसरी बात करेंगे, सही मानों में जिसको समाजवाद कहते हैं, हम वह लायेंगे। लेकिन वह दिन दूर नहीं है जब इस सरकार को भी इस उद्योग का राष्ट्रीयकरण करना पड़ेगा। आज इस उद्योग में रुपये की चोरी होती है, काट्टैक्ट होता है आठ दस लाख रुपये का और हिसाब-किताब में दिखाया जाता है 50 हजार रुपया। तो इस उद्योग का राष्ट्रीयकरण करने से यह चोरी रुकेगी। जब इसका राष्ट्रीयकरण हो जायेगा तो जो फिल्म के बड़े बड़े कलाकार हैं, उनको हम गवर्नर और राष्ट्रपति से भी ज्यादा पे देगे और हम उनकी इज्जत करेंगे। लेकिन उनकी कला से हम लोगो को प्लानिंग माइंडेड बनायेंगे, सोशलिस्ट माइंडेड बनायेंगे, साम्प्रदायिकता से दूर रखेंगे और उनमें देश रक्षा की भावना पैदा करेंगे। ये सारी बातें जनता में पैदा करने के लिये सिनेमा से बढ़ कर दूसरी कोई चीज नहीं हो सकती है। इसलिये मैं सरकार से गुजारिश करूंगा कि वह इस उद्योग का राष्ट्रीयकरण करे। इससे सरकार की

[श्री शीलभद्र याजी]

ग्रामदनी भी बढ़ेगी। इस उद्योग में जो आर्टिस्ट हैं उनको घबड़ाने की जरूरत नहीं है। इसके जो मालिक हैं, प्रोड्यूसर हैं, उनको खरूर घाटा होगा और खर्च करने पर उनके घर से चार चार, छः छः और दस दस लाख बाख़ रुपया निकलता है, वह नहीं निकलेगा। लेकिन आर्टिस्टों को हम पाँच दस हजार रुपये तनख्वाह देंगे और उनसे कहेंगे कि लोगों को देशभक्त बनाओ। अभी जो प्रेम मुहब्बत की बात सिनेमा में चलती है, वह भी चलेगी क्योंकि उसकी तरफ लोगों का अधिक झुकाव होता है, लेकिन उसी के साथ साथ ऐसी फिल्में बनाई जायेंगी जिनसे लोगों में यह भावना पैदा हो कि किस तरह से प्लानिंग में मदद की जाये, जिनसे लिग्युइज्म, भाषावाद, साम्प्रदायिकता, जातिवाद, नेरोइज्म से लोग ऊपर उठें। यदि इस उद्योग का राष्ट्रीयकरण हो जाये और हमारी जो समाजवाद की मूल नीति है वह देश में स्थापित हो जाय तो फिर हमारे यहाँ किसी तरह की बीमारी नहीं रह सकती है।

आजकल फिल्म इतना लोकप्रिय है कि लोग इसके पीछे पागल है। हमारी बहन जी ने मुझे आजम की बात कही। यह प्यार मुहब्बत फिल्मों में इसलिये चलता है कि इस तरफ लोगों का झुकाव है और इसमें ज्यादा पैसा आता है, इसलिये इस तरह की फिल्में अधिक बनती है। ये सारी बातें तो सरकार की नीति के अनुसार सेंसर बोर्ड के देखने की हैं। लेकिन इतना मैं जानता हूँ कि जब तक इसका राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं होगा तब तक इस उद्योग से विशेष लाभ होने वाला नहीं है।

जहाँ तक आल इण्डिया रेडियो का सम्बन्ध है, यदि स्वतन्त्र पार्टी की बात मान ली जाय तो उससे एक बड़ा खतरा पैदा हो जायगा। फिर तो उसमें स्वतन्त्र पार्टी की नीति का भी प्रचार होगा, हिन्दू महासभा की नीति का भी प्रचार होगा, जनसंघ की नीति का भी प्रचार

होगा और उससे हिन्दुस्तान का सत्यानाश हो जायगा।

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: You do not read even the report of the Committees.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : यदि हम तीन कनीजिया और तेरह चूल्हे वालों को फ्रीडम दे देंगे तो हिन्दुस्तान की जनता एकदम पथभ्रष्ट हो जायगी और देश की शान्ति भी चली जायगी। इसलिये इस ओर भी ध्यान रखने की आवश्यकता है।

यह जो प्रस्ताव आया है इस पर मन्त्री जी ने अपनी राय दे दी है कि अभी वे इसके लिये तैयार नहीं हैं। लेकिन हम पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर उनको मजबूर करेंगे और हम ऐसी परिस्थितियाँ पैदा कर देंगे अपनी सरकार के सामने कि वह इस उद्योग को नेशनलाइज करने के लिये मजबूर हो जायगी। ग्रामदनी के खयाल से भी और देश में स्वस्थ वातावरण उत्पन्न करने के लिये यह बहुत जरूरी है ताकि देश में अच्छे नागरिक बन सकें जो समाजवादी हों और जो प्लानिंग माइंडेड हों।

श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र : अशोक मेहता जी को उसका डाइरेक्टर बना दीजियेगा।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : मेहता जी नहीं, अशोक कुमार काम करेंगे तो उनको बना देंगे।

श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र : अशोक मेहता जी को।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : आप काम करेंगे तो आप को बना देंगे। वैसे तो आप ने यह काम शुरू किया था, कुछ पैसा भी लगाया लेकिन आप तो फेल हो गये और आप अच्छे आर्टिस्ट साबित नहीं हुये।

तो मैं यह कह रहा था कि सरकार इस उद्योग का जल्दी से जल्दी राष्ट्रीयकरण करे। जनता को सही मार्गदर्शन देने के लिये समाज-

वाद की तरफ ले जाने के लिये और देश में अच्छा जलवायु बनाने के लिये मैं समझता हूँ कि यह सबसे अच्छा जरिया है। इस लिये सरकार को निर्भीक बनना पड़ेगा, साहसी बनना पड़ेगा, बोलू बनना पड़ेगा, क्योंकि इसके बगैर काम नहीं चलेगा। स्वतन्त्र पार्टी और जनसंघ पार्टी ये दोनों रिएक्शनरी पार्टी हैं और इनके लिये राष्ट्रीयकरण का विरोध करना स्वाभाविक है। इसलिये इन से भी होशियार रहने की जरूरत है। लेकिन सरकार का अपना मूल नीति पर ज़रूर चलना चाहिये। इसलिये मैं फिर कहूँगा कि इस फिल्म उद्योग का जल्दी से जल्दी राष्ट्रीयकरण होना चाहिये क्योंकि बगैर राष्ट्रीयकरण किये हुये फिल्म का जो असली मकसद है उसको हम पूरा नहीं कर सकेंगे।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं तहंदिल से डा० तलवार ने जो तलवार चलाई है इस इण्डस्ट्री पर उसका स्वागत करता हूँ।

SHRI M. AJMAL KHAN (Nominated): Madam, I have to say very little about nationalisation of the film industry because everyone knows that nationalisation is a thing in which there remains no competition and if there is no competition, especially in art and literature, then, the industry will be killed automatically. The film industry depends on stories. Everybody cannot write a story on order. If you nationalise poets, they are not able to compose very good poetry or couplets. There was a poet in the days of Jehangir, and he was Yazdi. There were a number of poets in the days of Jehangir, and before poet Yazdi there were other poets like Sadi, Hafiz and Omar Khayyam, who sang in praise of wine. Now poet Yazdi composed a couplet, and it was such a great couplet that no poet in the world could compete with him in giving that idea. Now that idea did not come by control; it came automatically, through

the deep psychological instinct which the poet had. It is a Persian couplet and he says:

تاک را سحاب کن اے ابر نیستان در بہار

قطرہ کو سنے تواند شد چرا گوہر شود

†[ताक रा सीराब कुन ऐ अब्रे नीसान दर बहार,
क़ज़ा-ए कू तवानद शुद चिरा गौहर शबद]

It means this: There is the tradition that if the rain of the Basant or spring season falls in the mouth of a sea-shell in the sea, it becomes a pearl. So the poet says: It is useless to rain in the mouth of a sea-shell to become a pearl. It is better that that rain water should fall on the grape-vines, so that that drop of water might become wine instead of becoming a pearl. And for this couplet Jehangir gave him one lakh Ashrafi, that is, gold coins. As I said there were hundreds of poets like Sadi, Hafiz and Omar Khayyam whose couplets could not compete with this one couplet. So by nationalisation of the poets or artists you cannot bring good art before the people of the country. Of course one thing can be done, have a kind of censorship on things which India considers to be immoral although such things are not considered to be immoral in other countries. In India we have great honour for women, and in vindication of such honour a couplet by Sheikh Ali Hazin comes to my mind, who lived in Banaras. There was a custom in those days that a woman, when she became a widow, died along with her dead husband; she was burnt. Now Ali Hazin and millions of people saw all these things, this kind of cruelty, but it was only Sheikh Ali Hazin who could go deep into the matter and compose a couplet, and that couplet, within a week, rang throughout India. That couplet was:

†[] Hindi transliteration.

[Shri M. Ajmal Khan.]

در صحبت زن هلد کسه مردانه نهست
مروختن بر شمع مردانه کار هو پروانه نهست

†[درمهلخت چو زننه هلد کسه مردانه نهست،
مروختن بر شمع مردانه کار هو پروانه نهست]

As you know, in those days we had no electric lights but we had diya or chirag, what you call oil lamps. Now to those oil lamps butterflies or flies used to come and closely hover over them and they got burnt in the process. Here Hazin says that the Indian woman is braver than a man. Why? It is because of the custom in those days. Now the fly came on a burning candle and so died whereas an Indian woman died on a dead candle, and the dead candle was her dead husband. Even then she comes like a fly and is burnt over it. Now this couplet rang throughout India. So such things, you know, cannot be brought about by control. Now a story-writer or a poet or an actor should be a great psychologist. He should know the psychology of children, the psychology of grown-up people, the psychology of the people who live in villages, the psychology of the people who live in the cities and the trend of the mind of the people towards his work through which he wants to lead them. But this cannot be done by control. With these words I have to say that literature and art cannot be nationalised. It is not a mechanical thing; it should be left alone.

Thank you.

श्रीमती विद्यावती चन्वेंदी (मध्य प्रदेश):
उपाध्यक्ष महोदया, आज जो माननीय सदस्या, मिसेज तलवार ने फिल्म इंडस्ट्री के राष्ट्रीयकरण का प्रस्ताव रखा है मैं उसके समर्थन में चन्द शब्द कहने के लिए खड़ी हुई हूँ।

हमारे बहुत से माननीय सदस्यों ने अपनी अपनी दलीलें दी हैं, अपने विचार

†[] Hindi transliteration.

रखे हैं और जहाँ तक उनके विचारों की बात है मैं यह बात मान कर चलती हूँ कि हमारी माननीय सदस्या ने जो विचार व्यक्त किये हैं और जिन कारणों की वजह से राष्ट्रीयकरण के लिए जोर दिया है वही बात उन्होंने रखी है। बाद में उन्होंने कहा है हम राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं चाहते।

यह सही बात है कि आज हमारा जो चल चित्र उद्योग है उसमें बुराईया और दोष आ रहे हैं। उसके बहुत से कारण हैं। एक कारण यह है कि इंसान एक इन्सान है उसमें कमजोरिया होती हैं। इन्सान कमजोरियों, बुराईयों की तरफ जल्दी झुकता है बजाय अच्छाईयों के। एक व्यापारी व्यापारी के दृष्टिकोण से फिल्म बनाता है कि उसमें उसे अधिक से अधिक लाभ हो। फिल्म इंडस्ट्री में भी व्यापारिक लोग फिल्म के निर्माण में इस दृष्टिकोण को सामने रखते हैं कि आया उसमें लाभ होगा या नहीं होगा। यह जानते हुए भी कि इसमें हमारे देश के ऊपर अच्छा असर नहीं पड़ेगा, आने वाली पीढ़ी के ऊपर अच्छा असर नहीं पड़ेगा, लेकिन चूँकि जो रकम उन्होंने फसा रखी है उसका कैसे ज्यादा से ज्यादा फायदा हो यह दृष्टिकोण वे अपने सामने रखते हैं। जैसा मैंने निवेदन किया, मनुष्य की कमजोरी है उस कमजोरी का फायदा उठाते हुए अपने को ज्यादा से ज्यादा सफलता मिले, ज्यादा बिजनेस में फायदा हो, लोग किस तरह के सिनेमा देखेंगे, इस दृष्टिकोण से लोग फिल्में बनाते हैं और उसी का असर आज यह हो रहा है। आप देखती होंगी गली गली में, कूचे कूचे में। किसी चाय की दुकान पर चले जाइये, रेडियो पर जो गाने आते हैं हमारे बच्चे वही सुनते हैं और फिर घर में गुनगुनाते हैं। अगर पूछा जाय तो उसका अर्थ नहीं समझते। चूँकि गुनगुनाते रहते हैं इसलिए गाने के बाद उनके ऊपर असर भी पड़ता है।

श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र : यह कहाँ से सुनते हैं।

श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी जो फिल्मों में गाने गाये जाते हैं ।

श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र कहा सुनते हैं, चाय की दुकान पर ।

श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी दुकानों पर, घर पर और फिल्में देखने जाते हैं । कुछ माननीय सदस्य भी जो फिल्में देखने जाते हैं और घर में आकर गुनगुनाने बैठ जाते हैं वह भी बच्चे सुन लते हैं इस तरह की सारी बातें होती हैं जिनका हमारे बच्चों पर असर पड़ता है । बहुत सी फिल्में ऐसी भी हैं जिनकी वजह से हम आने वाली पीढ़ी का जो अनुशासन सिखाना चाहते हैं वह नहीं सिखा पाते । यह सही बात है कि फिल्म का मुख्य उद्देश्य होना चाहिए कि हम आगे आने वाली पीढ़ी को बनाये, हम फिल्म के द्वारा अच्छी से अच्छी शिक्षा दे सकें, हम नन्हें नन्हें बच्चों को बता सकें कि उन्हें किस तरह की शिक्षा लेनी चाहिए, टेक्नीकल चीजें उसमें बताई जाय, असली और सही कला हम समाज के सामने रख सकें, न कि छोटे किस्म की चीजें उनके सामने रखें । यह, माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदया, तभी सम्भव है जब राष्ट्रीयकरण हो, सरकार इसे अपने हाथ में ले । भले ही हम यह मानते हैं, इसमें उनको बड़ी कठिनाइयाँ आएंगी जब हम अपने विचारों को बदलेंगे । आज मनुष्य की जो मनोवृत्ति है हमारी और हमारे समाज की फिल्म देखने की जिस तरह की मनोवृत्ति है अगर उसके विपरीत चित्र बनायेंगे, राष्ट्रीयता उनमें दिखायेंगे, बच्चों के सामने अच्छे चित्र लायेंगे तो उसमें घाटा भी हो सकता है शुरू में, नुकसान भी हो सकता है । लेकिन उन सब घाटों और नुकसानों को मद्देनजर न रखते हुए हमें राष्ट्र का चरित्र बनाना है, हमें राष्ट्र को आगे ले जाना है आगे आने वाली पीढ़ी के लिए कुछ शिक्षा देनी है ।

हमारे बहुत से माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा, जैसा कि याजी जी ने भी इस बात को कहा और मैं भी इस बात को मानती हूँ कि हमारे बहुत से कलाकार आगे नहीं आ पाते । क्या आप यह मानते हैं कि फिल्म इंडस्ट्री में गुटबाजी नहीं चलती है ? वहाँ तो बड़ी गुटबाजी चलती है, वहाँ लोग अपने रिश्तेदारों को, अपने लोगों को आगे आने देते हैं जो कि कला के नाम पर उसका अब म भी नहीं जानते हैं और अच्छे से अच्छे कलाकार जिनको चास मिलना चाहिए उनको नहीं मिलता है । तो मैं चाहती हूँ कि सरकार इसका राष्ट्रीयकरण करे, क्योंकि यदि ऐसा हो सके तो अच्छे लोगों को, योग्य कलाकारों को और हर एक को पूरा मौका मिलेगा ।

जहाँ माननीय सदस्य ने एक शायर की तारीफ की वहाँ मैं कहूँगी कि कि आज भी उनकी कमी नहीं है, हमारे यहाँ आज की मधुशाला लिखने वाले मौजूद हैं लेकिन मुश्किल यह है कि हम उनकी इज्जत करना भूल गये हैं, हम पुराने इतिहास के पन्ने उलटा करते हैं और हमारी आगे देखने की आदत नहीं है । आज जो अच्छे अच्छे कवि हैं कलाकार हैं, लेखक हैं उनको पहचानना है और उन्हें आगे लाना है । यह हमें करना है और उनको इसमें पूरा मौका दिया जाना चाहिए । आज बहुत से लेखकों द्वारा अच्छी से अच्छी कहानी लिखकर दी जाती है लेकिन उसको रिजेक्ट कर दिया जाता है और वही कहानी कुछ अदल बदल कर अपने गुट के लोगों के नाम से पिक्चर में आती है और समाज में आती है और उन नये कलाकारों को कोई प्रोत्साहन नहीं मिलता है और वह चिल्लाने रहते हैं । अगर फिल्म उद्योग का राष्ट्रीयकरण हो तो सरकार इन सब चीजों को ध्यान में रखेगी और अच्छे अच्छे लेखकों को, साहित्यकारों को, कलाकारों को मौका मिलेगा, मेरा कहना यही है ।

[श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी]

एक बहुत दुख की बात है। मालूम नहीं हमारे सेंसर बोर्डों में जो व्यक्ति हैं, कौन से सदस्य लोग हैं, मेरा उनसे बहुत विनम्र निवेदन है कि जब उनके सामने फिल्में आती हैं तो वह क्या सोच समझ कर उसको पास करते हैं जिनमें बड़ी से बड़ी अश्लील चीजें होती हैं जिनका हमारे ऊपर, हमारे बच्चों के ऊपर और उनके स्वयं के ऊपर बुरा असर आने वाला है उनको वह नहीं देखते हैं। उसको वह क्यों नहीं देखते हैं। यह उन्हें देखना चाहिए और समझना चाहिए। सेंसर बोर्ड के काम से मुझे अति असंतोष है। उसमें सुधार होना चाहिए। बहुत अच्छी से अच्छी फिल्में होती हैं उनमें कहीं न कहीं कोई नुक्ताचीनी लगा देते हैं और रद्दी से रद्दी फिल्म पास हो जाती है। उनका इतना एडवर्टाइजमेंट होता है, इतना सारा प्रचार होता है कि उन पर लाखों करोड़ों रुपया खर्च कर दिया जाता है। केवल प्रचार पर इतना अधिक खर्च होता है और इस पर जो रुपया और पैसा खर्च किया जाता है उससे रद्दी से रद्दी फिल्में ऐसी हो जाती हैं कि उनसे बिजनेसमैन को ज्यादा से ज्यादा पैसा मिलता है और भोग ज्यादा से ज्यादा उसको देखा चाहते हैं और जैसा कि मैंने पहले बताया है कि मनुष्य में एक कमजोरी है और उस कमजोरी का लोग बराबर फायदा उठाते हैं।

माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, और भी बहुत सी चीजें कहने को थी। लेकिन शमा और परवाना ये सारी चीजें ऐसी हैं कि क्या कहा जाय कौन शमा है कि कौन परवाना है। कहा गया कि परवाना शमा पर आकर जले तो क्या हो। हर एक पुरुष, हर एक मनुष्य अपने घर में शमा और परवाना है लेकिन यह जरूरी नहीं है कि हर जगह शमा और परवाना बने। आज समाज में भाई और बहन के नाते दृढ़ करने हैं, पति और पत्नी के, नस्ल को सुदृढ़ करना

है, राष्ट्र के चरित्र को सुदृढ़ करना है और हमें बताना है कि हमारे देश में एक गांव की लड़की दूसरे गांव में उसी तरह बहन की तरह पूजी जाती है। आज विदेशों की बुराइयों को हम लेने लगे हैं तो इन बुराइयों को हम दूर करें, अगर विदेश की कोई चीज अच्छी है तो उसका लेना बुरा मैं नहीं मानती लेकिन हमें अपनी संस्कृति को देखना है कि हम अपनी संस्कृति को, हम अपनी परम्परा को भूल जायें इससे ज्यादा दुर्भाग्य की और कोई चीज नहीं होगी और इसमें सबसे अधिक दोषी आज की फिल्म इंडस्ट्री है जो केवल अपने फायदे की दृष्टि से बनाती है।

इन शब्दों के साथ, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस बात का समर्थन करती हूं कि फिल्म इंडस्ट्री का राष्ट्रीयकरण हो ताकि उसमें सुधार हो, उसमें राष्ट्रीयता हो और हमारी आगे आने वाली पीढ़ी के लिए अनुशासन और राष्ट्र के प्रति जागरूकता मिले। धन्यवाद !

SHRI A. D. MANI: Madam Vice-Chairman, I was surprised when my hon. friend Dr. Talwar placed this Resolution for the consideration of the House. Now, nationalisation has become a part of unfortunately, our national thinking.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Distorted thinking.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Yes, distorted thinking. The hang-over of the doctrines of the Fabian Society of Great Britain is still hanging over our country. We think nationalisation is a solution for any problem. If articles are not sold at moderate rates we think of having super bazaars in every city. We do not know how these super bazaars are going to function, but that is a different matter. I wish the mover of the Resolution had pointed out where nationalisation has been an effective success in our country. It has been an effective success in the defence industry. The Hindusthan

Machine Tools has a creditable record of performance. So also the Hindusthan Antibiotics. We have also made a success of our Railways which are a national undertaking of considerable scale. But we have not succeeded in many other projects. All our Plans have been based on anticipation of expected profits from public sector industries which have not materialised.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE:
Have you any vested interest?

SHRI A. D. MANI: Yes, I have the vested interest and that is that art should be free and there should be individual initiative in art. I am not ashamed of it. If the hon. Member, the mover had shown that nationalisation has been a success in the economic sphere, she could have advanced some argument that the film industry also should be nationalised. But all her arguments put forward in support of the Resolution related to posters and so on. She spoke about posters which are shocking. She has spoken also about various scenes in films that offend her ideas. Madam, we live in a fast changing world. In the days when I was a young boy I used to see Charlie Chaplain in the silent movies. In those days long coats were being worn. But these are days of short coats now, and of mini skirts and exposed legs. There has been a great revolution going on in the minds of young people all over the world. They are tired of established customs and they do not want to conform to what their parents would like them to conform to. They feel that they should change. There is a great change in the modes of thinking of people. Madam, I am one of those who feel that in the realm of art there should be no unnecessary restrictions. I do not support obscenity. Obscenity is being taken care of in a separate Bill which is being discussed by a Select Committee of which I happen to be a member. I do not want obscene posters. But we should not shudder at the idea of amorous scenes being enacted in films. Many years ago

when the Indian Cinematograph Bill was under discussion in the Central Assembly of those days, Sri Sri Prakasha astounded the House by saying that Indian husbands are not supposed to kiss their wives in films. A number of Englishmen asked him if it was true that Indian husbands do not kiss their wives. I do not know why even kissing scenes are cut out from the films. I do not suggest that promiscuous kissing should be there. But why should we ban kissing scenes from being shown in Indian pictures? I am interested in freeing art from inhibitions. I feel that artists must be allowed to express their talents in films.

I would like to say that I am not satisfied with the performance of the Indian film industry. Many of the films which are now produced are, more or less, a replica of the films produced in Hollywood, and a very poor replica too. They do not contain any message of consequence. They do not entertain. They are interminably long and they are loaded with songs which we do not find in Hollywood pictures, except in musicals. I would like the Indian films to improve in quality so that we can get an export market for them. I wish all encouragement should be given to Indian artistes, actors, scenario writers, play writers, to go abroad on government expense so that they may acquire the technique of proper production of films from Hollywood and other places.

Madam, I would like to say this further, that in regard to the nationalisation of the film industry we must bear this in mind that already the All India Radio is under the control of the Government and this has led to considerable protests in various quarters that the Opposition's view is not properly presented on the radio. I do not share that view. The Opposition is certainly given some chance to express its views, but not directly. It is the All India Radio which summarises the Opposition's views. There may be fuller broadcasts put out and I am not happy that the All India

[Shri A D Mani.]

Radio should be under the Government. The All India Radio is a vital means of communication in the country and a suggestion has been made by the Chanda Committee . . .

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Did you get at least a minute yesterday? I was not in the House yesterday, but you were in the House. Did you get one minute? No. It was all the Prime Minister's speech.

SHRI A D MANI: I was not able to listen to the radio last night. Unfortunately I was preoccupied. I understand the All India Radio puts out the point of view of the Opposition. I have listened to them myself. But I did not listen to last night's transmission. If it is true that only the Prime Minister's speech has been given out and not the Opposition point of view it is a matter to be regretted and I hope the All India Radio will improve its performance in regard to this matter.

Now the documentaries are produced. They are very good documentaries and they do credit to the Government and also to this country. Some of the documentaries that are produced reflect great artistic skill and I would like to offer not one bouquet but many bouquets to the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting but even with regard to these documentaries objection is often heard that only Government views get a major share of publicity. If the Prime Minister or the Vice-President of India for whom all of us have got great respect or the President of India takes part in any function it is filmed and portrayed on the screen.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Or if a Minister opens a cafeteria.

SHRI A D MANI: Or if a Minister opens a cafeteria that also is exhibited. And these documentaries are being exhibited compulsorily on the Indian screen by an amendment of the Indian Cinematograph Act. There has been a good deal of objection to

such compulsory exhibition of documentaries. I do not want therefore when the All India Radio is already in the hands of the Government that one more medium of publicity in the form of the film industry should go into the hands of Government.

Now, Madam, it is necessary for the House to examine the implications of nationalisation. The moment the film industry is nationalised, its account and activities come within the control of the Estimates Committee of Parliament; they come within the control of the Public Accounts Committee. Madam, the hon. the mover of the Resolution talked of black market money being passed on to film stars. I know that a number of film stars get much more than what they show in the actual returns submitted to the Income-tax Department but even in regard to this matter there is a feeling that the Government is unduly soft to film stars. When the house of the film star, Miss Mala Sinha, was raided in Bombay, thousands of rupees were found and . . .

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Twenty lakhs.

SHRI A D MANI: Twenty lakhs of rupees were found stacked in her bath room and there was a good deal of publicity for the action taken by the Enforcement Directorate but what has happened since that time?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I can give you that information if I can interrupt you. Miss Mala Sinha's house was raided and Rs. 20 lakhs were found out of which she had to pay a fine of Rs. 18 lakhs odd and the balance of one lakh was refunded to her while in the case of Mr. Biju Patnaik even though Rs. 45 lakhs was found from his residence, not a pie he had to pay and he has all the Rs. 45 lakhs with him.

SHRI A. D. MANI: My information is that in that case Miss Mala Sinha

put up a very valid defence from the legal point of view for the possession of lakhs of rupees in her house and no action was taken

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Action has been taken

SHRI A. D. MANI: I am very glad that some action has been taken but

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Action to the tune of Rs 18 lakhs.

SHRI A. D. MANI: That may be. The film starts get much more money than what they show in their returns but the way to get over this problem, to solve this difficulty, is not the nationalisation of the film industry but to see that the Enforcement Directorate of the Ministry of Finance works far more efficiently than it does at present.

Madam, I may draw the attention of the House that in regard to the nationalisation of text-books which has been attempted by State Governments the experiment has not been a conspicuous success. In the State of Jammu and Kashmir where the text-books have been nationalised 300 mistakes figure in the errata. When that has been the performance of the State Governments in regard to art and literature—I would not say production of text-books comes within literature but it comes within reading material—then we have to ask ourselves whether we should advise the Government to nationalise the film industry. I would say therefore that in the interests of art, in the interests of the development of individual initiative we should leave the film industry in the hands of private producers, in the hands of private capital, in the hands of private story writers. We do not want story writers for the films to be recruited by the Union Public Service Commission. I know my hon. friend, Mr. Lokanath Misra, was himself a distinguished actor in his time.

AN HON MEMBER: He was a failure

SHRI A. D. MANI: He was a success; he was a more handsome man then than he is at present. He knows

about Indian films and also he is associated in some indirect way with the Indian film industry more as a friend than as an actual participant at the present time. Madam, I would like to say that the Indian producers should be asked to improve their standards and they should be asked to evolve a code of ethics for the film industry. I may inform the hon. the mover of the Resolution that when I was in Hollywood some years ago I had made enquiries about the working of the film code in the United States and one of the articles in their film code says that in no good film should it be shown that wrong has triumphed over right. You will never see in any western film produced in America or in the United Kingdom a murderer getting away scot-free or a person who has robbed a bank becoming a Member of Parliament. They always show that wrong doing is finally punished by God.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: In India in actual life those people also become Chief Ministers.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I do not know. I would like therefore that the film industry should be encouraged to have a code of its own. The film industry must be told that production of Indian films is not satisfactory, that they are below the mark, that they pander to the vulgar taste and that they should conform to that code if they expect any financial assistance from the Government in regard to the allocation of foreign exchange. That is the only way in which the film industry can be asked to give a better account of itself. I therefore feel that the hon. the mover of the Resolution should withdraw her proposition and allow the film industry to be in the hands of private initiative as it is in all countries in the world excepting in those countries which are under authoritarian forms of Government.

SHRIMATI LALITHA (RAJA-GOPALAN): Madam, at the outset I would like to state that although the Resolution has been moved by a colleague of mine, I differ from her and

[Shrimati Lalitha Rajagopal'an.]

I do not support the nationalisation of the film industry. I think nowhere in the world including even the U. S. S. R. where of course the Government has more voice in the film industry has this been nationalised. I do not think that nationalisation is advisable. I would suggest to Mrs. Talwar, instead of bringing this Resolution for nationalisation of the film industry if she had brought forward a Resolution suggesting ways and means of improving the film industry in the country I think the Government would have really appreciated that attitude.

Coming to the question of nationalisation, I think more than two lakhs of people will be affected as mentioned by Mr. Yajee although of course I do not agree with him on the main question of nationalisation. In the circumstances, in the environment and in the situation in which we find ourselves today I think nationalisation of the film industry is something that cannot be thought of.

Of course the film industry in India has made very rapid strides since its inception. The proof of the pudding is in the eating and we find we are winning so many international awards. Particularly the name of Mr. Satyajit Ray is very popular in the continent and in America. We know that and we are proud of it. I also find from the African Delegations of which I was a member that our Indian films are very popular there and in fact the people there are starving for Indian films. So the film industry has done a very good job but there is more to do. At present the trend in the industry regarding production of films is not in the right direction in certain matters. There are many reasons attributed to this. Firstly I will say that nationalisation of the film industry will really have an adverse effect. The private producers should be given all help by the Government financially as well as materially in producing good films. I find that the production during 1965 of Hindi

pictures—of course it is combined with other languages—was about 107, Tamil 56 and Telugu 50. I am sorry to say this, and I entirely agree with Mrs. Chaturvedi and Mrs. Talwar, that the standard of Hindi films has gone down very much. This has been a criticism by almost all the speakers. But the point is this. They should also realise why the standard of films has fallen. It is because the producers are only after box office hits and they want to get hold of only the top-notch stars. At the same time one cannot forget the fact that people are so much fed with the new, modern trend films, which show the Western ideas more than our culture. Whenever Satyajit Ray's films or other good Hindi films are shown, you will always see that the house is full. People flock to see such films. Everyone would like to see something which depicts our culture also. You cannot deny that fact. Only a section of the people are after these obscene films.

I am happy to say that the institution of the national and State awards has really done a good thing. Producers, some of them at least, are tempted to produce films which depict our culture, which depict our art and which depict our heritage. I will not blame the producers entirely for this. The producers lack finance firstly and secondly the star value is there. Government should take care to see that they give them proper finance and see that they produce good films. I think this can also be improved and there should be no place for middlemen and distributors in the film industry. I would like to know from the Government how far the film Finance Corporation has been able to help producers, how many have actually applied for help and how many have been benefited.

Secondly, I come to the star value. This absolutely places a producer at the mercy of the stars. They demand fabulous sums of money. I entirely agree with Mr. Mani regarding measures against black money. Of course, black money is there. Whenever the

stars sign their contracts, they show only half the sum. If they get four lakhs, they sign a contract for Rs. 2 lakhs and Rs. 2 lakhs goes as black money. In this connection I make bold to suggest to the Government that some sort of legislation should be brought forward to fix the maximum that a star should get for acting in a film. This will solve the problem of black money, which is now a parasite in the film industry. Also, this will set a sort of code of conduct and procedure for the stars as well as the producers.

I come to the next point, censorship. In this respect I regretfully say that it is not functioning in the right direction. The reason for this, I think is, there are members on the Censor Board who have no knowledge or interest in films nor are they connected with them. It is only a question of influence that one gets in the Censor Board. I am of opinion that the Board should consist of only members who have a full knowledge of the industry and who have a real aptitude for films. If this suggestion is accepted I think it will alleviate their troubles to a certain extent.

Then, I come to the censoring of films. Censoring of films differs from State to State. We should adhere to some strict standards and the censorship should be as rigid as possible. In this connection I would like to refer to my State. In my State many producers and film artistes, as I have repeatedly said in this House, are from the DMK and this is a very good medium for them to put forward their politics. Tamil is one of the oldest languages and full of pun and satire. One word contains three meanings. I very well remember when my husband was on the Board of Censors. He went to witness a film in which the late N. S. Krishnan acted and there was one sentence in the dialogue. 'Let us all go to Russia. It is a very prosperous country.' In those days our relations with Russia were not as good as they are now. It said, 'Let us go to Russia where the people

are good, where the people are happy.' This was objected to by my husband. When this was conveyed to the producers, they changed the word to 'Ruchia', which means tasteful. 'Ruchia' is 'Russia' in Tamil. 'Ruchia' also means tasteful in Tamil. So, one cannot object to it, because it conveys two meanings. It does not mean only 'Russia'. It can mean 'tasteful' also. This is the way they did it. They have pun in Tamil language and this has been used to the fullest extent by the DMK people up till now. Then, another thing I would like to say is that in our Tamil films, most of the songs are full of DMK politics. I would even go to the extent of saying that in the pictures produced by the DMK people the costumes are in red and black. Even some pictures show their flag before they show their films. This is the State of affairs. Another point I would like to stress is this because these pictures are sent only to the rural areas where they have the cinemas shown in tents. It has a sort of mass influence over them and as soon as they just hear the name of M.G. Ramachandran the whole theatre roars with applause. It has a sort of mass impact on them. This is a very good opportunity for them to put forward their political ideas through this.

Now, I come back to the constitution of the Censor Board. I have already mentioned it while speaking on Mr. Bhargava's Resolution, but I feel I have to say it again that they should be men of merit and not influence. It is always the practice that a retired government official or a lawyer is chosen, as a member of the Censor Board. In their life-time they have not had time to witness a cinema or they have no idea of a cinema. If these people are taken as members, how do you expect them to go through the thing and understand the implications of the whole thing? I will not be surprised if there are some members on the Regional Boards who do not know the regional

[Shrimati Lalitha Rajagopalan.]

language, who have no knowledge of Tamil.

I come to one more point before I conclude. As very rightly pointed out by Mr. Lokanath Misra, the plight of the film artistes and others is very bad and I entirely agree with him that only the top-notice stars are able to live well. The others are living in absolute poverty. In this connection I would like to say that self-employed people should also have some protection given to them say in the form of a pens on scheme or whatever it is, as suggested by Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari in his time, so that it could be used during old age or even when a calamity happens to them. Then before I conclude, Madam, I would like to say one or two things as regards our production of documentaries and other things. Somebody was suggesting just now that our policies are not clearly brought out, but my point is that we are producing documentaries and these documentaries are exhibited in foreign countries also, and we are securing international awards. I think Government is putting its policies through the documentaries and the Films Division and is doing really remarkable work.

Then I come to Mr. Chordia's point. He said about classical music. He said that during Dr. Keskar's time classical music was encouraged. I do not deny it. It was Dr. Keskar who brought classical music, who gave importance to classical music. He also said another thing. He accused that after Dr. Keskar's regime, because of Vividh Bharati and Sugam Sangit classical music had receded into the background. But I would like to point out to him that it was during Dr. Keskar's time that Vividh Bharati was also introduced just to divert listeners from Radio Ceylon and it really gained good ground. I do not think there is any point in saying that just because of Vividh Bharati the classical music has receded into the background. But I would also

like to point out that after Dr. Keskar's departure there is a setback to classical music not because of any change in policy or anything but because we had the Chinese aggression, the Pakistani aggression; there was economy, there was austerity, there was no exchange of artists from one State to the other. But now I think the situation is calm. Last time in the Music Festival, Sangit Sammelan I found that none of the artists from the South or any other place was brought here, and we were only hearing the North Indian people. When you say you want national integration and integration of different States, unless you bring in artists from other States and you send artists from here to other States, it is not possible for you to develop your culture in any sphere. I think this should be given thought of now and there should be interchange of more artists between different States.

Then I come to the other point of posters which was mentioned by Mrs. Mangladevi Talwar as well as Mrs. Chaturvedi. I do entirely agree with them and I have been fighting since I came here in Parliament about these posters, and I also apprised the Prime Minister about this. The Prime Minister told me that at present they had no legislation and they were consulting the Law Ministry regarding this. I have been waiting for a decision from the Government, and I do not know whether the Law Ministry have been consulted and whether the Government have come to some sort of decision regarding this, or whether the atmosphere is going to be like this and we are going to be more and more influenced by this kind of obscene posters. It is all left to the Government to decide. I hope the Government will in course of time at least take some measures to see that this kind of posters are not there. I think the Law Minister himself is here, and I am making an appeal to him to go into this matter and do something about it.

श्री जगन्नाथ प्रसाद पहाड़िया (राजस्थान) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदया, फिल्मों के राष्ट्रीयकरण के सम्बन्ध में पक्ष विपक्ष दोनों की बातें हम ने सुनी । मैं स्वयं इस भ्रम में पड़ गया हूँ दोनों तरफ की बातें सुनने के बाद कि मैं किस को कहूँ कि कौन सी बात सही है और कौन सी गलत । लेकिन सब से पहले जहाँ से मैं अपनी बात शुरू करना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि फिल्म का मतलब किसी का प्रतिबिम्ब है, ठीक उसी तरह से आज हमारे इस सदन में भी हमारे माननीय मंत्री श्री पट्टाभिरामन् हैं क्योंकि न यहाँ फिल्म के मंत्री महोदय है, न उपमंत्री महोदया है; उनके प्रतिबिम्ब के रूप में यहाँ पट्टाभिरामन् जी बैठे हुए हैं । तो जिस तरह से श्री पट्टाभिरामन् जी उनके प्रतिबिम्ब की तरह बैठे हुए हैं, ठीक उसी तरह से इस फिल्म के अन्दर कुछ दिमाग काम करते हैं, कुछ व्यक्ति काम करते हैं और उनकी छाया सारे देश में, सारे संसार में फैलती है । मैं इसकी गहराई में नहीं जाऊँगा क्योंकि यह मामला बहुत टेकनिकल है ।

लेकिन जो बातें यहाँ कही गई हैं उनसे कुछ ऐसा लगता है कि राष्ट्रीयकरण के बीच का कोई रास्ता निकालना ही पड़ेगा । सम्भव है कि राष्ट्रीयकरण से फिल्म उद्योग को बहुत नुकसान पहुँचने वाला हो और मैं समझता हूँ कि शायद पहुँचे भी । लेकिन तर्क जो दिये गये हैं वे मेरी समझ में नहीं आये । एक बात यह कही गई कि फिल्मों का राष्ट्रीयकरण अगर कर दिया जाय—मैं फिल्म उद्योग के राष्ट्रीयकरण की बात कर रहा हूँ, अन्य व्यवसाय और धन्धों के राष्ट्रीयकरण की बात नहीं कर रहा हूँ—तो उससे किसी के व्यवसाय की स्वतंत्रता को हानि पहुँचेगी और यह हमारे विधान में निहित है और विधान का उल्लंघन नहीं होना चाहिये; किसी के व्यवसाय को नहीं छीनना चाहिये । लेकिन सब व्यवसायों पर यह लागू नहीं किया जा सकता । खास तौर पर फिल्म ऐसा व्यवसाय है जिसके बारे में हम को सोचना ही पड़ेगा और यह भी

सोचना पड़ेगा कि कौन सा व्यवसाय राष्ट्रीयकरण के लायक है और कौन सा व्यवसाय राष्ट्रीयकरण के लायक नहीं है । मेरी राय ऐसी बनती है कि अगर इससे व्यवसायों की स्वतंत्रता को हानि पहुँचती है तो चोरी करना भी एक व्यवसाय है, डाका डालना भी एक व्यवसाय है, जेब काटना भी एक व्यवसाय है ।

श्री अर्जुन शरोड़ा (उत्तर प्रदेश) : यह बहुत अच्छा व्यवसाय है ।

श्री जगन्नाथ प्रसाद पहाड़िया : जब आप चोर को पकड़ते हैं तो उसके व्यवसाय की स्वतंत्रता छिन जाती है, जब आप डाकुओं को पकड़ते हैं तो उनके व्यवसाय की स्वतंत्रता छिन जाती है । लेकिन यदि आप चोर की स्वतंत्रता को नहीं छीनते हैं तो आप को समाज बुरा कहता है और दुनिया यह बात कहती है कि सरकार को ऐसा इन्तजाम करना चाहिये जिससे देश के अन्दर चोरी का व्यवसाय बन्द हो जाय । मुझे तो ज्यादा जानकारी नहीं है, लेकिन ठीक उसी तरह से कहा जाता है कि इस फिल्म उद्योग में काफी भ्रष्टाचार होता है, काफी गड़बड़ घोटाला होता है । तो यह कहना कि किसी व्यवसाय विशेष का नेशनलाइजेशन करने से उस व्यवसाय की स्वतंत्रता को हानि पहुँचेगी, इससे मैं पूर्णतया सहमत नहीं हूँ । मैं सब व्यवसायों की बात नहीं कर रहा हूँ, मैं सिर्फ फिल्म व्यवसाय की बात कर रहा हूँ क्योंकि बहुत से व्यवसाय ऐसे हैं जिन में प्रतियोगिता होती है और उस प्रतियोगिता के कारण नई नई चीजें निकल सकती हैं और उनका राष्ट्रीयकरण करने से हो सकता है कि जनता को नुकसान पहुँचे ।

एक तर्क यह दिया गया है कि कला का राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं किया जा सकता । यह सुन कर मैं भ्रम में पड़ जाता हूँ, लेकिन इतिहास के पन्ने पलट कर अगर हम देखें तो कुछ ऐसा लगता है कि राजाओं और

[श्री जगन्नाथ प्रसाद पहाड़िया]

बादशाहों के समय में यदि पूर्ण नहीं तो अर्ध रूप से कला का राष्ट्रीयकरण अवश्य था। साहित्यिकों के कवि दरबार तो मेरे खयाल से पहले राजाओं महाराजाओं के यहां ही हुआ करते थे और जनता के दरबार उस समय हुआ करते थे, ऐसी बात सुनने में नहीं आई। हो सकता है कि ऐसा मेरी जानकारी में न हो। कला भी कई प्रकार की है और सब कलाओं का राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं हो सकता, इस बात को भी मैं मंजूर करूंगा। जिसकी जो मर्जी चाये, वह उसको उसी तरह से करे, क्या इसी को कला माना जायेगा? जिनका मैंने पहले उदाहरण दिया, क्या वे भी कला हैं? क्या संग्रहप्रत्यंग का प्रदर्शन करना भी एक व्यवसाय है? यदि ऐसा है तो एक ऐसा और व्यवसाय है जिसको मैं अपने शब्दों में यहां पर कह नहीं सकता . . .

श्री अर्जुन खरोड़ा : वगैरह कहे कैसे मालूम होगा।

श्री जगन्नाथ प्रसाद पहाड़िया : अगर नहीं समझते तो उसको रंडीबाजी बगैरह कहते हैं। यदि इस व्यवसाय को भी बन्द किया जायगा तो कला का नाम सामने शायद आ जायेगा। आज हम देखते हैं कि नृत्य और संगीत के नाम पर कितने ऐसे केन्द्र खुले हुए हैं, जिनमें नृत्य और संगीत के नाम पर कुछ और व्यवसाय होता रहता है और कानून के अनुसार उनको बन्द किया जा सकता है लेकिन नृत्य और संगीत के नाम पर उनका कारोबार चलता रहता है।

एक भावनीय सदस्य : क्या गाना भी बन्द कर दिया जाय?

श्री जगन्नाथ प्रसाद पहाड़िया : गाना अवश्य हो, लेकिन गाने के नाम से दूसरा काम नहीं हो। इसलिये मेरा निवेदन है कि अगर ऐसी कोई कला हो जो कि समाज को नुकसान देने वाली हो और हमारे सामाजिक जीवन पर असर डालने वाली हो तो उस कला का

यदि राष्ट्रीयकरण कर दिया जाय तो उसमें मुझे कोई एतराज नहीं होगा। मैं समझता हूं कि इस कला में कितनी ही बातें ऐसी आती हैं जिनका अगर हम राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं कर सकते तो उन पर प्रतिबन्ध लगाना पड़ेगा। और अगर हमने राष्ट्रीयकरण करने के साथ साथ दूसरी बातों की ओर ध्यान नहीं दिया तो हो सकता है कि हमारा यह राष्ट्रीयकरण भी उसी तरह विफल हो जाय जैसे और क्षेत्रों में हुआ है और जिनका उदाहरण भुवालका जी ने दिया। वैसे वे अलग बातें हैं, उनमें कुछ कमियां हो सकती हैं, कुछ खराबियां हो सकती हैं, सरकारी अफसरों का कुछ गड़बड़ हो सकता है। उनको भी सुधारा जा सकता है, लेकिन थोड़ा थोड़ा। मैं उनके मत से सहमत हो जाता हूं जब सरकारी उद्योगों की रिपोर्ट हमारे सामने आती है।

एक बात यह कही गई है कि प्रतियोगिता बन्द हो जायगी अगर फिल्म उद्योग का राष्ट्रीयकरण कर दिया गया। मैं इसका एक रास्ता सुझाना चाहता हूं। वह रास्ता है कोऑपरेटिव सोसायटीज का, सहकारिता का, सहकारिता के आधार पर, जिसमें न व्यक्तियों की स्वतन्त्रता की हानि होगी, न व्यक्ति विशेष के व्यवसाय छिनेगे और न सरकार को उसका राष्ट्रीयकरण करना पड़ेगा। कुछ उद्योगपति जो इस उद्योग में लगे हुए हैं वे अपना पैसा लगाधें मिलजुल कर। मैं सहकारिता की बात इसलिए करता हूं कि जब कुछ व्यक्ति विशेष मिलेंगे तो अपना स्वार्थ नहीं देखेंगे। उसके साथ साथ राष्ट्रीय-हित को भी देखेंगे, सामाजिक स्तर को भी देखेंगे और इस बात को भी देखेंगे कि हमारी फिल्में जो बनाई जाये उनसे हमारे इस संस्थान का नाम आगे बढ़े, न कि किसी व्यक्ति विशेष का। क्योंकि व्यक्ति के अन्दर अपना नाम कमाते की जो भावना होती है, पिपासा होती है वह उस व्यक्ति को नीचा दिखाने का रास्ता भी सुझाती है।

श्री रामकुमार भुवालका : पहाड़िया जी मुझे माफ करेंगे। फिल्म में किसी एक व्यक्ति का पैसा नहीं लगता, सामूहिक रूप से पैसा लगता है।

श्री जगन्नाथ प्रसाद पहाड़िया : मुझे मालूम नहीं किस रूप में लगता है। मैंने एक रास्ता सुझाया है। अगर ऐसी हालत है तो मुझे कोई एतराज नहीं, लेकिन माना यह जाता है कि प्रोड्यूसर का पैसा लगता है। प्रोड्यूसर कोई व्यक्ति विशेष होता है कोई कोआपरेटिव सोसायटी या कारपोरेशन नहीं सुना मैंने अब तक। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्रीमती ताराबाई साठे) : ऐसी एक कोआपरेटिव सोसायटी बन चुकी है।

श्री जगन्नाथ प्रसाद पहाड़िया : एक सोसायटी बन चुकी है, यह मेरी नालिज में भी है। ऐसी और सोसायटियाँ बनें तो काम बढ़ेगा।

यह तर्क दिया गया है कि प्रतियोगिता बन्द हो जायेगी कला के राष्ट्रीयकरण से। कला का राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं होगा तब भी प्रतियोगिता बन्द नहीं होगी क्योंकि विभिन्न सोसायटियाँ मिल कर काम करने लगेंगी। राष्ट्रीयकरण भी हो जाय तब भी मैं समझता हूँ कि प्रतियोगिता बन्द नहीं होगी क्योंकि विभिन्न राज्य सरकारें अपनी सोसायटियाँ बनायेगी या कुछ कारपोरेशन बनेंगे सरकार के, वे आपस में प्रतियोगिता करेंगे। लेकिन अगर प्रतियोगिता को हानि पहुँचने वाली है, तो जैसा मैंने निवेदन किया, राष्ट्रीयकरण न कीजिए, कुछ व्यक्तियों को सामूहिक रूप से काम करने का मौका दीजिए। जहाँ तक मेरी जानकारी है, कितने ही लोग मेरे पास आए हैं, मैं नाम लेना पसन्द नहीं करूँगा, जिन्होंने कोआपरेटिव सोसायटी बनई और कोशिश की इस बात की कि सरकार से कुछ पैसा मिल जाय और यह पैसा लेकर फिल्म उद्योग को

आगे बढ़ाएँ, लेकिन उनको आज तक सफलता नहीं मिली। इस तरह जो कोआपरेटिव सोसायटियाँ बनीं वे भी आगे नहीं बढ़ी और कुछ व्यक्ति काम करते चले जा रहे हैं जिनकी आलोचना यहाँ पर बराबर होती है।

एक बात मैंने निवेदन की। उस सन्दर्भ में मैं यह कहना चाहूँगा कि इसके लिए बहुत कुछ जिम्मेदार है आपका फिल्म सेंसर बोर्ड। ऐसा समझा जाता है कि फिल्म सेंसर बोर्ड के जो मेम्बर नियुक्त किए जाते हैं वे कोई अन्धवक्ता के आधार पर नहीं किए जाते। जो मंत्रालय या जो डाइरेक्ट वे मन में आ जाय या जो व्यक्ति पसन्द आ जाय उसको वहाँ रख दिया जाता है। फिर फिल्म सेंसर बोर्ड के जो काम, जो डेफिनिट ड्यूटीज दी हुई हैं कि फिल्म को पास करते समय कितनी बातों का ध्यान रखना चाहिए उनका ध्यान ये लोग नहीं रखते। आधे से ज्यादा मेम्बर कभी उन फिल्मों को देखते भी नहीं, उनकी कहानी पढ़ते नहीं, उनके अन्दर क्या टेक्नीक की वाने हैं उन्हें नहीं देखते। अफसरान जो बैठे हुए हैं फिल्म सेंसर बोर्ड के वे मनमाने ढंग से फिल्मों को काटते हैं, पीटते हैं, पास करते हैं। कितनी ही फिल्में जा चीन के हमले के समय बनी थी, पाकिस्तान के हमले के समय भी बनीं जिनमें हमारी राष्ट्रीय भावनाओं को बढ़ावा दिया गया था और इस बात को दिखाया गया था कि चीन या पाकिस्तान जो हमारे दुश्मन हैं उन्होंने हमारे उपर गलत ढंग से हमला किया, उनकी गलत बातों को बताना चाहते थे हम फिल्म के जगिए से हिन्दुस्तान के रहने वाले लोगों को और हिन्दुस्तान के बाहर दुनिया के दूसरे लोगों को, लेकिन गेक दिया गया। एक बीच में अड़गल आ गया ताशकन्द समझौता। ताशकन्द समझौते का बितना पाज़न दिया जा रहा है पाकिस्तान के द्वारा वह अध्यक्षा जी, आप और सदन से छिपता हुआ नहीं है, लेकिन उसके नाम पर

[श्री जगन्नाथ प्रसाद पहाड़िया]

हमारी किन्ती ही फ़िल्मों का प्रदर्शन नहीं हुआ कितने ही कलाकारों ने जो अपनी कला का प्रदर्शन किया था अपना श्रम लगाया था टेलिन्ट लगाया था उसको रोक दिया गया। जिस भावना से रोक दिया गया था उससे हमारे दुश्मन को—जो आज भी हमारा दुश्मन है भारत सरकार मानती है या नहीं—उसको कोई नुकसान नहीं पहुँचा, लेकिन हमको जरूर नुकसान हो गया। इस लिए मेरा निवेदन है कि किमी खास फिल्म के हिन्दुस्तान में प्रदर्शन में अन्तर्गष्ट्रीय परिस्थिति खराब नहीं होती। आपको फिल्में विदेशों में नहीं जाती। अगर विदेशों में जाती है भी तो ऐसी फिल्में नहीं जाती। इसलिए क्योंकि अन्तर्गष्ट्रीय भावना पर असर पड़ेगा, कोई राष्ट्र आपसे नाराज हो जायगा इसलिए किसी फिल्म को रोक देना मेरी राय में अच्छी बात नहीं है।

इसके साथ ही साथ मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आज जितना भी मेटिरियल फिल्मों में लगता है वह अक्सर बाहर से आता है। फिल्म में काम करने वाले लोग बराबर इस बात की शिकायत करते हैं कि जितना फारेन एक्सचेंज हमको चाहिए उतना मिलता नहीं, जो चीजे चाहिए वे समय पर आती नहीं। इसलिए हमको बहुत दिनों तक फिल्मों की एक्टिंग को रोकना पड़ता है और नतीजा यह निकलता है कि जो कलाकार होते हैं वे मनमाने ढंग से पैसा मांगते हैं। एक-एक फिल्म के बनाने में साल दो साल लग जाते हैं, कलाकार अपना रुपया चाहता है। जैसा कि कहा गया है, उद्योगपति अपने ब्लैक मनी को भी उनको देते होंगे व्हाइट करने के लिए, लेकिन अगर व्हाइट करने को नहीं देते तो तब भी मैं समझता हूँ कि श्रम का बदला चुकाना पड़ता है, उसको पैसा तो देना पड़ता है। इसलिए जो मेटिरियल बाहर से मगाना पड़ता है जो फिल्मों में लगता है उसके कारखाने भारत सरकार खोल दे। इसका राष्ट्रीयकरण

करे, न करे, इसका राष्ट्रीयकरण जरूर करे। मैंने सुना है कि कितने ही उद्योगपतियों ने इस बात की दरखास्ते दी कि फिल्मों में जो मेटिरियल इस्तेमाल होता है उसके कारखाने बनाने की इजाजत दी जाय लेकिन उसमें रुकावट आ गई। पता नहीं कौन सा दबाव आ गया बाहर में या भीतर से या कोई परेशानी हो गई मुझे मालूम नहीं। इतना मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि फिल्मों के अन्दर स्वदेशी की भावना को पनपाना चाहिए। कुछ दिनों पहले हमारी प्रधान मंत्री जी ने इस बात का नारा लगाया था जब बड़ा प्रेशर हमारे ऊपर अनाज के बारे में आ रहा था तब जब हम अपना इम्पोर्ट बढ़ करना चाहते हैं ज्यादा से ज्यादा एक्सपोर्ट को बढ़ाना चाहते हैं तो फिल्म इंडस्ट्री में भी अगर स्वदेशी की भावना को बढ़ावा दे सकें तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इस मुल्क की बड़ी सेवा होगी और फिल्में अच्छे ढंग से बन सकेंगी।

एक बात जैसे मैंने फिल्म इंडस्ट्री के बारे में फिल्म सेसर बोर्ड का निवेदन की थी उसी तरह से मैं अपने फिल्म बनाने वाले भाईयों से निवेदन करना चाहूँगा। तर्क दिया जाता है कि राष्ट्रीयकरण से पक्षपात को बढ़ावा मिलेगा। अक्सर लोग रिश्तत लेकर अच्छे कलाकारों को नहीं लेंगे, बुरे कलाकारों को भरती कर लेंगे। वह आज भी चलता है। राष्ट्रीयकरण हो या न हो इसको बन्द करना ही चाहिए। जो अच्छे अच्छे कलाकार देहात में, शहर में काम करते हों, कहीं काम करने हों, एवलेबिल हों, उनको पकड़ पकड़ कर लाना चाहिए और इस उद्योग को बढ़ावा देना चाहिए न कि कोई रिश्तत दे दे या किमी अफसर को खुश कर दे उसको वहाँ रख दिया जाय।

इस सम्बन्ध में मैं कुछ सुझाव आपको देना चाहता हूँ। मेरा पहला सुझाव यह है कि फिल्म ट्रेनिंग इस्टीट्यूट आपने पूना में खोला है मैं सरकार को उसके लिए बधाई

देना चाहता हूं मंत्री और उपमंत्री महोदय नहीं हैं इसलिए उनके बदले में जो मंत्री बैठे हुए हैं उनको बधाई देना हूं। लेकिन इस तरह के एक इंस्टीट्यूट से काम नहीं चलेगा देश के अन्दर इस तरह के दो चार पांच इंस्टीट्यूट खुलने चाहिए जिसमें देहातों के रहने वाले जो बम्बई नहीं जा सकते पूना नहीं जा सकते उनको भी इसका लाभ मिल सके और वे जाकर अपनी कला का प्रदर्शन कर सकें और इस तरह अच्छे अच्छे कलाकार स्टेज पर आ सकें।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि फिल्मों के अन्दर एकमात्रात्मिक और नैतिक स्तर कायम करना पड़ेगा। उसकी बहुत बात हो चुकी है। कितने अश्लील प्रदर्शन होते हैं मैं उसको बढ़ावा नहीं देना चाहता। हमें कोई न कोई रास्ता और मकसद तय करना पड़ेगा और ऐसी फिल्में बनानी पड़ेगी जिनसे देश की एकता बढ़े राष्ट्रीय भावना को बढ़ावा मिले, देश के अन्दर समाजवाद की भावना को बढ़ावा मिले, जातिविहीन, वर्गविहीन समाज की स्थापना हो सके इन उद्देश्यों को जो विधान में हमने तय किए हैं यहां तय किए हैं, बढ़ावा देने वाली फिल्में बन सकें तो मैं समझता हूं कि राष्ट्रीयकरण करे या न करे जो हमारा सली मुख्य उद्देश्य है राष्ट्रीयकरण का उसकी पूर्ति हो सकेगी।

इसके साथ साथ मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि अपराधों को बढ़ावा देने वाली फिल्मों को भी आपको बन्द करना पड़ेगा। बहुत सारी फिल्में ऐसी होती हैं जिनसे युवक और युवतियां न केवल फैसनेबिल बातों की नकल करते हैं बल्कि चोर और डकैत भी बन जाते हैं। उनको बड़ा मजा आता है ऐसी फिल्मों को देख कर। वैसा एक्शन करना चाहते हैं वे उसको प्रेक्टिस में लाने की कोशिश करते हैं। इसलिए

मेहरबानी करके ऐसी फिल्मों को बन्द करिए जो राष्ट्रीयता और देश की एकता को बढ़ाने वाली न होकर अपराधों को बढ़ाने वाली है।

अन्त में मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि हिन्दी का प्रचार फिल्म के जरिए काफी हो सकता है। जिस ढंग से करना चाहिए अभी तक नहीं किया है। इसलिए ऐसी फिल्में बननी चाहिए जिनसे हिन्दी का प्रचार हो सके। छुप्राछुन हो मिटाने वाली, राष्ट्रीय भावना को बढ़ावा देने वाली हिन्दी का प्रचार करने वाली नशाबन्दी की तरफ ध्यान दिलाने वाली फिल्में बनाई जायेगी तो हमारे जो भाई राष्ट्रीयकरण की मांग करते हैं उनकी भावना को भी संतुष्टि मिल जायेगी और वे भाई जो राष्ट्रीयकरण की मांग का विरोध करते हैं उनकी भावना को भी संतुष्टि मिल जायेगी इतना ही मुझे कहना है।

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): Madam Vice-Chairman, I am thankful to Dr. (Mrs.) Mangladevi Talwar for arranging things in such a manner that we get an opportunity to discuss the film industry which is a very important media of mass communication and, I must say, a much neglected media of mass communication . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Every media is neglected.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: This is most neglected.

This neglect on behalf of the Government, this neglect on behalf of sensible people, has created a situation in the country when India is the third biggest producer of films in the world, and first among the producers of bad films. Our films are inordinately long. I do not know why the Government has not yet imposed a limit on the

[Shri Arjun Arora.]

size of our films. In spite of the fact that film is an imported material which requires foreign exchange, even during this scarcity of foreign exchange we have not imposed any limit on the size of a film. The result is that most of the Indian films are more than three-hour long boredom, with songs which have no meaning, dances which have no basis. The Government must do something about it. I think of films as media of education and of entertainment. Lengthy films produced in the country, even though box office hits, are neither educative nor do they provide healthy entertainment. Therefore, the Government must do something about it.

From the presence of the Law Minister to hear the views of the House on this subject I conclude that the Government accepts the correctness of the idea of nationalisation of films. Its only difficulty appears to be how to frame a law. I hope our very able Law Minister, who is here, will certainly find a method of framing a law for nationalising the film industry.

My friend, Mr. Pahadia, who preceded me was all the time talking of *kala* are, and talking of the nationalisation of art. Nobody in the world seeks to nationalise art. And how can you nationalise art? The question is that the film industry should be nationalised, and every one knows that in countries where the film industry has been nationalised, the best films are produced. I will give you only one example. Shakespeare is a world figure, but he is essentially an English figure. The British film industry, the American film industry and the English-speaking film industry elsewhere have produced a number of films based on Shakespeare's plays, yet the best film based on Shakespeare's plays produced so far is *Hamlet* produced in the Soviet Union. This is not my opinion which some people might incorrectly say is

biased. This is the opinion of Sir Lawrence Olivier who is an honoured figure in the British film industry, himself a great artist and husband of more than one film star. It is his opinion that *Hamlet* produced in the Soviet Union is the best film based on any of Shakespeare's plays. It is not a question of nationalising art, it is a question of nationalising an industry and a nationalised industry helps art to grow.

What is the position of our artists? What is the position of workers in our film industry? There are some glamour girls and some well-known stars. They are thriving on box office hits. They accept money not only over the table but under the table. Black money in the film industry is a big phenomenon. The moment a contract is signed there is a deal under the table. The whole thing starts with corruption and ends with corruption. The films produced in our country are affecting the morals of the people.

Madam, the Government is trying to help the film industry by setting up a Film Finance Corporation. That Corporation has failed to help the film industry in the country to produce good, effective films which provide entertainment and which have some educative value. In that the Film Finance Corporation has entirely failed.

The other method adopted by the Government is the much-criticised Board of Film Censors. Mrs. Lalitha (Rajagopalan) said something about the Board. Other people also said something about the Board of Censors. I do not know much about the working of these Boards. But I do know, as every one knows, the result of the work of this Board. Censoring in India has failed in its objective. It has not helped the film industry to give us good films.

As far as this industry is concerned, there is no question of there being any competition. Anybody who has

tried to study the working of the Film centres of Bombay and Madras knows that it is the thriving money bags which control the whole industry. They sit over the producer. They sit over the directors. They insist on some hipshaking by some artists, some vulgar songs by other artists. These financiers do not give finance unless the film promises to be a box office hit, appeals to the vulgar tastes of the people and encourages people to develop further vulgar tastes. So if we nationalise the industry we are not going to affect any artist. We are only going to affect a few money bags.

In the film industry while a few top-notchers have plenty of money and lead a luxurious life, the fate of the lesser known artists is pitiable. The fate of the new entrants is pitiable. They have no opportunity to grow. They have no opportunity to develop. They do not even have an opportunity to make the two ends meet. If the film industry is nationalised, or if a co-operative film industry is encouraged, it will demonstrate that films can be made without the help of money bags. The well-known writer, journalist and film producer and director, Khwaja Ahmad Abbas, has produced some of the best films during the last few years and yet he has not relied upon any financier. He has shown that good films can be produced with very little money. His firm *Shahr Aur Sapna* was awarded the President's Medal. He told me himself that the artists themselves provided all the necessary finances and they did not beg for finances from any capitalist. They did not give anybody an opportunity to provide finances and then interfere.

Madam, as a matter of fact good films are produced only where big money is not involved. There are, of course, other producers who have also produced good films. But every time you find a good film, if you go into the background you will find that big money is absent. Artists themselves, lesser known people, have

themselves provided the finance. Once they have got independence from the greedy financiers, then alone they are able to develop art. So, nationalisation is not only necessary for us to have good, educative and entertaining films, it is also necessary so that the real artists have an opportunity to develop and ultimately benefit the country. The Government uses films in a limited way to educate and inform our people through documentaries. I must say that the documentaries have helped our people and have helped us in projecting a correct picture of India abroad. Some of our documentaries have won laurels in foreign countries. Yet, I feel there is great scope for improving the documentaries. At present documentaries are screened because it is compulsory under the law to devote 10 minutes to them. These documentaries should be such that the audiences will insist on the documentaries being screened. At the moment what some of the cinema houses do is to screen the documentaries in the first 10 minutes when people are just entering the hall and taking their seats. That is a misuse of time. That is a misuse of documentaries which are a great source of education. Of course documentaries must be improved and the Government must take energetic and effective steps to improve them. There is in the country one big dearth and that is, the dearth of entertainment. Films are almost the only entertainment available to the poorer sections. Even there there is a shortage of cinema houses. Many good films which are not box office hits and which do not mean big gains to the owners of cinema houses are not able to get even a week's showing in big cities like Delhi. There is an absolute need of good cinema houses and many more cinema houses in the country, in bigger and smaller cities. The Government is very anxious about tourists. The Government has opened tourist hotel corporations, tourist transport corporations, tourist bar and wine corporation—everything for the tourists—but it should do

[Shri Arjun Arora.]

something for the entertainment of our people also so that they can be improved. That will be possible if there are more cinema houses in our cities, more theatres in our cities and it should be the responsibility of the Government to see to it that every city with a population of more than a lakh has a Government cinema house, where good, educative, informative films are screened. There is in the country a great flood of vulgar and bad films from Hollywood. I do not mind good films from Hollywood. Of course good films from Hollywood are very few. You cannot see a good Italian film in the country or a French film and you cannot see even a good Soviet film unless the Soviet Embassy invites you. So the Government should do something so that our people who are interested in films and hungry and thirsty of entertainment are able to see good films produced all over the world. Why this monopoly of Hollywood? The Government should do something. Even if there is a delay in the nationalisation of the film industry, the Government should float a Film Corporation which will provide our people an opportunity to see good international films. The opponents of this idea and those who are fond of vulgar Hollywood films, or third-rate entertainments which spoil the morals of the youth, may say that language will be the barrier. Those interested in film art and industry know that Charlie Chaplain, the greatest film artist of the 20th Century, speaks no language and his films are popular even though he speaks no language in the film.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has started speaking now.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: But he does not speak in any language mentioned in any Schedule to our Constitution or laid down in any other Constitution. He speaks a language which only he understands and of course by his acting he gives meaning to his language. Good international films

from France, Italy, Sweden, the Soviet Union and other countries are bound to be popular and their popularity and standard will ultimately affect the standard of our films. I feel that films are an important media and the Government headed by our very worthy Prime Minister should not neglect this.

SHRI G. P. SOMASUNDARAM (Madras): I want to say only one thing.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I am for the Resolution. I forgot to say that.

SHRI G. P. SOMASUNDARAM: Madam, I have to mention one thing. It was mentioned from the other side by an hon. Member that the D.M.K. has been exploiting the cinema people. It was mentioned there about N. S. Krishnan and M. G. Ramachandran but even the Congress people are utilising Shivaji Ganesan and Padmini. It is going on everywhere. I am glad to say that most of the cinema people are in our party. It is sure and certain but when in 1962 the Chinese conflict broke out, the man who gave a lot of money was M. G. Ramachandran. I want to tell the House that fact.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI TARA RAMACHANDRA SATHE): The Minister will intervene.

SHRI C. R. PATTABHI RAMAN: Madam, if I may permit myself the statement, though this is the third occasion when a discussion like this has taken place on the floor of this House, I wish to say that on this occasion there was a comprehensive discussion on so many aspects of the film industry and I wish to say this that the interest shown here will no doubt be borne in mind by my esteemed colleague, Mr. Raj Bahadur, who is unavoidably called away. His Deputy has gone to Moscow with some artists.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: She is after all with an artists' delegation.

SHRI C. R. PATTABHI RAMAN: Perhaps because of my Purvashram, having been in the Ministry and was having some connection with this subject, I am speaking for the Ministry. It was in 1962 that Mr. Tariq brought some similar resolution. In 1964 Mr. Dubey brought a Resolution that 'the film industry should be nationalised and the same wording as used by my friend Dr. Talwar was used. There had been a Film Enquiry Committee in 1951. I had intended to quote extensively from that report. They did say this:

"Apart from the fashionable philosophy . . ."

regarding nationalisation they had their own ideas—

"of nationalisation, the justification for this suggestion has been asserted to lie in the disorganised condition of the industry, in its neglect of the social service which films can render, in the deplorable conditions . . ."

That is where many Members will find an echo in what they have been saying.

"...in the deplorable conditions of work which prevail, and in the useful medium of mass education and uplift which films provide."

But then they go to say:

"The word (nationalisation) may be a convenient term to describe all the various processes of production and commercial aspects of this enterprise and it is generally in this sense, for want of a better and more accurately descriptive word, that we have used it ourselves, but we are definite that there is much less emphasis on mechanical or manual aids to production and much more scope for individual or corporate expression of artistic and aesthetic values

in this than in other industries. It would be as suicidal for thought and expression to follow uniform and regulated patterns in this field as in the realm of books."

Then they go on to regimentation where, they say, there may be difference of opinion. They say:

"We are convinced that the position in which the industry finds itself today is in substantial measure due to the neglect, apathy and indifference of the very repositories of public conscience and authority—the State, the Press and the community which would be the agents of a nationalised economy. Their failure up to date is as such a warning against the attainment of the promised millennium as that of the industry is against complacency and letting things along."

They were aware of the fact that things were not going on well in the industry. Incidentally, Madam, it may interest the House to know that it has been pointed out frequently and it is true that roughly about two lakhs of people are involved as artists, technicians and cameramen. Some are among the best in the world. It might not be known that some of the very best cameramen, technicians and artists are all here and yet we go on blackening ourselves so much. It is high time we told ourselves that our technicians can hold a candle before the very best in the world. Such is the record so far as the technicians are concerned.

Then, Madam, so far as nationalisation is concerned, it has to be looked at from the point of view of assuring full development of the industry while serving to public interests as well. As has been said so, the reference the constitutional position is there, to article 19(2), which guarantees freedom of expression, and the film industry will, naturally be interested in that freedom of expression, in the freedom

[Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman.]

of trade and - business, and so restrictions on the film industry have to fall within the scope of that article. But that is not the argument which I am going to place before the House, by itself. But I have to say this that the present restrictions came to be incorporated in the Cinematograph Act, 1952—there have been some amendments—which governs censorship of films.

Then, Madam, apart from the political and social implications of the nationalisation of the film industry, we have to consider the other aspect also. Film is a very powerful and universally popular medium of mass communication. Yet, Madam, of course as pointed out by so many speakers, if such a medium is used exclusively by the State, there is grave danger of regimentation of ideas and of the human mind itself. It is such a step to take. It has been pointed out frequently. Reference has been made to the other countries where you have the industry nationalised. But can we, in a democratic set-up as it is now functioning, can we have a regimented nationalised industry, is the question. But it is also true that all films are not alike in quality as well as in returns. I believe some two or three years ago the production per year was about 142 films so far as Madras was concerned, about 129 so far as Bombay was concerned and 70 to 80 so far as Bengal was concerned. Their box office collections and their quality were seen. Some are good; quite a few are indifferent and quite a large number are bad. I have no doubt about it. But it is the proportions that we have to keep in mind when we are dealing with this aspect of it.

Then State interference with forms of art will stunt their growth and discourage new experiments. I do not know whether we are equipped at all levels to deal with the arts and the tasks undertaken for the uplift of the industry. Then, Madam, there is the Industrial Policy Resolution which governs us.

Following that Resolution I want to say that we have nothing actually to take over. I do not wish to take the time of the House, but the crux of the problem has been dealt with by the Resolution. It is only industries of basic and strategic importance or in the nature of public utility services that are to be in the public sector. In other cases the State is to enter the field only if they are important and require investment on a scale beyond the means of the private sector. It is therefore, Madam, that we have the Hindustan Photofilm Manufacturing Company, which is in the Nilgiris in South India, which is perhaps one of the best in Asia. Already they are manufacturing one type of film and very soon they are going to have the full equipment to manufacture other types of films, to start production soon. There we have to manufacture raw films and there it is really beyond the scope of private investors. Therefore we have entered into that field.

Then while discussing this subject it may be of interest to know what is the capital involved so far as nationalisation is concerned. I take it that some sort of compensation will have to be paid to the industry taken over, and it may be pertinent to consider what will cost Government. I am grateful; I have got the figures. The capital investment in the film industry, as estimated by the Indian Motion Picture Producers' Association, stands today at about Rs. 82 crores and the break-up is like this: Studios, Laboratories and Stores—Rs. 20 crores; Production and distribution—Rs. 20 crores, Cinemas—Rs. 42 crores. At the present juncture it is obvious that we just cannot contemplate spending about Rs. 82 crores, to say the least, to try and take over the industry. Apart from that there is another aspect also to consider. There are fourteen languages in this country and I have always stated that whenever we talk of India—if I may be permitted this statement—we cannot compare India with Italy or France or England, but if we compared

India to Europe, perhaps Delhi will be Geneva. I talked like this in Kerala and said that the State of Kerala will be like France. Then they asked me if the comparison was because the Government of 'heir State was falling every now and then. I said that it was primarily because they were artistic people. Really speaking, it is the different languages, fourteen languages, different tastes if I may say so, and different conditions and so it is a stupendous task so far as the nationalisation aspect is concerned.

Then so far as returns are concerned, supposing we nationalise the films, will the return from them be adequate? Frankly, many of the films do not pay, it may be of interest to the hon. Members to know, while some are box office hits. The latter is itself a curse because some producers are trying to pander to the vulgar tastes and get more money. That is also a defect in the films. But so many films, by and large, are failures, and the people who put money into them are not the people who can hardly make both ends meet.

Then it is very difficult to predict in advance audience reaction for Government to take up this sort of business. I am going later on to refer, Madam, to how we are governed in the matter of posters. Reference has been made to the Children's Film Society also, and to all this I am going to refer in passing. But this is a fact—the fact of audience reaction—which has got to be kept in mind. Apart from the implications of nationalisation, apart from the question of regimentation, there will be frequent demands, "I want this film, I want that film," and the Government will not be able to cope with the demand.

Then so far as censorship is concerned, I am glad the hon. Lalitha (Rajagopalan) and some others also have referred to it. It may be of interest to know that today the Central Board of Film Censors contains

Mr. Bhatt—who is not a retired man—as Chairman, and Mr. Sarkar, Mr. Singh, and Mr. Vasan, a Member of this House, and the Maharani Scindia of Gwalior a Member of the other House, Mr. Shamlal, Editor of the "Times of India", and a number of other names—I do not want to keep the House waiting on account of this. Now these people are from various walks of life, from education, art, industry; they are all there, and supposing they read through something which is not quite in order, and yet they are passed by the Board as such, there is always the appeal provided for, and Government can always intervene. If they pass certain films and there is an appeal against their passing, we can also take the step in suitable cases to curb them.

SHRIMATI LALITHA (RAJAGOPALAN): I did not mean the Central Board; I meant the State Board.

SHRI C. R. PATTABHI RAMAN: In the State Board similarly, let us say; I quite see the point. After all, the distinguished husband of my dear friend, who was Secretary of the Congress, he was himself on the State Board at one time, as has been pointed out by Lalithaji, but the real idea is to see that we will have to consult the State Government and see to it that it covers the language areas and the people. Sometimes mistakes may happen. I do not say that all State Boards are perfect, but all the time we are aware of our duty and we are trying to improve the situation, and we sincerely hope that if there is any defect, hon. Members will tell us, and I will certainly communicate it to the Ministry concerned, and we can always improve this and our censorship law provides for the review of the films passed by the censors.

Then I told you that I would come to posters. It will be of interest for the House to know that while censorship of movie films comes under the Act, the undesirable posters put

[Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman.]

on display in advertisement of films passed in censorship do not. You will find that many a thing which has been cut off from the film will still be in the poster, because the law governing posters is different from the law incorporated in the Cinematograph Act. Anyhow, what we do is this.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Vice-Chairman, I have to point out that as you may know, a suggestion was made that three hours should be allotted for the private Member's Resolution. I objected to it, but then my suggestion was not accepted and three hours were allotted and only a few more minutes are left for the completion of three hours now. Therefore, let me take the chance of moving my Resolution after the three hours are finished.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): He is intervening. And there are so many speakers.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Three hours were allotted and . . .

DR. M. M. S. SIDDHU (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, I had given my name for speaking.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): That is what I said. There are many more Members desiring to speak.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am accepting your decision Madam.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Madam Vice-Chairman, I am sorry I have again to protest against the behaviour of my hon. friend Shri Bhupesh Gupta. He walks into the House when the Minister in charge is speaking and without taking the permission of the Chair or informing the House that he wants to intervene, he has intervened. He has

again broken the established rule of the House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I strongly object to such a suggestion, Madam.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: I have to request Shri Bhupesh Gupta to be a little more courteous to the House. If he wanted to say something he should have referred the matter to the Chair and taken the Chair's permission and then intervened. He cannot just walk in and begin to speak when the Minister in charge is speaking.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am very sorry, Madam, if I have been discourteous to you. But I take strong objection to this kind of remarks by the hon. Member. I may tell you I was in a meeting and I came here rushing. The Prime Minister had called a conference. I told her that I had to move a Resolution and because the three hours are about to be over I rushed in here in order to move my Resolution. Therefore, I invited your attention to that Resolution. I did nothing else.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): I have told you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I think Mr. Bhargava should learn a little more courtesy also.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): Let him finish.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am not suggesting anything. You do whatever you like. I only pointed out the difficulty that arose. I am not obstructing him at all. I hope Congress Members will stop teaching me courtesy.

SHRI C. R. PATTABHI RAMAN: I was stating, Madam, that printed

material is not covered by the Cinematograph Act of 1952 and the question of obscenity is dealt with by the I.P.C. and the provision is administered by the State Governments. But to guard against the display of objectionable posters in relation to films, the Central Government has taken two steps. Firstly, they have appointed an informal consultative committee under the presidentship of the Chairman of the Central Board of Film Censors, with representatives of the public and the film industry, to scrutinise the posters submitted to them before display. Secondly the Central Government has drawn the attention of the State Governments to their exercising scrutiny over the posters before display. Also some public-spirited persons have formed a committee which prevents undesirable posters from being displayed.

SHRIMATI LALITHA (RAJAGOPALAN): What we want is legislation from the Government regarding these posters. That is what the mover of the Resolution also said. There is no legislation now. When Mrs. Gandhi was in charge of the Information and Broadcasting Ministry I had approached her and explained how there was no legislation and I think she had consultations with the Law Ministry regarding legislation on the matter. These committees being formed by some people to deal with posters is not enough. What we want is legislation.

SHRI C. R. PATTABHI RAMAN: It has to be examined. It may involve an amendment of the Constitution. We are not running away from the matter. We are aware of the position, Madam.

There is no doubt that some films which should be discouraged have become box-office successes. Hon. Members have referred to this. Government is aware of it and we are trying our best to see that the quality is improved and good films are encouraged. The Films Finance Corporation has taken some measures.

When I myself was in that Ministry we had suggested three things. First of all there should be a theatre built by the Corporation—Mr. Arora may note—in every important municipal area, to be a sort of a model. We also wanted to see that financial assistance was given even where there was no financial return, if the film was such that for its artistic value it deserved encouragement. And then there were films from which we expected returns. But then this is not the place nor the time to go into all those details.

Then there are documentaries produced on the various aspects of our national life and there are newsreels covering various events. These documentaries and newsreels are in English and the twelve Indian languages and are shown for 20 minutes in each picture house. They are also shown by the field publicity organisations for circulation through mobile vans in the rural areas. Those in Kanya Kumari would like to know about Bhakra Nangal, just as people here would like to know about the photo film plants or the Avadi factory.

Then the "star" system in film industry was referred to and there were also references to black money and so on. The star system is there, it is true. And this is not confined only to the stars, but it covers directors, story-writers, back-ground singers also. Some artistes even insist on their own camera men and make-up men. It is a regular guild. You don't have merit but only favourites. Though we are aware of all this we can only improve matters by financing good films. It is hardly a sphere where we can interfere. With regard to finance, I have already stated that we are trying to see that as far as possible good films are encouraged.

As regards exhibition facilities, it is true that exhibitors demand heavy fixed fees and are not prepared to share the proceeds with the distri-

[Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman.]

butors or producers on a rational basis. Exhibitors have of late been arbitrarily raising their charges. It is also true that entertainment tax tells heavily on films. The rates of this tax vary from 25 per cent to 75 per cent in various States. Over and above the entertainment tax, cinema houses are subjected to show taxes imposed by the Municipalities and the Panchayats. It is estimated that the revenue from entertainment tax on cinema films is about Rs. 23 crores annually. Except a few States like Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh which have given some assistance to the film industry no part of the entertainment tax is ploughed back into the industry. Since the States realise such a large revenue, it is incumbent on them that they re-invest part of it in promoting the welfare and standards of the film industry. The film industry is also subjected to heavy taxation by way of duty on the import of raw film, excise duties on the prints, income tax and so on. There is also the question of the amortisation of the taxation on the exploitation of a film. Devaluation has also affected the film industry. All these matters have to be taken into consideration while assessing the performance of the film industry.

I may here explain that we are taking a number of positive steps to improve and encourage the production of good films. The State awards to films have been referred to. They are a step towards the production of films of high aesthetic and educative and cultural value. The best feature film is awarded the President's Gold Medal which carries a reward of Rs. 20,000 to the producer and Rs. 5,000 to the director. Then for the second best feature film is given Rs. 10,000 to the producer and Rs. 2,500 to the director. I do not have the time to give these various other figures. Then the Prime Minister's Award goes to the best children's film and there are also certificates of merit to various other films.

This again is a sphere where we are trying to see that quality films are produced. This will enable the persons concerned to say that their such and such films have won such and such an award.

And then I may say that selected Indian films are sent under Government auspices and in consultation with the trade for participation in various international film festivals. I have got an entire list of prize-winning films. Those judges abroad, they are not giving prizes to these films just out of sympathy for India. The merit of the films won them these prizes. There are the citations. Some of the films that have won such prizes come from my hon. friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's State, Bengal. Satyajit Ray has won international prizes for his films. We also find that we have done very well in the international field, even though they do not know the language. I think the mover of the Resolution referred to the film "Awara" in Russia. In the U. S. S. R. the artiste himself was always hailed. They refer to India as Gandhi country and they also refer to our country by the name of the famous star in that film. We have made a mark. It is not because the U. S. S. R. wants to pat us on the back but because of the excellence of the films.

I referred to the Film Finance Corporation. It is true that it has been having rough weather. First it was under the Ministry of Finance and it came under the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting in August, 1964. With a subscribed capital of Rs. 50 lakhs, the Corporation had sanctioned loans totalling Rs. 1.35 crores in respect of 46 films since its inception up to 31st March, 1966. Of this, an amount of Rs. 1.08 crores has been disbursed to 39 films by that date. As many as 21 films financed by the Corporation had been released during the period. It will be recognised that the resources at the disposal of the Corporation being limited the extent of assistance has

not been as large as we would like it to be but we are endeavouring our best to see that we do our best in this matter.

Some reference was made to the Film Institute of India in Poona and it has been said that many are not getting employment. I have got the figures. Up to 1964-65 92 persons obtained diplomas. I had been there; it is a very fine place. It is one of the fine institutions where people are learning not only the camera technique but also acting. It is true that not one of them has been given a chance in the film industry but it is a question of time. As a matter of fact many of them are acting in documentaries, short films and are also taking part in training activities. On the whole it has been doing very good work.

Then we have got the Children's Film Society and there are very few places in the world, Madam, where such Children's Film Societies are functioning. I do not say that we have done very well but by and large our record has been very good and we have earned a number of awards. This Society is doing very good work. The Society has been provided grants-in-aid, totalling Rs. 70.75 lakhs. It has produced 45 films and in addition has adopted two Indian feature and 3 documentary films, besides three Soviet and five British films. During 1965 alone, the Society organised . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How long he will take, I would like to know.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): Let him finish.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order, Madam. The point is, you decide one thing and you follow a different thing. I think the decision was . . . Anyway, you go on and finish it.

SHRI C. R. PATTABHI RAMAN: Madam, I do not know what he is referring to.

Now, with the assistance of the Ministry of Education and the University Grants Commission, a University Film Council has been formed to instil a sense of critical appreciation of films among the students and to improve their tastes. It has 34 universities as members.

A Film Consultative Committee has been constituted to function as a forum for exchange of views between Government and the film industry and to assist Government in the formulation of policies relating to the film industry. Recently a Study Group appointed by Government in the Ministry of Labour and Employment has recommended the appointment of a Wage Board for all the three sectors of the film industry.

Madam, we are also considering measures for improving the conditions in the film industry. I had frequently stated when I was connected with the Ministry that it was high time that we had a Provident Fund for indigent artistes and for those who pass on to bad days from their bright days. Therefore we are all the time evolving measures to improve conditions and I would appeal to the mover to take these into account. For instance, the attention of the State Government has been drawn to the need for expanding exhibition facilities, the lack of which is at the root of many of the ills of the industry. The State Governments have been requested to ensure an addition of 5,000 cinemas on a phased basis. They are also being requested to rationalise the entertainment tax structure which at present operates oppressively. A Committee is being constituted to go into the question of long-term requirements of the industry in respect of equipments and the manufacture of such equipments in India. It is also proposed to set up a Committee which will recommend artistic films with

[Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman.]

purposeful themes for exemption from entertainment tax. The question of setting up a Producers' Fund to partake the nature of an insurance fund to offset or mitigate the box office hazards often encountered by purposeful social films is under consideration. We are also considering the question of setting up a Public Trust to which film stars and others can contribute part of their income and such contributions would qualify for income-tax exemption.

Madam, my attention has just been drawn to the fact that with regard to obscenity, the Act is being amended, and I think the Bill is getting ready. Madam, I am thankful to the distinguished artists who opened the debate. Mr. Lokanath Misra, and also so many others who have taken part. I have taken notes and if I do not refer to them individually it is not because of any lack of respect . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now that he has spoken. I want to say that it was in order to save time that I took out my name, and now . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): The Minister is intervening. If you want to speak on this Resolution you will get the opportunity next time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am just saying that the decision was that this will be finished in three hours. But now what is being done is . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): Let him finish.

SHRI C. R. PATTABHI RAMAN: I was saying that if I do not refer to all the Members individually it was not due to any lack of courtesy but because I seem to have taken more time than intended.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): You can take your time. He is referring to another Resolution.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Shall I make the position clear?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): I know the position. Now how much time will the Minister require?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The point is, the time limit of three hours that was decided upon is passed already.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): But there are so many speakers. And the Minister has not yet finished.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I would like to know particularly about one point. What has happened to the Cinematograph Committee?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): If he finishes before 5.00 I will take the sense of the House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is not a question of taking the sense of the House. You can ask the House but it was decided that this would finish in three hours.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): Let him finish first anyway.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That was what was decided. In fact I objected to the three-hour limit but it was decided like that and now you want to go beyond it. Therefore please do not ask to respect any direction of the Chair. I requested that the three-hour limit should not be there and that it should go on as long as was needed. But it was said, no it will be three hours. Well, the three hours have passed and the

discussion is going on. I find nobody is concerned about it except me. Do you think I am only speaking for my Resolution?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): Within the Rules three hours were allotted but if there are more speakers . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There you see. If the intention here is to kill my Resolution that is a different matter; otherwise you should have closed the discussion and called me to move it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): He has to finish his reply and the mover will also reply.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am very sorry that even when I do not want to enter into a controversy I am dragged into it. In fact, if you had said it before I would not have even come. The decision here was this Resolution would go on for three hours but it has been going on even beyond three hours and I find everybody silent about it. I would like to know why the permission of the House was not taken at exactly the conclusion of the three hours. Was it taken? No. Now you say there are more people to speak. I did not speak on this in order to accommodate.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): When he finishes I will ask the permission of the House whether the House wants to continue or not.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How does that come in?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): The Minister has not yet finished his speech and there are many speakers and I would like to have the sense of the House whether the House would like to continue with this Resolution or not.

SHRI N. PATRA (Orissa): There is a party meeting today. We have to go.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Does it mean sitting longer?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would submit to whatever the House says. Let me make that clear. But that day I said, 'Don't fix three hours but leave it to the Chair' but then it was not accepted. It was said that the three-hour limit must be there and my suggestion was turned down. So am I not entitled to say today, 'play the game'? If the House still says otherwise I will submit to the House but this is a strange thing. What I fought for on that day you are asking for today. Naturally I will accept it. The principle goes. If this is not accepted, we shall withdraw from the Business Advisory Committee. It is quite clear. As a Party we shall go out of the Business Advisory Committee.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): Nobody from the House said that only three hours are given. There are so many speakers.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, kindly understand it. Precisely that was my argument that day. Madam Vice-Chairman, you kindly understand it. I am not quarrelling with you or with the House over this matter at least. That was precisely my argument on that day.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): Will you please hear what I say? I have asked the House whether the House would like to extend this Resolution or not. The House did not say anything. Let the House say what the sense of the House is.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is all right. I hope it will be there. Before every business opinion should be taken. I do not know, but it is only my appeal to the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): Surely the House also does not want to sit longer.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Let me move my Resolution.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: It is already five o'clock.

SHRI R. S. DOOGAR (West Bengal): Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, we have no objection to your moving your Resolution.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would appeal to the Congress Party. I have accommodated them, I am not disturbing him at all, because I stand vindicated. That is what I wanted. I hope you will follow it. I pleaded that there are many speakers on the non-official Resolution. There should be no time-limit and it should continue for two days, but you did not accept it and I was silenced on that day. Today only I want implementation of your decision. You do not allow it because the next Resolution is mine.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Madam Vice-Chairman, may I make a submission at this stage, if you will allow me? The time allotted was three hours. I quite agree with Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. We started this Resolution at 12.15. It means that 45 minutes were consumed in the morning. That left 2 hours and 15 minutes for the afternoon. That means up to quarter to five we could have continued with this Resolution in the normal course. The Minister was called before the time expired and the Minister was on his legs. Nothing has happened which should annoy Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. As soon as the Minister had finished and if he was present in the House, probably his Resolution would have come up, but he was not in the House and we had to see that the House went on somehow till five o'clock and that was the reason why the Minister was called just ten minutes before the expiry of the three-hour period.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, I know what is my fate. I want it to go on record that my entire idea was if I spoke it would take a long time and that would lengthen the debate. So, I said, take my name out. I would be in the Prime Minister's meeting, because the Party Leaders have been called there. All these things were made known. Here the information about the meeting was also at short notice. She regretted that it was at so short notice. I rushed there. Even then I took a'l this precaution and cut out my name. I said when the reply began I should be called. Everything I have done. Now, if I am wrong, I apologise to the House, because in this matter I do not want to oppose the House. After all you are **acting on your stand**. That I agree. But remember it in future, if a three-hour limit on a non-official Resolution is put, at least our Party will not be in the Business Advisory Committee and we shall non-cooperate. If you allow us, it is all right. I am not questioning your stand or even what my friend Mr. Bhargava said, or anything that the House says. After all, if I am not allowed, I am not allowed to move my Resolution. I pointed it out to you all the more because I have been pleading the same thing which has been happening today. Unlike the other House, here many Members give their names and their right should not be curtailed. If necessary a Resolution should be discussed for six hours or eight hours, as long as the Chair permits it. Now, it was turned down. By chance in the ballot it came this time. Otherwise, it would not have come at all. Surprisingly enough nobody was there, neither the officials here nor the Government to advise you. At quarter to five as per the decision of the Business Advisory Committee, the discussion was closed and you were called upon to take the permission of the House. I do not question even that. Therefore, you see how things work. All right. If Mr. Bhargava and the Congress Party want to have it, they can kill my Resolution. You can finish it. A'terna-

tively, you can allow me to move it. Now, Mr. Doogar, whatever you want you can say.

SHRI R. S. DOOGAR: You can take the sense of the House and allow him to move his Resolution.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): You can finish your speech.

SHRI C. R. PATTABHI RAMAN: Madam, I do not think I will be justified in taking much more time. While we are very happy to have various suggestions made, a point to be borne in mind is that though the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting have assumed responsibility for the welfare of the film industry, a number of other Ministries and State authorities, who actually deal with the various problems affecting the industry, have also to be consulted. For instance, except for the sanctioning of cinematograph films, import and export of films, import, manufacture and distribution of raw films, etc., all the other aspects are the concern of the State Governments. The largest share of the revenues realised from the film industry is also appropriated by the State Governments. Much of the revenues are utilised by local bodies and in view of their commitments for development expenditure, the State Governments are rarely prepared to forego revenue or undertake schemes for the development of the industry in that State. As it is not possible for the Central Government to compel the authorities to provide relief and as the resources of the Central Government are also limited, it will not be possible for the Government to accept this Resolution as it stands. Madam, I do not think I will be justified in taking more of your time.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Now, I have to ask a question. What happened to the Resolution that we passed in this House to appoint a committee to look into the cinematograph censorship?

SHRI C. R. PATTABHI RAMAN: I am going to end with it. The Government is considering that. Actually if there is any delay it was because of the Indo-Pakistan hostilities and later on because the economy measures came. It is not that the Government is unaware of it. I had asked for the details when the hon. Member put the question. As regards Mr. Bhargava's Resolution, I wish to assure the House that it is still under consideration.

With regard to a trust to provide retirement benefits after they withdraw from the screen, that also is being thought of. The funds will be utilised also for raising the standard of films.

So far as the exemption of entertainment tax on films of high quality with a social and national purpose is concerned, we are evolving some process. As I have said already, excepting one or two States, the others have not agreed and we are persuading them. I hope we will be successful. I thank you, Madam.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): Mrs. Talwar.

DR. M. M. S. SIDDHU: Are we going to sit longer?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): I shall take the sense of the House. Is it agreed?

SHRI R. S. DOOGAR: After we finish this Resolution, I would request the House to allow the hon. Member to move his Resolution.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Thank you very much. It is a little gesture.

DR. (MRS.) MANGLADEVI TALWAR: Madam, I am very grateful indeed to my colleagues and various hon. Members who have taken such an active part in the discussion on this Resolution. There were so many speakers. I would like to touch upon very briefly and reply to the points they have raised.

[Dr. (Mrs.) Mangladevi Talwar.]

First, Mr. Lokanath Misra said that I did not know anything about the film industry. It is true, Madam, that I have not had the privilege of being one of the actors or producers or directors of the film industry. I would like to know from Mr. Misra why he left the industry. Was he one of those few people who did not get encouragement?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I left it myself. I did not want to continue.

DR. (MRS.) MANGLADEVI TALWAR: He actually had no desire. He only supports this because he feels he must support.

Then Mr. Bhuwarka gave me figures and he objected to all the industries being nationalised. I had in the beginning said that I did not stand for nationalisation of all industries. I only referred to the film industry and that too on very good grounds, and I gave a phased programme. I mentioned that to avoid hardship or any damage to the industry a phased programme should be planned.

Then Mr. Chordia actually supported me in every way. He said that I wanted the film media of this country to follow the examples of Hitler and Mao Tse-tung. In fact he did not perhaps listen carefully to what I have said. I only said that we should not allow this media to be in the hands that are spoiling the mind of the people. The mind of the young people is being affected with the type of posters which every speaker has agreed are not things to which young people or old people should be exposed. I only objected to those things and I do not want the Congress Party or any other party, Madam to take advantage of this media and use this media for its own party work.

Shri Sheel Bhadra Yajee supported me very strongly. Shrimati Chaturvedi also supported me. Hardly there was any point of disagreement.

Mr. Mani opposed me. But he also agreed that there are some undertakings like the Railways Hindustan

Steel, etc., in the public sector. Madam, different people have different points of view. He said that he objected to nationalisation because he said that it would only obstruct the artists and other people of talent to grow. He has given many other reasons. I cannot touch upon all of them. But his objections were many and I can only say that he is free to have his own point of view.

I was rather surprised to hear from Shrimati Lalitha Rajagopalan when she mentioned that the film industry in the Soviet Union is not nationalised, it is only under one Minister. Madam, it is always the case that every department of Government is only under some Minister, and as Shri Arora pointed out the film industry in the Soviet Union is under the full control of the Government, and I agree that they are producing good artistic things. Ballet dancing is exceptionally good in the Soviet Union. Also Hamlet, which is of British origin, has been produced based in Moscow, and there cannot be any greater tribute to that country's artistic talent.

Then regarding Shri Pahadia:

“वे तत्स्थरेहे लेकिन हर बात में उन्होंने मेरा समर्थन किया और उन्होंने कहा कि इसको सहकारिता के रूप में ले जाना चाहिए। लेकिन उन्होंने ‘जिस्ट’ में मेरा समर्थन किया है।”

Then Shri Arora supported me and I have nothing to say anything to contradict anything that he had said.

Then of course I very carefully listened to the Minister's remarks, to his intervention, and he has given much useful information and the Government's point of view on this. I am grateful to him. In view of the Minister's remarks and the points of view of many of my colleagues expressed on the floor of the House, Madam, I do not wish to press the resolution. I beg leave to withdraw the resolution.

+For text of the resolution *vide* col 1921 *supra*

Resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

RESOLUTION RE PREVENTION OF INTRUSION OF BIG MONEY AND USE OF GOVERNMENT MACHINERY IN ELECTIONS

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SA-THE): Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you may move. There is time limit also.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): I am very grateful to you, Madam Vice-Chairman, to Mr. Doo-gar and even to Mr. Bhargava—we do quarrel but we come to an agreement; I am grateful to you all. I beg to move the following Resolution:—

"This House is of opinion that in order to ensure free and fair elections the Government should, in consultation with all recognised political parties, take effective and concrete measures to—

(a) prevent intrusion of big money into elections;

(b) prevent the use of Government machinery in any form or in any manner, in favour of any political party;

(c) restore fully fundamental rights and civil liberties and, in particular, stop all detention without trial of members and workers of any political party or of any popular mass organisation."

Again I thank you. If you ask me to speak, I will speak.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SA-THE): You can continue next time. The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Monday.

The House then adjourned at nineteen minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 21st November, 1966.