

and Toilet Preparations (Excise Duties) Act, 1955, a copy of the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue) Notification GSR No 55, dated the 17th January, 1959, publishing an amendment in the Medicinal and Toilet Preparations (Excise Duties) Rules 1956 [Placed in Library See No LT-1175/59]

ENQUIRY REGARDING NOTICE OF A MOTION OF PRIVILEGE

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) Sir, I have a motion I gave notice yesterday of a motion of privilege under rule 164

MR CHAIRMAN I am very sorry You cannot raise this question here I have already referred it to the Privilege Committee Please sit down I said, you should not raise it here today

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA I thought you said that I could read out at least the motion

MR CHAIRMAN Not at all Please sit down

THE CINEMATOGRAPH (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1958

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (DR B V KESKAR) Sir, I beg to move

"That the Bill further to amend the Cinematograph Act, 1952, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration"

The main purpose of this Bill is to make certain changes in the present Act following the directive laid down by the Parliamentary Committee on Subordinate Legislation According to its opinion, certain provisions in legislations which are included in the rules framed under the Act are of such a

nature that they should be included in the body of the Act itself and not be prescribed in the rules The Cinematograph Act was also examined carefully in the light of this opinion of the Committee and this Bill has been brought in to effect the modifications accordingly The Bill, therefore, seeks to include the express provisions in the principal Act respecting the composition of the Board and the constitution of the Advisory Panels to enable the Board to perform its functions for sanctioning films All these provisions are already there in the rules and have been functioning for the last so many years The only change that is being made now is that they are being incorporated in the Act instead of being kept in the rules

Though slight changes in the present field have been made because the Act is being amended, there is no substantial change in the machinery as it is working today As the Act was going to be amended for this purpose, advantage has been taken of the experience gained in the working of the Act for the last six years and as a result section 3 of the Act has been slightly modified by enlarging the composition of the Board

In 1952, the Constitution of India Act had only come into being for a year or two After the Act came into force—and up till now, for the last so many years—the judiciary has given many decisions which have clarified legal expressions and phraseology In view of these decisions, care has been taken in the present amending Bill to make minor changes in the definitions and the legal procedure laid down in the Act so that it conforms to the latest views of the courts It will, therefore, be generally seen that the Act is mainly a clarificatory one, seeking to make the Cinematograph Act of 1952 much more precise and up-to-date There is no substantial change involved

Clause 4 of the Bill tries to lay down an enlarged Board for the purpose of certifying films Clauses 5 and 6 which form the main body of the present

[Dr B V Keskar]

amending Bill are practically existing in the rules and they have been taken up here in the Act itself. In clause 7, there are a number of sub-clauses which deal with what is considered to be normally necessary as protecting powers given to every autonomous body and there is nothing which is of a very special character. For example, provisions like—

"No act or proceeding of the Board or of any advisory panel shall be deemed to be invalid by reason only of a vacancy in, or any defect in, the constitution of the Board or panel, as the case may be

All members of the Board and of any advisory panel shall, when acting or purporting to act in pursuance of any of the provisions of this Act, be deemed to be public servants within the meaning of section 21 of the Indian Penal Code

No suit or other legal proceeding shall lie against the Central Government, the Board, advisory panel or any officer or member of the Central Government, Board or advisory panel, as the case may be, in respect of anything which is in good faith done or intended to be done under this Act "

are all normal and essential provisions of law which are generally put when such Boards act. Formerly they were not put in the Acts themselves, they were in the rules. Now they are being put in the Act. It will be seen, therefore, that in the Act no substantial change is proposed in the machinery to be set up and the Bill purports only to modify the Act for the purpose of bringing it into line with the recommendations of the Parliamentary Committee on Subordinate Legislation. I hope, therefore, that the House will agree to the changes as proposed in the amending Bill.

MR CHAIRMAN Motion moved

"That the Bill further to amend the Cinematograph Act, 1952, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration "

SHRI ANAND CHAND (Himachal Pradesh) Mr Chairman, as the hon Minister has just now said in moving the Bill that it has a very limited objective, I would not like to go in detail into this matter, because I hope that a time and opportunity would come when, in the light of the working of the Cinematograph Act, as well as the report of the Committee which was appointed some years ago to go into the whole question of the cinema as such, the Minister will have time to consider the matter and to lay a more comprehensive piece of legislation before the House. Such a measure was laid before this Sabha in 1956, but it was withdrawn. I do not know what reasons prompted its withdrawal. Anyway, that is a matter which is not strictly pertinent to the Bill which we have before us here today.

Sir, in this measure which is before us the question is one of putting into the scope of the Act itself those provisions which up till now have been in the rules. The question of having censorship on films is something which has been accepted as a policy. I will not, therefore, go into the matter as to whether it is advisable or otherwise, because, we believe, we here in India have wedded ourselves to some kind of control on the exhibition of films. So the Board of Censors is a forum which is an accepted forum for the purpose.

I would also not like to enlarge at the present juncture upon the various kinds of films that are being exhibited today. We have the foreign films, we have the indigenous films. There is a lot of controversy about the films that are being exhibited today in India, films coming from America—crime films—and films dealing with gangsterism. But I would like to mention one thing in passing, and that is this: In India itself the standard of films that are being put before the audiences or are being shown in cinema houses

has, to my mind, considerably deteriorated. I do not know what the reason is. It is apparent, of course, on the one hand that anybody who invests money,—and I believe, making a good film these days costs anything from ten to twelve lakhs of rupees, if I am not mistaken—the producer, has in mind the question of getting back as much of his investment as possible and as quickly as possible. Therefore, he includes in the films scenes, exhibits and certain other things which to his mind are money-catching devices and the moral tone of the film or its educational and cultural value is not in the forefront. But what I would like to submit in relation to this particular measure is that, to my mind, in spite of the fact that we have a Board of Film Censors, that there are certain rules which guide them in censoring the films, a large majority of films, I would say, produced in India today are such as leave much to be desired. I think it is not a question only of deleting scenes—taking away of certain footage from a film—which are offensive. There are certain other things in a film which, to my mind, in spite of the censor, have objectionable features.

I know that there are certain rules about showing, let us say, parts of the human body as such. I am not very well conversant with them. For example, a rule says that in certain cases the legs of the female dancer may not be exposed. That might be good in itself. But what I say is that the dialogue as such, especially the comic element that we put in these films, or the words spoken or the motions made are, to my mind, much more offensive than the mere fact of the exposure of certain parts of the body. I believe there is much ground for improvement in this particular matter. It is not a question which may be strictly enforced and laid down by rules. Therefore, we must go to the basic conception, and that conception is that the persons who censor these films, the persons who are put in charge of carrying out this work, must be people who do not go by

strict rules or certain ideologies or certain moral bias as puritans. They should see the film well and try to take out those portions which are offensive in character, offensive morally, offensive to people who see them and who have certain amount of inhibition about morals and so on.

Sir, in the other House the question was raised by somebody that the persons who are to be put on the Film Censor Board should be those who have got nothing to do with this world and who are a sort of Sanyasis and Munies, that they should have nothing of the worldly, what I may call, necessities or usages or should be far removed from these things so that they can have a very healthy and moral influence on the film.

SHRI V PRASAD RAO (Andhra Pradesh) Then they do not leave anything in the film which can be exhibited.

SHRI ANAND CHAND That, of course, is something which I am not standing here to support. But at the same time I think that there should be what I might call a reorientation of thinking and policy in the Censor Boards from time to time. And it is not only by laying down rigid rules that we will be able to do that.

Now, Sir, another fact which I wanted to submit in this connection is that these Advisory Panels, as they are called, are also going to find a place in the statute itself. So far as I have been able to understand, these Advisory Boards are not functioning. State-wise, they are functioning, I think, region-wise. And, if I am not mistaken, there are at present three—one in Madras, one in Calcutta and one in Bombay. When we are going to develop films in the Indian languages, I think some sort of encouragement should be given not only to regions but to the States also. In this industry there are, of course, many things on which it is dependent. It is dependent, to a large extent, on the stars that are available in the States, on people who are in this job, and up

[Shri Anand Chand]

till now, I believe, Bengal, Madras and Bombay have been the main centres so far as film production is concerned. The industry has got much to do.

As I was reading somewhere, I think, last year in 1958, Indian feature films reached a total of something like 290 or 295. It is a very large number indeed. It is a very big industry, I believe, so far as the money question is concerned. In the taxes alone something over 7—7½ crores of rupees are collected every year. Therefore, being an important industry, I would submit that there might be more incentive given to films or film production, not only in the regions but in the States in which today it is in infancy so that the hidden talent in the country and the hidden talent in those regions may come to the forefront.

Now, Sir, I would like to say a few words about films, so far as they concern the children of this country. I have been to a few shows of children's films and I have also some knowledge of the Children's Film Society. While reading the proceedings of the other House, I was glad to find that many Members supported the idea of a larger number of children's films being produced in this country. Now, Sir, in India when we say 'children', we find that there are different age groups. One age group is from 6 to 12 years and another is from 12 to 18 years. Now these children are really the future citizens of our country. What we show to them is, to my mind, of great importance. Personally, I do not like many of the films bearing 'U' certificates being exhibited in this country and being shown to children or to young persons. Most of them, to my mind, do not convey any healthy ideas, they have no proper theme, and over and above that, they have almost no moral value. There is nothing that the boy or girl takes away home except a few catchy tunes which he or she learns or the names of the film stars who today, as everybody knows, are much more popular than even the leaders of the people in this country.

They very well know the names of these film stars, although they may not be knowing the names of even some of our Ministers. To that extent, of course, they are welcome. But in the matter of inculcating certain good points among the youth of this country, they have not been able to help very much. We find that the hon. Minister himself is an advocate of children's films. He has given help to them. There is even that Children's Film Society. I believe it has produced some very good feature films, and now an effort is being made to translate them into the various regional languages as well. But the point is that we have to take into consideration the number of children that we have in this country. I think, Sir, in a population of about 40 to 41 crores we are bound to have not less than 10 crores of children below the age of 18 years. Our attempt of giving them two, three or four films a year is, to my mind, not at all sufficient. Of course, there is the Children's Film Society which has been registered. The Government of India is giving some grants to it, and there are certain eminent people who are associated with it. But I find that even in this Society the rules that have been laid down are rather rigid. For example, if a State or an institution is going to become a member of the Society as such, the contribution that they have to pay every year is something like Rs 25,000. They have to contribute this amount to the Society in order to continue their membership of the Society from year to year. Well, that might be all right so far as the State is concerned, but so far as certain institutions are concerned, I think the figure is rather on the high side. Then again, Sir, in the matter of rules and regulations, I think the Constitution is not flexible enough to admit a large number of societies in the States coming forward and participating in that venture. The basic idea is that children's films are to be produced, and therefore we must offer some incentives to encourage a large number of people in the various States to become members and produce more and more children's films, so that some

better standards can be laid down in that direction. But that object is defeated when we allow a rigid constitution and when, Sir, such high monetary limits are prescribed. At the moment it is not possible for a large number of intellectuals or private societies to come and join such a venture. Well in spite of that, it has done some good work. But my submission is that its funds may somehow be augmented. That is very important.

The other point that I would like to make is that some provision must be made, compulsory if necessary, for cinema houses to exhibit films even, say, once a week, which are exclusively meant for children. This will produce the desired incentive. Of course, we have no doubt smaller projectors—16 mm. They have no doubt helped a lot so far as some schools or associations are concerned. But we have got to do something more in that direction. Now there are three shows in a day, and on that basis there are 21 shows in a week plus the 22nd show at 9 A.M. on Sundays. Out of these 22 shows if we reserve one show exclusively for children, I do not think it would in any way, reduce the value of these films or earnings from them. I think it will give the necessary incentive to the country, and especially to our youth.

Lastly, Sir, I submit that I have put forward an amendment. I do not know what the hon. Minister will have to say about it. But it deals with the Board as such. It says that not only should the Board deal with certification of films on the basis of adults and others, but it should also take into consideration the cultural and educational aspects of human life. That amendment I would like to move, with your permission, at the proper time. But now the object is that those films which lay emphasis on nation-building and cultural activities and films which have some educational value, apart from providing entertainment for children, may find a separate place in the body of the Act itself. My object in putting forward this amendment is

to stress the importance of cultural and educational values, apart from these films providing entertainment and amusement. That is a very important question which we have to consider. That is all that I have to say.

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI (Madras). Sir, I know that the Cinematograph (Amendment) Bill, 1958 is only a further elaboration of the Act of 1952, and what has already been laid down in the Rules regarding the composition of the Board of Film Censors and the constitution of advisory panels is sought to be brought into the principal Act. Therefore, Sir, there is not much to be said on this amending Bill, which is the result, as has been pointed out, of the experience gained in the working of the Act for the past six years. Nevertheless, I would like the hon. Minister to consider the following two points for being suitably included in the amending Bill, and I hope that this can be done.

The first point is that there should be a distinct category of films just for consumption by children and adolescents. Clause 5A on page 3 of the Bill describes only two categories, namely, 'U' films, i.e. films styled as 'universal' and fit for public exhibition to all, irrespective of age, and secondly 'A' films which are fit for adults only, thus depending on the negative aspect, namely, the exclusion of children from such 'A' films. That only shows that the 'U' certificate carries with it the meaning that it can be shown to children without any harmful effects. This is a purely negative attitude. By adopting such an attitude we are losing sight of a very valuable medium which this industry provides for education and for giving proper direction and guidance to our young people, combined with attractive amusement and entertainment.

Then, Sir, according to the Act of 1952 and this amending Bill a child becomes adult at the age of 18 years, whereas the Constitution of India has laid down that the age-limit for a citizen to exercise his right of fran-

[Shrimati T. Nallamuthu Ramamurti.]
chise is 21 years. This only shows that a person below the age of 21 years is not fully mature.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Therefore, Sir, I submit that there is all the more reason for having a separate category of films for non-adults. I would request the Minister to consider this suggestion and have a separate classification for example, 'C' for cultural and children's films. In my opinion, Sir, it should be the concern of one and all that our children should have films absolutely different from those meant for adults. They should be based on child psychology, so that children might be able to get full entertainment at their own level.

The second point is that there should be some carefully thought-out criteria for the selection of Chairman and members of the Censor Board as well as of the advisory panels. The Minister may kindly say if any set of rules has already been laid down for fixing qualifications for such membership. I feel, Sir, that this is a very vital point to be considered, especially when we are considering the question of children's films. I am interested in children's films as an educationist, and therefore I am very anxious that nothing that would be harmful to children should be released in cinema houses. I also feel that certain eminent persons in the field of education and culture and personalities commanding people's confidence should be requested to serve on such Boards and Panels, so that certain proper standards might be set up in the selection of films. Films, as we all know, whatever may be said by certain sections of critics, have come to stay and it is a very mighty weapon, exercising its influence on the minds of young and old, for good or for evil. Hence in all countries it has been realised that children's films should be different from films for adults and that the themes, background and projection of ideas and ideals should be chosen with extreme care and for all this,

expert educationists, persons with insight into the child mind and experts in child psychology are necessary. Artists also should be of the right kind, for directing the form and content of films for children. As we have in education distinct stages from nursery schools to the secondary schools and so on, so also there should be stages for the release of films for the young. We have to place the best of ideals before children away from sex perversions, crimes and questionable and subtle suggestions and wrong attitudes to life. In most countries this has been realised. The Hoover Commission was appointed to study contemporary modern trends in the U.S.A. and it observed as far back as 1933—and their remarks hold good even today—that films had injurious influence on the minds of the young. Research conducted by various social scientists, psychologists and educationists in Western countries reveals that the impression received by the young, by seeing pictures made primarily from the adult point of view and specially with sex crimes and escapist themes, tend to inculcate in their conscious and sub-conscious minds an urge to live the type of experiences that they visually witness on the screen. Also the report of the Departmental Committee on "Children's Cinemas" appointed in Great Britain known as the Wheare Committee, particularly condemns the false values that everyday entertainment films inculcate. It says:

"A large number of films are exposing children regularly to the suggestion that the highest values in life are riches, power, luxury and public adulation and that it does not matter much how they are attained or used."

Further on, it says:

"We are convinced that the regular portrayal of false values is more pervasive and dangerous than the depiction of crimes and impropriety."

Even with strict censorship, these films cannot be made suitable for the young. In many countries of Europe, and America, special films for the young are produced and in countries like Soviet Russia, Great Britain, France, Czechoslovakia, Switzerland, Belgium, Canada and many other countries, they have made great progress in this field. In Russia they have a number of children's theatres. In Great Britain a Children's Film Foundation has been formed by the film industry and it receives annual grant from the British Film Production Fund and films are produced regularly and as a matter of convention these films are shown at special children's matinees all over the country.

In our country, Sir, similar efforts have been made to prepare films suitable for children. The Cultural Film Society, a voluntary organisation in Delhi under the Presidentship of Pandit Hridaynath Kunzru was started in 1952, for showing foreign films in Delhi and to focus the attention of the Government and of the people on the need for special films for children and also their value. This society, I must say here, thanks to the keen interest evinced by our hon. Minister Dr B V Keskar and the support given by the Government of India, established a Children's Film Society in 1955. I take this opportunity to congratulate the hon. Minister on the good seed he had been instrumental in sowing in this direction, because the Children's Film Society is progressing from strength to strength. It only requires more and more support in order to release suitable films for children. I need not go into details. I shall mention only the main objectives of the Children's Film Society. Its purpose is to produce films for children and adolescents, to bring out adaptations of foreign children's films for our requirements and through Children's Films Clubs to create or inculcate a sense of appreciation in the minds of children for such films and establish children's film theatres. The Children's Film Society, Sir, with its President Dr Kunzru and

Vice-President Shrimati Indira Gandhi, has taken a great deal of interest in this work and it has come to stay. Many films have been produced and adaptations made. To mention the names of a few only, there are "Jal Deep", "Scout Camp" and "Char Dost". And there were a few short films too and many foreign films have been dubbed into Hindi. I might say that the very first film—"Jal Deep"—that was produced by the Children's Film Society won the first award in the children's section of the International Film Festival in Venice and it has also received the Prime Minister's certificate of merit awarded by the Government of India. So this very first children's film produced in India has been considered the world's best film. I may also add that these films are very popular, for example, Ganga-ki-Lahren, and they have been exhibited regularly in Sapru House on Sunday mornings. Audience research has been scientifically conducted and this has shown that these films have become very popular with children and all States have taken up this question and are popularising children's films and State Committees have been formed. Especially in Madras they are very enthusiastic. Our Education Minister has taken keen interest and in Madras our Children's Theatre was opened by our Prime Minister Pandit Nehru. It was mentioned that the amount asked for membership was rather too much. But the Society must have funds and therefore, this is essential and it is for that that this is done. In fact, films are made in Hindi and in other languages too. "Jal Deep" has been dubbed into Tamil and it is being dubbed in Telugu and it is proposed to be done in Malayalam. Indeed these films are most popular with the children. I need not say that "Scout Camp" has been shown and the children were very enthusiastic over it. Very many persons have expressed their opinions including our President Dr Rajendra Prasad and the hon. Home Minister, and these go to show that we are going in the right direction. When recently the 40 film projectors were made as a gift to the

[Shrimati T Nallamuthu Ramamurti] Children's Film Society by the U.S.I.S., that is to say, by Dr Frank, one of the local film stars Mr G Ramachandran, volunteered to produce children's films in Tamil at his own expense. Therefore it is clear that this mentality that there should be special children's films, films suitable for children, is catching on and it only requires on the part of the Ministry to encourage the private sector in the film industry to go ahead with it so that a certain quota of their films may be made specially as children's films. The grant to the Children's Film Society should also be increased so that not two feature films but twelve may be produced so as to make it possible for them to show one feature film for children every month.

The cinema houses must be directed. I think there should be a kind of strict rule passed. I do not know how the Ministry is going to do it, but, as some friend on the other side said, it should be made compulsory for cinema houses to show the children's films either on Sunday mornings or on Saturday at the matinee hours at a special or nominal rate.

Finally, Sir, may I appeal to this House that in the interest of our younger generation and sound education and to build a happy and healthy nation a special classification of children's films should be made. This positive approach should be made instead of merely a negative one of including children's films in the universal category. In order to promote this separate classification, I feel that sufficient direction should go from the so-called film censors. We should have highly qualified people as censors and they should give proper direction in regard to the type of films that should be produced for children. That is why I had said earlier that qualifications for the censors is a very important aspect. Their duty is not merely to classify the certificates as this or that. We must also find out the machinery for the release of such films. This also is

very important. The Film Enquiry Committee of 1951, whose chairman was Shri S K Patil, has stressed on page 61 of its Report the need and value of special films for children. I will not take up much time of the House, going through the extracts of that Report. All must have seen it but it emphasises the need for special classification of children's films.

I have said this much to stress the need in the amending Bill for the inclusion of a separate category for children's films.

Before concluding, Sir, I would like to mention a few points with regard to the perpetration of certain things in our films due to defective censoring, I would say. Something drastic must be done to put a stop to such things. The first and foremost is the length, the inordinate length of the film. I do not know what the Government can do but I suppose they should prescribe some limit in regard to the length, so many feet. Then there come dances, in season and out of season, songs in season and out of season, songs irrelevant to the whole show. These are introduced in order to lengthen the film, dances such as harvest dances and other types which are neither foreign nor Indian, folk dances, harvest dances, country dances, etc., unrelated to their background, for example, harvest dances done by maidens in fine georgette saris, with jewels unknown to the area and with jerks and jumps that one never sees in any harvest dancers ordinarily dancing after a fine harvest. This perversion of culture and tradition should be banned ruthlessly. Also, historical accuracy should be insisted upon where history is brought in. Take a monarch of any century. They clothe the monarch in some bizarre costume saying that he must always splash in colour, in gold and jewellery and full of glamour. The court, they say, must be a set court far away from all history.

I now come to the stars playing on instruments, especially the Veena. I

happen to know music, especially Veena and that is why I am saying this. You find the painful sight of a star playing on the Veena. A very fine melody is being sung and while the melody sung is in the low *sathi* or notes, the star's fingers are on the high *sathi* or notes of the instrument and *vice versa*. This shows that she is a big ignoramus in regard to music, especially with regard to that instrument. It is a travesty of all that is culture and music in our country and that should be banned. Then there are the routine repetitions. It has become the fashion of the day to create social films in which invariably there is a rural landlord or a *mirasdar* who is ordinarily a miser. In every story, this is the same. He has got a very fine son who spends all his money on education and comes back tip top, in shoes, dress, etc. There is, in that village, a poor family, a widow or a woman whose husband has suddenly disappeared for some reason or other. She has a lovely daughter. That family is in trouble, in debts and the debts have to be paid. The *mirasdar* who is a miser drives these people into the street. The thing proceeds in this way when ultimately, the son, who is educated, comes to the rescue of the poor family. Then the love story starts. Invariably they make patch-work of such themes in almost every film as if we are bereft of themes in our social life. Then comes the question of sentiment, ecstasy. I do not know from where this kind of expression has been taken. When a girl falls in love, she is in ecstasy. Whether she is a high-class girl or a rural girl or a girl belonging to the middle classes, when she is in love, she takes a flower in her hands and dances like a mad person round a fountain, round a tree, up hill and down dale and so on. There are also the jerks and jumps. One-fourth of the film is filled with this kind of dances, an eye-sore, I tell you. She goes on like this with some music behind the scenes. Another thing is this. While she is love-sick and is singing away in one place, her lover, in another place far away goes on singing and dancing in the same way

SHRI D A MIRZA (Madras) The hon Member is a Member of the Advisory Committee

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN That is why she is saying all these things

SHRIMATI T NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI I am not. It is not a question of my being there or not. I am stating the general features that ought to be banned in any film that is produced for exhibition, features that are not true to real life or sentiment or culture or tradition. I am not particular about this person or that person being on the Censor Board. In every film, such love scenes are put in a very prominent way. I have spoken to some of the producers after seeing these films but they say that all these are required for box-office success. If, they say, they do not put these things, people do not buy tickets. The way to popularise any kind of idea is to direct the people to the way of life that would heighten their standard of life, not lower it. Some of the producers all over India are trying their best to produce films of high standards. For example, pictures like *Avvayar*, *Nandanar* etc., are very good. The Censor Board that is proposed to be formed under this Bill must be given power not only to act in a negative way, which is to cut this or cut that, but also be empowered to direct the producers in a way that would enable them to produce proper films.

With these words Sir I support the Bill. I would request the hon Minister to remember all these, especially about film censoring about the need for a separate classification of children's films and, interested as he is in children's films I am sure he will see that the 'C' category is placed in position. Not only that, Sir, but he must also see that cinema theatres are made available for the exhibition of such children's films. And finally I would request that encouragement be given to such of those producers as have undertaken to come forward to help the proper display of the right type of films irrespective of the return they might get. Many of them have come

[Shrimati T. Nallamuthu Ramamurti.] forward and I hope the Government will help them. Finally may I also be allowed to point out the need for greater assistance to the Children's Film Society? Thank you.

DR. A. N. BOSE (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am sorry I cannot welcome this Bill which is framed with a negative approach. It comes forward to prevent, to restrict, to excise, to cut but not to offer a friendly hand towards our growing film industry. Sir, our film industry in spite of all its lapses and faults has been growing by leaps and bounds. It has achieved laurels not only in this country but the world over. It has already made a name for itself and it can compete with the best films of any other country. I had expected that the Government would come forward to encourage this vital industry, to encourage production and to undertake production themselves, to give it financial assistance, and at least to raise the import quota for raw films, to make a more liberal distribution of raw films to deserving producers. I had expected that the Government would come forward with a scheme for producing children's films. I had expected that the Government would come forward with positive 'C'—films made for children instead of negative 'A'—films not made for children but for adults only. Sir, the Government is not the fittest institution to become a moral censor, the censor of public morals. Not only the Government but the Government officers also are not the best custodians or censors of public morals. This very day during question hour a reference was made to a menu card which was printed and distributed for a dinner for the entertainment of the Test cricketers from West Indies. I had the fortune or misfortune to see this card. It bears the photos of glamour girls with a mere apology for clothing and I understand—if I have no wrong information—that high officers of Government, responsible officers, attended this party. Sir, I am not blaming anyone. We are men of flesh and blood with our faults and with our weaknesses

and I do not blame anyone, whether he be an official or whether he be a sportsman, if he chose to attend a function like this. Nor do I blame the glamour girls who showed their charms before a distinguished body like this. But what I mean is that none of us should arrogate to ourselves the position of being the moral guardian over others. None of us is free from sin so as to enable us to pelt stones at others and so we should not assume the role of being a tutor of morals or a censor of morals over others.

Then, Sir, what is the code which the censors will introduce and enforce? Are there any fixed moral values? Can anyone say that this is moral and this is immoral? Are not ideas of moral values changing from age to age, from time to time, from country to country? Take for instance drinking. If there is a drinking scene in a film, is it to be regarded as immoral irrespective of the context or the circumstances? If drinking is demonstrated in a film just for the purpose of showing the evil effects of drinking, should it be regarded as moral or as immoral and fit for excision? Even when shown for a moral purpose, for a healthy purpose, the scene may have quite the opposite effect on different people. It depends entirely upon the constitution, the psychological nature of the person who sees the scene.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: (Uttar Pradesh): Will it not be best to avoid seeing films altogether, avoid going to the cinema houses altogether?

DR. A. N. BOSE: That will be cutting down your head because of headache. If you have headache, you don't cut down your head.

Sir, on page 3, in clause 4 it is stated:

"5B. (1) A film shall not be certified for public exhibition if, in the opinion of the authority competent to grant the certificate, the film or any part of it is against the inte-

rests of the security of the State, friendly relations with foreign States, Public order, decency or morality, or involves defamation or contempt of court or is likely to incite the commission of any offence."

This is too vague and too comprehensive. It is the function of art to expose social injustice and if a gross social injustice is exposed, it might well lead to some disturbance of public order. It might either arouse public conscience and lead to a very peaceful rectification of the injustice or it might otherwise lead to some violence or disturbance ultimately correcting the injustice. The words 'decency or morality' are too vague. Who is to decide what is decent and what is indecent and what is moral and what is immoral? Sir, our old temple sculptures are full of representations of sexy and erotic scenes. These find place in our documentaries. Nobody ever thinks of cutting out these sculptural designs in our ancient architecture. Some people might take it into their head that Venus de Milo is obscene. Who is to decide whether these works of art representing sex and erotics are moral or immoral? And this Bill does not set forth any qualifications or attainments for the selection of Chairman and other members of the Board who might draw up this fine line between sex and sexuality. Even assuming that gross sexuality finds vent through films, is the sexual impulse curbed by taboos like these? They only create an unhealthy inhibition. My small experience has been that when a film with an 'A' certificate comes to be shown in a cinema house young people and adolescents are attracted to go and see it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can continue after lunch.

The House stands adjourned till 2.30 P.M.

The House adjourned for lunch at one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half past two of the clock, MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

DR. A. N. BOSE: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I was just going to say that the urge of sex cannot be curbed by taboos. If you try to do that, it only comes out more violently, through more anti-social channels or creates unhealthy inhibitions. From my little knowledge I find that films which are advertised with an 'A' certificate become an additional inducement to the adolescents. An 'A' certificate is an inducement not only to adolescents, but to adults as well and that is why many film producers would prefer an 'A' to a 'U' certificate.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Bombay): 'A' means adult only; 'U' is universal—is it?

DR. A. N. BOSE: Yes, I do not find in the Bill any age limit between an adult and a child. Might be, it is in the rules. Even if there is any limit, who will verify the age, who is to control and see that the children do not go to a film meant for adults only and who are to be responsible for exercising this control—the guardians of the children, or the cinema authorities or the police? In clause 5, page 4, we find that any police officer, who might be suspecting that in a hall a film with 'A' certificate is being seen by children or adolescents, may enter into the hall and exercise his power to see that the children do not witness the show which is meant for adults only. I cannot imagine a more pathetically funny scene, a police officer forcing his entry into the hall and then driving out adolescents who have mustered strong to see a film which has been advertised with sexual scenes, scenes smacking of sexuality.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Focussing of sex.

DR. A. N. BOSE: You cannot check vice in this manner. After all, vice is more ingenious in evasion than virtue is in detection. The clipped portions of the films appear in advertisement panels in the advertisement

[Dr. A. N. Bose.]

columns of the newspapers, open to the gaze of a larger number of the public. Is there any provision to check this display? In spite of rigid censorship, 'rock-n-roll' films are flooding the market. What is the provision to check this flood? When in an Indian film, a scene of a kiss or an embrace is shown, it appears to be revolting to the censors. But when Western films make a riotous orgy of these demonstrations, we almost shut our eyes . . .

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: You see them, I mean the censors.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: The censors see them.

DR. A. N. BOSE: In some respects, the provisions of the Bill are not merely negative, but even positively dangerous to free institutional enterprise. There might be some case for censorship against professional film producers. But there is none against schools, educational societies, clubs or associations, which might be producing and showing educational and cultural films for their own clientele or for the public at large. The Bill does not provide for any exemption from censorship on their behalf.

Then again, on page 4, in clause 4 (6), lines 25 and 26, while persons whose certificate has been withdrawn and persons whose 'U' certificate has been changed into 'A' certificate, have been given an opportunity to represent their views before the Government, those whose films have been suspended from exhibition altogether for a certain period have not been given any such opportunity. When a direction has been issued for the suspension of exhibition of a film for a particular period, extending upto two months, no opportunity is given to the person concerned for representing his views in the matter. I do not understand why this discrimination is made against these people. Sir, I quite appreciate that the intention of the hon. Minister is good. I shall agree with him that there is a dangerous drift in

our cinema. Where I differ with him is as regards the means he is going to adopt. The means which are envisaged in this Bill are not conducive to the growth of a sound and healthy film industry. In the first place, this Bill does not set up any code the censors will follow. In the second place, this Bill does not specify the qualifications which the censors must possess. Sir, I submit, that it is not at all possible to fix any code distinguishing between morality and immorality. Neither is it possible to find any persons, whatever might be their qualifications, who are competent to make the finer discriminations between good and bad, moral and immoral. I do not say that the film producers should be given a free hand, that they must be allowed to indulge in any kind of immoral demonstrations. Let them be punished if they are guilty of moral turpitude, just as you treat an obscene book, just as you treat pornography in speech, in conduct, or in writing. Let the film producers be treated in the same manner. I am opposed only to statutory control. Let there be control by all means. Let there be a non-official Board of Censors as in the U.K. and for the rest, I think, public opinion, public conscience will assert itself in due time and do the needful.

Thank you.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am glad this Bill has at last seen the light of the day, because as early as four years back, the hon. Minister had promised a comprehensive Cinematograph Bill. Once it was introduced. Perhaps it was withdrawn. But even today, I feel that the Bill is very disappointing and is not meant to cover all the hopes raised. Everyone of us is aware about the agitation in the country, about the nature of films. Even in the Consultative Committee and even in this House, it was for the first time that a Resolution of this House was accepted by Government, moved by Mrs. Lilavati Munshi then, with certain

modifications suggested by the hon Minister. The criticism that was laid before the House was known to the Minister, and yet what do we find? We find that the Bill is not really touching any of those points. The Ministry took the trouble, in 1954 perhaps, to hold seminars, and a lady from England, Miss Norris, was present, and producers of film like Sohrab Modi and other persons were asked to speak why the standard of film should not be raised. They put forward their difficulties that box office receipt was the chief factor ultimately in spite of their best efforts to do their duty by the country. They said they did not lag behind anybody in the country to see that the future of the coming generation was not affected by the films. They said that some of them had become broke. Sohrab Modi, I remember, said so about some films which were meant to be put before the people showing the glorious past of the country.

Then it was suggested, I remember—the hon Mr. Kunzru is not here today—that the Government would move for having a Film Finance Corporation, and there was a suggestion that some films should be made which Government considered ideal, where 51 per cent of the finance should come from Government. I do not know where all these things have gone. They seem to have been forgotten by the hon Minister in his zeal to see that 'shastriya sangeet' becomes the order of the day and film music does not really catch the imagination of the younger generation who would then be apt to forget 'shastriya sangeet'. Well, that was a good effort, but at the same time he did forget the important part of the Ministry's work, namely, that that was a thing which was never expected from the hon. Minister when he took up this Ministry with the zeal and interest he showed in this subject.

Sir, we are apt to forget the importance of visual education in our various problems of the day, economic and other matters, particularly foreign

affairs over which I do not understand why we are so much exercised when the very ground under our feet is sinking, when the whole house in which we are staying is on fire or likely to be on fire, because the future of our children is at stake, children who are being brought up under the influence of these cursed films today, crime films full of other aspects of life which are neither Indian nor Western. Sir, everybody realises that visual education is an important part of education, and films can play a very important part in bringing the nation to a proper standard from all points of view in the shortest possible time and not only as far as the education of children is concerned. It is for that reason that various Ministries go to the Information and Broadcasting Ministry with a request to produce films for them. The Labour Ministry go to them on some subjects about the conditions in mines and other places, the Education Ministry about films useful for being shown to children, the Railway Ministry about films regarding places of interest in the country, the Health Ministry about films on family planning, and so on. What being so, Sir, it should be quite obvious to the Ministry that 75 per cent of its energy, time and resources should be devoted to the proper development of the film industry and the proper guidance of that industry. Sir, I wish that the Ministry had applied itself to this question with that conviction and zeal as it did to a subject like television. In this poor country there are very few people who would be able to use the television sets; very few people within the radius permissible of 20 miles at present in big towns would be able to use this television only through sets provided in public places by the Ministry. Who are the people, Sir, who would be able to benefit by television except the commercial people who will be able to sell their sets? It is they who are interested, who are trying to offer perhaps some temptation of giving some free set which they have brought for exhibition in our country and also of providing some sets which they

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.] could not take back as perhaps the models have become old and the expenditure over taking them back would not be worthwhile. We are very gullible, we are taken in, and they persuade us to spend on television. It would be like putting the cart before the horse if this country which cannot give its people even food to eat, where 80 per cent. of the people are going about without shoes on their feet and where perhaps 40 or 50 per cent. of the people have not even houses which can shelter them from sun and rain, were to spend even that small portion of its money on television on the ground that it should not seem lagging behind other countries. What is the use, I would ask, of showing that we are marching along with other countries only by importing scientists and going with a begging bowl all the time not only for our scientific advancement but also for our daily bread? That scientific advancement can come within six months when the time comes. It is not a very difficult thing these days. The commercial people who are anxious to sell more material will themselves provide the scientists and the wherewithal.

Sir, these remarks may look somewhat not connected with the Bill. But, Sir, the opportunities to speak on such an important subject and to put before the Minister the most important points on which the women, the people of the country and the educationists have been exercised, without having any help given to them and feeling helpless, are so few that only on the floor of the House this matter can be given its due importance. And so, in this First Reading, I hope, the Minister would not think as is the fashion with many Ministers to say having the chance of the last word to speak, that matters relevant and irrelevant were discussed. Matters may be relevant and irrelevant to the particular clauses that may be brought, but the relevant point is that clauses which should have been brought have not been brought.

Now I would also like to point out, Sir, that with this attitude there is so much, if I may use the word, confusion with regard to the correlation of the different Ministries in the matter of the cinemas and the films and the functions they have to perform for the advancement of the younger generation, that we see such spectacles, there being no decision as to who should deal with the import aspect of a film and who should deal with the export aspect of a film, whether it should be the External Affairs Ministry which should see whether a certain film is good for being sent abroad or whether it should be the Education Ministry which should send it abroad. We have seen films being sent abroad without anybody going into the question, on the ground that people have every right to have free trade. If we can put restrictions on certain things that are necessary for the country as not to be sent abroad, is it not our duty and the duty of the Ministry to come forward and say that when the exhibition of certain films or certain portions of them which may go without much criticism here would still bring discredit to the country, they should not be sent? It should be the duty of the Ministry. People may come from outside; they may take films anywhere they like and ridicule our country in the eyes of the world. I would here refer to the films 'The Cinerama' and 'Round the World in Eighty Days'. I asked a question on the floor of the House whether the Ministry was consulted in this regard and strangely enough, the question was transposed from the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting to the Ministry of Commerce and Industry as if they had something to do with giving permit. Why it was not sent to the Home Ministry for allowing that gentleman to come, I do not know. With this confusion, anything could happen. After all, what would people say when in this twentieth century, in 1959, this film is being shown three or four times? Millions of people go to western countries like England, etc. It is shown in the film that in India

today, only to maintain friction on the sliding motion of the Darjeeling-Himalayan Railway train, two men sit in front of the engine and go on pouring some sand on the track instead of devising some mechanical method to stop the train from slipping back. And the whole train is shown as going backwards. It may be a sense of humour. And so many anachronisms are shown in that film. In the film relating to sixty or seventy years ago, the performance of 'suttee' is shown in the forests of Madhya Pradesh. A deep forest is shown near Allahabad where ultimately that princess who was to have committed 'suttee' was rescued by the gentleman who went round the world in eighty days, and finally he married her. If somebody had taken care to see that such things were not shown, it would have been better. Similarly, there are other features also which I do not want to go into. Immediately the word 'film' is brought, at once without much thought of going into the whole question, somebody in the Secretariat thinks that 'film' must mean 'raw film' and that 'raw film' must go to the Commerce and Industries Ministry. And what can the Commerce and Industry Ministry do about this? So, with regard to the films that are imported, some confusion goes round. I am open to correction, about 1,500 films from abroad were imported last year as against about five hundred odd films produced in this country. I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether, with the machinery that has been devised here for examining and censoring these films, it is possible to examine these 1,500 films? As a result, what happens? These films, because of the method of censorship, are not examined as closely as they deserve to be. Either they should be censored, or do not have them. There should not be double standards. Our film producers always complain that we have different standards for foreign films and for our films.

If the object is not only to see that there is consistency about the life in our country but also that the younger

generation particularly is saved from the deleterious effect of bad exhibition or of seeing bad films, I do not think we should allow in our country the exhibition of crime films and gangster films. Because those films are very popular and get better box-office receipts, our film producers also have started copying them. And the crimes that are depicted, I feel, would create sooner a nation of criminals than a nation of people who are devoted to learning other things. In fact, that is what has happened in America. If you were to meet and talk to educationists, many of them would say that the films have had a bad effect on people there. I would here refer to one or two films of this type. One is 'Aparadhi Kaun' and the other is 'Hill Station.' The portions that I would refer here are crimes, such as showing the key-door to an underground cellar, where to hide criminals or where to carry on gambling. The films depict breaking of glass by throwing acetylene flame, opening of safes, playing on guns, switching off the lights and removing the jewellery from the neck of the lady whose birthday was being celebrated, cutting telephone wire, cutting the signals and all these things. Is it necessary to have them? It may be said that it is life; it may be said that the younger generation of people who have not been reading books have not been spoiled. But you have to appreciate that films are seen by uneducated people; particularly those living a dull, drab life want to have some sort of entertainment. These films are seen by people for their music and other attractive aspects; they are seen in the villages by very young children and the impression of these on them is very deep. Very often, when children were asked whether they learned such things, they said that they saw them in the cinema. In some of these films like 'Ek Hi Rastha', Daisi Irani or somebody is brought in as a child in imitation of Shirley Temple. She is shown, in a certain act of injustice to the mother by the father, as pointing the pistol at the father. And there are many things like getting rid of a person you

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.] do not want in public life by asking a driver to run down and kill him. There are many things of that type. I would like to say that if there is an effective censorship, these things would not come in. Our hon. Minister is keen on Shastriya Sangeet, as he rightly is proud of our culture. We are all proud of it. But it is no use doing one thing on one side and on the other, keeping your eyes shut to the most important aspect which is having a greater effect of spoiling our national character, our national life. I would refer to the present day films where practically every film has some sort of a dance scene, as is done in hotels today. Women in ugly, stripped dresses are dancing in a very crude and vulgar manner, and particularly, life that is neither western cultural life nor Indian cultural life is depicted . . .

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Is it any life?

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND:through the so-called Goanese type of Hindi. I do not know which type of life is being depicted there. I was talking to a most important person—I will not mention name—concerned with the censorship of films, and he said, if you like to see the argument that these producers would give, it is that our big hotels are staging this type of crude life as entertainment. A woman is brought on the stage and she is asked to dance in such an ugly manner; neither it is the classical dance of the west or the east, nor is it any jazzmusic. It is in such a vulgar manner which I had seen in 1937 going round to see the night life of New York. Therefore, it is no use sitting in complacency here because under Article 19 of the Constitution, freedom of expression is given to producers, such as it is given to any writer or any public speaker or a publisher of a paper. It is no use being afraid of the High Court judgements some of which have gone in favour of some of the producers who went to the courts against certain decisions

regarding censorship. The plain thing to do is that Article 15 of the Constitution gives us power, in the interest of moral and ethical standards to take steps to curtail certain liberties. But if this is not enough in the light of judgments of High Courts, and even, maybe, of the Supreme Court, it was high time, before this Bill was brought, for the Ministry to have taken steps to change the Constitution in the interest of the country's future. It is such a serious matter. I feel we are sitting on a volcano today as our Prime Minister said in another place and in another context at Delhi University, but it has connection with this also, that when nearly thirty to forty years have passed between one generation and the other we are not in a position always to know what is going on in the minds of the younger generation. We are so much cut away from them. We are here training our younger generation in a different manner by just ignoring the effects of this. No less a person than Dr. Kane, who is sitting here, was telling me during recess that there was a time, some fifteen or twenty years back, when he used to make it a point to go to a picture once a week for entertainment. Now the films are so hideous and ugly that somebody said, "Don't you open your eyes". I would say that I know some people who close their eyes when they see some ugly and hideous scenes in the films. He said he has stopped going to the cinemas. I should say that the Ministry should have, after consulting the party people, put before the people, the need for changing the Constitution. The producers themselves have said this. No less a person than V. Shantaram, when he had come before the Consultative Committee, said that if they were guaranteed certain profits by taking care that certain films did not become failures, they would co-operate with any policies of the Ministry. Something should have been done. When we are wasting money over plans and over so many projects, over useless buildings that are coming up, when the schemes which are to be taken up in these

buildings are not ready, I am sure the country would have given money for this entertainment, for this arm of education by raising even a loan. That should have been done.

Sir, I would like also to say that before such Bills, which leave much to be desired, are brought in the busy legislative programmes in the House—there is not much time again and again to bring this Bill—it would have been better if the Consultative Committee of the Ministry and such Members of Parliament as are interested had been taken into confidence and had been asked to make any other suitable suggestions.

Sir, I would like also to point out here that something has to be done—this is the first reading—by the Ministry to reduce the number of imported foreign films. Many other countries are doing it. They are restricting it, I think, to as low a percentage as 10 to 20 of the production of films in their country, while here we are importing three times the number of the films produced in our country.

Sir, having said that, I would also, before I go further, like to refer to the agitation raised by women, particularly in Delhi, where very often it is difficult to get more than 200 women from the middle class and lower middle class because of their family obligations and duties in the house, as many as 4,000 women had collected at a meeting conducted by Adarsh Mahila Samaj in front of the Laxmi Narain temple, which is popularly called Birla Temple—Birla, is made the twelfth incarnation; perhaps money is the god these days.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not concerned with all this.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: I am coming to this. This Delhi meeting demonstrated and even wrote to the Prime Minister and to some higher persons who are not supposed to be

mentioned in this House. But nothing has been done with regard to changing the censorship of the films.

Secondly, the time for seeing films in places like Delhi and Bombay has also to be changed. The hon. Minister might say this is not his function; it is the duty of the Home Ministry. But what I am pointing out here is that there has to be co-ordination. Information does not mean giving information in any way, without seeing to the effects of that information, without seeing how it comes in the way of children going to colleges. Many students go from home from far off distances telling their parents that they are going to schools and colleges but they go to these cinema houses. Sir, it is high time that not only the interest of the trade is seen, but the interest of the younger generation, their right to have an education, which is not sullied by such factors, is not interfered with by such temptations, is made available to them.

Coming to some of the features of the Bill, Sir, I would like to mention here the question of certification—"Universal" and "Adult" under sub-section (iv) of Section 4 of the Bill. It has again come in sub-sections (ii) and (ii) of the same Section.

How is it possible in our country, as was pointed out by Dr. Bose just now, to implement this "Adult" and "Universal" certification? It is found, as a rule, that when "Adult" is put, not only here, even in England where they have the means of checking the age, and people there are more law-abiding—it acts as an advertisement for rush to the cinema. In our country it is very difficult to check the age, because of what I suppose malnutrition and other things, to say who is 18 and who is 25. Sometimes a man of 25 looks 18. As a result, Sir, it would be better if—I am making this suggestion for incorporation—"adult" films are shown either on certain days or only at late hours so that in the general rush when people are waiting—sometimes what is usual with our

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.] cinema people is they will show one show "Universal" and the next show "Adult"—people do not get mixed up. So, if some device of consulting the exhibitors themselves is found to make this practicable, that would be better. Otherwise I would suggest that altogether different theatres should be built for adults where a check could be exercised. Something will have to be done; otherwise this distinction has not much meaning, not much use.

Sir, the trailers of "Adult" films are always shown when films with "Universal" certificates are being shown. That again creates a craving for seeing films which the people are not meant to see. Apart from the posters which are being put there—I am glad the Delhi picture houses at least have stopped these posters as a protest—the cinema advertisements in the newspapers also are something in which the Ministry by taking the help of the Home Ministry should have done something, and should do something.

Sir, with regard to the children's films, I would like to say a word. It is a good thing that children's films should be produced. Not only that, it is very essential that there should be some sort of provision for entertainment of children—by children here I would really mean those that are below ten years. But the type of films that are produced, howsoever educative they may be, as far as children below ten are concerned—I am speaking of Ganga Ki Lehren—go over the head of these people. Similarly, films like Scout Camp. I do not know what is there in it for children. I am referring at the moment to children below ten. I would come to adolescents later. Even the children seeing those horrifying scenes about Dakus in caves get so much frightened that they would never like to see them; they would close their eyes. Sir, we imported a film from Russia. It was a very good film. I forget now what that film was. But we have to make some distinction bet-

ween the films suitable for different age groups. If we want our little children to see films, they should really be suitable to them.

There is another thing also. I have heard something about the film 'Haria', although I did not see that film myself. It shows a person who is supposed to get into the I.A.S., as if that is the greatest triumph or human achievement. That person is shown as pushing some lady school teacher into a ditch or something like that. Now, Sir, little children only see these pranks. Pranks which are natural should be allowed. But there is no point in teaching such types of pranks.

Then, Sir, I would like to say something with regard to expenditure on these films. I am told that on the film 'Scout Camp' about Rs. 90,000 were spent. I do not know about 'Haria'. There are many people who would be prepared to sell you a film. Children's films need not be of a three-hour or four-hour duration. They need not be as lengthy as 12,000, 13,000 or 14,000 feet. As a matter of fact, it would be much better to give scope to private enterprise in the matter of these small films in order to see if expenditure on them could be reduced and more films could thus be made available. If four or five films could be produced for the cost that is at present incurred on one film, I think we would be gainers. I would also suggest that films of the type of 'Scout Camp', which deal with adventure, camp life and discipline, are useful for children of the age group of 12 to 18 years. We should take care to see that little children are not shown those films. Then among these films also there are two classes, Class I and Class II films.

Sir, having said all that, I would like the hon. Minister to tell us as to what is going to be done to start a film corporation for financing these films, of course, not undertaking them completely, because all such ventures become very expensive. That is all due to inexperienced persons running

them. At least there should be 10 to 20 films per year and we should see whether the public appreciates them or not. I would therefore request that this question should be taken into consideration not only by the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, but it should be tackled in consultation with the representatives of five Ministries which I mentioned just now, namely, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Labour, the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, the Ministry of Community Development and the Ministry of Education. We should try to produce films which make a real difference in the life of the people of this country. We should try to stop the influence that is created by films exhibiting crime and gangsterism which are being shown. Our films which copy those things should not be given any certificate.

Then, Sir, one word more with regard to the number of censors mentioned here. It has been stated that they are paid a fee of Rs. 10. It does not really matter whether they are paid this much or even nothing at all. The point is that the number of censors today—I am talking of Bombay—being ten and the number of films to be seen there being perhaps 600 or 700, some of the censors find it very boring to go there and sit throughout the duration of those films. Usually what is done is that a censor goes and sits for about one hour and then he tells his colleague “I am of the same opinion as yourself, and please take my signature; I am signing this.” And what is worse still? I know it myself that sometimes the opinion about a particular film is written in advance by some kind-hearted officers and these members are asked to simply sign it. What is the use of such film censorship, I would like to ask? I would, therefore, like to suggest that at least 100 people are necessary on this body, and each of them should not be given, in a year, more than ten films to be seen, and that too at the rate of not more than two or three in three months. Then only will they be able to feel that this is not just a

duty to be done without any relevance to the importance attached to it, and then only will this censorship have some meaning.

Sir, there is just one more suggestion. Though film cuts are introduced, yet when any member of the advisory panel goes, with the help of a free pass given to him, for checking conditions of safety and other things, there is no indication for that person to go and find out from the box office or the manager's office as to what portions have been removed. Sir, the checking system in our country is so slack that there is nothing to prevent anybody from putting in those portions which were actually removed by the Board. So, Sir, it is very necessary that a detailed description in respect of such persons who are entrusted with this duty should be available in the manager's office in order to see whether the portions objected to have been removed or not. That is not being done at present.

Lastly, Sir, it is impossible for the Government to achieve its objects through its paid censors, when this task is so big. It would, therefore, be desirable for the Government, through various organisations, especially social organisations and women's organisations, to have a six-film club or a twelve-film club where members can offer their comments and criticisms about a particular film. Such criticisms will, I suppose, be of considerable help to the Chairman of the Board of Film Censors. If that is done, I think, it would make a world of difference, as far as the general interests of the public are concerned. The public will also feel that the Government does care for its views. At present, Sir, in whatever section of society you go, you will find complaints that the members are doing nothing about the type of films that are being shown and the havoc that is being played in these matters. For this reason, Sir, I would like the hon. Minister to take

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.]

interest in these matters, and I think within one year or so something can certainly be done to see that films of really suitable types are shown and there is not much cause left for complaints. With these few words, Sir, I support the Bill.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, my observations on this Bill will be very few. The influence of films on society is indeed tremendous. In fact, fashions are copied, gangsterism is copied, crimes are copied and other evils are copied not only among the lower classes of people, but also among the middle and higher classes of people. So it is very necessary to see that the fare that we give in the films is something which does not degenerate society. This question, Mr. Deputy Chairman, is a very difficult one. When entertainment is provided, you cannot make it didactic. You cannot make it censorious. People must like it. Yet, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would like to say this and refer to one matter in addition to the many things that have already been mentioned here. We see in some of our films, as opposed to what is obtaining in other countries, Hindu gods and goddesses being portrayed in the most abominable manner. Krishna is being portrayed and the way in which it is done is such that you have the greatest contempt for Krishna after seeing that film. We see Siva and Parvati being portrayed and after seeing the film one has the greatest contempt for Siva and Parvati.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Parvati with lip-stick.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: That is not how we build up cultural values. The influence of films is very great and sometimes even Deputy Ministers go about copying their dresses. You can imagine . . .

AN. HON. MEMBER: Whose dress?

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: Dresses of film stars. I cannot imagine what sort of cultural traditions you are building because these produce contempt for our gods and goddesses. I understand that in Christian countries the filming of Christ is prohibited. And that is for the very simple reason that they want to retain Christ as a god or a messenger come with a message to the world and they do not want that he should be shown in a cheap manner in films. So also in Muslim countries they dare not show Mohammed the Prophet or any other saint in a film. It is only in this country, Mr. Deputy Chairman, where we see this thing being done. We are called a religious people with belief in spiritual things and we bring into contempt gods and goddesses whom we worship in our homes. I would like to enquire whether we cannot put a ban on the depiction of gods and goddesses in films. Mythological themes had a sway, but today we are going in more and more for social topics and themes for stories for films and this is but as it should be. But when we are thinking of preserving the cultural values of the country, such presentation of gods and goddesses whom we worship should not be allowed and they should not be treated in the light manner as is done at present in our films.

The next point that I would like to mention, Mr. Deputy Chairman, is this. The influence of films being so tremendous, the duty of the Film Censorship Board also becomes very important. There is the question of the selection of the personnel for this. I think one hon. Member has already touched upon this matter. This, indeed, is a very important matter. It is true that the type of people we want for censoring films may not have the time necessary for this purpose. For that very reason and in order to reduce the time and the strain on the Censors, the number on the Board should be increased—again a suggestion that has been made by the previous speaker. I say this, because it is not money that matters. After all

decent people may not mind the receipt or non-receipt of Rs. 10. What really matters is that we must have people who can set up the proper standards. You cannot set up standards on paper. You cannot do so by issuing rules. It is something which comes out of what each man feels as he sees the thing, what he feels will be the impression that the film will make upon the youth, upon the old and on others. When this is to be judged, it cannot be done by the written word. This man who judges the film must himself have that view of life which would make him judge the film properly. To my mind, this is the most important aspect of this work, namely proper men on the Board.

One other matter, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would like to mention. I find a welcome departure and a substantial new amendment in this Bill. Till now we issued certificates to films, saying that some are for adults and some for everybody. But the unfortunate thing is, when you want to confine a film to adults that is the very film to which all the adolescents flock. I was told—I do not see films very often—if you want to attract college girls and boys to a film, the simple way is to just say that it is reserved only for adults. You just say that, then college girls and boys will flock to it. That is what I understand. And as in the case of some other measures that we have, till now no penal action has been taken in any cinema house in Delhi or in any other place for that matter, where children have been admitted to adult shows. I see that in clause 5, a new provision—Section 7A—is to be added and there is to be a provision for taking action in this matter. I hope, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that action will really be taken. As you know, we have passed many measures and many Acts, Acts by the dozens, and if all of them were administered properly, then society would have been much better. But very many of the Bills we pass remain unenforced, just pious hopes or enactments. But I should hope,

Mr. Deputy Chairman, having in view the tremendous possibilities of films, that this provision will be enforced. I hope steps will be taken to watch and to have checks, surprise checks made so that this provision may be enforced.

There is only one other matter which I want to mention. I hope the Censor Board which censors these films are also the censors for the educational films that are being imported into this country. Will Dr. Keskar kindly confirm?

DR. B. V. KESKAR: Pardon?

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: Are the educational films imported into this country being censored by this same Board of Censors?

DR. B. V. KESKAR: Films of every type are censored by them.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: I find that we imported some educational film on health and then for seven, eight and nine months they were held up at Bombay because the Board had no time to go through them. I suppose the reason was that big producers canvassed for their films to be censored earlier and there was the inducement to get them censored earlier. But nobody cares when they are educational films, to be utilised for the health of the country. There is no inducement for the censors to go through them, I think we should issue special instructions with regard to educational films that they must be passed as soon as possible so that they may be useful.

I have nothing more to say, Mr. Deputy Chairman, but to conclude by saying that some of these suggestions and new provisions are welcome, especially the provision for the enforcement of the law when adult films are shown to children. Another matter which I have mentioned earlier is about the depicting of gods and goddesses and on that

[Shri T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar.] there is no provision in this Bill. I do not know whether instructions can be issued departmentally over this matter. If that cannot be done, I hope another amendment will be brought forward in the interest of the great cultural traditions of this country.

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have heard the speeches of the hon. Members who have spoken before me and I find that all of them laid great stress on the necessity for the censors taking proper care to see that objectionable portions are not allowed to come in. As a matter of fact, as you know, this industry at present is one of the biggest industries in the country. I think it is second biggest industry, the biggest being the textile industry, and this has a very powerful and great scope for doing good or evil. If this film industry is properly canalised and properly directed, it can be one of the most powerful means for education in our country, which is very much needed. Therefore, it is absolutely necessary that the harmful parts of this industry are controlled and efforts should be made to see that the country begins to produce proper class of films which will be very useful for the education of children and for the education of adults.

The documentaries that are being produced by the Government are very useful and they give a lot of information. Even the children go there and enjoy them. They get a lot of information and education. These pictures also do a lot of propaganda work in order to show what Government is doing. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand suggested that Government should take the initiative in having a number of good films, which will be worthwhile making, so that the pictures may be easily available. At the moment, the producers look to the income side. They will not produce a film unless they feel that that will be a great success and will bring in a

lot of money. That being their chief aim, they cater to the taste as it exists at present. The taste at present is not good. Films which do not have a love story or sex appeal do not have a good run and that is why producers are producing films of that nature. Therefore, something should be done to encourage better types of films being produced by way of either help or subsidy so that the producers will be in a position to produce a better class of films.

The question of the censors has been brought in. I think that it is a fact that they do not get any time to examine the films that are shown to them very carefully. Moreover, the kind of people that you have on these Boards is such that the feeling that is expressed here in this House by a number of speakers does not appeal to them much. Therefore, at least some of the persons on these Boards should be persons with some sort of an Indian religious background so that the objections that have been pointed out in regard to the Gods and Goddesses being depicted in a vulgar manner any be borne in mind and the production of such pictures may be stopped.

So far as this Bill is concerned, some powers have been taken to check some of these evils but so long as some effective steps are not taken to divert the channel, to regulate it on proper lines in regard to the kind of films that should be produced in the interests of the country, we cannot hope for much.

The Bill, as has been pointed out, gives authority for the Censors to give directions regarding the portions to be cut out, the portions to be left out, etc., etc., but there is need for some sort of positive directions to be given. I do not know whether it would be possible to do this. I am not much conversant with this industry but if something could be done to direct the producers to produce a better class of films, that will certainly go a long way in making this industry a useful

adjunct for the work that the Government is trying to do for educating the people.

With these remarks, I support the Bill and I hope the hon. Minister will take steps to see that something positive is done to improve the type of films that are produced and to stop the large number of rotten films that we see in the country today.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, much has been said about this. I would only like to add a word or two. Firstly, I have very great objections to the length of our pictures produced in India. India, which is the second biggest producer of pictures, I think, believes in producing pictures of quantity, that is, in length and not in quality. I do not know how many times the hon. Minister has said that one of the greatest obstructions so far as this film industry is concerned is the want of films. I do not know, therefore, how, in spite of the difficulty that we are experiencing in respect of raw films, the Censor Board or the Government is allowing such lengthy pictures. In an Indian picture, we see unnecessary dances and songs introduced at every stage. If at least these songs and dances were true to our Indian culture or Indian taste, one can appreciate it but, as my hon. friend, Mrs. Seeta Parmanand, said, they are neither Eastern nor Western. It is neither the best of the Western nor the best of the Eastern but I think it is the worst of the Western and the worst of the Eastern combined together. What I want to say is that, firstly, the Censor Board should see that the length of the films is cut, secondly, the Censor Board should start censoring the pictures even at the stage of the script. Most of the time, the picture is censored after production, that is, after the script is written, the films shot and just before exhibition it is sent to the censors for censoring purposes. If there is anything objectionable, it is cut here and there and a lot of hotch-potch is done. There is no con-

tinuity, no homogeneity. If instead of all this, you start censoring at the initial stage of the script, that will be better. If you find some pictures not coming up to the standard, the best thing is to prohibit the exhibition of the entire film, instead of cutting here and there. If you do that, it will teach a very good lesson to the producers who believe in box office collection, who believe in minting money but not in producing a piece of art or culture.

I should like to congratulate the Government on the feature films produced by them. The documentaries and the feature films are very good and some of these features are not shown to the public for the full one hour or one and half hours. Full opportunity is not given to the people to see these feature films completely. I want Government to make it compulsory for every exhibitor to show this feature film in full at least once or twice a week.

Incidentally, I would like to mention about the import of raw film. Though this does not directly concern the Ministry, I would like the Minister to urge upon the Ministry of Commerce and Industry not to put any ban on the import of raw film. Some friends suggested that if we allowed the full import of raw films, it might mean encouraging the producers to produce lengthy films. This need not be so. You can have a statutory limit. You can say that a film should not be more than so many feet in length. You should not, in any case, stop the import of raw film and this I say for two reasons. Firstly, this is one of the biggest industries which gives a lot of scope for employment and secondly, it earns foreign exchange also. For these two reasons, I feel that no unnecessary limit should be put on the import of raw film.

The other thing that I want to say is about the children's films. I am glad that the Government have now taken to producing children's films but, as mentioned by a friend before

[Shrimati Yashoda Reddy.]

me, private producers should be given greater encouragement because children's films are of the greatest value to day. Producers do not produce pictures of high standards because they say that they do not get good box office returns. If a picture with subtle humour is produced, people do not understand it. I am sorry to say that our people are not educated enough to understand subtlety or humour or anything. Surely, you can train the younger generation. If you cannot solve the problem, the only thing you can do is to solve the problem by educating your younger generation and for educating the younger generation, film is one of the most important media. For this purpose, I think, Government, even at the cost of other things, should give more financial help and incentive to the private producers of children's films so that they can produce more pictures suited for children.

Even in these pictures for children, another thing which I want to suggest is that the national aspect of our culture should be stressed, not the aspect of one region or another, whether it be Andhra, Bengal, Orissa or any other region. It is not the regional or the language culture but the national culture and heritage, that feeling of oneness that we are all Indians, it is that national culture that should be brought in in these pictures which are shown to the children so that the children who see these pictures should become national-minded, India-minded and not regional or State-minded.

Sir, just now my hon. friend who spoke earlier, Mr. Avinashilingam Chettiar, said that these pictures are about Gods and Goddesses. Here I would only like to say one word. I am also one of those people who are very fond of pictures but now-a-days I dread to go and see pictures because the standards have become so low. The only set of pictures which are still a little tolerable—though they have also got many drawbacks, they

are still decent for ordinary people to see—are these mythological pictures or these religious pictures because our social pictures have become a sort of horror pictures which nobody can understand and which are beyond the common man's comprehension because these producers are so imaginative. I do not really know what has happened to our censors when they allow such pictures to be exhibited. Though these mythological pictures have their own drawbacks they are the only pictures in India today which we can see. I do not say they are the best—you need not laugh at me—but they are the only silver lining in the black cloud of Indian films. So I want to stress this point that when the hon. Minister looks into this matter he must see that people with more imagination, with more aesthetic values and with better standards are employed in the Censor Board and that, I think, will go a long way to improve the film industry. Thank you.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am rather surprised to hear that the film industry is one of the important industries in the country or a very progressive industry in India. As far as my knowledge goes about this film industry, I do recollect that in the year 1949, probably on the 29th August, a Film Enquiry Committee was constituted and that Committee submitted its Report in the year 1951. After that we had the Indian Cinematograph Act of 1952 and then the Cinematograph Rules of 1958. In between there was a Cinematograph Bill of 1956 introduced in this hon. House but probably later on it was withdrawn. From what I have heard in the House today I do feel that the opinions expressed by hon. Members here do reflect the correct view and they put me in a position to understand where the Information and Broadcasting Ministry stands. We find that there is a complaint against the film producers that they are only producing such films which in the

long run are going to give them money, a box office hit and the like and what we find on the other side is that our Censor Board is not functioning as it ought to function. There are complaints that films are exhibited which ought not to have been exhibited because they are vulgar and that the censor has not done full justice to it. I really fail to understand as to who is to be blamed for this. Either we should put the blame on the Information and Broadcasting Ministry or on the industry. What I feel is that since 1949 when the Film Enquiry Committee was appointed, Government has taken steps to improve the censor standards and also the film industry but we find that even after nine years or 10 years—because we are now in the year 1959—there is no improvement. Although there were Resolutions passed in Lok Sabha and in this House, we find that things are where they were. So I wonder whether the hon. Minister is confident that the introduction of these few amendments regarding these Censor Boards would in any way help in improving the film industry. I have my own doubts, Sir, because the same type of Board which we had under the Rules is to be continued. It is only just giving a statutory position. Now, I can understand that very well. There was a case, if my recollection is right, where a point was raised whether Parliament has given absolute power to the Film Censor Board and I think probably that is why the hon. Minister has taken his courage in both hands to come before this House with this legislation.

Sir, I have tried to follow the legislation and I would like to submit that the Government itself is not clear in its mind as to what action should be taken. And when I say that, I say that with a full sense of responsibility because we find from the reports—I would not name the Ministers but I am bringing it to the notice of the Information and Broadcasting Minister—that the Ministers give all kind of hopes. They say, 'we

are going to have a Film Finance Corporation; we are going to have Film Councils; we are going to have Film Institute; we are going to have Production Bureau' this, that and the other. I regret to note that even the hon. Minister who is piloting this Bill gave out such hopes in the past. Now an hon. Minister goes to perform some Muhurat ceremony and they say, 'what we want is that the film industry should improve itself and it should have a free hand.' Now I fail to understand whether it is the definite policy of the Government of India or not to maintain the Film Censor Board. And if it is their policy I would certainly request the hon. Minister to put proper persons on the Film Censor Board. We have just heard a member in this very House who was on the Film Censor Board and as was explained, probably it is not possible to do full justice because there are very many films. May I inform you and through you the House that only 253 films have been censored by the Censor Board in the year 1957 and about 293 in the year 1958?

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY:
How many were produced?

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: I think the production must also have been to that extent. As the hon. Lady Member herself said, it is only scissoring which is done by the Censor Board. They should do away with the film altogether.

Now, what do we find? This is the standard of the Censor Board. I would not go into the details of the pictures but I would only give you some names of the films which will give you an idea of how it will affect a young man, whether they are 'U' films or 'A' films. You find a film named Honey-moon.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH (Madhya Pradesh): That will give some attraction.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: That is what I say. Either you have attraction or you do not say this is not

[Shri Amolakh Chand.]
a proper picture. Why have a Film Censor Board if they cannot understand what is "Honeymoon"? Then, another picture you will find the name is "Yaar". I do not know if the members of the Censor Board know as to what is "Yaar". "Yaar" is paramour.

Now, Sir, what we find is that the Film Censor Board have said that those persons who are in authority or those who have to maintain law and order should not be depicted in films to degenerate or create feelings against them. And now what do we find from the Film Censor Board? The name of a film is "Sipahi-ki-Sajani". If you translate it, it would mean 'beloved of a constable'.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: Do you mean to say that constables have no beloveds?

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: I know. Why talk about poor constables who maintain law and order in the name of the Government? Some of us may have our own 'Sajanis' and 'yaars' and all that. What I want to impress on the House is how these names are taken and how they are acted upon to bring people to the cinema hall. I will come to that later on. Now, Sir, you will find a film named "Zara Bachh ke, Zara Hat ke". What is all this? These are the names of the films. Then, you find "Dilli ka Thug". I was moving about in the city of Bombay in the first week of January, with a few friends, and then we saw a board "Dilli ka Thug". And I may tell you how the people are affected. "No, no, he is an innocent man. This depicts other 'higher-ups' in the Government." "Dilli ka Thug"—what is this? I cannot understand. How can you call it in the name of a city or a place like Delhi? Delhi is your capital.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): What was that film?

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: That is the name of the film. I have not seen

that film. Probably, before that there would be the Films Division or some view of the Parliament around and thereafter "Dilli ka Thug" will follow. I am just trying to tell you how these Boards are functioning. Then, you will find "Miss Toofan Mail"; "Miss Punjab Mail"; "Miss Janata Express" "Miss 1958", and so on and so forth. Then, I would like to tell you of the film "Pahla, Pahla Pyar". Then, you will find other names "Sun to le Haseena". That means, "Oh! Beautiful, Just Hear Me". If I tell you how it is advertised, when you put these words in Hindi or in other languages, they read so bad that I do not know as to why these censor people have not even the commonsense to understand the names of the films. Now, if you just put it like that "Sun to le Ha-Seena".

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: Why "Seena"? It is "Haseena".

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: "Ha-Seena". But I may tell you how these advertisers use these names which are altogether vulgar.

Now, Sir, what I was trying to impress on the hon. Minister was to keep proper respect for proper places. It is not necessary that we should overburden all the Censor Boards with ladies. I do not object to them. They are very good critics. They might have a very good mind, heart and culture. But that does not mean that they should not be able to follow such ordinary things. Anyway, I will not take up the time of the House. . .

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: When they tolerate, why do you object?

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: If everything is to be tolerated, if a man is attacked and he does not go to the police station, it does not mean that you should not talk about it. I cannot understand this from my hon. friend, Dr. Raghurir Sinh, who is a lawyer, also a scholar, and he knows all these things very well, but here before the House he pleads ignorance. Anyway, we are not connected.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: I have not been on the Board of Censors.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: And when I talk about this, I cannot ignore what place Indian films have got in the international market. You go to China, you go to Moscow, you will hear the name of the film "Awara". Then if you look into. . .

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: Everybody sings that song.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: Now, that you know. Songs you know. What you find is that there are Indian films which have earned international awards, and look to their names, look to their contents. It is an honour. And what we should aim at is to produce such pictures like "Pathar Panchali", "Jagte Raho", "Do Ankhen Barah Hath", etc., etc.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: My friend does not seem to know the actual meaning of "Pathar Panchali".

AN HON. MEMBER: He will take lessons in Bengali.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: I am not a Bengali, but I know what it means. Whatever I could understand, I have given you the meanings. Anyway, what I mean to say is that there is sufficient scope and there is necessity for improving the standard of our films. Films, as everyone has pointed out, have immense potentialities of publicity, propaganda, for raising the moral standards and all that.

I do not agree that mythological films should not be produced. They should be produced in the proper atmosphere. Now, Sir, who cares to read our Puranas, who cares to read our ancient stories and all that? The people have got neither the time nor the energy and films are the only means which can let our people know what our past was. Now, Sir, I would like to just say a few words, because other hon. Members have spoken about the children's films, health films, tourist films, about the documentaries.

108 RSD—5.

The Government of India's production of documentaries is very good. I have seen them so often. But they are not shown in such cinema halls where other films are shown and I think it is necessary that some steps should be taken. At the same time, I know of exhibitors who are against the orders of the Information and Broadcasting Ministry. Regarding the news reels, they even protest why they should show these films free of cost. I am sure the hon. Minister agrees that his documentaries should be shown more and more.

Now, Sir, there is another aspect and that is about the foreigners coming in and shooting pictures in India. There is no censorship. As I have tried to know, there is no censor. Andbody can come to India, have his own camera, his own raw film, and go on shooting all the slums, all the bad things which can be exhibited in foreign countries. I would like the Censor Board or the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting to find some way out to stop such things, and about that, I think, Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand has said a lot.

Now, Sir, the main question comes and that is a very ticklish problem to be solved. What should be the standards of our Censor Boards? Can they have double standards, one for the India-produced films and one for the foreign films? Now, with regard to foreign films, I have not yet been able to follow and understand as to why it is essential that foreign films should be shown in India, except those dealing with scientific matters or art and culture or something of the sort. Life in this part of the globe is quite different from the life in the other part of the globe. I wonder whether the hon. Minister would be able to tell us as to how many of our films are shown in various other countries and the number of films which are shown here.

4 P.M.

It has become the fashion, that anybody who has to pass the time and who has got easy money in his pocket

[Shri Amolakh Chand.]

gets hold of a friend or two, goes to an English picture, sits there for two hours, talks this way and that way, and comes back with the expectation that he may see also an Indian film like that. That is why we heard that the industry was now trying to produce such type of films. What is the difficulty for the censor to censor these modern films according to Indian standards? If you do not want that the Indian pictures should exhibit such things which do not come within the definition of decency, morality and all these words—which are not defined anywhere in this Bill—why do the foreign pictures with foreign costumes and with foreign manners not offend you? I fail to understand this, and I would like to know something from the hon. Minister for my own personal edification as to what is the method they employ in censoring these foreign films.

Now, Sir, I would just like to make some remarks about the constitution of the Film Censor Board. I thought that the hon. Minister with all his experience of the British and the American laws on the subject would have brought forward a comprehensive Bill to have a proper censoring of the films. I do not know, Sir, if he even cared to go through the constitution of the Ceylonese Censor Board or the Hayes Code of the United States or the Cinematograph Act of 1938 of the United Kingdom. I have tried to see them, Sir, and I find that there in England it is the Board of Trade which deals with this matter, and in the United States of America they have not yet come to a definite conclusion as to what sort of censoring there should be on the motion pictures, as they call them. Sir, I was surprised to find the Film Advisory Committee reconstituted, and for the interest of the House I would like to submit some of the names. The Joint Chief Controllers of Imports and Exports of Bombay, Calcutta and Madras will be the Chairman of the respective Committees. I fail to understand as to what these

Joint Chief Controllers of Imports and Exports of Bombay, Calcutta and Madras have to do with the film censoring or the advisory panel. . .

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN): That is in regard to raw film. It is not censoring. That is in regard to import of raw film and distribution.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: He wants to know about the finished film.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: What I find before me is that the Film Advisory Committee is reconstituted. The Government of India has decided to reconstitute the Central and Regional Committees.

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN: That is for raw film distribution.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: I am privileged to hear from the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister that it is something else than what has been given in the papers. Presumably he would send another press note to correct the wrong impression. The members of the Central Committee will also be members of the Regional Committees. Anyway, the copies which I have with me disclose that.

DR RAGHUBIR SINH: Not explicitly worded.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: May be. Probably the Controllers of Import and Export as Chairmen will look into the question whether films should be imported or exported or something of the sort.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: Are we exporting raw films?

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: My friend Dr. Raghubir Singh is becoming raw at the moment. I am dealing with films at the moment.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: He is talking of raw film.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND Now, Sir, I tried to go through this Bill and certainly I was surprised to find that the hon Minister still wants that the State of Jammu and Kashmir should be outside the Film Censor Board. I do not know what the special reason for this is. I think, there are valid reasons why the films that are shown in the State of Jammu and Kashmir should only be films which have passed through the Censor. While attempting to amend sub-section (2) of section 1, he does not want that Jammu and Kashmir should be included.

Then, going through clause 4, on page 2 line 5, what I find is "and the Board may, after examining or having the film examined in the prescribed manner". I want to understand what the prescribed manner is. When I look at clause 7B on page 5, it is only delegation of powers by the Board. The Board can function; the Chairman himself can function as the Board, the two members of the Board can also function as the Board, the Chairman and other members can function as the Board, and they have to examine. I could not understand what the idea is behind the statement "after examining or having the film examined in the prescribed manner". What I thought was that by "prescribed manner" he was referring to the old rules in which this expression was there.

SHRI P D HIMATSINGKA. It means, prescribed by rules that may be framed.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND If Mr Himatsingka, solicitor and advocate as he is, will bear with me for a minute. I will just explain the point. The point is that if you look at clause 5A(1), the wording is "If, after examining a film or having it examined in the manner provided in this Act" It is examined in the prescribed manner, that is under the rules, and that rule was only applicable when the whole thing itself was a part of the rules under the Cinematograph Act. But now you have grafted the rules bodily into the Act itself. What I submit is that

DR B V KESKAR I do not want to interrupt the speaker in his beautiful speech. But I would point out that all the rules have not been incorporated here. There will be rules, but no important directive will be in the rules. It will be in the Act.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND What I am suggesting is that, when we come forward with a piece of legislation, it should be clear. The hon Minister could have explained the position, because all my amendments were before him. Naturally I wanted to understand the position, and yet I feel that having put that thing in the statute, again referring to the prescribed manner at one place and at another place to the manner provided in this Act leads only to confusion. And this might lead to more litigation because the film people are litigation-minded.

Then, we find in sub-clause (2) of clause 4 —

"No action under clause (ii), clause (iii) or clause (iv) of sub-section (1) shall be taken by the Board except after giving an opportunity to the applicant for representing his views in the matter."

No time-limit is prescribed because from what little I know of these film people, sometimes a notice is issued. No time-limit is prescribed and they can come after a month or two and say that because no time-limit was prescribed, therefore we are now approaching or giving our own point of view. These are the things which I wanted to suggest. If the hon Minister, as advised by the Law Ministry, feels that these amendments are worth considering, I hope he will consider them, but if he says that he is not in a position to accept any of the amendments, I will be happy not even to move them.

Coming to clause 5B, we find the words 'the film or any part of it is against the interests of the security of the State'. 'Security of the State' is a defined term, we know about it. 'Friendly relations with foreign States'—well and good. 'Public

[Shri Amolakh Chand.]
order—understandable. Then are these words—‘decency or morality’. ‘Decency’ according to Indian standards or foreign standards? ‘Morality’ according to the individual concerned or to the Indian standards or the foreign standards? So, what I feel is when you want to give directions to the film industry or to organise the Film Censor Board, please be clear in your own mind as to what is meant by ‘decency’ or ‘morality’. Or by ‘culture’, do you mean this culture? This is what I am concerned about. What I want is, when you enact a law, let it be definite; let the people understand what they have to produce, what they have not to produce, because as recommended by the Film Enquiry Committee, there was to be advice available to the producers in a very friendly and frank manner. What we find is, the Government of India could not make up its mind whether they should have it or not.

I tried to understand clause 7F; but I failed. You say, ‘No suit or other legal proceeding shall lie against the Central Government’—well and good. No action should lie against the Central Government. ‘The Board’—very good, ‘advisory panel or any officer or member of the Central Government’—I could not understand what these mean. I could understand that this ‘member’ refers to the ‘Central Government, Board, advisory panel’ this, that or the other. But ‘member of the Central Government’ means a Minister I do not know if there are other interpretations on it. But certainly, I would like to know whether the idea is that even a member of the Central Government is exempted. The Central Government functions only through the Secretary to the Ministry and nobody else. So, what I feel is that we should thank the hon. Minister if he would give a statutory position to the Film Censor Board which was till now only the creation of the powers of the Central Government. But then, at the same time, I would like the hon. Minister to look into all the points that have been raised on the floor of the House

and see if the rules that are going to be changed as a result of this enactment do provide and ventilate the feelings and aspirations of the people of India.

श्रीमती सावित्री निगम (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभापति महोदय, वैसे तो इस सिनेमाटोग्राफ बिल में जो अमेंडमेंट मूव किया गया है, वह किसी प्रकार भी विवाद स्पंद नहीं है, किन्तु इस अवसर का लाभ उठा कर अन्य सदस्यों की तरह मैं भी माननीय मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान उन फिल्मों की ओर दिलाना चाहती हूँ, जो कि सचमुच आज किसी भी विचारशील व्यक्ति के लिए एक विकट समस्या का रूप धारण कर चुके हैं। इस विषय में जो बातें कही जा चुकी हैं, उनको मैं किसी प्रकार दुहरा कर सदन का समय लेना नहीं चाहती। लेकिन मेरा विश्वास है कि अगर इन समस्याओं को सही ढंग से माननीय डा० केसकर साहब के सामने रखा जायगा, तो शायद जिस प्रकार संगीत के विषय में उन्होंने बावजूद तमाम कठिनाइयों के और तमाम आलोचनाओं के, एक बहुत ऊंचा स्तर संगीत का उठा दिया है, उसी प्रकार वे फिल्म का भी स्तर ऊंचा उठा सकेंगे। इसी कारण मैं इस अवसर का लाभ उठा रह हूँ।

श्रीमन्, इन पिछले ५, ६ वर्षों से दृश्य और श्रव्य साधनों में सब से प्रभावशाली अस्त्र जनमानस को प्रभावित करने का सिनेमा या चल चित्र है, उसके स्तर में तेजी से गिरावट आ रही है। इस सम्बन्ध में अनेक संसद सदस्यों ने तरह तरह से प्रकाश डाला है। इस समय जब कि देश में आधे से कहीं अधिक संख्या में लोग अशिक्षित हैं, हम एक प्रजातांत्रिक व्यवस्था की प्रतिष्ठा करने जा रहे हैं, देश में समाजवादी समाज की रचना का उद्देश्य लेकर आगे बढ़ रहे हैं और हमें समझदार और जाग्रत नागरिकों की सब से अधिक आवश्यकता है। ऐसे समय में हम इस प्रभावशाली माध्यम को जन जन

को शिक्षित बनाने में और उनके हृदय में देश भक्ति, राष्ट्र प्रेम तथा कर्तव्य पालन की भावना उत्पन्न करने में आसानी से उपयोग में ला सकते थे, लेकिन दुर्भाग्यवश ऐसा नहीं हो सका। आज जिस किस्म के चित्र बन रहे हैं, उनका समाज पर बहुत ही बुरा प्रभाव पड़ रहा है। जैसा कि बहिन सीता परमानन्द जी ने कहा कि जेबकटी और धोखाधड़ी की शिक्षा सिनेमा के द्वारा मिल रही है, वह बिल्कुल सच है।

श्रीमन्, सबसे अधिक जो एक हानिकारक चीज हमें इन फिल्मों के द्वारा बढ़ती हुई दिखाई देती है, वह यह है कि बाल नारियाँ और बाल पुरुषों की संख्या बढ़ती जा रही है। मनोवैज्ञानिक या साइकालोजिस्ट्स के लिए यह एक बड़ी भारी समस्या उठ खड़ी हुई है। जो कम उम्र के छोटे छोटे बच्चे इस तरह के विकृत रोमांस और प्रेम की कहानियाँ फिल्मों में देखते हैं, वे एक प्रकार से बाल नारी और बाल पुरुष का रूप धारण कर लेते हैं। यही कारण है कि ऐसी अर्धविकसित अवस्था में अनेक बच्चे, बच्चियाँ इस प्रकार के जो अस्पताल हैं, उनमें भेजे जा रहे हैं। अभी मेरी एक एक्सपर्ट से बातचीत हो रही थी और उन्होंने बताया कि पिछले पाँच छः वर्षों में ऐसे बच्चे बच्चियों की संख्या बहुत बढ़ गई है और उनका इलाज बहुत कठिन हो जाता है, क्योंकि अभी तक हमारे देश में नये किस्म के औषधालय हैं और न आवश्यक यंत्र है। इसलिए मैं माननीय मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान इस ओर दिलाना चाहती हूँ कि उनको शीघ्रातिशीघ्र कुछ न कुछ ऐसे कदम उठाने चाहियें, जो कि इन फिल्मों में सुधार लाने में सहायक हों।

मैं यह मानती हूँ कि फिल्म सेंसर बोर्ड ने काफी प्रशंसनीय काम किया है। समय समय पर वे लोग अपने स्टेटमेंट निकालते रहते हैं, जिनसे पता चलता है कि वे काफी कोशिश में हैं कि जैसे फिल्म आज सिनेमा जगत में चल रहे हैं, वैसे कम से कम आगे न

आने पायें। लेकिन यह उस समय तक नहीं हो सकेगा, जब तक कि यह जो फिल्म सेंसर बोर्ड बना हुआ है, उसके अधिकारों को सरकार अधिक न बढ़ाये। अभी जितने अधिकार दिये गये हैं, उन अधिकारों के द्वारा वे केवल कहानी में कांट छांट करते हैं।

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU in the Chair.)]

उसके बाद वे थोड़ा डाईलाग को भी सुधारने की कोशिश करते हैं, लेकिन इस के मामले में और अभी आनन्द चन्द जी ने जैसा कहा कि बहुत सी चीजें ऐसी होती हैं, जो असल में जो रूल्स हैं और रेग्युलेशंस हैं उनके अन्दर तो नहीं आ सकती, लेकिन जो चीजें रूल्स और रेग्युलेशंस के अन्दर आ सकती हैं वे उनसे भी कहीं अश्लील, बलगर और खराब किस्म की होती हैं। जिनका प्रभाव किसी भी कोमल व्यक्ति पर, नवयुवक पर या नवयुवती पर बहुत ही खराब और हानिकारक पड़ता है।

श्री उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री प्रकाश नारायण सप्रू) : सड़क पर चलते हुए भी वे बहुत खराब चीजें देखते हैं।

श्रीमती सावित्री निगम : श्रीमन्, मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह निवेदन करना चाहती हूँ कि यदि वे फिल्म सेंसर बोर्ड को फिर से रिआर्गनाइज करके उसके अधिकारों को और बढ़ावे और उनको जो अधिकार दिये गये हैं उनमें उतनी रिजिडिटी न रहे जितनी कि है बल्कि कुछ फ्लेक्सिबिलिटी रखी जाय, तो शायद वह कुछ ज्यादा संशोधन कर के फिल्मों का स्तर कुछ ऊँचा उठा सके।

बहुत से लोग बराबर यह प्रश्न करते हैं आखिर सेंसर बोर्ड की निगाह से ऐसी फिल्म कैसे गुजर जाती है और फिल्मों के ऐसे नाम कैसे गुजर जाते हैं लेकिन अगर वे फिल्म सेंसर बोर्ड के सदस्यों से मिल कर उनकी कठिनाइयों

[श्रीमती सावित्री निगम]

को देखे तो उन्हें पता चलेगा कि पूरा फिल्म व्यवसाय एक तरफ रहता है, कानूनी इटर-प्रिटेसन करने वाले उनके बहुत उम्दा उम्दा वकील एक तरफ होते हैं और दूसरी तरफ फिल्म सेंसर बोर्ड के कुछ बेचारे सदस्य होते हैं और उनके लिये यह बहुत ही असम्भव सा काम होता है कि वे उस आर्गेनाइज्ड संस्था का मुकाबिला कर सकें। जो फिल्म के व्यवसायी हैं, उनका तो केवल एक ही उद्देश्य रह गया है कि वे अधिक से अधिक रुपया कमायें, चाहे भारतीय संस्कृति को अधिक से अधिक धक्का पहुंच जाय, चाहे देश कोई नैतिकता को धक्का पहुंच जाय, उसकी कोई चिन्ता उन्हें नहीं होती, उनका तो केवल-मात्र उद्देश्य यह होता है कि वे ऐसी फिल्में बनायें जो कि चलनाऊ हों, जो कि ऐसे गानों से भर हो जिनको कि लोग पसंद करें, चाहे वे गन्दे से गन्दे ही हों न हो और उनको अधिक से अधिक रुपयो की कमाई हो।

श्री उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री प्रकाश नारायण सम्प्र) : आप किताबों के ऊपर भी सेंसर बोर्ड चाहेंगी ?

श्रीमती सावित्री निगम : मैं यही कहना चाहती हूँ कि जितना नुकसान एक हजार अश्लील पुस्तकों को पढ़ कर नहीं होता है उतना नुकसान एक फिल्म से होता है, क्योंकि फिल्म को एक बार में बहुत से लोगों को दिखाया जाता है और अपठ जनता को दिखाया जाता है। फिल्मों को कम समझने वाली जनता ज्यादातर देखती है और जो समझदार लोग हैं वे कम देखते हैं। पुस्तकों में तो केवल उन लोगों को नुकसान पहुंचता है जो कि पढ़े लिखे हैं लेकिन फिल्मों तो बेचारी अपठ जनता को बहुत भ्रम में डाल देती हैं और उनका उनके ऊपर बहुत गलत प्रभाव पड़ता है।

इसी प्रकार से, मैंने यह भी सुना है कि बहुत सी फिल्मों में सेंसर बोर्ड के सामने में

गुजरने के बाद और उनसे सर्टिफिकेट लेने के बाद कुछ ऐसे अश जोड़ दिये जाते हैं जो कि बहुत ही भेदे होते हैं और गिरावट को, नैतिक पतन को लाने वाले होते हैं। इसके लिये भी ऐसा कुछ न कुछ माध्यम निकालना चाहिये जिसके द्वारा कोई भी फिल्म, जो कि प्रचारित हो रही हो उसको जब चाहे तब, किसी की शिकायत आने पर, फिल्म सेंसर बोर्ड वाले अपने पास मंगा सकें और फिर से उसमें काट छाट कर सकें।

श्रीमन्, एक बात के बारे में मैं और कहना चाहती हूँ जो कि बहुत ज्यादा खतरनाक है और जिम विषय पर समय-समय पर बराबर अनेक विचारशील व्यक्तियों ने माननीय मिनिस्टर महोदय का ध्यान दिलाया है, वह है माइथालोजिकल फिल्मों की बात, माइथालोजिकल कहानियों को तोड़ मोड़ कर उसका दुरुपयोग करने और उसका एक्सप्लायटेशन करने की बात। इंडियन माइथालोजी की कहानियां, जो कि लोगों के हृदयों को शानि, अध्यात्म और आत्म-परमात्म के ज्ञान से ओतप्रोत करती रही हैं उनका भी शोषण अब फिल्म व्यवसायी बड़े जोरों से करने लगे हैं। वे कहानियां जो कि हमको संस्कृति, धर्म और प्राचीन महान परम्पराओं के अनुरूप उच्चतर जीवन व्यतीत करने की हमेशा प्रेरण देती हैं, वे अब इन्हीं फिल्मों के कारण लोगों के हृदय में धर्म के प्रति बिल्कुल अविश्वास सा उत्पन्न कर रही हैं। धर्म के प्रति अविश्वास ही नहीं बल्कि जितने भी देवी-देवता और प्रातः स्मरणीय विभूतियां हैं, उनके प्रति एक घृणा की भावना उत्पन्न कर रही हैं।

श्रीशोलभद्र यात्री (बिहार) : अश्लीलता क्या है ?

श्रीमती सावित्री निगम : माननीय सदस्य महोदय से मैं प्रार्थना करूंगी कि उनको जो भी प्रश्न मुझ से करने हैं, उनको जब हम

बाहर चल कर बातचीत करेंगे, तब कर लेंगे, अभी मुझे बोलने दें ।

श्री उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री प्रकाश नारायण सप्रू) : बातचीत तो यहीं होनी चाहिये ।

श्रीमती सावित्री निगम : श्रीमन्, अभी मैं ट्रेन में एक सफर में जा रही थी और वहां मैं दो मां-बेटियों की बातें सुन रही थी । मां से बेटी कह रही थी कि आप कहती हैं कि आई० टी० कालेज की लड़कियां बड़ी अजीब पोशाकें पहनती हैं लेकिन आपने यह नहीं सोचा कि हमारे देवी-देवता क्या पोशाकें पहनते थे । मां ने कहा, कि तूने क्या देवी-देवताओं की पोशाकों को देखा है ? बेटी ने कहा, कि हां, हमने तमाम फिल्मों में देखा है । उनसे तो हमारी आई० टी० कालेज की लड़कियां कहीं अच्छी पोशाक पहनती हैं । तो इस तरह मे हमारे नवयुवक और नव-युवतियों के हृदयों में हमारे जितने भी सम्मानित और प्रातःस्मरणीय देवी-देवता हैं उनके प्रति एक अजीब अश्रद्धा की भावना भरती जा रही है । अभी थोड़े दिन पहले मुझे "शेषनाग" फिल्म को देखने का अवसर मिला । शेषनाग फिल्म जो है वह रामायण की उस पतित-गावनी कथा का आधार पर बना है जिसका पठन-पाठन लाखों व्यक्ति नियम-पूर्वक करते हैं और बड़ी ही श्रद्धा से जिसका पठन-पाठन होता है । लेकिन इस शेषनाग फिल्म में रामायण की कथा को बहुत ही तोड़ा मरोड़ा गया है । उसमें दिखाया गया है कि सती उर्मिला माता से बातचीत करती है और रामचन्द्र जी की प्रशंसा वगैरह करती कहती हैं कि मैं अभी जाती हूँ । रामचन्द्र को आमंत्रित करूंगी, प्रेरित करूंगी कि वह धनुष-यज्ञ में आकर धनुष को तोड़ कर तुम्हारा वरण करे । कहीं भी रामायण में इस प्रकार का घटना नहीं है । न तो बाल्मीकि रामायण में और न तुलसीकृत रामायण में इस प्रकार की घटना है । इसी प्रकार आगे चल कर उस फिल्म में फिर यह दिखाया जाता

है कि लक्ष्मण पुष्प-बाटिका से जा रहे हैं और वहां उर्मिला भी जा रही है और दोनों बिल्कुल माडर्न तरीके से । माडर्न रोमैटिक तरीके से आपस में टकरा जाते हैं । बिल्कुल इसी तरह की उनकी वेब-भूषा है और इसी तरह के अश्लील डायलाग होते हैं ।

श्री टी० पांडे (उत्तर प्रदेश) : सभापति जी, मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस भारत की जो आधुनिक नारियां हैं या जो पुरुष हैं उनके जीवन से क्या आप नाराज हैं जो इस प्रकार की बातें आप कर रही हैं । क्या आप देश की तरक्की नहीं चाहती हैं ?

श्रीमती सावित्री निगम : नाराजगी की कोई बात नहीं है । जिन देवी-देवताओं से, जिन सती उर्मिला के चरित्र से आज भारत की ही नहीं, सारे संसार की नारियां एक सीख ले सकती हैं और उनके पदचिह्नों पर चल कर अपना जीवन गौरवपूर्ण बना सकती हैं उन सती उर्मिला का इस प्रकार से एक बिल्कुल भट्टे और अश्लील ढंग से लक्ष्मण से टकरा जाना और सस्ते किस्म का वार्तालाप करना, मैं सोचती हूँ, किसी भी व्यक्ति के लिये जो कि हिन्दु धर्म पर रती भर भी श्रद्धा रखता है एक असहनीय घटना है । इसी प्रकार से, जब दशरथ रामचन्द्र को वनवास देने को आज्ञा को देहाते हैं तो उस समय लक्ष्मण उनको बिल्कुल आधुनिक पुत्रों की भाँति डाटते और फटकारते हैं और उनका इतना अपमान करते हैं कि शेषनाग फिल्म के इस दृश्य को देख कर रोंगटे खड़े हो जाते हैं ।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : यह रामायण की कथा हो रही है या आप बिल पर बोल रही हैं ।

श्रीमती सावित्री निगम : श्रीमन्, इस प्रपंग को बनाने का मेरा जो तात्पर्य है वह यह है कि या तो माईथालोजिकल फिल्म

[श्रीमती सावित्री निगम]

बनाई ही न जाय और यदि वे बनाई जाय तो उनको इस सतर्कता के साथ बनाया जाय कि ऐसे सम्माननीय व्यक्तियों का और देवी-देवताओं का, जिनके ऊपर, जिनके चरणों पर, करोड़ों हिन्दु जनता हमेशा श्रद्धा से नत रहती है उनका इस प्रकार से अपमान नहीं किया जाय ।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : कौन से देवता

श्रीमती सावित्री निगम : इस प्रकार की फिल्मों के द्वारा आजकल क्या हो रहा है ? इस प्रकार की फिल्मों में घटनाओं को जो इस तरह से तोड़ा मरोड़ा जाता है उसका कारण यह है कि लोग अपनी दमित इच्छाओं और वासनाओं को देवी-देवताओं के चरित्र पर थोप देते हैं और उसके साथ ही साथ वे यह चाहते हैं कि आजकल का जो ढंग है, तरीका है, उसको अपनाने में, यह कह कर कि जब हमारे देवी-देवता ही ऐसे दुश्चरित्र थे या ऐसा काम करते थे तो हमें ऐसा करने में क्या हानि है, उन्हें एक सुविधा मिल जाय ।

तो, आज जब कि हमारे देश में अध्यात्मवाद की नींव पर एक नैतिक शक्ति का महल खड़ा करने की आवश्यकता है तब ऐसा करने के बजाय ये फिल्में एक तरह से स्तोत्रपायजनिग कर रही हैं और हमारे देश के नैतिक स्वास्थ्य को बिल्कुल नष्ट करके हमें बहुत जबरदस्त धक्का पहुंचा रही है ।

श्रीमन्, किसी भी देश की समृद्धि, किसी भी राष्ट्र की सुरक्षा वहां के नागरिकों के चरित्र पर ही निर्भर होती है । और इन फिल्मों के कथानकों द्वारा, जिससे कि ये फिल्में हमारे मनोरंजन का साधन और धार्मिक शिक्षा का सबसे बड़ा माध्यम बन सकती हैं, उन्हीं के द्वारा लोगों को एक प्रकार से नास्तिक बनाने की शिक्षा दी जा रही है ।

श्री उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री प्रकाश नारायण सप्रू) : नास्तिक बनाने में क्या खरबी है ?

श्रीमती सावित्री निगम : मेरे कहने का तात्पर्य यह है कि जब लोगों को देवी-देवताओं पर अश्रद्धा होगी और धर्म पर अश्रद्धा होगी, तो उनका विश्वास हटता चला जायेगा ।

तो श्रीमन्, मेरे दो अनुरोध हैं । पहला यह कि फिल्म सेंसर बोर्ड की ताकत को बढ़ाया जाय, उसका रियोरियंटेशन किया जाय, उसका रियॉर्गेनाइजेशन किया जाय । दूसरा अनुरोध मेरा यह है कि माइथालोजिकल फिल्मों के बनने पर रोक लगाई जाय वह इस प्रकार से लगायी जाय कि एक एड्वाइजरी बोर्ड बनाया जाय, जिसमें माइथालोजिकल ईं-टीरीज के ज्ञाता हों, विद्वान पुरुष हों, जिन्होंने हमारे धार्मिक ग्रंथों का गम्भीर अध्ययन किया है और उनको उसका सदस्य बनाया जाय । पहले उनकी एड्वाइजरी ली जाय तब सेंसर बोर्ड के सामने उन फिल्मों को रखा जाय । जिस कथा या कथानक के आधार पर फिल्म की रचना हुई है पहले वह उनकी निगाह से गुजर जाय और उसके ऊपर उनकी राय ली जाय कि वह सही है कि नहीं क्योंकि जब मैंने 'शेषनाग' फिल्म पर लिखा-पढ़ी की तो मुझे पता चला कि वह न तो तुलसीकृत रामायण का है और न बाल्मीकि कृत रामायण का है बल्कि किसी काश्मीरी रामायण के आधार पर उसकी रचना हुई है । इसीलिये मैं चाहती हूं कि माइथालोजिकल ग्रंथों के ज्ञाता जब तक उस एड्वाइजरी बोर्ड में नहीं रहेंगे, और जब तक कथानकों का अध्ययन करने के पश्चात् अपनी स्वीकृति न देंगे, तब तक फिल्म सेंसर बोर्ड केवल माइथालोजिकल फिल्मों पर अपनी राय देने के लिये सर्वथा असमर्थ है । केवल इस कारण ही मैंने इस सदन का यह समय लिया है । मेरा यह अनुरोध है कि श्रीप्रातिशीघ्र इसको किया जाय कि एक एड्वाइजरी बोर्ड एक्सपर्ट्स का जरूर

बनाया जाय। जिसका काम हो केवल माइथालोजिकल फिल्मों पर अपनी राय देना और जब तक कथानकों पर, डाइलाग पर उनकी पूरी स्वीकृति न मिल जाय तब तक उन फिल्मों को सेंसर बोर्ड के सामने भी न लाया जाय। यही मेरा अनुरोध है और केवल इसीलिये मैंने श्रीमन्, आपका समय लिया है।

दूसरी एक आखिरी बात मुझे यह कहनी है कि माइथालोजिकल फिल्मों के विषय में एक इन्क्वायरी कमेटी बैठा दी जाय। मैंने जो उदाहरण दिया है केवल उसमें ही नहीं, अनेक दूसरे फिल्मों, जैसे सती अनुसुया, सती सावित्री, अंजली आदि फिल्मों को ले लीजिये, सब में माइथालोजिकल कथा कहानियों को तोड़ा मरोड़ा गया है और इसमें लेशमात्र भी बढ़ावा या अत्युक्ति नहीं है।

इसके अतिरिक्त मैं एक और बात कहूंगी कि अब तक जिस तरह से फिल्म सेंसर बोर्ड का काम हो रहा है वह बिल्कुल असन्तोषजनक है और मेरा अनुरोध है कि उसका रिआर्गेनाइजेशन भी शीघ्र होना चाहिये। धन्यवाद।

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am a bit apprehensive that I may not be able to focus the attention of the House after such varied, entertaining and interesting speeches like that of my hon. friend, Shri Amolakh Chand, and after mythological speeches like that of Mrs. Nigam. (*Interruption*). It was indeed a mythological speech.

I wish, Mr. Vice-Chairman, the Ministry had taken this opportunity to review the working of the principal Act and bring in a comprehensive legislation covering all the aspects of film production, distribution as well as exhibition, instead of only trying to include these Rules in the principal Act.

Sir, much has been said from all sides of the House that today we are having a good number of bad pictures. Of course, I am not taking an attitude that only because the Government is not enforcing a very strict censorship, these bad pictures are coming about. In a way, Sir, the contemporary art reflects the contemporary life.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Quite right.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Sir, literature, paintings and also films, in a very broad and general way, reflect our contemporary life. When the whole nation had been fighting for its independence, we were fired with enthusiasm and hope for the future. During that period of 1935 to 1946 we were producing some really very good pictures, of which the whole nation can be proud. Even then, Sir, there were a few bad pictures. I do not say that there were no bad pictures in that period, but taken as a whole, I think, Sir, many friends will bear me out that, by and large, the pictures that were produced in spite of the backward technique, used to reflect the urges of our masses. Today, Sir, certainly bad pictures are coming into being, and more and more of them are coming into being, in spite of the great strides that have been taken in the technique of cinematography. Certainly the system of production ought to be improved. At the same time, Sir, it also reflects that we are not able to take the nation forward and fire the whole nation with that enthusiasm, for national regeneration and national reconstruction. Had it been otherwise, had we imbued our masses with that enthusiasm and with that spirit of socialism, which almost all the parties in India adhere to, certainly, I think, far better stuff than the one which we are witnessing today would have come forth from our studios. But that does not mean that nothing can be done from the side of the Government or from the side of other organisations to improve the present system of production or the

[Shri V. Prasad Rao.]

present standard of our pictures. Certainly all those things that were pointed out are there.

There are pictures which show nothing but gloom and which do not give any hope for our future, and also there are pictures which are very vulgar and which smack of nothing but carnal feelings. But why is that so? Firstly, I think, the mode of production or the system of production itself is mainly responsible for the production of such things. The main aim of the producer today is to make as much money as possible. These producers indulge in only tall talk. They speak of art, of decency and of noble sentiments, but the real sentiment that governs them in the production of these pictures is nothing but money. Well, I have some friends working in the cinema industry. I had a talk with them and I also reminded them of the days when they were with us in the same colleges and when they were aspiring for so many big and noble things. I asked them as to why they were producing such cheap pictures as these. They said that as long as they had to compete with certain people in the field, they could not help producing such pictures. Not that they were incapable of producing some decent pictures, but they said that in the system of production itself, in the very method and mechanism of production, such things were inherent.

Apart from that, Mr. Vice-Chairman, a sort of monopoly is developing which is trying to typify these pictures. Today, Sir, no ordinary person can afford to produce a picture. Unless one has got at least half a million of rupees, he cannot dream of producing even a simple picture. In spite of the fact that there should be freedom of expression, freedom of art and freedom of so many things, certainly, Sir, an ordinary man or a common man cannot have that freedom. It is only their freedom that we are thinking of. We are not thinking of the freedom of the masses of this country. In America and Hollywood

actually the people who decide the type of pictures that are to be produced are the biggest financiers and bankers. It is not the glamorous actors who decided what type of pictures should be produced. It is not the technicians who decide what sort of pictures should be produced. It is the big financiers, it is the big controllers of studios who dictate and decide what type of pictures are going to be produced. They can produce any kind of pictures. They can produce a picture which may exhibit friendship towards the Soviet Union. If they want to pursue cold war, certainly such pictures are produced which promote the interests of the American big business. I do not mean to say that all those pictures that are coming from the U.S.A. are bad. I remember there were some glorious pictures which have inspired many. "For whom the Bell Tolls" was one such and it made the heart of every democrat swell. That was a glorious picture. There was another depicting the freedom movement in Mexico, the peasant revolution in Mexico Viva Zapata. So also the life of Emily Zola. The Great Dictator of M. Verdoux—such pictures they can produce. But by and large, they are but the exceptions. These are the exceptions, not the general rule. You talk of freedom of expression, freedom of art. But it is really the freedom that is given to big finance, freedom to the rich to decide what they want. So I cannot agree when it is said that censorship should be left to these people, these industrialists to decide what they should produce. It should be properly controlled by the Government. Certainly they who profess to build up socialism, who talk of a socialist pattern of society, would want that our literature, our art and our films should be imbued with that spirit to regenerate man and to enoble man and to see that everybody contributes his mite to the construction of our society. If these things are to be there, then certainly some sort of control must also be there. We cannot allow the producers to continue as they have been doing. Our complaint is that

while pictures depicting sex and pictures of a carnal type are there unaffected, pictures depicting the struggle of the common man, the struggle of the peasant for land, they are affected. That is why I referred to the directive issued by the Ministry. What are these things? In the whole of these things, there is nothing to ban the propagation of superstitions. In the name of mythology, superstitions are propagated. There is no doubt there are stories from mythology and the hon. Lady Member over there was saying that she likes mythological pictures. I have not seen many myself, but I have certainly seen a few. In one I find Sita draped in 1958 nylon sari, as if she is in a beauty parade. What is all this?

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: I did not say I liked them. What I said was that when compared to the so-called social stories or themes of today, they are treated better. I did not say that I like them and I did not say that they are without drawbacks. Even in mythology they express joy by a dance and sorrow by a song. I don't deny that.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: The whole trouble is when I refer to mythological pictures, the hon. Member speaks as if she is an expert in mythology. That is also mythology. Who can be an expert in mythology? I know in the twentieth century somebody wrote something and said it was part of the Ramayana . . .

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: To those who do not believe in God, nobody can explain. To those who believe in God, at least an explanation is possible.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: I hope my hon. friends will not monopolise God also, just as they have monopolised many things, including political power.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Even through pictures you can know God.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: I am talking about mythological pictures and not of God or anything else.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: But mythological pictures have a religious background.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: There is nothing now that bans superstition. Only the other day I saw a picture where child marriage was glorified, where it was said that marriages are all made actually in heaven and that there is nothing like choice, that it has nothing to do with choice of any kind. This is the sort of thing you see now. Why, even in 1937 and 1938 we had better pictures. But now such things are being allowed by the censors. While that is there, here a mild picture depicting the struggle of the peasantry their hunger for land, when such a picture comes up, I am sorry to say, it is banned on the pretext that it is accentuation of class distinctions, that it is stimulating class hatred. I do not know how that accentuates that. We all now say that land is to go to the tiller, and we are all agreed that land reform should be implemented before the end of 1959. I think the Congress also has passed such a resolution. Whether they all mean it seriously or not, I don't know. But at least they have passed a resolution that by the end of 1959, this measure should be implemented. If the same urge in the peasant, his hunger for land is depicted, how does it come to mean accentuation of social or class conflict? This conflict is already there. These aspirations are already there. But the moment it is depicted in the picture, it comes under the axe of the censors. Shri Venkateswara Rao is not here. He was once a member of the Film Board. The Telugu pictures "Drohi" was concerned and because some of the landlords of the erstwhile Madras State did not like it they referred it to the full Board. They did not like the depicting of the peasant fighting against the landlord for getting his share. It was sent to the Film Board and then some portions were deleted.

[Shri V. Prasad Rao.]

What I meant to stress is that when the urges of the common man are depicted, they come under the axe in the present state of things whereas they let go so many sexy things depicted under some pretext or the other. Much has already been said on this and I do not want to repeat it now. Now, what is to be done? You may ask, what can the Government do about it? Certainly the rules and directives to the censors can be modified so that pictures that rouse the base instincts are not allowed. Otherwise their effect will be most devastating on the minds of the youngsters especially. On their minds they produce really a very bad effect and some provision must be made to see that such pictures are not allowed to be produced. That is why stricter control should be there. Without stricter control you cannot bring about any betterment in our films. As it is, today, absolutely no training is necessary for making a film. If a rich business man, a young man of 25 or 30 takes a fancy to pictures and if he has a couple of lakhs in his pocket, then certainly he can go in for producing pictures. For any profession you need such and such qualifications. Even if you want to be a peon, you must have the minimum qualification of literacy. But here for producing pictures no qualifications are necessary.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: For being a politician also no qualifications are necessary.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Here the only qualification is a fancy for films coupled with money and nothing else is needed. Such is the state of affairs today. We cannot allow such things to continue. If any such capitalist bacha is going to produce a picture, then certainly that is not going to be very beneficial to our nation. So a certain qualification must be prescribed for the producer. A sort of licence should be issued. So also for directors. The Film Enquiry Committee has also pointed out that a Cinema

Institute should be there for training the technicians, especially the directors. Today actually you need not have any qualifications even to direct a picture. I know a big zamindar who has not got any other qualification except some money and a very lecherous attitude. That was his only qualification to become a cinema director. He could afford to spend millions of rupees and he did spend some and produced very bad pictures which were thrown at the nation. So certainly besides introducing a system of licensing to test the *bona fides* of the producers, at the same time we must have an Institute to train technicians as well as directors. More especially the immediate need is for training directors.

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I come to the structure of monopolies. Taking advantage of the raw film scarcity today some vested interests who are already entrenched in the film field do not want any newcomers or new competition to come up. They want to monopolise all the raw film that is available. Some days back a memorandum had been submitted by some of the South Indian producers including, I think Shri B. N. Reddy, who is also a member of the Legislative Council of Andhra Pradesh. In that it has been very clearly pointed out how some big studio owners are trying to shut out entirely new and young enterprising producers from coming into the field and how they are trying to stick on to their monopoly.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: Is he a small producer?

SHRI V. PRASADA RAO: Small producers and new entrants are entirely shut out from the field. I will give a particular instance. Recently in Hyderabad production was started not by any unqualified fellows, but some of the artists and technicians formed themselves into a sort of a team under a very competent director whose picture was acclaimed as one of the

biggest in the South. They had also one of the best photographers and a few actors. They all joined together and they wanted to produce a picture themselves. Certainly that is the best unit that can be had but when an application was made for film to the South Indian Regional Committee, it was rejected on the plea that they were entering a new field. He was a director himself and he was having some 15 years' experience and some of the photographers also had years of experience but still they could not be given film because it was said that they were entering a new field. I think they had already produced one picture but even then they were not granted any film quota on this ground that they were new in the field. But the real reason is that some of the big studio owners in the South do not want to face new competition from such young technicians. Because once these technicians and actors themselves form into a team and produce good pictures, that will not be to the advantage of these big owners whose days in the film field will then be over. That is exactly the reason why these people are denied such things. Today a big monopoly racket is working in the film field which is shutting out the enterprising youngsters especially those who are in the field and who want to take up production. And this monopoly racket is working as a great impediment in the way of these youngsters coming up.

Sir, I would say only one more thing and then finish, and it is about the appeal to the Government. He says that rules will be made under this Act. But rules were there previously, and they shut out all the progressive elements and allow only such pictures. Now, what is the remedy provided, if an injustice is done? Here it is stated that an appeal can be made to the Government. Sir, I think the Government is the last resort to which a film producer should go. I think we all understand the ways in which bureaucracy works. Certainly the Minister may be aesthetic-

minded today but that does not mean that tomorrow also he will continue. He might not be there tomorrow. So to entrust these powers to some Secretary or Deputy Secretaries is not at all an advisable thing. The best thing would have been to have a higher tribunal of appeal against the order of the Film Censor Board a judicial tribunal competent to judge these films in the light of the code which you might prepare in the future should have been provided for instead of leaving the power in the hands of the Central Government. A Deputy Secretary may be asked to look into a picture. A film which has already been rejected by a Board of Censors consisting of nine persons cannot be judged by a single Deputy Secretary or a Secretary. As such it is not a correct thing to do. The best thing would have been to have a higher tribunal where all those pictures rejected by the Censors could have been exhibited and their opinion could have taken. Even at this late stage I would request the hon. Minister to consider the question of constituting such a tribunal.

Lastly, I once again appeal that as far as distribution of raw film is concerned, more justice should be done to the young and new producers who are coming up in the field.

SHRI N M LINGAM (Madras): Sir, I thank you for this opportunity though it comes late in the day.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU). But you can continue the next day.

SHRI N M LINGAM: Sir, a great deal has been said not only about the scope of the Bill but about the whole gamut of the film industry and its effect on the morals of the people and on their behaviour. Sir, to me it appears that one important aspect of the question has been overlooked. The principal object of the Bill is to see that the Censorship Board is given a statutory position and that they function effectively under the amending

[Shri N. M. Lingam.]

Bill. But, Sir, the Government has not gone deep into the problem of this censorship. Although the Statement of Objects and Reasons mentions article 19(2) of the Constitution which enables Government to take power to regulate the production and exhibition of films Government have not risen to the occasion and thought it necessary to take such powers. The Statement of Objects and Reasons merely mentions article 19(2). I do not know why Government is so nervous about assuming powers. Probably the Ministry is waiting for a verdict from this House for assuming such powers. From the trend of the speeches it ought to be clear to the hon. Minister that the House is in favour of empowering Government to regulate production and exhibition of films. Sir, I feel that either we should regulate the production and exhibition of films, see that they are wholesome, that they are in tune with the renaissance through which we are passing, that they are in tune with the creative period through which we are passing, that they contribute to the economic and political education of the people and that they do not in any way affect us in a negative manner, or we should give up censorship altogether, because censorship as envisaged in the Bill is bound to be very ineffective, as has been pointed out by several Members very clearly. In the first place no qualification for the censors has been prescribed; secondly, the clause dealing with censorship is very vague. It says, having regard to public order,

safety and security of the State and to public morality and decency, the Censors may pass a film for public exhibition or cause excisions to be made in it or ban a film altogether. But these are vague terms, vague phraseology, probably imported bodily from similar pieces of statutes elsewhere. So in the very nature of things the proposed censorship is bound to be ineffective.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): You will take a little more time?

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: Certainly, a lot more time. But if you will allow me to continue I shall speak for some time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): That will depend on the House.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: We can adjourn now.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: We can adjourn now and he can speak on the next day.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 11th February 1959.